Five essays on Bay Area arts: Grace McCann Morley, Sally Woodbridge, Tom Killion, the Japanese Tea Garden, stone and textile

These short studies highlight and bring together particular arts in the San Francisco Bay Region in the twentieth century. They suggest that topography, natural resources, and cultural history are major factors in the Region's identity as a particular place-world. Not all the cultures that constitute the Region are in consideration here; it focuses on only a few that illustrate the thesis.

The first reviews the accomplishments of Grace Morley, inaugural Director of the San Francisco Museum of Art, serving from 1935 through 1958. The second looks over Sally Woodbridge's four decades of writing on Bay Region residential architecture. The third explores the work of Bay Region artist Tom Killion over recent decades, notably in his 2015 book of woodblock prints, *California's Wild Edge*. The fourth explores the Japanese Tea Garden as a place that is also an edge, between the wild and the cultivated, the surrounding City and the imagined place-world of Japan. The last looks at granite and fiber arts; they have been strong in the Bay Area in the twentieth century.

The studies are informed by the phenomenological inquiries into place and edge by Edward S. Casey at State University New York. In his first book he points out that places are distinct entities and that they can constitute place-worlds or regions. Primarily viewed as spatial they also have a cultural/ temporal dimension, represented in physical structures, history, traditions and thought.

In his study, on edges he has this to say. "This book pursues the thesis that edges are constitutive not only of what we perceive, but also of what we think and of the places and events in which we are situated.[1] A place has multiple edges and it is intimate with them; they implicate each other and adjacent places, too. The SFMA edges artworlds of other places, it exemplifies the region and San Francisco particularly as cosmopolitan. Residential architecture of the Bay Region in the middle third of the twentieth century edges local topographies in distinct ways. The title of Killion's book declares its theme, California as an edge on the Pacific; a geographical take on a pertinent aspect of the state as place-world. The Pacific itself is both place and edge, the threshold of the nearby experienced Bay Region and Japan, an imaginatively experienced

[1] Edward S. Casey, *The World on Edge*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993, Prelude, xiii.

place.
The Japanese Tea Garden is complement to Sally Woodbridge's instances of constructed dwellings meeting topography; it is of and between the wild and the built, there where the natural easily melds with design in the time of experience.

The Formative Years at the San Francisco Museum of Art: Grace Morley, 1935-1958

"When you start a museum with a doubtful Old Master and ninety-eight good, contemporary French prints . . . and have no money at all for purchases, it is impossible to have very clearly defined goals except the major one of bringing the best possible cross sections of modern art to the city, exposing both artists and public to it, trying to help them understand and enjoy it." [2]

Working for UNESCO in India at the conclusion of her life in the arts [she died not long after this letter from 1979], this seems a remote view. But for the fledgling twenty-three years of the San Francisco Museum of Art Grace McCann Morley was the person most closely and steadily involved with its development.

---

[2] Letter to author 22 August, 1979.

Native to the Bay Region with degrees from U.C. Berkeley in Greek and French she went east, first for a doctorate at the University of Paris, then to Harvard's Fogg for a museum training course under Paul Sachs, followed by teaching and then to the Cincinnati Art Museum as Curator. Her return was precipitated by the search for a Director of the restructured San Francisco Museum of Art, soon to open in a new downtown building. Recommended by Walter Heil, Director of both the M.H. de Young Memorial Museum and the Palace of the Legion of Honor, Morley must have seemed an ideal candidate for a museum with strong local roots and galvanized by national aspiration. She came with professional connections, familiarity with other museums, organizations and their resources and well aware of the situation she was coming into. "When I was young, and even as recently as the 30's when I returned here, San Francisco was really remote as far as art was concerned."[3]

Distance fostered regionalism. The San Francisco Art Association, formed by artists and collectors in 1871, had declared in its bylaws the intention to exhibit its members' work. It succeeded in this paced and modest way but the SFAA and more broadly, the city,

[3] Letter to George Culler 3 March, 1958, archives of the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art.

had national ambition. The 1915 Panama-Pacific International Exposition joined local commitment to national ambition. The SFAA brought the Futurists and other contemporary European works to Maybeck's Palace of Fine Arts on the Marina, many from New York's 1913 Armory Show, including Duchamp's *Nude Descending a Staircase*, purchased by a San Francisco collector.

The Exposition closed but the Association, who mostly drove large public art exhibitions for the Bay Region, continued to mount them, of local artists for the greatest part, until financial strains and lack of title provoked closure of the PFA, planned only as a temporary structure. In 1921, together with the San Francisco Musical Association a small, core group incorporated the San Francisco Museum of Art with the plan of buying a site across Van Ness from Civic Center. Only with the self-interested aid of the American Legion and a municipal bond issue did construction begin however and this with the Great Depression unfolding and New York's Museum of Modern Art already open. In 1932 Brown's classicist building, complementing those of Civic Center, opened; the VFW was the first to move in and, taking more area than planned, shouldering the Museum to a side entrance. Floor space was also given over to musical performances but the Art

Association's long-standing goal of a permanent exhibition space had been met even though, as Morley's comment indicates, there was little plan beyond that. For the next twenty-some years determining and maintaining a program was her focus.

The players

"It was the delegated authority, the support of initiative, the lack of interference in detail, and the confidence shown unfailingly in the director's professional competence which allowed the museum to develop and grow so rapidly."[4] Grace Morley wrote this to her successor, George Culler, referring principally to the Board of Trustees. When the Museum itself opened in 1935 the Board president, W.W. Crocker, asked whether she thought that she could fill the galleries without bothering them. Mortimer Fleishacker's reflection on the situation is equally detached, though both were committed to the project. "The San Francisco Museum of Art. I can't say that's been one my most absorbing interests. My father was on the Board and my mother was interested in art. I think I was asked to

[4] ibid.

serve on there more or less to succeed my father."[5]

It's not surprising then that Mrs. Cabot Brown, landscape architect and Womens' Board member, should observe that many on the mens' boards "were not interested in the arts."[6] Even Culler felt of the Board that "as a group they had never quite gotten the concept of trusteeship in relation to the Museum."[7] They were businessmen primarily, encouraging support from their friends, though Crocker and his sister Helen Potter Russell, a Women's Board member, dug into their own pockets more than once to cover year-end expenses.
It was this other board that played the more dynamic role.. Established in 1934 with the "broadest possible roots in the community" and idea of a 'Lady Bountiful' in mind, to function at receptions and previews, "these women were of a caliber to whom that would not have had continuous appeal. They were perfectly willing to do their job socially . . . but they were of a type to respond with

---

[5] Mortimer Fleishacker and Janet Choynski Fleishacker, "Family, Business and the San Francisco Community", oral history conducted 1975: Regional Oral History Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1975, 173, courtesy the Bancroft Library.

[6] Mrs. Henry Cabot Brown, interview with author, 23 July, 1987.

[7] George Culler, interview with author, 12 November, 1986.

more conviction to other more serious interests."[8] As Morley, so instrumental in establishing the Board was aware, these were people key to the Museum's professionalism. And there were among the Trustees those of closer commitment to the arts and to the Museum. William Gerstle was also a painter, Albert Bender regularly gave works by local artists and Timothy Pflueger, architect and president of the SFAA, was felt by Morley to be the effective leader, though only vice-president.

The Director's vision was still determinant in the years after the war but new members of both Boards and the addition of a Junior Board, "young, ambitious women", to the Womens' Board paralleled social shifts in San Francisco and reconfigured the identity of the Museum, now solidly grounded in the community. Albert E. Schlesinger and others recognized that private contributions, given the assets of New York and Los Angeles supporters in building collections and endowment, were inadequate and that older families in San Francisco were now rivaled by new business organizations and he introduced the Hotel Tax Fund, benefitting the Museum along with other cultural organizations.

---

[8] Grace L. McCa.nn Morley, "Art, Artists, Museums and the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art", oral history conducted 1960, Regional Oral History Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1960, 74, courtesy the Bancroft Library.

Corporate sponsorship came into the picture and social activities gained prominence. Nell Sinton, an artist and Womens' Board member, reflecting on the museum in the 1940s said that "it really was an art museum. It was for art. It was not pretentious. They had parties, they were nice, but they weren't central."[9] Morley recognized this postwar social change and reflected on the Board memberships during the time Sinton was referring to. "They were looking for no benefits for themselves and were seeking simply to advance a good cause. This was not so evident after the war. . . . The attraction of the museum as a means for social recognition even business recognition, had grown."[10] Her directive, though correspondent with the Womens' Board direction, focused on the professional standards and ideals she had taken as her charge in 1935. She could be autocratic in this respect, leading to disagreements, particularly with the reconfigured Womens' Board, the body most closely entwined with the Museum's activities. Culler noted of Morley's response to those seeking association was that "if people wanted to help, that was fine and if not, they

---

[9] Nell Sinton, interview with author, 1 July, 1987.

[10] Grace McCann Morley, typescript of an oral history conducted 1982, California Oral History Project, The Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution 29.

should just stay out of the way."[11] With the increased emphasis on patronage and membership activities this could only lead to conflict with the Trustees, too, and professing the need for a more professional administrator they pressured her to resign in 1958.

Changes in how the Museum presented itself involved staff, too. In 1935 there were only the city-supplied maintenance personnel and a handful of others chosen by Morley; all carried out the mundane tasks of operation. Four years later the regular staff had reached eleven, funded in part by a Carnegie Grant that Morley had written. Some specialization became possible; an assistant curator, a registrar, and significantly, people in charge of publicity, the newsletter the Bulletin, childrens' classes, information and sales, with a trio of secretaries and a photographer rounding out the group.

Departments, though, were slow to follow as employees were too few in number to be able to accommodate diverse demands; a Conservation Lab wasn't established until 1973, by Elise Stern Haas. Still, the effort to create a professional staff went on and in 1941 Morley invited Douglas MacAgy to move to San Francisco to assist her. She had seen a Picasso exhibition he organized at the Cleveland

[11] op. cit., Culler, interview.

Museum of Art and soon after his arrival he was appointed Curator, moving on to head the California School of Fine Arts. John Humphrey, a “disappointed painter”, was packing and unpacking exhibitions in 1935. By 1981 he had been Curator of Prints for twenty years and the Museum’s early strength in photography holdings, owing much to local collections, is due to him. Frank Stauffacher, who died early, guided the Museum’s film program during the 1940s.

Given the inchoate state of the enterprise in the prewar years though, there was not yet a firm division between paid employees and volunteers; on Morley’s departure the staff numbered only twenty, about a third of whom were part-time. Of the volunteers, one who later became an important Trustee recounted that “it was always a privilege to work down there and they worked for nothing." She mused that “there was a wonderful sort of feeling of excitement”[12] and this was especially true of those who were young and not yet settled in professional life. And yet, as both Morley and Schlesinger recalled later, the professional standards of the staff ran high even given the irruption and interruption of the war

[12] Elise Stern Haas, “The Appreciation of Quality”, oral history conducted 1972, Regional Oral History Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1979: 12, courtesy the Bancroft Library.

when the Museum saw half the staff leave.

Membership offerings had grown during these years for membership as an aspect of service to the community was at the nucleus of the Museum; it was, after all, a nonprofit organized for public benefit but not well supported by the City. Financially backed by the Trustees and with the support of the SFAA whose annual exhibitions could now be held there it was able to offer free admission. But Morley was hindered in her drive too, as, empathizing with his work, she wrote to Crocker, thanking him and acknowledging that memberships were essentially closed off by the stricture against competing with the SFAA. The SFAA did contribute revenue yearly until 1937, though; the Museum then opted for memberships, partly with the aim of defining a group within its audience reach to which it could be of special value. As the Director wrote in the Quarterly Bulletin the Museum had made no moves toward membership until "it could demonstrate its usefulness in community service" and its growth was deliberately slow for, as she wrote: "Members must represent that part of the Bay Region community which believes in the liberal cultural and educational program of the Museum"[13], a declaration indicating

[13] Morley, Bancroft, "Womens' Board Contributions to Museum Growth, 1.

Morley's youthful introduction to Woodrow Wilson's universalist ideals. Income was just as significant, though, for "also I was faced with the fact that the museum was growing very fast and thirty-five or forty people that Mr. Crocker wrote to personally didn't produce enough money." [14] A two-tier membership was instituted with a monthly bulletin of activities, the Museum Quarterly, catalogue discounts and invitations to receptions at the base level. By the late 1940s a larger membership came to be emphasized because the Museum's collections had grown, educational programs and cultural offerings required work and there were shows that took more care to install. Cox headed the first large membership drive and in the early 1950s he and Schlesinger instituted corporate memberships with corresponding special activities. Though Morley actively approved of openings as a society event "of a very broad and democratic kind" the problem arose as memberships were more perceived to be of economic importance. The tiers grew to seven and the democratic aspect was subverted by events affordable and accessible to only a few. Membership lost something of its close-knit character and identification with the Museum. These divergences could only set up problems for the future of the Museum and its Directorship; still, benefits were to

[14] Morley, Bancroft, 32.

the programs and activities of the institution.

Exhibitions

The introductory quote, written long after the opening, informs us of the ‘inventory’ of the SFMA when Morley came back but equally it tells us of three key aspects of the Director’s vision of the mission of the museum. The focus would be on modern art, Cubist and after, though not so stated, on education as well as presentation and the art would be brought in. With a city grant for exhibition expenses and meager collections, private and the Museum’s, changing shows had to be its primary activity. But which shows Morley’s roots in the Bay Region and the Museum’s longstanding allegiance to the SFAA meant that local artists would have consistent presence. But she noted that “there were here good artists, measured by talent and integrity, but they lagged years behind other centers of the country for lack of contact with original works representing the current movements of art . . . . There was a public uninformed on art in general, and altogether out of touch with contemporary art -- worse indeed in 1930 than it was in 1915 or 1916, when the Museum was founded. There were few collectors, few people interested in art.”[15]

---

[15] Morley, Bancroft, 74.

Physical remoteness played a part; until 1955 there was only one flight a day from the Bay Region. Distance was exacerbated by the scarcity of secondary material to stimulate interest and criticism. Color reproductions were rare. Art journals were few, often dedicated to perpetuating the reverence for older works and especially graphic art and reflective of dealer interests. The Argus: A Journal of Art Criticism had shut down in 1929 after only two years. And as the critic Alfred Frankenstein noted, having moved to San Francisco in 1934, there were only "about five" galleries. Courvoisier and Gump accommodated approved, established taste. Of the few remaining, one more closed and then a second. Another passed from Beatrice Judd Ryan to a second owner and then to Ansel Adams who elected for a career in photography instead. Galka Scheyer, the tireless advocate for the later-named Blue Four, left for Southern California after attempts to introduce the Bay Region to them. The City's two established museums were traditionalist, settled in character in the preceding decades. The Palace of the Legion of Honor reflected Alma Spreckels' penchant for pre-twentieth century French art in its 1924 inaugural exhibition and after. The M.H. de Young Memorial Museum, formed from the 1894 California Midwinter Fair exhibitions, adopted a broader view of

art consistent with its range of collections in older European works and nonwestern pieces. Both relied on their collections and Morley found them little interested in changing exhibitions or education; storehouses or repositories rather than institutions committed to investigating the present. Long after her departure she mused that the other museums could depend on large endowments and permanent collections where the SFMA had to maintain a very active changing exhibition schedule, just as MOMA did.

The San Francisco Art Association and its teaching branch, the California School of Fine Arts, both with high standards, were dedicated to contemporary practice but were only able to bring in out-of-state exhibitions every several years. The Museum then logically opened with the 55th Annual of the San Francisco Art Association. The SFAA had been the main propulsion of the SFMA for decades and Museum Trustees had also to be Association members; the two Boards often overlapped. Both organizations were committed to contemporary art and as Morley pointed out, the show underscored the Museum’s close engagement with local artists, in contrast to European museums that felt no such obligation.

But the Museum had another directive, signaled by the Director's installation of a complementary exhibition, a loan of Impressionist and Post-Impressionist paintings. With scant local collections it was drawn substantially from New York and reveals Morley's larger educational objective, that the work of local artists be seen in historical and cultural context.

"We thought that we had two functions in San Francisco. First, to inform the artists on what was going on in art of their time, for their benefit, and incidentally to help the public, by informing it, to understand what their own artists were doing, as well as about living artists in general. And second, to do our part in bringing to wider attention, locally, nationally, and internationally, the art of the area, because we were, in a sense, a regional museum -- representing the region."[16]

The first year demonstrated the Museum's dual commitment. Following the SFAA Annual came the Carnegie International, contracted much earlier. Though it brought only the European section Morley was able to add works by American artists who had also participated. Then there were shows of Miro, Picasso, Braque, the "Post-Surrealists" and the Field Collection of contemporary American paintings.

---

[16] Morley, Bancroft, 107.

African Negro Art marked the beginning of a long relationship with New York's Museum of Modern Art and the SFMA continued to show "most of their important exhibitions." There were works by Mexican schoolchildren, posters by San Francisco schoolchildren and a photography show. The Museum hosted, at its own cost, the Tenth Annual Exhibition of the Society of Women Artists, an organization founded in counterpoise to San Francisco's all male Bohemian Club, and it continued to do so yearly. With fourteen small galleries the Director was pressed to constantly scan for exhibitions and with such a slight staff volunteers hung these at times. Gratuitous loans from collectors and dealers brought Old Master drawings, temple hangings from China and even stamps to the walls, a miscellany but an accomplishment as well. "It seems fantastic, perhaps, but over a hundred exhibitions, large and small, were presented each year in the first few years after the museum opened" Morley noted later. Early Chinese art was not familiar then and the Asian Art Museum did not open until 1966 but Morley's connection to Mills College together with Bender's influence brought just such a show, satisfying to a collecting elite but new to a more general public.

"During the first years of the museum we emphasized . . . the basic exhibitions that were

summaries of the history of the development of modern art, exhibitions that were reports on what was going on by artists who seemed interesting, leaders at the time, as a stimulus, as a standard, against which the local artists might measure their own production, and as a means of informing the public so that they too, would become interested, stimulated, and have standards.″

The artists she showed are documentation; the four painters sponsored by Scheyer [each shown individually], Miró, Beckmann [three times beginning in 1938], Moore, Albers, Bayer, Breuer, Gropius, Moholy-Nagy, Chagall, Leger, Feinenger, Dufy, Gauguin, van Gogh and more. For many City residents these exhibitions were the introduction to modern art; the painter Nell Sinton said of a 1937 show that "no one had ever heard of Klee when she brought him to town."[17]
Picasso's *Guernica* was brought to town two years later, a reluctant disposition from New York to the presumed safety of the West Coast. The loan had been preceded and was followed by other shows that included his works. Matisse, though, figured larger, due in part to local interest. He was shown first in 1936 when Sarah and Michael Stein, brother of Leo and Gertrude, loaned from their collection as did

[17] Sinton, interview.

their friend Harriet Lane Levy, both generously. 1948 saw *Jazz* come through on tour and then MOMA's great 1952 retrospective. Important artists such as Brancusi were never shown. But as Morley pointed out, exhibition expenses could be prohibitive, museums and circulating agencies were reluctant to loan to only one venue especially when the logistics of transport during the restrictions of the war years were significant factors. Obtaining, hanging and opening an exhibition was an involved process. In 1958 a large show of Alfred Marquet reaffirmed the Museum's grounding in early twentieth-century modernism and important because the SFMA originated it. When it opened Morley noted with relief and satisfaction that it had taken her twenty years to bring it to realization.

The Museum had organized earlier shows of Calder, Avery, Van Doesburg, Braque, Tanguy, Moore and others but the world of contemporary art was not only European modernism. In the opening years Federal Art Project drawings, the Chicago Art Institute's 47th Annual, the Syracuse Ceramics Annual and the Brooklyn Print Annual competition reached the walls as well as paintings by artists from Texas and Oregon. Through these shows both artists and public could gain perspective on developments in other regions and better appraise and appreciate the

work produced locally.

The region most forwarded was Latin America; Mexico first, for specific reasons. By the time the Museum opened the Bay Region was already, if limitedly, engaged with contemporary Mexican painting, primed by Ryan's loan exhibition of Rivera's drawings. Both Gerstle and Bender collected [Kahlo gave her first painting to him] and with the sculptor Ralph Stackpole they promoted Rivera's sojourn in San Francisco. Two public murals by him, at the CSFA and astoundingly enough at the California Stock Exchange, the impetus from Bender, were matched by one for the dining room of the Haas family's home on the Peninsula and in 1940, one for the Treasure Island Fair.
An impulse generated by Ryan's show and Rivera's projects grew when the Museum opened. In that year the SFMA put up Exhibition of Mexican Painting that included work by Orozco, Siqueiros, Tamayo, Covarrubias, Charlot and others as well as a show of Rivera's drawings and plates of his frescoes; both aided by Gerstle and Bender. Kahlo may have been slighted but not the whole of the Americas. The Peruvian painter Julia Codesido was shown, followed by exhibitions of Guatemalan textiles and Preconquest art from Peru in 1939. That year saw the opening of the Golden Gate International

Exposition and then the Treasure Island Fair, both with emphasis on Latin America and to which Museum staff contributed extensively. Morley continued to promote Latin American art across the country, leading to her appointment by Nelson Rockefeller to an important national position. The Quarterly Bulletin noted that "every month or so during 1942 and 1943 some Latin American art was shown."[18]

During the war years consideration of nations to the south had political and strategic motivation but Morley was driven by her Wilsonian ideal of international understanding, strengthened by her museum professionalism. In 1944 she taught courses in Latin American art at Stanford and Mills and Frankenstein wrote that if San Francisco was unaware of this realm of art it was not for lack of Morley's regularity in showing it. In 1954 the Museum cooperated in a large memorial show of Orozco's work and devoted an entire issue of the Quarterly Bulletin to him.

In the 1950s the Director broadened range with shows from Israel, China, Ireland, Turkey, Norway and Quebec; one exhibition was titled Art Today is International. A cosmopolitan perspective, though,

[18] Morley, *Quarterly Bulletin*, Spring 1944, 11.

was San Francisco's as well as the Director's; the first United Nations conference was held in the City in 1945 and commandeered much of the Museum's facilities. In a 1957 letter to Rene d'Harnoncourt, Director of MOMA, Morley regretted the neglect of Latin American art relative to that of Europe and "the exploration of possibilities in Asia" but the impetus to cultural globalization was still strong and the Museum contributed. When the City hosted the sixth national commission for UNESCO in that same year the SFMA put up Art in Asia and the West, a review of the influence of "the traditions of art in Asia and their influence as expressed in art of today in the United States, . . ." The members' preview drew some three thousand, the exhibition spaces illumined only by flame from brass Buddhist candleholders mounted on white sculpture pedestals. Of the show Morley wrote to two Trustees explaining that "blocking out a whole new area for exploration of art developments, with the pattern of the past as background for contemporary movements, is completely in our tradition, comparable to what we did in the late 30's, early 40's for Latin America . . .."[19]

The Museum could accomplish this only because its

[19] Morley, memorandum to E. Morris Cox and Helen Crocker Russell, 2 July, 1957, archives of the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art.

Director traveled regularly, to New York, Latin America, Asia, Africa and Paris. And so a venture that had begun principally as a reference to European movements was gradually subsumed in an international context as the leading ideas of those movements were seen to affect work in areas more removed from well-known centers. And if San Francisco was not New York, Morley's perspective and her relations in the art world meant that it had not settled for parochialism.

Still, there was the long-standing relationship with the SFAA, whose Annuals the Museum continued to host for some time, even if they were not given the same prominence and gallery space. One-person shows, however, were reduced in number, Morley observing that Ninfa Valvo at the de Young was popular with artists because she gave them that opportunity while her own goal was larger, if more abstract. "We show with conviction and integrity; we are fully conscious of our educational and cultural obligations to artists, students and public. We are scrupulous in requiring quality in what we show, partly because our space is limited as we do not have enough space to serve our artists here; partly because we could not deal with our artists and their integrity if we could not ourselves prove a sense of quality, a regard for values and an equal integrity to

theirs."[20]

By the end of the 1940s new commercial galleries of contemporary art relieved the Museum of responsibility and something of a restrictive patronage to and of the local artists. Clyfford Still, down from Washington, was given a show in 1945 and by 1949 was teaching at the CSFA. Some of his students founded Metart that year and in the 1950s the King Ubu Gallery, the Six, East-West, Spatsa, Dilexi, Batman and Dis opened, many of them artist-run and joined by coffeehouses and bars in North Beach that would hang contemporary works.

Morley, however, did continue to promote regional artists in various ways. In the prewar years she sent works to national Annuals. In the mid-1950s she succeeded at last in replacing SFAA members as jurors for its Annuals by nationally recognized figures, including Thomas Hess of Art News and Lloyd Goodrich from the Whitney, partly with the idea that by learning of Bay Region artists other museums might be more inclined to invite them for shows. In a 1957 letter to Goodrich she urged him to make his visits more frequent, to "keep you in touch

---

[20] Morley, memorandum to Trustees, Womens' Board and Activities Board, 10 September, 1955, archives of the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art.

with what is going on in the rest of the country." [21]

Four years earlier, the IIIrd Biennial Exhibition of Contemporary Art was held in Sao Paolo and Morley's established reputation was such that she could have the United States represented by Pacific Coast artists that included ones from the Bay Region with not-yet established reputations; Ruth Asawa, Roy de Forest, Richard Diebenkorn and David Park among others. When a subsequent European tour was announced and three national circulating agencies requested the show she wrote that "this survey of art activity in a region remote from the art market of New York and from older Eastern Art Centers was planned to illustrate the decentralization of art development in this country . . . and the importance of the regional contributions to art here."[22]

In her statement there are two central points, "art activity" and "regional contributions" and they are intertwined. While painting drew most gallery space and attention, the Museum from the first years was engaged more widely. 1936 saw the biennial exhibition of the American Institute of Architects, the

---

[21] Morley, letter to Lloyd Goodrich, 11 January 1957, archives of the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art.

[22] Morley, *Resumé and Advance Report on 1955*: 3, archives of the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art.

Industrial Art Exhibition focusing on “the results of Abstract Art in Industry” and two shows of decorative arts. In the first half of the 1950s Handwrought Silver, Contemporary Danish Furniture, Prize Winning Lamps and Designs from the MOMA Competition and Knife, Fork and Spoon from the Walker Art Center came to the walls. Morley’s formal idealism is stated clearly and convincingly in one brochure. “Contemporary art in all its forms has become an increasingly important part of modern life. Good color, line, form, and design quality are unconsciously considered when one selects a home, furnishings and clothes -- indeed, any and all of the multiple objects which are required for daily existence.” The Museum, like MOMA, at one point printed a checklist to accompany an exhibition of contemporary decorative art with prices of the articles, showing where they could be purchased in the city.

This position could extend to entertainment. If Morley disregarded Regionalism and Social Realism with their storytelling aspect the Museum did install Exhibition of the Original Celluloid Cut-Outs for Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs in 1938, noting that it was “composed of a careful selection of examples . . . chosen entirely for their art quality as

compositions in color and line."[23] By then the Museum had been obtaining films from the Museum of Modern Art for some years, emphasizing their significance as an art form of the times. Cartoons with their pronounced formal attributes were good material for exhibitions and the second Disney feature was given a place in 1941. Later, Schlesinger's friendship induced Disney to produce an exhibition of the history of animation which opened at the SFMA in conjunction with the city-wide premiere of another Disney animated film.

Morley was earnest in her regard for the formal innovations of twentieth-century art rather than to any particular mode or medium. Modern Art in Advertising, produced by the Container Corporation of America, went up in 1947 and included work by Bayer, Kepes, Leger and Moore. The Director wrote in the accompanying brochure that "the exhibition demonstrates that art can find a sound place in our modern life and that it can make an appropriate contribution of very real value in a practical way to an industrial society . . ." By contrast, in the early years the Museum surveyed works and creative practices left behind by industrial society. African

---

[23] Morley, *Catalogue of the Exhibition of the Original Celluloid Cut-Outs for Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs*, Louis Sloss Ackermann Fine Arts Library, San Francisco Museum of Modern Art.

Negro Textiles in 1935 complemented a MOMA loan exhibition; later there were shows of pictographs, textiles, First Wave American works and more. But Morley's objective was to extend art as living in the present and immediate and with everyone. At one point in the 1950s, accompanying an exhibition of contemporary decorative art, the Museum, like MOMA, even printed a checklist with prices of the articles, showing where they could be purchased in San Francisco.

Photography was a different matter, primarily the realm of either the professional or the dedicated amateur. Amateurs often belonged to camera clubs, taking pictures in the Pictorialist mode and the Museum hosted shows of this nature for almost fifteen years. But as with social documentary photography or photojournalism Morley did not view such shows as furthering the art education goals she had in mind. Her reference was the formal, the "lucid penetration of the medium". Brett Weston and Ansel Adams were shown early and then Barbara Morgan's dance photographs in 1945, sharing walls that year with paintings by Pollock, Tobey and Hartley. In 1946 Strand, via MOMA, and an Edward Weston retrospective were hung, along with canvases by Rothko and Motherwell. Two years later the northwest gallery, once the preserve of the SFAA,

was given over to photography and the Assistant Director, Richard Freeman, used it to feature prints by Minor White, then an instructor at the CSFA and who, for the five years he was in the City before leaving for the Rochester Institute, was an important contributor of ideas and energy. In the 1950s viewers were also exposed to Imogen Cunningham, Wynn Bullock and, of course, Adams. But Adams, despite local sponsorship [Bender published his first portfolio], donated his collection to MOMA where Stieglitz, Steichen and Newhall worked, the last two as successive curators of the photography department established in the 1930s. The SFMA never had the same financial and scholarly resources and though in 1953 Morley reassured a hopeful photographer that they were "endeavoring" to establish a program it was only after her tenure that it was accomplished.

Much the same was true of architecture. Brown and Pflueger were both architects and Trustees. Pflueger contributed ideas, night hours for instance, to the running of the Museum. But as architects they were conservative, Brown having designed the classicizing Civic Center and the War Memorial Opera House housing the Museum. Neither engaged with the international and contemporary as Morley was and in the SFMA's first years the principal contributor to exhibitions was the local branch of the A.I.A.. But in

1940 the Director brought Masters of the Bauhaus and a show focused on Mies van der Rohe, underscoring her alignment with the abstract and with the International Style, correlative with the Museum's goal of showing local artists in relation to innovative ones. Eric Mendelsohn, whose work was tangential to the International Style, was shown in 1942 and in 1945 Morley invited him to lecture when he was in town supervising projects for community housing and a hospital.

Even by the late 1940s, though, San Francisco had yet to develop a downtown office architecture; Mendelsohn's two projects are west of the civic and commercial centers. A different show in 1940, *Space for Living*, registers a sense of regional identity developing in an urban setting. It came from Telesis, the environmental planning organization newly formed after two established groups of architects from San Francisco and U.C. Berkeley merged. Members included William and Catherine Wurster, Thomas Church, Garrett Eckbo -- and Grace Morley. Unintentionally, Telesis brought together the Museum's referential frames of the international and the regional to its public. The group, with subsequent shows and catalogs, shared CIAM's philosophy of a global commitment to modern art and urban planning but with close attention to regional

expressions too, particularly the individual house, site and often, landscape architecture, the profession of two Women's Board members. From 1937 on the SFMA presented shows on gardens, modern particularly, and under Morley's Directorship the design of the lived environment in a modernist idiom was as much in focus as the larger scale urban international.

This was true for art's place within the walls as well. Interior Decoration in 1938 was followed by Western Living in 1942 and by 1949 Planning the Modern House, California Decorative Arts and Crafts and four more, all themed on planning in the kitchen, dining room, living room and patio. They correspond to the ideological bent of Sunset, headquartered in San Francisco until 1951 when it moved down the Peninsula. The revision of its motto in 1943 to The Magazine of Western Living corresponds to Museum shows from 1941, Architecture Around San Francisco Bay and Prize Winning Houses by Seven Bay Region Architects.

collections and programs

The SFMA opened, as the first quote points out, with little in holdings to display to San Francisco. Morley said of the Museum that "it found itself severely handicapped for lack of a collection of modern art of

sufficient importance to serve as illustration and reference and as a standard always at hand for comparison with visiting exhibitions and for educational work."[24] Bender and Gerstle provided substantially to make up for the lack but it was Charlotte Mack, Helen Crocker [Mrs. Henry Potter Russell] and Harriet Lane Levy [a friend of Sarah and Michael Stein] who, marking a continuity in appreciation of modern art from the 1915 Fair through the postwar period, contributed the more important works. The extensive collections of the Steins and Robert Oppenheimer enriched the Museum through long-term loans but did not pass into the permanent collections and acquisition and accession funds did not grow in the way needed. Bender gave generously to establish the Purchase Fund but he died in 1941 and Morley found that W.W. Crocker, banker and Helen's brother, was principally concerned with securing funds for operations. In the 1936 Annual Report the Director noted that the Museum had benefited by the gestures of its donors "but carefully planned purchases must supplement and complete the generous gifts of friends." W.W. Crocker's four great gifts of Braque, Picasso, Rouault and Tamayo of the 1940s were not from his own holdings but acquired with aid from his funds; patrons and Trustees in particular, recognized and

[24] Morley, Bancroft, 68.

endorsed Morley's purchasing acumen. Still, the forethought and structure of a long-range plan never evolved and changing exhibitions remained the nucleus of the Museum's public presence.
The Director's conundrum was rooted here. For different reasons, the Museum did not grow its holdings through a collector base or purchases, especially when postwar art prices climbed and temporary shows remained the focus. They did, though, maintain their own unquestionable value. Morley was attentive to the place and role of works of art in society and she wondered, in an exchange of letters with the head of the American Federation of Arts, if the next question for museums was not "how important is your collection?" but "what service is your collection, whether great or small, to your community and to your country?"[25] And she added that "lending for circulation rather than guarding inert on gallery walls works so familiar that the local public scarcely notices them" meant that the Museum had to have works to lend and Morley's frank reply to a request was that "We only begin to have resources that we can make useful to others." That admission was in regard to individual artworks but the Museum developed other resources in service to the Director's unswerving goal to brief its

[25] Morley, letter to Juliana Force, 15 March, 1944, archives of the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art.

immediate public on modern art movements and the underlying design principles that also informed the mundane. She later said that "in a way we feel that everything an art museum does that serves the public is education in a very profound sense"[26], an idea of art museums dating to the last third of the nineteenth century and carried into the twentieth as more museums were founded. Because resources and energies were not channeled into conservation, research or publication and given the Director's background the SFMA characterized itself as first an educational institution.

Challenged with the exhibition schedule Morley could not have accomplished the Museum's 'outreach' goal singlehandedly. She was backed by the Womens' Board that already in 1936 released their substantial Report of the Educational Committee and members and other volunteers staffed many of the subsequent programs. An inaugural six-part lecture series, Fundamentals of Art Appreciation and Background to Contemporary Painting, was taught by Morley and her assistant, Gretchen Davis, however.
The objective for all the programs was that they should become self-sustaining. At the same time the Museum was emphatic about making them, as its galleries, broadly accessible. Frankenstein, in a 1935

[26] Morley, Archives of American Art, 27.

review, mentioned committee work to "determine what particular groups in the city at large should be taken into consideration in making out the educational program." He added that "courses of study for labor organizations, for business people, homemakers and teachers have been arranged"[27], facilitated by the Museum's evening and weekend open hours. The childrens' art classes were held on Saturday mornings and regardless of social or economic place all children were encouraged to come, the accent on art as a natural activity.
For the adult community there was more. "All important exhibitions and especially those presenting new and unfamiliar material, have been accompanied by study and demonstration galleries to complement the interpretation and instruction furnished by lectures and courses" Morley stated. There was a wider Bay Region public, too, and Morley addressed it early with a three-year grant, extended afterwards, from the Carnegie Foundation, one of a group of family foundation grants, the Rockefeller Foundation perhaps the most prominent, that she secured through her professional relationships.
The Carnegie grant allowed an in-house set of courses and corresponding extension packages sent out to communities throughout much of Northern California. Extension education, like the acceptance

[27] Alfred Frankenstein, *San Francisco Chronicle* 20 January, 1955, 21.

of art museums as educational institutions, was not new to American museums, an indication of the aim to have cultural learning circulate, to draw metropolitan centers and rural areas closer in an awareness of modern art. Morley, a leading member of regional organizations, understood the disparity between the resources of the large urban museum and those of smaller communities. Much later, in a forum on museum problems she insisted that the participation of museum directors in the larger cultural and scholarly life of these smaller communities, with materials going to schools, libraries and social clubs was of signal importance. She recognized that San Francisco's position relative to greater cultural centers was paralleled by that of smaller communities and San Francisco.

The principal focus, though, was on the City's residents. A Quarterly Bulletin had been established in 1939 to be informational, serious and scholarly with a careful eye to layout, typography, quality of photographs and writing style. In 1957 it noted an attendance of over thirty thousand for courses and cultural events in 1956, not including the film and concert programs with their own substantial attendance figures. The educational aspect of the Quarterly Bulletin's role was filled out by the library, open to the public and stocked with books, periodicals, catalogues and other reference

materials. There was also the Art in Cinema program, poetry readings, jazz performances, photo-forums and various dance programs, emphasizing the modern and local companies. A different enterprise in engaging the Museum's public began in 1950 with the SFMA's production of Art in Your LIfe, a series of thirty-minute shows for local television. The Museum, in all its programs, emphasized first the direct experience of art, seconded and contextualized by history and the design principles articulated earlier in the century by art movements and the thinking of John Dewey. The Director, though, recognized that reproductive mediums could further its goals as well.

Grace McCann Morley's role

By the time of the early 1950s the SFMA had not yet been open two decades. Staff was still minimal and departments were not developed in breadth. The Museum lacked real depth in world-class collections of twentieth-century art and substantial, sustained accessions funds. Its dependence on short-term changing shows and loans and its endorsement of local artists did not contribute to a reputation as a prestigious institution. By 1949 Morley, as Culler did later, recognized that Los Angeles had surpassed San Francisco in its monied power, commitment to contemporary art and willingness to collect.

Critical commentary on both holdings of the Museum and its and activities ranged widely. Alfred Frankenstein and Alexander Fried wrote regularly and intelligently in columns for the Chronicle and Examiner respectively. The East Bay painter Erle Loran, who had lived in Cezanne's studio, wrote insightfully for national publications, though reviews by local artists and critics that appeared in national periodicals bore something of the character of reports from foreign correspondents. On the other hand there was the Sanity in Art movement. One artist questioned whether Cezanne would, in twenty years, still stand up to Eugene Speicher. As ever there was some tension between those who felt that the Museum wasn't doing enough for local or traditionally representative artists and those who believed that the Museum was either too provincial or endlessly reprising early modern [twentieth-century] art movements.

Views on the collections generally held that the Museum was still not strong. Harriet Lane Levy moved to Carmel but her bequest did go to the SFMA and included the iconic, early painting by Matisse, Girl with the Green Eyes, still emblematic of the Museum. She and Charlotte Mack, generous in their gifts, represented collectors of the early twentieth century, however, and were not immediately

succeeded by ones more interested in newer art. Morley, though, with the backing of the Trustees, was able to buy a Pollock and two Rothkos and in 1947 a Clyfford Still when Peggy Guggenheim offered it, despite the controversial aspect of the work and its purchase. Photography perhaps fared better. In the 1950s Mrs. Drew Chichester added prints by Edward Weston and Adams donated from his own body of works. Prints by Stieglitz and Atget in the same decade solidified the Museum's reservoir of the modern, begun with Bender in the 1930s.

But collecting was ever an issue, twinned with Morley's goal of education. She aimed to address these in the 1955 Bay Region Painting and Sculptures how for which she asked Board members to choose works by local artists, the purpose "to encourage study and active judgment of contemporary art by those closest to the Museum as a means of providing for them some of the pleasure of experiencing art and of planning a major exhibition"[28]. But two years later, in an exasperated letter to the Womens' Board President, Elise Stern Haas, after the earlier Collectors and Collections show she confided that "aside from you and Bill Crocker, Helen Russell and a few others we know, there is no serious collecting here, to the point that I

[28] Morley, Bancroft, 78.

am reproached by the dealers and feel apologetic among colleagues and feel some difficulty borrowing from both dealers and museum collections now."[29]

George Culler, succeeding Morley, observed that there "had not developed a tradition of substantial support" and even in 1963, a year before an Endowment Fund was finally established he found that almost all monies went into operations, leaving little for acquisitions. The Board however perceived the issue as a managerial one, some seeing the Museum as a "one-woman show", and determined that greater administrative capacity was needed. Morley was eased out in 1958, at about the same time that Barr at MOMA was critiqued in the same way, for being autocratic in the direction of the museum, and he, too, was replaced.
The matter of Morley's contribution is broader than this. When she took charge in 1935 there was only MOMA as an institution dedicated to Post-Impressionist and early twentieth-century art. San Francisco, despite its inherent cosmopolitanism, was far from art centers in the East and Europe, dedicated to its local artists and culturally conservative. The innovations of Cubism and abstract art, more than twenty years past, were mostly

[29] Morley, letter to Mrs. Walter A. Haas, 16 May, 1957, archives of the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art.

unfamiliar to the Bay Region. The Director, who had studied in Paris and gone through museum training at Harvard before teaching and curator positions, was an internationalist and focused on abstract art movements. Given San Francisco's generally uninformed state she saw education in modern art as the principal function of the SFMA. With its scant collections, undeveloped collector base and a city grant for exhibitions the Museum's trajectory was already set. Morley's nationwide museum and gallery connections and her awareness of contemporary art allowed her to initiate a program of changing shows that, for the greater part, reprised the blossoming of advanced art.

The self-imposed challenge, of encouraging San Francisco artists, patrons and the wider public to appreciate and understand modern art could probably only have been a one-person show. It was truly a pioneering role and though it had solid support from the two Boards there was no established institutional structure and momentum. At the same time Morley was conscious of the Museum as a social destination for everyone from the social elite to working class to children and she encouraged openings, gallery talks, film showings and receptions. If the SFMA never became a cynosure of San Francisco's aspirations that was more to do with the City and its leaders than to Morley's Directorship.

The Bay Region, by the time she left, had a successful, forward-directed institution, one that would belatedly be renamed the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art.

Sally Woodbridge: Writing Architectural History in the San Francisco Bay Region

Sally Woodbridge, now nearing ninety, does not go out to view contemporary architecture and no longer writes. Some fifty-odd years ago this was not so.[30] In the 1960s, as Alan Michelson notes, she was "a pioneer"[31] and one of but two women among a handful of art historians focused on California architecture. By that time a number of institutional, commercial and residential buildings had proven a maturity in tradition, originality and forward thinking that brought the state to national standing in the architectural periodicals.

These buildings were visible primarily in the metropolitan centers of greater Los Angeles, San Diego and the San Francisco Bay Region. The first

---

[30] Telephone conversation with the author, 31 May, 2017.

[31] Enote to author, 6 June, 2017.

California architecture, “Native American”, small-scale and often consciously impermanent, had been destroyed or abandoned together with its cultural situatedness; for all but archaeologists that presence had vanished into soil. Fort Ross, coastal reminder of a brief Russian commercial venture, did survive and was restored, as were secular and religious buildings of Spanish Mexico from San Diego to Sonoma, encouraging a young California to scenically romanticize its past through architecture. The baronial mansions of the Gold Rush Era contributed in their own way as did the slightly later Hearst family buildings. These ranged from Julia Morgan’s commissions for Wyntoon, an immense hunting lodge at the state’s north end to William Randolph’s Castle on the Central Coast to the classicism of some of U.C. Berkeley’s academic buildings, about which Woodbridge wrote. The worldly ambitions of Anglo Second Wave Americans in California drew legitimacy through the historical authority of eclecticism of styles, including those of Spanish California.

By the fourth decade of the twentieth century this changed as modernism edged historicism aside.[32] Buildings were often public, consciously future-oriented, light-hearted or ideologically austere, their

[32] Woodbridge, Sally Byrne, *California Architecture: Historic American Buildings Survey*, Chronicle Books: San Francisco, 1988, 80.

architects arriving from the Midwest or the East Coast in the interwar period. By 1920 Princeton had established its architectural school and M.I.T. its own independent program in 1932. At U.C. Berkeley John Galen Howard came from M.I.T., to found the School of Architecture in 1903, preceded by Bernard Maybeck who taught drawing in the Civil Engineering College and who had come from New York. And just as a number of architects came to California from elsewhere so did the historians, Sally Woodbridge among them.

Esther McCoy was an art historian who grew up in the Midwest. After working in New York she came to Santa Monica where she wrote for John Entenza's Arts and Architecture, drafted for R.M. Schindler and in 1960 published Five California Architects: Charles and Henry Greene [a chapter authored by Randall L. Makinson], Irving Gill, Schindler and Bernard Maybeck, all of whom designed in Southern California, Maybeck with but one house. McCoy went on to write on the Case Studies Houses, on Craig Ellwood and Richard Neutra, both Southern California residential architects.

David Gebhard came from Minnesota via New Mexico to the Pacific Coast and U.C. Santa Barbara in 1961, teaching and writing there for more than three

decades. Like McCoy he concentrated on Southern California and with Robert Winter coauthored a pocketbook regional architectural guide in 1965. Both added to the later 1973 a Guide to Architecture in San Francisco and Northern California as did Sally Woodbridge who edited it and most probably managed the enterprise. Gebhard stayed in Santa Barbara, ironically accommodating its twentieth-century interpretations of a diverse Mediterranean architectural heritage. He did, on the other hand, promote Charles Moore as the architect for the Faculty Club at U.C. Santa Barbara, a delightful Postmodern structure.

Robert Winter, now in his early nineties, lives still in the former house of Ernest Batchelder, tilemaker and central figure in the Arts and Crafts movement in Southern California. Like Gebhard he came from the Midwest but to Southern California via the Eastern Seaboard and then taught for decades at Occidental College in Pasadena. He does not presently write for publication.

Sally Woodbridge is yet in North Berkeley where one looks west to the Golden Gate and imposing Mount Tamalpais. She had come to the Bay Region after her 1951 graduation in art history at Duke University

and "[B]ecause that was where the money was"[33] she wrote on contemporary buildings for architectural periodicals. Her husband John was an architect in the San Francisco office of a national firm and together they wrote Buildings of the Bay Area: a Guide to the Architecture of the San Francisco Bay Region, printed by Grove Press in 1960, a New York alternative publisher. Small in dimensions it was planned as the official guidebook for that year's annual convention of the American Institute of Architects to be held in San Francisco.

The publication must have taken some time to bring to press and it is probable, given her subsequent work, that Sally was responsible for research and editing. John is acknowledged as the photographer, credit for the maps is undetermined. Sally's daughter Pamela believes that her mother wrote the introduction as well as ones for later publications.

Woodbridge continued to write and in 1973 a guide to Architecture in San Francisco & Northern California was published by Peregrine Smith. This time there were five authors including her husband, Roger Montgomery who was a professor of Urban Design at U.C. Berkeley, David Gebhard, Robert Winter and herself. She is listed alphabetically last on both the

[33] Telephone conversation with author, 31 May, 2017.

front and the inside end cover with its short author characterizations but there it is noted that she was both contributing and managing editor.

This survey was much more ambitious than the 1960 one and shows in the awkward portability of a peculiarly tall, narrow, thick book of some 556 pages. It features a “Guide to this Guide”, a fourteen-page general introduction, a three-page outline of “Bay Area Planning” followed by a three-page account of BART [Bay Area Rapid Transit], keyed area maps with introductions to each, small illustrative photographs of ‘notable’ buildings, a glossary, a bibliography, a “Photo History” with larger photographs and historical documentation and an exhaustive index to both architects and buildings. It seems most probable that Montgomery was responsible for the sections on planning and BART but if Sally’s daughter is correct she wrote the witty and insightful fourteen-page introduction.

It’s not at all evident in what way Gebhard contributed [or Winter, for that matter] for there is only the unattributed introduction, but Woodbridge was in contact with Gebhard by this time. In late 1972 she wrote him saying “I am suffering from what I suppose is, in this day, a middle-aged disease – I want to make something of myself! I have

acquired a keen interest in an extensive oral history project that would be part of the dept. archives. I have talked to many people encluding [sic] Jim Hart at the Bancroft, Dick Peters, Spiro Kostov, and Ken Cardwell about it. Everyone is highly enthusiastic, but they all point out that if I were enrolled in the graduate program it would be much easier for me to get funds. Also Dick wants me to teach a course, like the one you taught, next fall, which interests me enormously. So to shorten things a bit I have decided to enroll in the Ph.D. program because it seems to make the most sense both in terms of coordinating all my efforts and in having a specific goal."[34] She asks for a letter of recommendation.

By then the 1973 guidebook must have been moving closer to press and Woodbridge was already engaged with the projected volume that would be published by Oxford University Press in 1976, *Bay Area Houses*. Letters of the next few years show her in regular communication with Gebhard concerning their collaboration on the book and editorial details. But Gebhard had his own enterprises underway, too. By 1972 his monograph on the L.A. architect R.M. Schindler was published and he and Robert Winter,

---

[34] Letter to David David Gebhard, 28 December, 1972, collection of Architecture and Design Collection, University of California, Santa Barbara.

two cities apart, had been working in Southern California for over ten years. Their regional orientation is reflected in their *Guide to Architecture in Southern California* of 1965, a volume twin in dimensions, approach and format to the 1960 one by the Woodbridges though theirs was published by the Los Angeles County Museum of Art. And just as Sally Woodbridge had, they were at work on an expanded edition. In 1977 a guide to Architecture in Los Angeles and Southern California came out, matching the Northern California one in size, format and publisher. Back in Northern California Sally Woodbridge was occupied in large part with Bay Area Houses and needed Gebhard's input. In mid-1973 she wrote, saying "I trust the Southern Guide is going together smoothly! Give my best to Bob when you talk to him. . . . Realizing that you must be in the throes of the Southern Guide I don't expect much from you at this point."[35] But with all the parts that had to be pulled together for Bay Area Houses she would write again.

The 1973 guidebook would be enough to establish her place in art history as well as highlight how germane her work was for those who live in or visit the region; its coverage extends from Carmel in the south to Redding in the north. But her status as an

[35] Letter to David Gebhard, 2 June, 1973, collection of ADC, UCSB.

architectural historian is substantiated with the 1988 publication of California architecture: historic American buildings survey which covers buildings from the eighteenth century to the first third of the twentieth, from a cow barn in Gilroy to Neutra's steel-frame Southern California house.

Historic American Buildings Survey was initiated in the 1930s by the National Park Service and in California was reinvigorated in the late 1950s by individuals in Los Angeles. A partnership of Southern California historical groups established a summer documentation program in 1968 and San Diego followed shortly later. Their activity prompted the inclusion of post-Civil War buildings which HABS had not initially dealt with. In the early 1970s a few ventures began in Northern California, first in Palo Alto. In 1975 the California Historical Society, centered in San Francisco where NPS also had its Western Region office, took over co-sponsorship of the entire statewide project. The next year CHS appointed Sally Woodbridge to be the editor of the reference volume that would take twelve years to come to print. As well as editing HABS she wrote the ninety-page essay, "The History of California Architecture", though S. Allen Chambers was the architectural historian for the project. At the same time she "served on the State Historical Resources

Commission from 1980 to 1984”[36] and wrote the foreword to Missions of California, published by Chronicle Books.

Woodbridge’s “History” was and may remain the benchmark work in accounting for the state’s architectural past. It fulfilled the mandate of the program but stopped short of ‘contemporary’ architecture, that from the mid-1930s on. And though Woodbridge was central to the California-broad HABS and peripheral to Gebhard and Winter’s Southern California guide her center of gravity or sense of place was the Bay Area. When in 1974 the Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association held its first meeting it was in her living room and she led walking tours until fairly recently.[37] Yet her engagement with architecture and architectural spaces extended beyond Berkeley. In that year she became the West Coast correspondent for Progressive Architecture. A year before, together with the sculptor, she published *Ruth Asawa’s San Francisco Fountain: Hyatt on Union Square.* Four years after that she was a coauthor for *Victoria’s Legacy:Tours of San Francisco Bay Area Architecture*, from a small local publisher. And in

---

[36] Author unknown, *HABS*, inside end cover.

[37] Anthony Bruce, enote to author, 8 March, 2018.

1989 Chronicle Books printed *New Architecture: San Francisco.* Though not named as principal author Woodbridge contributed, wrote the introduction and was apparently the managing mind and hand. The dust jacket asserts that it "[F]eatures thirty-five of the Bay Area's most innovative architects, discussing their work in interviews alongside photographs of their latest designs."

In 1992, though the Woodbridges were no longer married, they put out *San Francisco Architecture: The Illustrated Guide to Over 600 of the Best Buildings, Parks, and Public Artworks in the Bay Area*, published by Chronicle Books, an arm of San Francisco's principal newspaper and "updated" by a smaller press [Ten Speed] in 2005. A year later, with a different collaborator, she issued *San Francisco in Maps and Views*, published by Rizzoli, guarantee of a book rich in well-reproduced images. In 2006 she was coauthor of *The Sculpture of Ruth Asawa: Contours in the Air* from the University of California Press, a kind of completion of the 1973 introduction. Asawa, whose husband was the architect Albert Lanier, was a member of the San Francisco Arts Commission and one of the few whom Woodbridge was familiar with. Also acquainted with architects Moore, Dailey, Wurster, Bernardi, Emmons and Esherick she associated with them "not socially but

professionally."[38]

In this capacity she conducted an oral history interview with Charles Moore for the Archives of American Art in 1984. Of the same generation as Gebhard and Woodbridge he had formed California connections even in his doctoral years at Princeton. In 1963 he collaborated with the landscape architect Lawrence Halprin on the Sonoma Coast planned community of Sea Ranch, designed Kresge College at U.C. Santa Cruz in 1971 and was one of the contributors to the 1973 guidebook. While organizing Bay Area Houses Woodbridge wrote to Gebhard that she and Moore had "spent long evenings discussing the Bay Region book . . .."[39] for which Moore wrote the concluding chapter, "The End of Arcadia". By then he was a nationally celebrated figure for his buildings but he stands out in an important theoretical respect. His doctoral dissertation, Water and Architecture, later became a book of the same name and studies how water shapes our experience of place. He later coauthored Body, Memory and Architecture, also a phenomenology-rooted study. As the Woodbridges were putting together their first guidebook he began teaching in the Department of

---

[38] Telephone conversation with author, 31 May, 2017.

[39] Letter to David Gebhard, 2 June, 1973, ADC, UCSB.

Architecture at U.C. Berkeley in 1959.

Wurster, an established and nationally published California architect since the 1920s, had been appointed dean of the department in 1950. In 1959 he orchestrated a move that folded the three schools of architecture, landscape architecture and urban planning into the new College of Environmental Design, housed since 1964 in Wurster Hall and which was designed by Joseph Esherick, Vernon DeMars and Donald Olsen, CED faculty members.

Wurster, like Catherine Bauer Wurster to whom he was married, held an inclusive view of the character and place of architecture that parallels Moore's; both allude to the phenomenological experience of architecture, beyond its formal or measurable aspects. In the 1960 guidebook he wrote: "Special conditions bring special solutions so why shouldn't San Francisco Architecture have a special character of its own? . . . Where else does it make so little difference what you live in as compared to what you look at? . . . Let me settle down to write a proper foreword for such a needed guide. To do so I should begin with geography and climate. . . . As the guide lists the buildings, old and new, please see them through the climatic and physical condition of

Northern California."[40]

Twenty-six years later Urban Ecology published Blueprint for a Sustainable Bay Area and Sally Woodbridge was a coauthor. Though her participation in what seems an urban planning manifesto her sensibility to the region and its architecture overlaps that of the group Telesis, founded in 1939. Comprised of architects, landscape architects and designers Woodbridge was not a member but both William and Catherine Bauer Wurster were. In the founding statement the group asserted: "People and the Land make up the environment which has four distinct parts -- a place to Live, Work, Play, and the Services which integrate these and make them operate." Woodbridge as an art historian focused on buildings, but like Wurster's foreword and Telesis' emphasis on the interrelatedness of people, land and region, she comprehended place as Edward S. Casey does, that it necessarily implicates culture and history.

Long before, in the fall of 1949, some ten years before Sally Woodbridge was writing on architecture of the region, the San Francisco Museum of Art [the

---

[40] William Wurster, introduction, unpaginated, in John M. and Sally B. Woodbridge, *Buildings of the Bay Area: A Guide to the Architecture of the San Francisco Bay Region*, New York: Grove Press, 1960.

San Francisco Museum of Modern Art since 1975] hosted a show and produced an illustrated catalogue under the Directorship of Grace McCann Morley, a member of Telesis. The exhibition title was *"Domestic Architecture of the San Francisco Bay Region"* and well-known local architects contributed short commentaries. Lewis Mumford in New York prefaced the catalogue with a more substantive essay based on a piece he had published in The New Yorker the year before and a presentation at MOMA. Mumford was a nationally recognized urban architectural historian and diplomatically apologized in saying that "... a few years ago, by some unfortunate slip, I characterized the buildings that have been assembled for this exhibition as examples of the "Bay Region Style," and contrasted it with the restrictive and arid formulas of the so-called "International Style."[41]

It's difficult to tell just what Mumford meant by his apology. A regional architecture and its architects, Maybeck the most prominent, had already been noted in the national press for some time. And Mumford may have been aware that it was a matter of tradition and not style, as Woodbridge and

---

[41] Lewis Mumford in *Domestic Architecture of the San Francisco Bay Region*, unpaginated catalogue of an exhibition held at the San Francisco Museum of Art September ninth through September sixteenth.

Gebhard were later to comment on. Mumford, like the local architects in the exhibition, was trying to say something about what he and others in New York perceived as both distinctive and shared among a number of twentieth-century buildings and builders in the Bay Region. He singles out Maybeck and Wurster and notes Wurster's praise of "Maybeck's poetic architectural imagination on his own work".[41] While Mumford did not know Maybeck Sally Woodbridge and Wurster did.

In his foreword to the 1960 guidebook Wurster uses the word "character", suggesting an ethos and reflected in the comment on Maybeck that Mumford cites. This sense of architecture shows in writing of Woodbridge and Moore, too, suggesting ideas of the phenomenologist William S. Casey. His Getting Back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-World was published by Indiana University Press in 1993.

Since then Casey has extended his initial points. He consistently maintains that place is not synonymous with space and site and he overrides Kant's Critique of Aesthetic Judgment of 1791, the cap to the philosopher's grand project on logic. Kant was perhaps the strongest advocate [over two millenia] of place as a set of coordinates in space. More than a

philosophical matter it is this perspective that grounds our everyday comprehension of space and place; witness our use of Apple or Google maps.

But Casey, building on the earlier thought of the French phenomenologist Merleau-Ponty and of Heidegger, points out that such a perspective, if pragmatic and and helpful at the moment, is shallow, that place is lived experience that begins with the body. Regarding architecture it is not simply measurable aspects but its active role in our lives. Plan and elevation are certainly important but Casey shifts architecture from buildings as analysable objects to comprehending building and setting together and he interposes a line from Wallace Stevens that architecture "reflects its region"[42]. Wurster, Moore, other architects, Sally Woodbridge and Mumford understood this. For Woodbridge this did not interfere with her professional accounts of buildings but she, as Wurster, saw architecture, setting, region and history as all contributing to, in Casey's term, a "place-world".

If then her writing over more than four decades discloses a subtle articulation of the architecture of the Bay Region as place-characteristic where do we see it?

---

[42] ibid., 149.

Bay Area Houses from 1976 might offer the clearest, fullest insight. With photographs by the respected Morley Baer and Roger Sturtevant, reproduced on good quality paper it is an authoritative study, appropriately published by Oxford University Press. Gebhard wrote both the twenty-page introduction and a twenty-page essay. Woodbridge was responsible for a seventy-four page essay and, as so often, edited the contributions of the seven authors and the nine others who inspired or added to the book. Gebhard and Woodbridge had already cooperated on the 1973 guidebook and together they wrote the preface which, in referring to the five authors says:
"At least in part each of us was drawn to the San Francisco Bay Area because of a regional architectural phenomenon which, by the time we arrived, had become known as the Bay Area Tradition. All of us were impressed or perhaps we should say beguiled by what we found. Here was a warm and winsome woodsy architecture which seemed to straddle all sorts of ideological fences"[43].

Just how this was written is indeterminable; what is interesting is that author and contributor lists are

---

[43] Sally Woodbridge and David Gebhard, preface, unpaginated, *Bay Area Houses*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.

customarily alphabetical but in this preface it is Woodbridge's initials that come first. It may be that this reflects their geographical centers of gravity; Gebhard, very widely knowledgeable, had been in Southern California and writing on its architecture for more than a decade while Woodbridge had been in the Bay Region even longer. But though at metropolitan poles of the state they were in regular contact with each other. In a 1975 letter she says that "[p]erhaps at the outset you might acknowledge that Area and Region were used interchangeably and that this book attempts to clarify, explain and investigate the term. Since the term was unsatisfactory to most people we use "Bay Tradition" instead. Etc. Etc. Speaking geographically the book uses the words "area" and "region"; speaking ideologically it uses "tradition"."[44]

Editorial details and concerns are found in other letters though unfortunately we don't have any from Gebhard to her. She informs him of her ongoing dealings with other collaborators, Morley Baer particularly as he was responsible for photographs. She and Gebhard covered the same field but in two chronological blocks, making their essays complementary. Gebhard's "Life in the Dollhouse"

---

[44] Woodbridge to Gebhard, letter of 16 August, 1975, collection ADC, UCSB.

focuses on the Second Bay Area Tradition; his introduction had covered all phases and Beach's initial essay had looked at the First Bay Area Tradition, up to 1918. Gebhard is interested here in the 1920s and style as a melange of historical and fanciful architectural forms bearing symbolic associations of childhood and playfulness. He says in conclusion that "The Bay Area Alice houses and other buildings of the twenties represent a peculiar and idiosyncratic episode within the Bay Area's Second Phase. Nothing quite similar occurred elsewhere at the time, nor has it occurred since."[45]

Woodbridge takes up where Gebhard left off, covering the 1940s and 1950s when the attributes of the Modern supplanted the historical imagery of inherited styles. The idea of the open plan and flexible use of space was one of those attributes and Gardner Dailey, whom Woodbridge knew, adopted it in his architectural practice. In his statement for the 1949 SFMA exhibition catalogue he tagged it as "The Large-Small House"[46] and Woodbridge turns to that as the starting point for her essay "From the Large-Small House to the Large-Large House". The shift is not simply one of form but social and economic too,

---

[45] Gebhard in Woodbridge and Gebhard, 114.

[46] Gardner Dailey, cited by Woodbridge in Woodbridge and Gebhard, 155-227.

from custom-built houses affordable to the emergent nuclear family of the middle class to expansive and expensive ones for the affluent of the postwar economy.

But Woodbridge's essay is more encompassing than that; it is the story of a region and its place-characteristic architecture during these decades, not merely a set of data points for analysis. She opens with a quote by Mel Scott, an important historian of urban planning, from his 1959 book The San Francisco Bay Area: A Metropolis in Perspective by U.C. Press. In her selection he presents an aerial view of the Bay Area just after the War's end, pastoral with small towns and truck gardens.[47] But some fifteen years later Woodbridge the historian reflects on the vision:

"The scene described above by Mel Scott could not last. Of the more than half a million people who came to the Bay Area during the war years, a majority chose to stay. By the end of the decade the population increase was 947,014. One way or another, the rivers of people were bound to fill up the empty spaces."[48]

---

[47] ibid., 155.

[48] ibid.

Rivers of people, however were not her concern as an art historian even if that inexorability opens and concludes her essay. Rather, she builds her history through detailed accounts of architects, their houses and topographies. It is not a taxonomy, however, for the essay, as others of hers, carries the thematic of regional place. Opposite on the page from Scott's vision and before her rejoinder she offers a statement by William Wurster from the 1949 catalogue, ten years before he contributed to the Woodbridge's first guidebook.

"Take-a-chance clients, mild, even climate, no insects or bugs, a long dry season and, above and over all, the immensity of the scene -- all have their share in shaping the design. Is it small wonder to find the vitality of architecture with these as the starting points?"[49]

Her essay proper opens by historically framing the Modern and its skeptical reception by the general public and lenders. But she points out ways in which the Bay Region's adoption differed, owing both to the natural setting and to its architectural heritage. Finally, the new environment offered possibilities for a life style that was particularly well suited to the tenets of Modern architecture. It was climatically

[49] William Wurster in SFMA exhibition catalogue, unpaginated, cited in Woodbridge in Woodbridge and Gebhard, 156.

possible to have the interpenetration of interior and exterior space so dear to Modern doctrine, and the requisite large glass areas usually framed incomparable views.[50]

She then begins an historical survey, saying that "[the] San Francisco architect who perceived all of this most clearly was William Wilson Wurster"[51] and she illustrates this with what in retrospect seems an unremarkable building outside Santa Cruz. Of it she says: "In his first published house, the Gregory farmhouse of 1926-27, he took the body of Modern architecture and gave it a regional soul."[52] Though she later returns to Wurster's work she then discusses another San Francisco architect who founded his practice in 1926, Gardner Dailey: "This urbane and charming man also designed superbly in the rural, regional spirit. In 1940, he transformed the California barn into a simple house with only 800 square feet of space. Small as it is, the living room is doubled in scale by raising the ceiling to the height of the roof and dissolving the walls with large areas of glass. Perfectly sited in a dip in the rolling landscape, the design expresses California's

---

[50] ibid., 156.

[51] ibid., 157.

[52] ibid.

enduring romance with the rural scene."[53]

Following this house on the Peninsula she reviews one in Marin County and then looks to townhouses in the City, the architect John Dinwiddie, Wurster again and extensively, the landscape architect Thomas Church whose academic background began in Berkeley and to Harvard for a graduate degree. Woodbridge relates that, as the landscape architect for Wurster, Dailey and others, he discarded the front yard back yard separation and instead "zoned the garden for use like a room, often controlling the circulation through the placement of raised planters, paths, and built-in sitting areas."[54] A house in Lafayette from the late 1940s, also landscaped by Church, she finds
"an excellent example of the large-small house. It is placed at the edge of the kind of beautiful knoll that was a favored and typical building site of the time. Because of the bounty of natural beauty provided by the landscape and the organization of the plan to take advantage of it, the relatively small spaces are not confining."[55]

---

[53] ibid., 158.

[54] ibid., 164.

[55] ibid., 169.

Church is discussed more fully, both in his work at houses reviewed by her, for his national status and for fostering younger landscape architects in his office, particularly Lawrence Halprin. Accounting for Halprin's first work, in 1949 for a house on the Peninsula, she opens by maintaining that "One of the persistent images of San Francisco Bay Area architecture was of the natural house taking its place unpretentiously in the environment. The bewitching embrace of this environment, or as Wurster put it, 'the immensity of the scene,' militated against the house as a highly polished object set against a backdrop."[56]

Wurster and Dailey were not the only ones working in the Bay Area Tradition, though Joseph Esherick who Sally Woodbridge knew, said of this time that "there were only a few good architects around" and he singled out Wurster and Dailey.[57] But this may be a qualified judgment if one is looking instead for distinctive houses in harmony with the landscape. Elsewhere in his oral history interview Esherick recalls being recruited to give the visiting Alvar Aalto and his designer wife Aino a scenic tour. He intended

---

[56] ibid., 177.

[57] Josheph Esherick, "An Architectural Practice in the San Francisco Bay Area 1938-1996": Oral History Center, U.C. Berkeley, 1996, courtesy the Bancroft Library, 97.

to show them urban architectural monuments but Aalto insisted on seeing how people lived outside the City. The 'tour' took them up to Tomales Bay in Marin County where Aalto, despite Aino's protests, left the car to study a barn more closely and was chased away by the farmer with a pitchfork. Esherick had been taken on just such a tour of barns and vernacular architecture in Oregon by John Yeon and Woodbridge says that it "made a lasting impression on him."[58]

The anecdote is hilarious in retrospect but it illuminates the appeal that unpretentious regional architecture had, especially as developed by Wurster. Woodbridge was well aware of that and of the particular approaches of different architects; John Funk, Henry Hill, John Dinwiddie, Roger Lee, Worley Wong and Mario Corbett. Corbett nourished younger architects in his office and of his own work Woodbridge observes that "[t]hough varied, Corbett's production had much in common with the prevailing carpenter-style school, with site orientation a major concern. The house achieved a sense of place that was consistent and remarkable."[59] Another of the lesser known

---

[58] Woodbridge in Woodbridge and Gebhard, 183.

[59] ibid.

architects that Woodbridge singles out is Roger Lee and she says that

"Lee was one of the most versatile practicioners in the small-house field and a leading contributor to the Bay Area Tradition. This Berkeley house of cottage scale sensitively sited over a creek in a small wooded glen illustrates the kind of image which Lee and his fellow designers Campbell & Wong projected so successfully as the "Bay Region house" of the postwar period."[60]

But her essay, like Gebhard's, is not simply a celebration of certain architects and buildings; each, as is the best in art history, is also a cultural history. Woodbridge's is a study in population boom, pre and postwar economy, the goal of prefabrication, materials, builder costs and the landscape of the region itself, from open grassy hills to redwood-dense slopes and valleys. Regarding Wurster's partner Emmons and the house he built for himself in 1948 in Marin County, it was "drawn from rural vernacular usage" she says.

In fact, this sanctification of the ordinary, originally Wurster's contribution, was still the most characteristic trait of local architecture at the turn of

[60] ibid., 206.

the decade, although it was soon to mutate under the influence of the economy of plenty. In the mid-fifties the character of the Bay Area Tradition changed from modest understatement to masked opulence. Although architects continued to use the simple, informal life as a frame of reference, it was somewhat stretched out of shape by clients whose budgets and demands were not so limited.

This shift is revealed in scale, plan and materials and Woodbridge discusses an expansive Marin County house by Esherick from 1957 and two by Wurster, Bernardi and Emmons from 1954 and 1958. Through scale and style each presents itself as a villa, the first by WBE on the Peninsula with a white stucco exterior framed in dark wood and with a formal garden by Church, all axially symmetric. This might seem the coda to Woodbridge's opening counter to Mel Scott's vision, a dream that could not last but Woodbridge is inclusive in her survey, not just advancing a scheme. She looks at works by Warren Callister and Jack Hilmer, both inspired by traditional residential Japanese architecture where the use of wood and modular dimensions meld with natural surroundings. Those natural surroundings feature again in some of her last discussions, of architecture at Belvedere, a not-quite island at the north end of the Bay where Hilmer built a home.

This, logically, would be where her essay could end, with the photograph by Morley Baer of a house dramatically cantilevered out over the water. But Woodbridge returns to the theme of her essay. More critical than changing formal attitudes was the changing structure of the economy. By 1960 the Bay Area had been radically redesigned, not by architects and planner so as by housing developers, bankers, highway engineers, industrial designers, shopping center developers and others involved in land transactions. The building boom had not only greatly enlarged the residential practice of Bay Area architects, it also aided the rationalization of the merchant builder's side of the construction industry. It was increasingly difficult for the architect to compete in the middle-income market. The combination of the beginning inflationary spiral in construction costs and a scarcity of reasonable building sites began literally to cut the ground from under the custom-designed suburban villa and townhouse. As architects looked to other types of practice to take the place of dwindling demand in the residential field, the long postwar development from the large-small to the large-large house drew to a close. The architectural legacy of this period was not an original concept of form nor a design vocabulary. Rather it was a planning concept, a way of giving expression to that almost mythical ideal, the

California way of living.[61]

This should be enough to conclude and secure an historian's career. But it was only the mid-1970s and Woodbridge was already at work on bringing the HABS to print with her ninety-page history of California architecture. Two more guidebooks followed and San Francisco in Maps and Views and the study of Ruth Asawa's sculpture -- as well as the introduction to a 1995 book on the "California Modern" homes by Joseph Eichler, ones designed for middle-income families in Southern California and the Bay Region. That would seem to bookend her 1976 essay and close her career but it was not. She researched and wrote more.

In 1992 Abbeville Press printed her monograph on Bernard Maybeck. Esther McCoy, Kenneth Cardwell and Richard Longstreth had already laid the scholarly groundwork and written on him but Woodbridge put together a large volume with popular appeal, sumptuously illustrated with color photographs and reproductions of his drawings and watercolors. Maybeck was the architect acknowledged as the principal figure in the foundation of the Bay Region Style and lived in North Berkeley from the late nineteenth century until his death in 1957. Sally

[61] ibid., 227.

Woodbridge knew him[62] and her modest apartment is a short walk from one of his most celebrated and frequently visited buildings, the First Church of Christ, Scientist. His projects are well known and appreciated; her work is scarcely recognized.

But until her publication there was no such presentation of this iconic figure in California architecture. Not an academic as were Gebard or Winter her study, founded in others' writing, notably Kenneth Cardwell, and earlier research[63] is deliberate, careful and comprehensive. With her historian's thoroughness she traces the architect's family background, his education at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris, brief work in New York and then his arrival in California in 1890, preceded by Willis Polk, Ernest Coxhead and John Galen Howard. It is a solid reference work but not dry, suggesting the requisite quality of readability for the historian's work. But it suggests something more for Woodbridge is an art historian, not a political one or a social scientist. Her sensitivity to the Bay Region and to the qualities that Wurster had identified in his 1960 introduction track through her writing with genuineness. Perhaps only coincidentally Wurster's

---

[62] Telephone conversation with author, 31 May, 2017.

[63] Richard Longstreth, enote to author, 2 April, 2018.

praise of Maybeck's "poetic imagination" from more than forty years earlier is reflected in Woodbridge's title, Bernard Maybeck, Visionary Architect.

Her accomplishment in building California architectural history then has two very different aspects. As art historian she was attentive to individual buildings; the volume on Maybeck carefully accounts for structural aspects, selection of materials, lived in, experienced spaces, relation to the landscape and the aesthetic particulars of a building. It is not surprising that two years after this volume she published Details: the Architect's Art. That kind of aesthetic scrutiny is far from a sweeping, generalizing one.

On the other hand Woodbridge was an art historian in young adulthood living in an intellectually and visually stimulating environment. She was professionally focused on residential architecture simply because houses were where most creative activity was taking place. But these buildings were not in an abstracted Kantian kind of space-place, they were consciously designed in relation to the landscape. Woodbridge understood this in a personal, lived way. She, more than other writers, comprehended a regional architecture in the complexities and contradictions of its historical

emplacement. If there were only this monograph it would be evidence of this understanding. But there are more than forty years of writing related to the theme of culture and geography in creative interplay.

Tom Killion, Gary Snyder and Edward S. Casey: edge, place, region

California's Wild Edge: the Coast in Prints, Poetry and History was published by a respected regional press in Berkeley and recognized by the Commonwealth Club of California with a Gold Medal California Book Award in 2016. Killion's woodblock prints are dominant but in corollary with a history of the California littoral [he has a graduate degree in history] and enlivened with contemporary reports and journal accounts from that history. Short sections of poetry are interspersed, most from the twentieth century and several by Gary Snyder, a long-standing friend. Snyder, raised in San Francisco, student at Reed College in Oregon, graduate student at U.C. Berkeley, has long lived in the Coast Ranges and the Sierras. Some twenty-three years Killion's senior his first poems of the region predate Killion's student days at U.C. Santa Cruz by almost two decades. But Killion, then as now a Marin resident with a studio at Inverness on

Point Reyes, notes in the introduction to his book that their relationship [this is the third collaboration] enfolds their common experiences of the California coast and he says that "[o]ur conversations about California coastal poetry began and ended with Jeffers, ..."[64] And so he opens with a 1924 poem, "Continent's End".

"I gazing at the boundaries of granite and spray, the established
sea-marks, felt behind me
Mountain and plain, the immense breadth of the continent,
before me the mass and doubled stretch of water."[65]

Following the poem is a double-page color print Killion had made the year before the book's 2015 publication, a sweeping view of the Central Coast near where Jeffers had built Tor, his stone house. The pages present a wide scope: "River Beach, Carmel Bay" on the left faces and completes the view with "Pt. Lobos, Carmel Bay" on the right.

Two years later, far south of Carmel Bay and seasonally out from the philosophy department at

---

[64] Tom Killion with Gary Snyder, *California's Wild Edge*: *the Coast in Poetry, Prints and History*, Berkeley: Heyday Press 2015, 1.

[65] Robinson Jeffers in Killion, unpaginated.

SUNY Stony Brook, the phenomenologist Edward S. Casey was sitting in a coffeeshop in downtown Santa Barbara, working on his latest study, The World on Edge, having just returned from an excursion north to Morro Bay. "As I look out across the remarkable rock formations thrusting up from the Pacific Ocean near Moro [sic] Bay, California, catching my eye is a ledge whose ragged upper edges are sharply defined. . . . In their exposed state they are overt and outgoing: as material entities, they are closed in on themselves. . . . These rocks belong to the single massive edge that is the California coastline: they are edges upon that edge. This coastline is not just the westernmost periphery of the United States; it is also the farthest edge of one side of an entire continent."[66]

That observation recalls the title of Jeffers' poem and made visual in the prints of Killion's book starting with the cover, a view down from Chimney Rock onto Point Reyes, the horizon of the Pacific beyond. The foreground is a narrow border of native irises in bloom, implying an abrupt dropoff from the cliffside to the rocky shore below. His introduction corresponds to the print. "I push through the last tangle of brush and come to the edge of a high cliff. Far below, the sea booms on a rocky shore. Gulls

[66] Casey, op. cit., xiv.

wheel on currents of air, and stretching out before me to the curve of a distant horizon is the vast, undulating liquid realm of the Pacific Ocean -- the watery half of our planetary home. I have come to the edge of the wild, where we earthbound creatures cannot hope to survive by our naked selves." Here is first person lived experience in fully descriptive sentences, a contrast to Snyder's short poem, also in the introduction and opposite a second reproduction of the same print of Point Reyes.

"On dark sea sand,
rock booms beyond: . . ."[67]

His words echo both Japanese haiku and a Zen emphasis on objectiveness or nonpersonalness -- just what is there, no more, the actualness of things in themselves as though there were no experiencing and writing subject. There is, of course, someone writing or we'd not have Snyder's words that presumably relate to personal experience, the boom.

With Casey on the other hand, observation leads to reflection and consideration, his directive as phenomenologist and his current study grows from the earlier thought of Heidegger and, in particular, Merleau-Ponty, both of whom he fully acknowledges.

---

[67] Gary Snyder, "Point Reyes", ibid., xii.

Robert Sokolowski, another philosopher, provides an incisive, catholic definition of the field. "Phenomenology is the study of human experience and of the ways things present themselves to us in and through such experience."[68] Here it is the coast of California that presents itself and it does so in distinct but related ways. Killion's response is principally pictorial, Snyder's is poetic and Casey's is philosophical. They are related not only in time, a few decades, but via a study that occupied the philosopher some twenty-four years before the one on edges.

Casey's first book, from 1993, was Getting Back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-World. Part I is "Implacement" and introducing the problematic of establishing place he recounts the near-disastrous incident in 1707 when a British naval fleet could not find its way home in an endless, changeless shroud of fog. The event led to the formulation of lines of longitude, allowing us to know [abstractly] our place in time and so in space. But Casey points out that no one has ever witnessed lines of longitude; they are useful in many circumstances but tell us very little of our bodily, lived place[s] in the world. Implacement, he

---

[68] Robert Sokolowski, *Introduction to Phenomenology*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2.

observes, cannot be reduced to points on a grid; that is another domain entirely, suited to Google or Apple maps.

He contrasts our spatially abstract system of determining our way with that of Micronesian Puluwat navigators who, like the British sailors, are in a great expanse with no seeming [to us] markers. Finding their way from their place they "make use of a complicated system of signals from the seascape and skyscape surrounding them at all times. From the sea, they observe ocean currents and flotsam and above all the exact size and character of ocean swells, including the jet spray as waves strike the hull of their canoes."[69] The great French phenomenologist Maurice Merleau-Ponty, writing from the 1940s through the 1960s, maintained that we come to know the world through the body, just Casey's point that also recalls Sokolowski's maxim.

"Body and landscape present themselves as coeval epicenters around which particular places pivot and radiate. They are, at the very least, the bounds of places . . . . Place is what takes place between body and landscape. . . . Thanks to the double horizon

---

[69] Edward S. Casey, *Getting Back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-World*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993, 15.

that body and landscape provide, a place is a locale bounded on both sides, near and far."[70] Killion's introduction to his 2009 book with Snyder, Tamalpais Walking: Poetry, History, and Prints embodies Casey's aphorism. "Today I stand looking south over miles of falling ridges, first forested, then bare grass, to the bay and sparkling city beyond. The serpentine outcrop is at my feet, on my right the Pacific shines to the fog-barred horizon."[71]

The double horizon that locates or establishes place is apparent in Killion's lines and also in his 2015 book's reference to a tenet of the Chumash, living on the Ventura and Santa Barbara Coasts and as far north as Morro Bay. "The Soul's Journey to Similaqsa" was transcribed into English in the early twentieth century: "The soul goes first to Point Conception, which is a wild and stormy place. . . . And there in the stone can be seen the footprints of women and children. There the spirit of the dead bathes and paints itself. Then it sees light to the westward and goes toward it through the air, and

---

[70] Ibid., 29.

[71] Tom Killion and Gary Snyder, *Tamalpais Walking*, Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2009, 4.

thus reaches the land of Similaqsa."[72]

Killion's monochrome print of Point Conception presents visually what the Chumash fragment narrates and aerial photographs affirm; the Point is exactly that and entirely remote. The lighthouse, still in use, has no lightkeeper and Killion's view is understandably not from the Point itself but from the slopes above. It is congruent with both the transliterated Chumash account and Casey's phenomenological assertion. Each is centered on the lived body's experience of place, the bounded near of the body and the bounded far of the landscape. Killion however is interested in more than the singularity of places and this redirects us to Casey's observation in his initial, 1993, study.

There he relates place and region. "A region, let it be noted, exceeds a given discrete place, whether this be a proto-place, a zonal place, a counter-place, or a com-place . . .. For places are the particular parts or portions of regions. Regions possess their own concreteness, as we realize when we consider the specificity of a regional landscape with which we are thoroughly familiar. . . . Regions are forms of

---

[72] cited in Killion, *California's Wild Edge*, p. 6 from *December's Child: A Book of Chumash Oral Narratives*, ed. Thomas C. Blackburn, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.

gathering, and in this capacity they have powers and virtues of their own, which are not foreign to the dynamisms of lived bodies that make possible the configuration of places.
In fact, lived bodies serve both to animate and to connect places and regions."[73]

A place "gathers in the dimensions and directions indicated by the body's insertion into it. Such in-gathering is distinctively different from the out-gathering accomplished by a region. The latter collects not directions or dimensions but places toward which the body is already directed and with which it is also connected dimensionally [Casey refers to Hegel here]. A region thus gathers places out. It puts them alongside one another; it is the shared outsideness of places to one another, and thus the reflection of their mutual differences."[74]

A region, places alongside each other "toward which the body is already directed", already imply edge and certainly entail California's Wild Edge. There Killion illustrates places along the coast from Santa Monica in the south to beyond Westport in the north where the two-lane Highway 1 shies from the Pacific and

---

[73] Casey, *Getting Back into Place*, pp. 73-74.

[74] ibid., 74.

untraversable cliffs and bends east, deep into the redwoods. The prints are, in a narrow sense, a record of just those places “toward which the body is already directed”, directed because Highway 1 is a significant artery [and vein] of and for the length of California.

The record invites comparison with a major work by Hiroshige, the woodblock artist of mid-nineteenth century Japan. In serially published prints The 53 Stations of the Tokaido visually matched traditional poems that evoked well-known passes or river crossings or villages on that road. Killion’s book marks and illustrates places along the least commercial of California’s three north-south highways; the poems and historical excerpts are counterpoint to the prints. Hiroshige covered the easternmost of Japan’s five major arterial routes in the Edo Period. Skirting the coast his prints are peopled with a variety of travelers headed toward Kyoto from Edo [now Tokyo]. The focus of the images is ever human activity; walking, carrying, dining, conversing. The images, in blocks, highlight color, but also impart phenomena of weather, particularly rain and snow which are more easily depicted than time of day or season in the woodblock printing process.

Though Killion does not mention Hiroshige it's hard to imagine that he is not aware of the earlier artist; his concluding three-page explanation of printmaking notes that he uses both Japanese woodcarving tools and paper. But the works are not quite like Hiroshige's. In his set of prints there are no settlements or structures, though many of the print titles refer to the unseen communities nearby. And there are no travelers to maintain narrative continuity. The continuity is that of the region and its constitutive places, a region implicit in the title, California's Wild Edge.

Edge, place and region overarch the work and thinking of Killion, Casey and Snyder but here is another relevant aspect, that of wildness. "Wild Edges" is the fifth chapter of Casey's new book and after acknowledging the diverse understandings of the wild he has this to say.
"Another caveat: this chapter focuses not on wilderness but on wildness. Wilderness is a condition that holds for a given territory that has been shielded from cultivation and the inroads of human civilization. Wildness, by contrast, is a state of becoming that is not located in any particular place or region; it is to be found everywhere, in every place or region, including modern cities and many parts of civilized states. It is not only all

around us but also directly underfoot; indeed it is in us, in our stray thoughts, as well as in our unconscious mental life and repressed emotions."[75]

Casey goes on to cite a line from Snyder's 1990 book The Practice of the Wild and later the poet, too, explicitly distinguishes between the wild and wilderness. "But wildness is not limited to the 2 percent formal wilderness areas. Shifting scales, it is everywhere: . . ."[76]

This distinction between wilderness and the wild is themed by the 2002 volume, *The High Sierra of California* and the 2009 *Tamalpais Walking*, both by Killion with Snyder's collaboration. The first has as its subject the region that edges treeline, much of it in federally designated wilderness. The second takes up the wild in local outings. Both feature mountains, the second coastline, too. In "Wild Edges" Casey offers five "cases in point." Coastlines and mountain profiles are two of those and he starts with a simple statement that could easily be the first line of Killion's 2009 book. "Outside of town, on a walk in the coastal mountains . . .." The sentence is actualized and anticipated both in *Tamalpais Walking*

---

[75] Casey, *The World on Edge*, 138.

[76] Gary Snyder, *The Gary Snyder Reader: Prose, Poetry and Translations 1952-1998*, Seattle: Counterpoint Press, 1999, 175.

and in *California's Wild Edge* where mountains and coastlines are ever prominent.

But leaves are another of Casey's "cases in point" as regards the wild and he offers a black and white photograph of fallen leaves in Central Park in evidence. As prosaic as the image is Casey has a larger point in mind, mutability, that edges change as what they edge does. "Given this dynamic becoming of wild objects, their edges cannot help but alter: . . ."[77] Snyder, too, indicates such in his writing, commenting that wildness is a momentarily observed order in endless flux.

Killion also recognizes this, though the static nature of prints calls for an approach that is allusive. California's Wild Edge opens not with mountain or shore but with "Red Kelp", a 1978 monochrome print that precedes even the title page. With only the dark shapes against the white of the paper the 'leaves' are botanically unmistakable yet as demandingly complex as Celtic knotwork. Still it is simply kelp flat on the sand, as many of us have come across it on casual beach walks. Thoughtfully composed as artwork it is yet true to the presence of the wild in the mundane, just as Casey's leaves are.

---

[77] ibid., 140.

Wildness is of great significance but it is the larger matter of experience of various phenomena that matters. In the context of the works by Casey, Snyder, and Killion studied here it is place, region, and edge that are central. Edge is the newest, as explored and articulated by Casey but it can be found throughout the works of Snyder and Killion much earlier. It falls to the phenomenologist to lay it out for us textually. He explains that edges are always opening out, opening onto other phenomena, other places, other edges, and other regions. As Jeffers, he observes that the California coast is one of our large natural and national edges. Jeffers, raised on the East Coast, had Europe ever in mind but Casey was raised in Kansas. In sojourn to Morro Bay he notes that the coast is the eastern edge of the Pacific, that considering it means acknowledging that it is also the eastern edge of Asia, another region. Killion, too, must know this; for one thing he is culturally aware of Japan. But he is hardly singular in this; cultural interest in and connections to Japan [more recently, China] figure in cities from San Diego to Vancouver, mostly in the second half of the twentieth century.

Of the three thinkers Snyder appears earliest to express awareness that edges open onto other edges, places and regions; this shows in his Pacific

writings of the nineteen fifties. From the Bay Region he set out west as a seaman and later to Japan twice to study. His narratives show that he, too, knows that our coastline is a boundary rather than a limit. If this coastline is but one instance in a broader study of edges it is Casey who nudges us to awareness. And while Killion's book most fully addresses region and edge through pictorial means it is the embedded historical excerpts that describe not just places but appreciation of the Pacific as both edge and region that fill out his study. The three, considered through this aspect of their work, are a nexus phenomenologically branching out to all who experience the California coast. The surfer back on shore recounts his day, the marine biologist on Bolinas Bay records her observations, the weekend watercolorist studies the day's work. A truly comprehensive phenomenological approach to the places and regions of the California coast would include not only these but works by Edward Weston, crab fishers' lives, a family on holiday and more.

The Japanese Tea Garden in Golden Gate Park in San Francisco

This is one of the more curious places of San Francisco, itself one of several city place-worlds in

the Bay Region. It is a civic garden, open to all, all the year, situated in an urban environment, akin to the Rose Garden in Berkeley. But the Japanese Tea Garden is different from Berkeley's as well as from San Francisco's other urban and public gardens. Those are all side by side with residential or commercial areas. In welcome contrast to their constructed setting they present themselves as natural.

The Japanese Tea Garden, however, is in the middle of Golden Gate Park. Before the 1880s the Park was only sand dunes bordering the Eastern Pacific. By 1893 it had been cultivated as a vast, wooded wildness crossed by trails and public areas and in 1894 the California Midwinter Exposition was held in it. When the fair shut down it was determined that a few attractions should remain. One of those, the Japanese Village, was transformed into the Japanese Tea Garden.

Setting the Japanese Tea Garden into place

Bordered on three sides by water San Francisco's outline is clearly defined and easily noted from either of its two bridges or several high points in the City. A map shows this as a contour, a limit, and because the contour is fixed it lends a misleading sense of

fixed identity to the City as place-world.[78]

San Francisco as experienced, however, is through boundaries, not as contour lines, and boundaries are permeable; people often cross easily from one neighborhood or district to another. Traffic flows out of and into the City from other cities adjoining it; we would never know that we were in South San Francisco, not San Francisco, if not for the name inscribed large on a hillside. Even the shoreline of the Bay is not a constant. The wholly urbanized Embarcadero was once water; the buildings stand on landfill and abandoned Gold Rush ships. The historical dimension of place is not always obvious in immediate experience. North Beach with its own rich history in San Francisco's polyvalent identity is an instance. Now a neighborhood indicated abstractly on a map, it was once simply a beach. Subsequently and still apparent in spots it was Little Italy. More recently it was the petri dish of Beat Culture and still in reach of living memory; Lawrence Ferlinghetti, the founder of City Lights Bookstore, turned one hundred this year. Visitors from out of town might not wander into Mara's Italian Pastries on Columbus but they may well want to sit outside at a nearby cafe with an espresso and wonder if Jack Kerouac or Gary Snyder lived nearby. An aura of the literary,

[78] The concept is Casey's.

historical identity of the place yet resonates, one that does not show on a map and is not delimited by streets or zip codes [North Beach has two].

The Japanese Tea Garden is unlike North Beach, place as neighborhood, but it, too, lives in history and culture. It was designed and formed within the designed and formed wildness of Golden Gate Park that in 1871 existed only in plan. Civic and commercially self-interested leaders had promoted the plan and politically steered it to materialization. John McLaren, a Scots master gardener designed it, became its first Superintendent and managed it for decades. It was intended to be natural and social both, like Central Park, encouraging city dwellers of all sorts to experience it in all seasons.

In 1851 London put on the Great Exposition and a series in other cities followed. In 1893 Chicago put on the World's Columbian Exposition and Michael de Young, San Francisco's newspaper magnate, traveled to the Windy City to attend it. As a publisher he was motivated to show San Francisco at the same status as Chicago and so proposed a similar exposition for San Francisco. Aware that New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art was in Central Park he thought to situate San Francisco's fair in Golden Gate Park. McLaren objected but was persuaded and in 1894

San Francisco hosted the California Midwinter International Exposition. When it closed down, three features carried on; distinct strands of the City as a place-world. One, logically, was de Young's art collection. It had hung, along with contemporary works by others [including thirty-two women], in the Fine Arts Pavilion on the Music Concourse. The donation of his collection became the nucleus of the eponymous de Young Museum. That museum, originally in an Egyptian style and now in its third architectural iteration, stood for the City's orientation to European artistic traditions. The Music Concourse, a long, open space with the Fine Arts Pavilion at its focus still has an amphitheater and is now enlivened by skaters and pedestrians crossing from the California Academy of Sciences across to the de Young and the Garden.

The Japanese Tea Garden had somewhat different roots than the Concourse or the Museum. The Chicago Exposition had featured a Japanese Pavilion, designed and built in wood by artisans from Japan, recalling an aristocratic pleasure structure with views onto nature. A proposal to transport it to San Francisco proved unworkable but a related idea, a Japanese Village, did and was a popular attraction. When the fair wound down three individuals, supported by the City, arrived at an agreement.

John McLaren would continue his overall administrative responsibility for the Park. Makoto Hagiwara, a master gardener from Japan, would create a garden on the site of the Village with a concession for a teahouse, oriented toward visitors. Hagiwara's vision was supported by George Turner Marsh who hoped to gain commercially by the concession. He owned a downtown gallery featuring art from Japan and Hagiwara had worked with him on his home. Presenting the idea of a garden to McLaren he became its designer and caretaker and after his death in 1925 his family carried on the role, though interrupted by the war. The Garden is still within the Department of Parks and Recreation.

The Exposition is experienced now through vintage photographs and the event's promotional literature. The midway and its excitement are long gone. The Music Concourse that once held the Fine Arts Pavilion is still an expansive public space, now differently used and enjoyed. The Museum and its holdings carry on San Francisco's particular dedication to the arts, much enlarged since de Young's day. The Japanese Tea Garden's history since 1893 is more multiplex. It includes early Japanese immigrants to the Bay Region, their community in San Francisco, civic and commercial leaders and Hagiwara and his family. The stories of the City's role in the Second

World War, the internments and then reconciliation in the nineteen fifties are also involved. Much of this history is in print and can be found through the San Francisco Public Library, the Nikkei Index and the National Japanese American Historical Society in Nihonmachi. It is the Garden in time recorded.

The historical is one way that the Garden can be experienced as a place but it is first a phenomenon of the moments one is in it; the historical grows from this. Moments in it punctuate movement through it, the time of experience. This is not unique; all places govern movement. One walks through public spaces from street intersections to hospital corridors to transit stations; they shape movement in time toward destinations. Lines are geometric because schedules and efficiency are important to objectives and destinations. The Garden does something different. Pathways bend, alter stride with stepping stones and require slower, deliberative movement. They open onto scenes of particular trees or plants, of stones, still bodies of water, a waterfall. Architecture [gates, pagoda, teahouse] comes into view, too.

Edward S. Casey, in his first book on place, admits that "I have been concentrating on gardens mainly because of their capacity to exhibit a range of

relations between the naturally given and the intentionally cultivated."[79] In the Japanese Tea Garden the two harmonize in experience as plantings and natural features come into view along with sculpture and architecture. But there are two other aspects, easily overlooked. Discussing three well-known historical examples Casey points out that one "dwells" in gardens in thought, in history and culture, as well as bodily experience.

The structures and sculptural monuments are the obvious locus for they refer to cultural traditions and to Shinto and Buddhism. Whether or not those are fully comprehended they are a significant way that the Garden presents itself in experience. In the same section Casey goes on to add that "... gardens instruct as to the expanded building potential of certain material elements"[80] and he cites an eighteenth century English author who identifies them minimally as ground, water, stone and wood.[81]

These are, excepting wood, what Hagiwara worked with, along with climate and plants and the natural resource of time, both brief and seasonal. Wood,

---

[79] Casey, *Getting Back into Place*, 168.

[80] ibid., 169.

[81] ibid.

though, is a prominent feature of the Garden, most prominent in the two gates. The western one was hauled over from the 1915 Panama-Pacific International Exposition after it closed, built by unnamed artisans from Japan. The eastern one is from 1893 and has an identified master carpenter/ shrine builder, also from Japan. There are two issues here. The first is that of art informed by tradition and formed through skilled practice. The gates in this sense are no different than Hagiwara's work; the two are complementary.

The other takes us back to Casey when he says that gardens are "liminal phenomena."[82] Gates are gateways are edges as Casey queries them in his most recent study. "But what if edges are not merely incidental aspects of perception? What if they are distinct presences in their own right -- indispensable not just to perception but also to many other kinds and parts of our experience of the world?"[83] Gates are long-standing, transcultural markers of thresholds, passage from one kind of place to another. They are often monumental and aesthetically indicative of cultural history. Because they are symbolic and usually materially intended to

---

[82] ibid., 155.

[83] Casey, *The World on Edge*, Prelude, xiii.

be lasting they serve as historical reminders of either vanished civilizations or entries to an anticipated future.

The eastern, principal gate originates in this fundamental sense of edge and threshold though it has formal sources in both Buddhism and Shinto. Its liminality, its character as threshold, is not historically fixed, however. Made from wood, by the nineteen eighties it needed to be rebuilt. Through its San Francisco branch a major Japanese bank supported the project and traditional tools, materials and artisans were introduced from Japan yet again, this time to maintain, to cultivate a significant cultural form. There is an important exception, however. It is a commemorative bronze plaque and the commission was given to Ruth Asawa. It is a recognition of past accomplishments but equally it indicates the vitality of the Garden, of San Francisco and of the Bay Region.

Asawa was a consistent civic presence in both her teaching and committee work and her 1960 fountain in the City's Union Square brought them together; schoolchildren contributed the motifs which were than cast by Asawa. By then her family was living in San Francisco after the wartime internments and relocations and Ruth was teaching art, practicing,

and serving on the San Francisco Arts Commission as did her husband, Albert Lanier, an architect who Sally Woodbridge included, but she didn't write on him; she wrote on Ruth Asawa. This is anomalous; Woodbridge wrote very little on individuals in the arts and not on sculptors or painters. But there are two pieces by her focused on this sculptor, one of them a celebration of the Union Square fountain and the other on her work more broadly. Woodbridge did write on public sculpture but she did not write on specific artists except Asawa. Earlier, in 1955, Grace Morley had contributed works by regional artists to the IIIrd Biennal in Sao Paolo and she included Asawa.

From Grace Morley's tenure through Sally Woodbridge's writings, Killion's prints, the Japanese Tea Garden and Ruth Asawa's work there is a significant theme that is part of San Francisco's identity as a place-world, itself one of several that make up the Bay Region also a place and an edge, too, a threshold. Facing the ocean on one side the other is open to ports, through the Golden Gate and that waterway opens onto other regions and places and one of those is Japan. The Bay Region and San Francisco particularly owe an aspect of character as place-world to both geography and culture; they are intimate.

The Garden as Edge

Seasonal passing is always a coming from somewhere, going somewhere, extending from the singular visit into a yearlong experience. The two are not separate, however. A gardener there and historian says that there were a half milion visitors throughout 2018.[84] One goes there any part of a season; early, full, late. That particular experience flows into the year and even into the ahistorical, via the underlying considerations from Shinto and Buddhism. The Garden is a place experienced in different modes of time but it is experienced geographically as well. Generally it is a place and edge of the 'wildness' of the Park and the constructedness of the City.

And it has an ahistorical, outside of time character, too, in the religious philosophies of Shinto and Buddhism. If the Garden then has different aspects of place-character of time experienced bodily as well as the ahistorical presented through it has other edge features as well. Casey points out that edges are not fixed but active and always in flux. With the Japanese Tea Garden it is not just the flow of visitors, almost constant since 1894, that is in flux

[84] Steven Pitsenbarger, enote to author, 2 February, 2019.

but time, momentary and seasonal. That experience is articulated in the religious philosophy of Buddhism, enfolding the moment within the constancy of change. Thresholds, edges, look to two, or more, places at once; they are experienced as liminal phenomena.

The Garden is a place that, as threshold, looks onto the two close by places that Casey notes in his discussion of gardens, the wild and the constructed. These are the Park and the City but it is not quite so simple for the Garden is a threshold of the cultural place-world of Japan, too; it edges all three. The City is prominent, evidently and immediately a place-world of the constructed, of buildings, transit routes and urban sounds. The Park is apparently wild but it, like the Garden, is cultivated, an outcome of design as aesthetic thought and of culture.

McLaren had a different design objective than Hagiwara, however. As a master gardener he had come from Scotland and his template was Central Park in New York. The Japanese Tea Garden refers to the imagined place-world of Japan in its overall design, architecture and the artifactually symbolic. Between these two is the nearby place-world of San Francisco.

San Francisco is not alone in this; it is a place within the Bay Region that is comprised of several identities. The Bay Region and San Francisco in particular faces west, across the threshold of the Pacific. Though there are several bridges it is the Golden Gate that is iconic for it is the edge of the tumultuous place-world of the Region's cities and the imagined place-world of Japan.

Gates are gateways, thresholds, as they have always been and the Garden was created with two. The first, on the eastern end, was built in 1893. That at the west was brought over from the Panama Pacific International Exhibition after it closed in 1915. As entry they mark the movement from one kind of place into one wholly other, culturally, botanically. Each and together they observe entry into a place different from the other aspects of the Park as well that of the broader City. But there is another significant aspect to their identity; they are are made with wood. Casey speaks of three "lessons" that gardens can teach us, noting the expanded use of materials for the landscape architect. He cites an eighteenth century English writer who identifies the principal ones as ground, water, stone and wood. Hagiwara used the first three but not wood, though it is a significant aspect of the Garden most prominent in the two entrance gates.

The second gate was built by Japanese artisans whose identities have not been recovered. The earlier one also relied on traditional forms, materials and artisanship but it had a principal figure responsible.
Shinshichi Nakatani was in the same generation as Makoto Hagiwara but he was a master carpenter rather than a gardener. If the Garden had, over a century, benefitted from the stewardship of the Hagiwara family and others its architecture had as well. But architecture requires tending, too, and in the mid-nineteen eighties the eastern gate had to be restored.

By then different relationships were at play. Gump's, an art and furnishings store founded in the nineteenth century, had come to focus on Asian art. In 1949 they donated a monumental bronze of the Buddha from their store to the Garden. The Japanese Peace Treaty, between forty-nine nations, was signed in San Francisco in 1951 and in 1953 the Consul General donated a large stone lantern, paid with small donations from Japanese children. In 1957 San Francisco and Osaka established a sister relationship. In 1974 a plaque was commissioned in recognition of the Hagiwara family. The commission was given to Ruth Asawa, a well-known San

Francisco sculptor and art educator whose family had also been interned. In 1970 she completed a fountain in Union Square with contributions of motifs by schoolchildren.

Ruth Asawa turns up in another context as well. Sally Woodbridge, writing on buildings, came to know a number of architects on a professional basis. Albert Lanier was one of those and his wife was Ruth Asawa. Woodbridge did not write on individual architects, Maybeck excepted, and she did not write on sculptors or painters but she did write on public art works and she wrote a large piece on the large Union Square sculptural fountain from 1970. Ruth Asawa designed the piece based on motifs created by children and then had it cast in iron; four years later she was completing the bronze Garden plaque.

The plaque, almost oddly, brings this work's theme back to the start, by refracting through Ruth Asawa. She worked as a San Francisco-centered and San Francisco-local artist. In the plaque she brought the natural and the art-generated, the cultural, together as the key way that the Japanese Tea Garden presents itself. The plaque is artifactual, introducing the Garden as a liminal place, between and of the natural and the cultivated. The natural was shaped by the Hagiwara family, long familiar with agriculture

and tending and added another element of Japanese traditional culture into the place-world of the City, already, receptive to cultural traditions if also excluding at times. When Grace Morley, long in touch with contemporary visual arts in Mexico and Latin America, forwarded Pacific Coast artists to the IIIrd Biennal in Sao Paolo in 1955 Ruth Asawa was one. She was both local and cosmopolitan in a way specific to California-Japan cultural relations.

Stone and Textile

If you live in the Bay Area rock is “The Rock”, Alcatraz Island, standing out in the Bay, but it is more a rock with some garden than what we think of as an island, picturesque, inviting visitors. More monumental but not often visible are the Farallon Islands, some twelve miles out in the Pacific west of San Francisco. They are wholly rock and the same granite as nearby Point Reyes and the core of the Sierras. Granite maintains its form and surface appeal through weather and climatic extremes; the peaks of the High Country are as dramatic as they were before they were ever viewed. Granite doesn’t fracture easily but it can be worn down as glaciation did in Yosemite Valley.

The Bay Region did not have marble; that was on the East Coast. But there was granite and there were three quarries in Northern California, two of them in the foothills of the Sierras. It was used for cladding buildings or as pavement, it wears well. By the later nineteenth century power tools made it suitable for sculpture, though it presents itself better in masses, as in the Sierras, than extensions.

Though Mono and Sierra Miwok tribes lived in the Sierras they weren't written on as large-scale phenomena until after the mid-nineteenth century. Galen Clark together with President Lincoln brought about the Yosemite Grant that ceded much of the area of Yosemite and the Mariposa Grove of Sequoias to California. John Muir trekked the High Country and in 1894 he published his narrative *The Mountains of California*. In those writings he declared that the truer name of the Sierras was The Range of Light. Two years before that he had founded the Sierra Club. The naturalist become writer, Muir was out traversing the country, noting the steepness of granite walls or how they reflect light at different times.

In 1963 the Club published The Eloquent Light. It was in their Exhibit Format Series, oversize with black and white photographs by Adams and text by Nancy Newhall. The dust cover presents an image of

the face of Half Dome that is eleven inches high by eight and a half inches wide. The verticality of the image mirrors that of the granite peak, its monumentality is explained through the representation.

But monumentality is not two-dimensional, it is a perception of something fuller, a three-dimensionality of being.

Half Dome is an oblique plane when seen or photographed from the west and below. In that view perception extends into the distance, the higher elevations beyond the Valley's rim and Adams' photograph does just that. With the graphic starkness of black and white, the substantialness of the book and the looming presence of Half Dome backed by snowfields there is a convincing monumentality analogous to the Sierra's granite formations.

A print reproduces the drawing with light via chemicals; the experience is that of a surface phenomenon. It is a feature of granite, too, with its mineralogical variations of light and dark. Marble is different, though; it has a low refractive index, one can see into it, and this invites comparison with skin. That and the softer contours and fine edges and extensions it encourages make it wonderful for representing the body, especially in movement.

Granite's appeal is less in the figural than in actual or implied massiveness and the surface presence of lights and darks. Materially these are quite the same as in traditional, chemical photography. Particles lie on the surface, displaying nuanced interactions of lights and darks. But because photography often proposes the three dimensional it opens something more and Adams' photographs do that, in their perspective of distance. But chemical photography has texture, even when it is as fine-grained as Adams' prints, a texture conveyed through lights and darks. There is then, not quite the representation of materiality but material itself.

Back down from Adams' peaks and ridges there is granite as stone formed and shaped by the sculptor, conforming to what the material denies or directs. It resists the refinement of fine carving and Nicholas Penny cites Daniel Chester French, as saying that "Granite is the most unsympathetic material of sculpture that I know."[85] French chose marble for his Seated Abraham Lincoln in Washington, knowing that it would be protected from rain by its enclosing temple structure. He was, after all, born in New Hampshire, the Granite State.

---

[85] Nicholas Penny, *The Materials of Sculpture*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993, p. 28.

In the Bay Region the salt air and days of fog or rain discourage marble, but granite stands well out of doors. In the middle third of the twentieth century Dick O'Hanlon worked in granite from either his studio in Mill Valley or his space as a sculpture instructor at U.C. Berkeley. He worked in bronze, too, but that was more gallery-oriented and smaller in scale. A significant work, in part because it is so public is Sunstones II, commissioned for Berkeley's Lawrence Hall of Science, uphill from the campus, on a sloping lawn looking west across the Bay to the Golden Gate and the Coast Ranges, crested by Mt. Tamalpais. The work is monumental in size, of granite, co-designed by an astronomer and intended to provide different celestial perspectives at different times of the year. Like Neolithic hewn stone monuments it establishes a particular sense of place in relation to both immediate surroundings and stellar phenomena in the yearly round.

There is another work that is integral with its setting, quite different but still public. It is beside the short pathway leading down to the Mill Valley Public Library. The 1966 building by Wurster, Bernardi and Emmons is on the street that winds up the shoulder of Mt. Tamalpais and near the studio that Dick and Ann shared. The building partly extends over a creek and is of redwood, the artifactual matching the

natural of the redwoods cloaking the slope. High above the canyon is the prism of Tamalpais and though the mountain is not visible from the library O'Hanlon's work is of the same monumentality, presenting form through the medium of sculpture. The peak, geologically timeless in form resonates with the agelessness and obduracy of the sculpture.

There are other works not by O'Hanlon but demonstrating the same sureness in working stone into form. These are the basins of hollowed stone in the Japanese Tea Garden, small-scale sculptures, several in granite.[86] Two hold water for ritual cleansing, Shinto practice as an elemental mode of experience. But if the basin, patiently ground out, is a focus much due to its size it is really understood in acknowledging the settings of its situation, an ensemble of other stones, each distinct but akin to the others in size, form and color. The identity or character of the piece is not simply as a singular material object but is experienced via the ground beneath and around. Around, the small stones are arranged in ways aesthetically significant but subtly, so that they guide attention without our being conscious of it. They and the basin are an ensemble, a setting in place. Setting in place also has to do with where and how we experience granite as

[86] Steven Pitsenbarger, note to author, 18 September, 2019.

building cladding, as wall. There it is our implacement in respect to the structure that determines our perception. If the granite is finely finished it can have a sheen and the mineralogical play of lights and darks add a liveliness that is magnified across an expansive area as we walk beside it. It is quite different from the way we experience O'Hanlon's sculptures or the basins in the Japanese Tea Garden. Not just the material and the work matter but how we experience them; place bears meaning.

What of textiles then rather than stone, granite?

We encounter them nearly everywhere we are, in the days and even in the nights. They are the surfaces of what we handle, what we wear, what we walk on and even what we are under; each instance, in form and material, has its own place actualization. The Coast Miwok, due north of the Golden Gate up through Sonoma County, collected plants near them and transmuted them into useful forms; floor coverings, for example. This utilitarian character of textiles means that they are often a feature of building interiors where there are a number of planar surfaces; floors, walls, beds, hangings to differentiate living spaces.

But as the Coast Miwok, and perhaps especially their northern neighbors, the Pomo, also understood,

textiles can easily become three-dimensional and then they are sculpture, if also with mundane roles. The role is actually two. Textiles can go from covering plane surfaces to covering the contours of the body; ponchos and rebozos and even crown to ankle to wrist whole-body garments that are tent-like.

Three-dimensionality opens onto baskets as well, containers that are long-lasting, useful, diverse in form, size, purpose, material and kind of weave. Even given the verticals/horizontals dictum of weaving they can display an innumerable variety of patterns, animated by the play of lights and darks of the selected fibers.

There are, then, two ways of experiencing and understanding textiles. We encounter them in any number of places in our everyday lives, as wall coverings, car seats, altar hangings, the clothes we and others wear, all of different fibers. The textile's whereness and the place, the setting where we experience it are complemented by the materials and by its aesthetic characteristics: form or shape, value contrasts, size, texture. We perceive these at the same time that we perceive and experience the setting, the ensemble.

The mutability of our relations with textiles is not only in our passage through the days, it is culturally

and historically varied. In the Bay Region that can be outlined, from the Miwok on. By the early twentieth century new materials, new design approaches and manufacturing capability came together to place textiles — not textile as concept —in different settings. Though there were teaching schools in England and other centers the Bauhaus drew the greatest attention, in part owing to its self-promotion but to some of its emigres to the United States.

In 1931 Anni Albers, as a Bauhaus teacher, became head of the weaving workshop at the Bauaus after having taught there; her husband Josef was teaching painting. The Bauhaus had shifted toward emphasizing handwork as fine art as well as the more ideological objective of mass production; it was a social idealist aesthetic movement after all. As a department head Albers extended her own practices and so the department's. When the school closed in 1933 she and Josef moved to Black Mountain College in North Carolina. In the 1940s her work won awards nationally and in 1949 she was the first textile designer given a one-person show at MOMA.

Dorothy Liebes is an interesting counterpart. Born two years before Albers, by 1950 she was winning awards in New York and had shown in a MOMA exhibition. But her dedication and education did not take place in Europe or North Carolina. She was born

in a town in Sonoma County, graduated from San Jose State Teachers College, attended U.C. Berkeley, taught school and then committed herself to weaving. She went first to Hull House in Chicago, then studied in Italy, France, Mexico and Guatemala, met and was encouraged by Frank Lloyd Wright [later a client] and by 1930 had opened a studio in San Francisco just off Union Square, the first of two that cosmopolitan Eurocentric San Francisco established. Some time after opening a third in New York City she moved there permanently.

Her works had two destinations. One sees them now in museum and corporate collections but Liebes began with a clientele of architects and interior designers in San Francisco. Then airlines and then DuPont turned to her as she was directed toward mass manufacturing as means to get good design out into the world. Th good design aspect is reflected in MOMA's identity; the museum had founded a design department the same year Liebes opened her studio in the City. Subsequently she was featured in MOMA's "Modern Interiors" show.

Traditionally, when textile has turned to the three-dimensional it has turned to basketry. With its multiple aesthetic aspects baskets become something else when conceptually they are understood as container of volume, shaping and

defining space. They then shift into the realm of sculpture when the technique of weaving comes into question.

Ruth Asawa grew up in California, went through the irruption and interruption of internment as a teenager, studied to be a teacher, traveled to Toluca with her sister, studied at Black Mountain with Josef Albers and came to rejoin her family in San Francisco, working until her death in 2013. Her most familiar pieces are prominent in four plaza-like places in the City where both visitors and residents commingle. What is less familiar is her studio/gallery work, some of which is in the collections of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco [FAMSF]. This work had its becoming at Black Mountain in the second half of the 1940s. Albers urged experimenting with different materials and Asawa began working with wire as a means of drawing in and around space, creating spaces within space. In the early 1950s in San Francisco she was producing sculptures in wire that, as finished works, actively engaged with the space of the room.

In 2006 The Chronicle's art critic, Kenneth Baker, reviewed a retrospective of her later, gallery-suited work and used the term "woven", as did the New York Times' writer of her obituary. This exposes the crux of the question: had Asawa taken textile beyond

its generally understood character? Art is always inventing itself and Asawa was testing the borders of what art looks like. An experience in Toluca when she had traveled there, introduced her to an indigenous tradition of textiles. The market is a large one and along with flat, woven pieces, baskets are sold. Some were made with wire, not plant fiber and Asawa observed how these artisans used a crochet hook to form a new kind of basket from metal. Baskets are an easy course of choice because they are useful by everyone everyday. They are familiar as containers for things. What Asawa grasped from Josef Alber's counsel and from market women in Toluca was the idea of basket. If baskets contain objects they are essentially space containers. If shaping, defining space and spaces is the aim then traditional materials and even the accepted definition of textile aren't determinative.

Asawa was a sculptor and the most familiar of her work is public, in metal and, for the Union Square fountain, involved the collaboration of schoolchildren in creating motifs. These reflected the City's aesthetic ideals; Asawa was already an established figure in civic art activities. The ones in the 2006 show and the de Young's collections, however, draw the viewer into a closer relation with the work in an enclosed space, one designed for that purpose.

Asawa knew, as did O'Hanlon, that the work and setting encourage experience where object and space are of a phenomenal whole. Where O'Hanlon's presented obduracy as perduring Asawa's have to do with reflection on space using forms unrelated to carving that are smaller in scale, the materials easily distorted or crushed.

These gallery pieces hang; they are intended to be perceived from different points of view. They shape the space in which they are situated in two ways. One moves around them because they occupy the space between entry and exit. This redirects movement away from the straight line of destination. At the same time one can see through them, they are not granitic masses, turning vision back. Asawa's works afford a kind of transparency while maintaining their materiality as artifacts, forms that look almost but not exactly as forms created by nature. In taking on this assertion of form over usefulness, textiles as traditionally understood become something else, drifting into the realm where art questions its boundaries.

There is another instance of this, public and more imposing; Running Fence by Christo and Jeanne-Claude. Completed in 1976, up for only two weeks and taken down without trace, it was a a continuous length of woven nylon fabric five and a half meters

high and extending some twenty-four and a half miles from Highway 101 to the Pacific where it ran down into the water's edge. It covered no surface and enclosed no space, as a tent might. Articulating the rolling contours of west Marin and Sonoma Counties in long curves it was a dramatic fabric line on and across the landscape, encouraging the viewer to see space in a slightly different way.

There is another possibility in textiles, one more intimate in scale, that of painting. Generally understood, painting is applying pigment in a liquid medium to a surface; a wall and more often a smaller work on linen, paper or wood, the framed works that we see in galleries. This places the viewer in a particular set of relations with the work in its surroundings; its flatness adjoins the planes of the structured space.

When painting meets textile a wholly different set of experiences occurs, for a few reasons. Textiles are encountered and lived with in a wide variety of settings, not only the planar. They collide with the useful and we are no longer sure if they are textiles. Is a grocery store paper bags with designs stamped on it a textile?

Enriching a surface graphically through stamping is one of two ways that painting works with textiles. The designer can dye yarns or select those already

dyed; in this case the color is an aspect of the fibers. Or if the fibers are thin and the weave is fine and the material is light, then the textile is a work surface; the structure is already established as field. The pigment can be applied with a brush; perhaps more commonly it will be impressed via stencils or stamps of many kinds, found materials. Motifs of all sorts are possible and repeats are usual, but the methods in resist and in overdyeing involve successive stages in creative production; in some of those stages a new creative action is possible. Beside this is the pigment and the color has to maintain its integrity throughout the creative set of processes. Synthetically produced colors guarantee uniformity, as they have for a century and a half. Colors derived from plants, however, vary, depending on the source and the stages in the creative process. Some plants can supply wonderful colors but they fade over time as they are light sensitive. But some, and some of these, can be made as colorfast as synthetic ones but with a nuance of the life of the source.

Indigo is one of these and frequently used as a dyestuff, in part because it provides a dark contrast with the light field of the textile surface.

There are plants that are botanically quite different but that all produce the pigment-producing indigotin. Their distribution is global, a kind of band that also

shows movements in chronological time. One variety grew in the Southeast, introduced from West Africa. That variety is grown in West Africa now and a few artists/educators have taken on using it as a pigment. One of these is Aboubakar who travels widely from Mali. To one workshop on the Pacific Northwest coast he brought iron-rich mud from the Niger, to demonstrate and teach something of how to use natural sources in dyeing with indigo, emphasizing local ones.

A slightly different indigo-producing plant has long been grown in Japan, too. The same range of blues is aimed for but the traditional techniques are somewhat different. With kasuri fabrics the practice still involves resist where some color is held back but the technique works with the warp and weft fibers. Because the width of the material is determined by the width of the loom the fabrics are about a palm's span across. Creating a garment requires and allows the designer to work with long strips and to introduce differently dyed sections and a variety of patterns. It has been well-suited to kimonos.

In 1975 Koji Wada opened a small shop in Berkeley that sold kimonos and Japanese artworks. At about the same time John Marshall, California-born and who had studied in Japan, was living in the East Bay and came to be focused on kimonos. Kasuri Dye

Works closed in 2003 and Yoji Wada died in 2008 but John Marshall is still collecting vintage kimonos and teaches traditional dyeing workshops in the summers. Though his studio is an hour's drive from 101 over the Coast Range his classes are regularly sold out early and draw students from beyond California.

The interest in weaving with traditional materials is still evident in the Bay Area, however, and it is with people who have been practicing it for a very long time and those newer to the medium. Elsie Allen was born near Santa Rosa, the city where Dorothy Liebes was also born and only two years after. Unlike Liebes she did not move to New York; her family was Pomo and they relocated further north along the Russian River valley where willow and sedge both grow, principal materials for Pomo basket weavers. Her mother and maternal grandmother were well-known weavers and she was taught it too, though not as a full-time activity until her children were fully grown. Interest in the art was low by then and Allen began teaching along with her activity in community organizations that forwarded Pomo student funding and social and economic issues, not unlike Asawa in the same period.

The Pomo were not pastoralists but sheep do well along that stretch of the Coast Range, particularly

near the coast, and the fleece from different breeds results in textiles of quite varied textures and uses. All the way up the Bay Region organizations that promote weaving have formed and flourish. Fiber Shed is a broad-reaching organization that promotes ecologically sustainable production of textiles from sheep to finished product. They offer regular workshops and sponsor member booths at Oakland and San Francisco farmers' markets. Oakland Fiber offers workshops [in an old cotton mill] and is a studio, too. A Verb for Keeping Warm in Oakland sells a wide variety of yarns and dyes for weavers.

The Artisans' Co-op in Bolinas on the Marin Coast is a retail site for fiber artists as well as ceramicists and painters. The Mendocino Art Center in Mendocino, founded in 1959 and where Elsie Allen taught, offers fiber arts classes as well as ones in painting and ceramics and has an artists in residence program. Fifteen miles north in Fort Bragg Pacific Textile Arts hosts workshops and has a storefront where local artists sell their work.

Textiles and fiber arts are dispersed across the Bay Region and further north in the Coast Range whether the presentation is via community organizations, retail outlets or individuals. If their audience or market doesn't seem large their level of activity and range of offerings is quite wide, ongoing and

expanding. Textiles are what we encounter in our phenomenal passage through the days; they have the “at hand” usefulness that Heidegger refers to and, if disparaged for that, they are ever-present in the arts and our lives. In the Bay Region their role is not a new one; being inattentive it is easily overlooked. The O’Hanlon Center, founded by Ann O’Hanlon after Dick’s death, featured a show of works sponsored by Fibershed.

Stone and textile present themselves as aesthetically quite different and differently experienced in place but they are complementary as phenomena. In the Bay Region the experience of each of those two is shaped materially and culturally/historically and so the Region is a place-world with stimulating interrelations of nature and culture. Part of its identity has to do with these two, the given and the made, in forming a particular place-world.