"ONLY HALF AN ARCHITECTURE"
Nature, Nation, and Interpretations of Modern Architecture in Canada

> JEFFREY THORSTEINSON

JEFFREY THORSTEINSON is an architectural historian with the Winnipeg Architecture Foundation and a design writer at Republic Architecture Inc. A graduate of the University of Manitoba and Queen's University, he is the author of Brutalist Architecture in Winnipeg (Winnipeg Architecture Foundation, 2012). His research focuses on interpretations of modern architecture in Canada and the history of architecture program at the University of Manitoba. He is currently working on an exhibition and book on the history of Green Blankstein Russell Architects.

Few texts have examined modern Canadian architecture in a national frame. This has limited the analysis of major themes in this discourse, particularly with respect to international practice and cultural history. Yet definitions of a coherent and specific "Canadian" category of modern architecture have been articulated. Such suggestions have appeared either tacitly or directly in popular texts, magazine articles, exhibition catalogues, and in writing by architects themselves. These constructions of a national approach chiefly define this category in contrast to others and as emblematized by a link to landscape, paralleling entrenched myths of national character.

The terms with which we discuss our lived environment, its meaning and history, reveal important underlying assumptions. Within the discourse of modern architecture in Canada, these terms have commonly pertained to issues of landscape. This focus on geographical context is notable when considered against a prevailing definition of architectural modernism based on universal, functionalist, and formal criteria. This variety of interpretation has an operative character, fulfilling a nationalist function in line with certain notions of Canadian identity. A concern with landscape was, in fact, an important strain in architectural modernism as a whole. A nationalist identification of Canadian modern architecture with landscape misreads this situation. This misreading, however, results from a similarity in motive and solution between strands of modernism and Canadian nationalism:

FIG. 1. HART MASSEY HOUSE, OTTAWA, ON, 1960, BY HART MASSEY. | COURTESY OF HELLMUT SCHADE/CARLETON UNIVERSITY AUDIO-VISUAL RESOURCE CENTRE.

a perceived lack in the structures of modernity and a reliance on land, nature, and place as remedy.

"CANADIAN" MODERN ARCHITECTURE

How has the quality of being Canadian been framed in writing on modern architecture? An emphasis on a connection to landscape is evident in even a brief survey of texts examining this subject. In 1983 architect Raymond Moriyama declared that modern Canadian works demonstrate that "architecture is more than the provision of shelter: it is a response, even to the point of subservience, to the land, climate, and nature."[1] In 1994 Peter Buchanan, echoing the language of British architects Peter and Alison Smithson, described a "Heroic period" of Canadian architecture, centred in the late 1960s and early 1970s, typified by bold "gestures set in relation to majestic landscapes"—works that projected a "powerful transcendent myth of Canada unified by the grandeur of the land to which human settlement could at least be an adequate partner."[2] John McMinn, in an exploration of postwar themes in Canadian practice and their resonance in the present, describes a "distinct" Canadian modernist architecture category "clearly focused on phenomenological preoccupations" and demonstrating a "materialist engagement with the specifics of place."[3] Lisa Rochon's 2005 book *Up North* likewise argues that modern and contemporary Canadian architecture is "in profound alliance with landscape" and that "what makes Canadian architecture unique" is its fight to maintain "a powerful sense of place."[4]

Intentionally or not, such writing has insinuated the existence of a "Canadian" category of modern architecture. This subset of practice, which we might term a "contextual modernism," has been posited as more authentically representative of national character in its relationship to place. The architects foregrounded in these interpretations and other similar texts comprise many of the country's most celebrated: Ron Thom, Arthur Erickson, Douglas Cardinal, Clifford Weins, and Étienne Gaboury. For the most part, works placed in this category date to the 1960s and 1970s. Bodies of work which have been framed as parts of this category include the regionalist West Coast Style and Prairie Expressionism. Characteristics read as signifiers of a response to landscape include sensitive siting, mimesis of nature, tactile materials, sculptural rooflines, and echoes of historical or vernacular approaches. Most buildings placed in this category are domestic, academic, and religious structures in suburban or rural settings. (In the literature I have surveyed, this nationalist line of interpretation appears more evident in English Canadian writing on architecture, although prominent French Canadian architects have characterized their practice in analogous regionalist and landscape-oriented terms and have been read by others as part of this Canadian category. A fuller analysis of the similarity, or lack thereof, between English and French Canadian discourses on architecture and nation, its relationship and meaning remains to be done.)[5]

As implied by McMinn and Rochon, this category has been formulated to include more recent works hailed as heir to modern Canadian practices.[6] This notion is also implied in Trevor Boddy's argument that the contemporary Canadian architectural community celebrates an overly narrow slice of work: "tiny [artful] wooden pavilions" in nature, adopting a self-consciously neo-modern "conservative, romantic and spiritual" approach.[7] This variety of interpretations is manifest in the 2005 catalogue *Substance Over Spectacle: Contemporary Canadian Architecture*, edited by Andrew Gruft; while addressing a range of practices, this text seeks to reintroduce the nation as analytic frame and identifies an emphasis on context as a key aspect of Canadian practice.[8]

We should be cautious toward any interpretation that attempts a totalizing view on a nation's approach to any practice. As put by Annmarie Adams and Martin Bressani, architectural history is "a domain well suited to serve nationalist claims."[9] Mark Crinson similarly argues that if nationalism engenders nations, "then nations aspire to be nation states, these then require nation-signifying buildings, which in turn manifest the nation." While this might inform architectural practice, a want for "nation-signifying buildings" might also skew historical analysis.[10]

Indeed, like Boddy, others have found fault in the characterization of architecture as "Canadian." James Viloria, for instance, argues that the study of early twentieth-century architecture in Canada "has traditionally been underpinned by a nationalist model that has related the built environment to notions of collective, universal and human identity."[11] Christopher Thomas offers a similar view in his article "Canadian Castles," which focuses on the reading of the Chateau and neo-Gothic styles as Canadian. This process was linked to the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century effort to establish a Canadian architectural mode, but the apex of such readings were the years 1945 to 1980, a period of Canadian expansion and patriotism that dovetails with the building of Canadian modern architecture.[12] Thomas argues such characterizations engaged in "slides and slippages" that concealed the complexity of practice in a manner conditioned by nationalism. Yet he also explores why these styles were

received as Canadian. Initiating the same process for modern architecture deemed "Canadian" may allow a fuller understanding of the complexity of practice and the meaning of national framing with respect to modernism, modernity, and nationalism writ large.

To begin, we can ask: to what degree is the insinuation of a distinct "Canadian" category of modern architecture accurate? Works that seem to embody a concern for site do represent a prominent strain in the country's modern architecture, especially among widely acclaimed examples. Many Canadian modern architects were interested in generating a landscape-minded practice, as manifest in period writing on this topic.[13] But there is scant indication that such efforts are linked to or motivated by the rubric of nation. An interest in landscape was pursued for a diversity of rationales. Whether Canadian modern architects as a whole pursued a concern for site in a way distinct from the variety of modern architecture manifested globally is hard to judge. The same can be said for the notion that this was a dominant body of modernist practice in Canada. In this way, such categorizations function as operative history, using of retroactive analysis to champion specific goals. These aims include national identity-definition, specifically a definition predicated on a sense of Canadian character based on a poetic and constructive relationship to landscape.

Indeed, a modern "Canadian" landscape-orientation has been identified in gestures whose reading as such is dubious. Note, for instance, Harold Kalman's description of the 1961 Ottawa home of architect Hart Massey (fig. 1) as presenting a "characteristically Canadian acceptance of the natural setting."[14] A juxtaposition of the Hart Massey house with Chicago's 1953 Ben Rose house (fig. 2) reveals the difficulty

of labelling the first as "characteristically Canadian." In both cases a Miesian steel and glass structure allows for topographical "acceptance." A similar reading is found in a 1962 speech on Canadian architecture by John C. Parkin, who argued that the Canadian use of the colour white is related to context. Parkin states: "In winter, when the snow arrives, only white can settle a house so completely into its environment. What elsewhere is rationalized as a device for setting a building apart from nature, in Canada, becomes the means of integration."[15] These readings rhetorically assimilate formal elements of modern architecture as "Canadian" in their supposed response to landscape. They function as a detournement: an alternate, Canadian, reading of modern architecture as a whole. Such selective reading might also be found in Marco Polo's characterization of Ottawa's Brutalist National Arts Centre as echoing Group of Seven landscapes and in McMinn's difficult to corroborate conclusion that the International Style was "less widely disseminated" in Canada than landscape-oriented works. It is also apparent in poetic but suppositional readings of Canadian architecture as regional, such as Milton S. Osborne's framing of the modernist planes of the Winnipeg Civic Auditorium as harkening to the flat surfaces of the Prairies, and Herbert Enns's recent similar interpretation of open, gridded Manitoba International Style practices as echoing the geography of the Canadian plains.[16]

MODERNISM AND PLACE

Such processes may be an essential part of architectural history, a field conditioned by relational social and cultural forces. However, an emphasis on the "Canadian" character of an orientation to landscape (itself an element at times seemingly imagined) distracts from our ability to perceive links between

Canadian practices and modern architecture writ large. This process also relates to deeper "slippages." Among these is a tacit acceptance of a unitary definition of modern architecture as necessarily universalizing, functionalist, and manifested in a constrained set of formal criteria read as evoking these meanings. Concurrent is an understatement of antimodern, nature-Romantic, and picturesque inclinations within modernism.

To understand the significance of other strains in the history of modernism, we might begin by noting Peter Gay's identification of modernism as "a call to authenticity." Indeed, while a rhetoric of internationalism was attached to modern architecture's development in the 1930s, nationally expressive forms are not necessarily incompatible with modern architecture and in a number of locations modern architecture was heralded as a means through which to construct a nationally appropriate built culture.[17] An interest in "authentic" forms, inspired by the fields of art history, ethology, and anthropology, shaped the terrain from which modern architecture emerged. Per Mari Hvattum, thinkers influential to the rise of modernism sought "a natural and rational starting point for a theory of human culture," one which could imply both universal uniformity and geographical particularization. Such thinking informed the definition of modern architects, in the words of Sigfried Giedion, "not merely as the building of an edifice but also as a building of contemporary life." And it led modernist pioneer Bruno Taut to argue: "All nationalist architecture is bad but all good architecture is national."[18]

Perhaps due to an endemic suspicion of nationalism and the at times abstract character of the nation-state, this is not the dominant frame for understanding a modern architecture of place; this is

FIG. 2. BEN ROSE HOUSE, HIGHLAND PARK, IL, 1953, BY JAMES SPEYER AND DAVID HAID. | CREATIVE COMMONS NON-COMMERCIAL - CC0 1.0 UNIVERSAL.

FIG. 3. THE CANADIAN INTEREST IN EUROPEAN MODERNIST REFERENCES TO CANADIAN GRAIN ELEVATORS IS MANIFEST IN THE DESIGN OF THE CANADIAN GOVERNMENT PAVILION, PARIS EXPOSITION, 1937; CANADIAN GOVERNMENT EXHIBITION COMMISSION, ARCHITECTS. | *RAIC JOURNAL*, VOL. 14, NO. 10, 1937, P. 203.

instead the notion of regionalism. The regionalist turn in modern architecture was present even in modern architecture's early history, evident in the concerns of such architects as Alvar Aalto and Le Corbusier, Walter Gropius, Lewis Mumford, Aldo van Eyck, and Frank Lloyd Wright. Many of these were inspired by the emphasis on authenticity and regionality that formed an important strain of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century architectural thought, particularly as manifested in the Arts and Crafts. By the postwar years these themes were popularized and developed, as manifest in Sigfried Giedion's concept of "New Regionalism" and James Stirling's 1957 "Regionalism and Modern Architecture," the first of which argues that the dominance of internationalist rhetoric in modernism was in fact relatively isolated to the 1920s and early 1930s.[19]

CANADA, REGIONALISM, AND LANDSCAPE

Indeed, a language of place and landscape in Canadian modern architecture during the period of its creation was largely not one of nation, but of region.

Canadian modern architectural writing possesses a prominent strain of regionalism, including the Massey Commission of 1951, which emphasized regional architecture in a national frame. One of its authors, Eric Arthur, noted: "To talk of a Canadian architecture is not far-fetched— so long as one recognizes differences... To talk, on the other hand, of a Canadian architecture indistinguishable in manner from coast to coast is to deny the basic principles of modern architecture and to ignore the cultural heritage of our country." Douglas Simpson, Étienne Gaboury, and other Canadians likewise endorsed regionalist strategies.[20]

Connections to international regionalist practices have been explored; Lisa Rochon and George Kapelos, for instance, trace the influences of non-Canadian regionalists on Canadian architects. But paired with an emphasis on the national character of such architecture, links to broader discourses are obscured. This is particularly true regarding critical regionalism, a category that much work defined as "Canadian" parallels, especially as framed by Kenneth Frampton who stresses sculptural rooflines, construction on untamed

sites, and material tactility. Architect Marianne McKenna stated that "What has become Canadian is what is termed 'critical regionalism.'" A 2006 exhibit and catalogue by John McMinn and Marco Polo discusses parallels between the works of B.C. Binning, Étienne Gaboury, Clifford Wiens, Douglas Cardinal, and other Canadians vis-à-vis critical regionalism.[21] But critical regionalism has had little role in the discussion of this presumed national architectural interest. Rochon, for instance, who instead ascribes a Canadian "state of mind" as key, has directly rejected this connection. This rejection has worthwhile grounding. As discussed by Keith Eggener in his article "A Critique of Critical Regionalism," this frame possesses limitations, including the implication that regionally minded work is more radicalized or autochthonous than in actuality.[22] Nevertheless, the resonance between the characterizations of modern architecture in Canada and regionalism should be emphasized, particularly if we understand this term as part of a larger category of context orientation in modern architecture and not as loaded with the specific quirks of Frampton's definition or as a manifestation of post-modernism.

There is scant indication that regionalism in Canada was linked to the rubric of nation. In this capacity, a slippage in definitions of Canadian modern architecture appears to be a collapse of the difference between an interest in landscape, regionalism, and a national frame of reference. However, definitions of "Canadian" modern architecture have gone beyond identifying regionalism as a notable strain in Canadian architecture. Rather, they have considered regionalism itself as a strategy legible as Canadian. What forms the basis for this line of thinking? An inevitable figure in this discussion is Northrop Frye. As Sherry McKay notes, Frye argued that "the question of Canadian identity, so far as it affects the creative imagination, is not a 'Canadian' question at all, but a regional question." This sense of the nation's character is transmitted in the common formulation of Canada as a "nation of regions," a notion that often structures how modern Canadian practice has been presented. The size of the country and the disparate character of its population centres underpin this concept.[23]

These notions undergird the aforementioned definitions of a "Canadian" body of modern architecture. Yet contemporary interpretive constructions of this category have often focused not on regionalism but on the notion of "alliance with landscape" and a valuing of a "sense of place."[24] To unravel why, we might start by considering a statement on historical Canadian architecture, one typical of the nationalizing readings discussed by Thomas. In 1967 Governor General Vincent Massey, while describing Canada's parliament buildings, stated: "I hope it is not too fanciful to suggest that the style is essentially Canadian, not only because it is different from the legislative buildings in the United States... but because it fits perfectly into its northern

setting."[25] Within this quote lie ideas of Canadian character recapitulated in the reading of landscape-oriented modernism as "Canadian," most centrally the idea of harmony with the environment. Exploring and making clear these ideas might help us understand the prevalence of these interpretations and grasp their relationship to modern architecture, modernity, and nationalism.

DERIVING IDENTITY NEGATIVELY

An essential element of Massey's point is the contraposition of Canada against the United States. Canadian self-definition against America, which enacts a simplification of both "other" and self, has long been a recognizable constituent of the country's culture. This tendency also appears to inform and structure definitions of "Canadian" modern architecture.[26] A useful model to understand the function of this process is proposed by Eggener in his analysis of similar themes in American practice. He proposes a three-stage model for the relationship to modernism in America. This begins with nationalism: an era of antipathy to modern architecture read as European, a phase coincident with a post-colonial United States peripheral to Europe. This phase is followed by internationalism and, ultimately, "naturalization": the American linking of building and site and the reclamation of the American roots of modern architecture in mass industry, skyscraper engineering, and the Chicago School. With the latter stage, by the 1950s, modern architecture could be found throughout the United States, minus anxiety of foreign influence and, in the words of Henry Russell Hitchcock, was "almost synonymous with American architecture."[27]

Is it possible to apply this schema to the Canadian experience? The first, nationalist, stage is easy to discern in the general

early twentieth-century Canadian disinterest in a European-originated modern architecture in favour of a continued theoretical emphasis on the question of the architectural representation of national identity.[28] This phase might be read as including early modernist-informed works which involved the decorative highlighting of Canadian nature and landscape, such as that of John Lyle.

Internationalism left a more irregular impression in Canada. While it has been argued that the International Style was "less widely disseminated in Canada," in truth examples of the Canadian embrace of a European-derived modernism can be found across the country in large numbers, tentatively in the 1930s and en masse by the postwar years.[29] Yet architectural internationalism in Canada was more limited in literature than it was manifest in practice. A notable example is Alan Gowans's *Building Canada* of 1966. Gowans lauded architecture that acknowledged, above all, Canada's status as a member nation of the "Western World," and called "Irredentist nationalism" a "cancer," deeming architecture as "the most mature of the Canadian arts precisely because it has rejected irrational fears of corrupting influences from beyond the confines of the country's political borders."[30]

Likewise, a Canadian "naturalization" process presents a divergent path. It can be found in the thinking of Canadians such as Eric Arthur and Milton Osborne who, in the first half of the twentieth century, welcomed European modernist references to Canadian grain elevators as precedent and found inspiration for a modern "Canadian" architecture in such thinking[31] (fig. 3). This half of the "naturalization" process was, nearly from the beginning, twinned with the notion of linking building and site, a language

of regionalism and attention to landscape, a pattern evident in practice and in readings thereof. Over time this strain of naturalization came to dominate; by the 1970s there was a paucity of claims for modern architecture itself as Canadian or concomitant with Canadian values and identity. The dominance of this one-sided "naturalization" rhetoric on a landscape-oriented modernism (with its nationalist undertones) arrives with the 1960s and 1970s—the focus of Buchanan's "Heroic period" and a central moment in Rochon's text and elsewhere.

It seems likely that interpretations of Canadian modern architecture engaged in self-definition against the United States by emphasizing tendencies that ran counter to a dominant, American-identified, definition of modernism, one that stressed the International Style and its postwar association with capitalist industry. This is true even if many roots of this "Canadian" strain of modernism lay south of the border. This pattern would account for an understatement in the similarities between Canadian and American practices, a slippage parallel to that described by Thomas in "Canadian Castles." Thomas postulates that earlier Canadian historians under-represented American influence in a manner conditioned by the American war in Vietnam and the Watergate scandal. This pattern, too, is echoed in contemporary accounts of Canadian modern architecture. Rochon's book, in its rejection of critical regionalism as a significant frame for Canadian practice, describes the theorized Canadian "mindset" as counter to an America she defines as "what we are not—gun toting, not evangelical, not war-mongering," the latter a reference to the most recent war in Iraq. The author goes so far as to include statistics from Michael Adam's 2003 best-seller *Fire and Ice: The United States,*

Canada, and the Myth of Converging Values (Toronto, Penguin Press) in order to emphasize the differences between the two nations.[32]

NORTHERNNESS AND NATURE

But why was an orientation to landscape identified as a "Canadian" strategy rather than other modes? Part of this interpretation necessarily relates to the ways in which modern architecture has been read, the understatement or marginalization of themes of nature-Romanticism, anthropological thinking, and regionalism, and an emphasis on the International Style which has tended to flatten and mischaracterize the meaning of formal divergences from this mode, many of which ought to be understood as functioning within a modernist sphere. However, this reading also has to do with notions of Canadian identity.

Beyond the aforementioned logic of a nation of regions, we might also note Massey's articulation of Parliament's "perfect fit" with northern setting, a rhetoric of "northernness" relating to the neo-Gothic idiom of the buildings, a language which parallels ethnic conceptions of Canadian identity as a dual partnership of English and French. Thomas argues that this understanding of Canadian architecture ends with the advent of the universalism of modernism, which is largely the case. However, Parkin does recapitulate such thinking in his 1961 statement on the nation's practice, arguing that Canada is unlikely to produce architects "of the sensuous virtuosity of an Alfonso Reidy or an Antonio Gaudi, nor engineers of the kind of [Eduardo] Torroja or [Pier Luigi] Nervi, for we are essentially a nation of North European origin, philosophy and conviction."[33] Non-ethic rhetoric of northernness and a kind of northern alterity is evident in the title of Rochon's text:

Up North. Both of these echo the larger category of Northern Romanticism, which, per Robert Rosenblum, played an important role in modernism as a whole and which was especially nature-Romantic in its location of a source of meaning in landscape.[34]

Yet Massey's point also invokes another notion: that of a special Canadian link to land.[35] This centring of geography in Canadian character is represented well in Frye's statement that the key question regarding the country's identity was not "Who am I?" but "Where is here?"[36] While all nation-states are defined by place, a geographical emphasis on the concept of nationality is stressed in Canadian accounts. Discussing the international modern architectural presentation of Canada at the Venice Biennale, Elsa Lam points to the deep roots of this concept of Canadianness, citing Gottfried Semper's 1851 Canada display at London's Great Exhibition. But what is the deeper meaning of this tendency, and how does it relate to the conditions of modernity, nationalism, and modernism?[37]

Beyond regionalism, a focus on landscape has other meanings. As noted by Christine Macy and Sarah Bonnemaison, while many nations have defined their identity through their landscape, in the New World such thinking had deeper salience. Americans, for instance, "sought sustenance for their national ego" in seeking "something valuable and distinctive that could transform embarrassed provincials into proud and confident citizens" by turning to one sense in which their country was different; "nature in the New World had no counterpart in the Old. Specifically, it was wilder."[38] This model mirrors Canadian processes of self-definition, which were likely informed by American models.

Those who have examined the specific cultural and political role of such thinking in Canada make another compelling argument on this subject. In the words of Ian McKay, Canadian interwar thinkers and artists, including the Group of Seven, "new-liberal," and Laurentian historians, narrated the nation in ways which grounded "the nation on the bedrock truth of the landscape."[39] This process of imagining the meaning of a Canadian community drew on the nation's large size and wilderness. But, as emphasized by R. Cole Harris, it also offered an importantly "culturally neutral" idea of nationality, shifting the focus from the already multicultural islands of settlement to the rocks between: a "disembodied Canada [that] could present an illusion of unity."[40] This interpretation points to Canada's status as one of the first modern, multiethnic, pluralist nation-states. In this view landscape fuelled a Canadian *Kultur*, one which eased and which supported a growing national *Zivilization*.

How does architecture relate to this pattern? Rochon and others have traced the connections between certain Canadian architects and the Group of Seven. Canadian practitioners may indeed have drawn, consciously or unconsciously, on this entrenched and popular line of thinking. The Group, however, was explicit about its nationalist ambitions. It was informed in this way and its aesthetics by European national Romantic examples. This is not true of modern Canadian architects. While a few early Canadian interlocutors of modern architecture (such as John Lyle) fused somewhat modern formal gestures with ornament highlighting the Canadian landscape for nationalist reasons, this approach did not gain widespread popularity.[41] As modernism progressed, with the removal of ornament as a vehicle of signification, it is nearly impossible to determine if nationalizing

aims lie behind an architectural orientation to landscape. While a few statements by architects indicate such thinking may have played a role, it seems that such nationalizing work was largely the product of interpretation. In this way, it is likely that the motivation for Canadian landscape-oriented architecture shares more with its international brethren than with a Canadian nationalist project.

ANTIMODERN MODERNISM

At the same time, it must be noted that the project of Canadian national identity-finding in landscape is a process of antimodern self-realization. It involved identifying a perceived authentic basis through which to reconcile a modern dilemma: the question of national identity in the modern world, a condition read as unrooted and overly abstract. Developed by historian T.J. Jackson Lears, the concept of antimodernism originated within the study of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century American culture. Lears identifies a dissatisfaction regarding aspects of modernity as having arisen during this period of history. He classifies this sense as "antimodernism." Lears's terminology refers not to any specific aesthetic doctrine but to social and cultural movements expressing sentiment counter to the processes of modernity. He argues: "antimodern dissent has survived most conspicuously in avant-garde art and literature" that "has so often protested the effects of modernization."[42]

The valuing of landscape and place is an important element in antimodern thinking. Thomas Brockelman characterizes this pattern thusly: "in the past two centuries to embrace place has meant to resist the 'abstract' character of modern life... Under the banner of topos, a battle is fought, the battle against the leveling and universalizing tendencies of modern

life." Brockelman argues that the concept of place presents to antimodern thinkers a "phenomenon of enticing concreteness"; he deems "the phenomenon of place as aporia of the modern." Antimodernism was also often closely tied to nationalism. As characterized by Benedict Anderson these two tendencies were linked: "The modernist-antimodernist aporia was by no means extraordinary... Nationalism, with its complex appeal to a vanished or imagined past and its ambitions for a limitless future, appears as the ordinary response to the aporia."[43]

The commonality of antimodern sentiment in Canada, particularly in the arts, has been well discussed. D.M.R. Bentley argues that "more efficaciously than any mind-cure therapy, new architectural styles and urban arrangements" were seen as able to "repair the psychological, sociological, and spiritual ravages of modernity."[44] How might antimodernism have been manifested in architecture? Antimodernist feeling, according to Lynda Jessup, often involved "a critique of the modern, a perceived lack in the present manifesting itself not only in a sense of alienation, but also in a longing for the types of physical or spiritual experience embodied in utopian futures and imagined pasts."[45] Sentiments of this kind are apparent throughout the discourse of modern architecture. They are particularly notable in critical architectural advocation for the renewal and even vivification of modernism and the repeated questioning of an overemphasis on functionalism. This enrichment of modern architecture was often sough through an embrace of the poetic, imaginative formal approaches, and tactile materials.

Many such statements, as Stirling's mid-1950s discussions of the "Crisis of Rationalism," can be read as reflecting deeper societal concerns. In this

way these works correspond with Sarah Williams Goldhagen and Réjean Legault's formulation of an "anxious modernism," a term postwar architectural modernists united "in their determination to renew rather than abandon the legacy of twentieth-century modernism" by recasting some of its tenets and abandoning others. These revisions aimed at solving contemporary needs and anxieties. In arguing for tactility and poetry such figures were arguing not against modern architecture writ large, but expressing an antimodern "yearning" for, in the words of Lears, "authentic experience—physical, emotional, or spiritual" and, often, demonstrating an unease with the "stifling overorganization" of modernity. These practices also prefigure and inform critical regionalism's attempt at "resistance" to the dominance of universal, rational, industrial "civilization."[46]

These discussions had currency in Canada as well. In 1950 Eric Arthur asked "is Function enough?" and posited modern architecture as capable of enriching the experience of modernity. Similarly, B.C. Binning argued for a vivification of modern architecture through the inclusion of art, a stance that mirrors some earlier Bauhaus thought. This sense of impoverishment also characterized the discussion of material means; Frederic Lasserre, for instance, stated his ambivalence to the functionalist International Style "curtain wall" in 1955: "The so-called curtain wall... is perhaps the terminal glib architectural answer to man's general desire for more light and more view." He elaborated: "A full street of Lever Buildings is a grimly brittle nightmare to contemplate, as would be a waterfront of only Mies' [van der Rohe] type of apartment blocks... architecture should respect its responsibility to create interest and give dignity in street and urban architecture." Further, a 1951

essay by Hart Massey argued: "function by itself is an insufficient basis for what is properly claimed as an art," and articulated the importance of architecture's "spiritual" role.[47]

Notably, the titular concept of the latter piece, "Only Half an Architecture," was later echoed by Arthur Erickson, who referred to landscape as the missing half of West Coast architecture. This sense was construed as pertinent to Canada's modern architecture as a whole in John C. Parkin's 1962 speech. In this way a generalized call for a reinvigorated modernism that echoed international trends was manifested in a concern for landscape that was, via Parkin, reconfigured as a signifier of a Canadian identity.[48] But in both cases, the thrust is the notion of a modern architecture imagined not as formally pure but as capable of responding to an antimodern sense of modern disenchantment. It is this sense, one distinct from abstract and technical concentrations, that underlies many period arguments, those which called for the integration with site and landscape, what might be termed the various "new" or other "prefix modernisms," and, in the words of Rhodri Liscombe, the postwar modern architectural "revival of stylism." Many of these arguments promoted material means divergent from those of a perceived banalized modernism, often identified with advanced capitalism. Materials that tangibly demonstrated their natural origins and relationship to historical idioms were held up to this end.[49]

In this same vein, Goldhagen and Legault argue that postwar modern architects who favoured locally inflected architecture did not do so to express national identity, but rather "on the grounds that an architecture of 'place' would combat the numbing iterability of the International Style." As such, regionalism might be

seen as part of an antimodern response to a perceived modern impoverishment. Viewed from this angle, attention to place—whether in the built environment or in the reading thereof—involves not a landscape-oriented narration of nation, but is emblematic of a broader response to dilemmas of the modern. Yet these responses resemble one another. Like such discourses in modern architecture, a landscape-based concept of Canadian identity emphasizes place in an antimodern fashion to fight "the battle against the levelling and universalizing tendencies of modern life" and seeks meaning in landscape and place.[50] Both involve the presentation of a concreteness: the first architecturally, the second vis-à-vis the modern nation-state.

MODERNISM AND THE PICTURESQUE

This concurrence points toward other historical continuities that have been obscured by the idea of modernism as necessarily representing a radical break with the past. The first of these, as discussed, is the recapitulation of patterns evident in the reading of historic Canadian practices in nationalist readings of modern architecture as "Canadian." The second is the similarity in these cases of the formal means judged as signifying the "Canadian." For example, Kelly Crossman lists four formal elements as typical of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century definitions of Canadian style: local materials, deference to climate, Canadian themes in ornament, and a self-conscious use of traditional Quebec styles and manners of building. A link to landscape has been perceived through the means of archetypal modernism (steel and glass, pilotis, the colour white). More often, however, it is versions of Crossman's four elements that are stressed in accounts of modernism read as Canadian due to

FIG. 4. RON THOM, TRENT UNIVERSITY, PETERBOROUGH, ON, 1969. | COURTESY OF TRENT UNIVERSITY.

FIG. 5. CANADIAN PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, ON. CENTRE BLOCK, 1916, BY JOHN PEARSON AND JEAN-OMER MARCHAND; LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, 1876, BY THOMAS FULLER AND CHILION JONES. | JEFFREY THORSTEINSON.

engagement with landscape: local, tactile materials; thematization of context; deference to climate; and allusions to past architectures. (These means also echo those advocated by Frampton as definitive to critical regionalism: tactility, "bounded" place-form, and a dialectical consideration of nature involving response to topography, context, climate, light, and tectonics.) To underline these similarities, we might note the formal resemblances of such chronologically divergent examples as Ron Thom's 1960s Trent University campus (fig. 4) and Canada's Parliament buildings (fig. 5), Arthur Erickson and Geoffrey Masssey's 1964 Graham House (fig. 6), and William Hay's nineteenth-century advocacy for a Canadian wooden architecture with very little ornamentation.[51] As such, elements seen as definitive of a "Canadian" modern architecture do appear a revival, or survival, of the traits which characterized historic concepts of "Canadian" architecture. This point is underlined if we note the coincidence of this "heroic period" with the late 1960s: crucible years in the definition of modern Canadian nationhood and the rhetoric Thomas discusses.

Yet these material and formal similarities are shared with numerous contemporaneous and earlier international modernist practices. Examples include: the embrace of wood siding and shingles in the work of Walter Gropius, Marcel Breuer, and many others; the sculptural forms and silhouettes of several postwar works; and much of the "tactile" use of field stone and concrete in modern and Brutalist practices. Some of these gestures have been read to represent a modern regionalism. This terminology, however, glosses over the material aesthetics and other themes operative therein. While at times developed with reference to region, these gestures more generally embody deliberate contrast with facets of modernity such as functionalism, the ordered character of the International Style, and the often polished products of advanced capitalism. In this sense a more useful concept may be that developed by Jorge Otero Pailos: "architectural phenomenology." This term characterizes the postwar architectural theoretical interest in the philosophy of phenomenology as an ahistorical experiential constant, a path offering an essentialist remedy in contrast to postmodern disunity and confusion.[52]

However, prompted by the aforementioned Canadian historical similarities, we might also note the shared formal elements, and their common association with attention to place, between modern architecture and older historic practices. In particular, many of these strategies mirror the picturesque, a recurring term in the discussions of historic practices read as Canadian. The roots of the picturesque reside in the eighteenth-century English thought of William Gilpin, Richard Payne Knight, Humphrey Repton, and Thomas Whately regarding the lessons which architecture and landscape design might draw from painting (fig. 7). Christopher Hussey assigns the picturesque a dominant role in the "aesthetic relation of man to nature," describing it as a key constituent in the eighteenth-century history of taste, one which sought the conciliation of man and landscape. Picturesque aesthetics and thought embraced "the vague, the local, the sentimental, and the subjective," while also inclining toward nationalism in the promotion of "the value of British scenery."[53] Gestures posited as demonstrative of these values included, beyond historical revivalism,

FIG. 6. GRAHAM HOUSE, WEST VANCOUVER, BC, 1962, BY ARTHUR ERICKSON AND GEOFFREY MASSEY. | COURTESY OF ERICKSON ESTATE COLLECTION, ARTHURERICKSON.COM.

FIG. 7. *VIEW OF A RUINED CASTLE OVER A GORGE*, 1798, GRAPHITE, WATERCOLOUR AND INK ON PAPER, 25 X 26 CM, IMITATOR OF REV. WILLIAM GILPIN. | TATE, 2016, [HTTP://WWW.TATE.ORG.UK/ART/ ARTWORKS/GILPIN-VIEW-OF-A-RUINED-CASTLE-OVER-A-GORGE-T09538].

the embrace of rough surface, sensitive siting, and irregularity (both of silhouette and of tone). In this light, certain works that have been read to typify "Canadian" modern architecture might also be thought of as representing a picturesque modern architecture.

The most prominent characterization of a picturesque modernism is in the postwar British context, where the term played a role in the debates between Nikolaus Pevsner, Hubert de Cronin Hastings, and others associated with *The Architectural Review* and the Townscape movement; Colin Rowe and Alan Colquhoun; and eventually the new monumentality endorsed by Reyner Banham and the Smithsons.[54] These accounts have emphasized some of the term's formal and thematic connotations, such as irregularity, eclecticism, and integration with urban context. But we can also centre on another of the genre's original themes,

one largely conceived with reference to landscape: the implication that, as paraphrased by Marc Grignon, "the designer should not impose abstract plans on a landscape, but should work with was is there, in accordance with the genius of the place, or *genius loci*." Such a location of meaning in nature as a response to the deracinated character of the modern corresponds with the rise of a Romantic interest in nature during the early years of industrialization.[55] Notably, this picturesque approach, enacted through the aforementioned formal means, arose during an eighteenth-century period of sudden aesthetic uncertainty. This moment's importance to the genealogy of modern architecture in the *longue durée* is well covered in Peter Collins's seminal *Changing Ideals in Modern Architecture, 1750-1950*. Its connection to modernism is implied within Henry Russell Hitchcock's 1929 text on *Romanticism and Reintegration*. This pattern echoes

Canadian nationalist, antimodern, and architectural phenomenological focus on landscape as a solution to perceived dilemmas. The roots of a modern picturesque in Canada, however, also owe much to the American experience. As argued by John Conron, the American picturesque has been an under-acknowledged cultural body of work, one that informed modern architecture's "cultural project of visual narration."[56] As in America, a vector for this tradition in Canada was surely the Arts and Crafts movement, which had a strong legacy in the country.

Interestingly, one valence of the picturesque is a sense of ownership. Leslie Dawn, for instance, has traced the connections of the Group of Seven to picturesque traditions, questioning the meaning of picturesque and artistic engagement with landscape in Canada as signifying colonialist intent.[57] Dawn argues that this undercurrent of ownership is particularly

notable in Canada, a nation forged on indigenous land. John Ralston Saul, who speaks out against Frye's notion of a Canadian "garrison mentality," offers an alternate reading. Saul states of Canada: "We have had lots of time for our 'social imagination [to] take root.'" He emphasizes Canadian culture as indigenized in its citizen's efforts at "reconciling themselves into the indigenous landscape."[58] This thinking proposes another potential source of inspiration for those seeking authentic meaning through landscape in the modern era.

An emphasis on the Canadianness of concern for landscape in Canadian modern architecture has obscured the character of modern architecture writ large as engaged with landscape and formal gestures which might be read in this way. However, while narrow definitions of national style ought to be questioned, it is worthwhile to note the resonance between motifs in the analysis and practice of modern Canadian architecture and past concepts of Canadian architecture and identity. These similarities indicate a continuation in modern architecture of historical themes. This continuity has been masked by an emphasis on the revolutionary character, universalism, and functionalism of this field, and a disregard for antimodern, nature-Romantic, and picturesque inclinations as part of modernism as a whole. Undergirding these parallels are typically modern sentiments that connect modernism and the rise of the nation-state.

As such, these readings of modern Canadian architecture correspond to mythic notions of Canadian identity, while also reflecting broader, international processes of questioning issues of locality and universality, function, and meaning in the modern era. Indeed, ingrained in modernism and in questions of modern

identity are antinomies: the natural and the invented, the local and the universal. These dialogues belong within historian Michael T. Saler's broader catalogue of antinomies which have fuelled modernist thought and practice: primitivism and futurism, expressionism and rationalism, classicism and romanticism.[59] While historians have claimed landscape-oriented modernism as Canadian by framing these practices against others, such works reflect the varied make-up of modern architecture as a whole, one based on these antinomies. The ground work for acknowledging this reality has been well stated in recent arguments against reading modern architecture in monolithic terms cited herein.[60]

A landscape-centred interpretation of Canadian modern architecture may have dissipated over time. An emphasis on regionalism continues, often without nationalizing language, spurred by localized logic of architectural publishing in a moderately populated vast country of far-spread cities and regions. Discussions of landscape and architecture are instead infused with and superseded by a language of late twentieth- and twenty-first-century ecologism. Eight years after his 1962 characterization of Canadian practice, writing in *Progressive Architecture* on the same subject, Parkin emphasized other concepts of national character, namely the role of the liberal democratic state. Recent historical volumes have offered composite accounts more conditional than those theorizing a Canadian approach predicated on a relationship with landscape. Works such as *Architecture and the Canadian Fabric* offer not broad narratives but imply the complexity of practice, largely avoiding totalizing conclusions. Yet these accounts, too, reflect an operative character conditioned by more contemporary concepts of national character: a Canada forged by its

liberal democratic institutions, technology, multiculturalism, and what historian J.M.S. [James Maurice Stockford] Careless has termed Canada's "limited identities."[61]

Histories of practice should reflect the complexity of built culture. The notion of a specifically Canadian landscape-minded modernism possesses nationalist characteristics. But, with that in mind, we should nevertheless note the parallels between patterns in modern architecture and ideas of Canadian identity. This genre of interpretation is an important constituent in a multivalent history of Canadian architecture and within a thematic history of Canadian architecture. Its roots and meaning are tied to the nation's past, its sense of identity, and its modern condition. The notion of "Canadian" modern architecture reflects a continual, international perception of the deracinated character of the modern, and points us toward the richness of response in Canada and elsewhere to the questions and answers posited by modernity, the nation-state, and modern architecture.

NOTES

1. Moriyama, Raymond, 1983, "Foreword," in Leon Whiteson (ed.), *Modern Canadian Architecture*, Edmonton, Hurtig Publishers, p. 6-7.

2. Buchanan, Peter, 1994, "Back to the Future," *Canadian Architect*, vol. 39, no. 3, p. 21-30. His examples include Erickson-Massey's Simon Fraser University and the Australian-Canadian John Andrews's Scarborough College. Smithson, Alison Margaret and Peter Smithson, 1981, *The Heroic Period of Modern Architecture*, New York, Rizzoli.

3. McMinn, John, 2000, "Double Vision," *Canadian Architect*, vol. 45, no. 4, p. 20-30.

4. Rochon, Lisa, 2005, *Up North: Where Canada's Architecture Meets the Land*, Toronto, Key Porter Books, p. 16.

5. Note de la rédactrice : À l'occasion des commémorations du 150e anniversaire de la Confédération en 2017, la question du

nationalisme canadien et de l'identité cana-
dienne en architecture est particulièrement
pertinente. Cependant, l'essai sur l'architec-
ture canadienne moderne publié dans ce
numéro fournit une analyse basée unique-
ment sur les publications produites en langue
anglaise. Le comité éditorial du Journal de la
SÉAC souhaiterait donc recevoir un article
équivalent traitant du même thème, sur la
base des écrits et publications en langue
française.

Editor's note: With the upcoming 150th anni-
versary of Confederation in 2017, the issue of
Canadian nationalism and Canadian identity
seems to be particularly pertinent. This essay
on Modern Canadian architecture, however,
primarily provides an analysis of the architec-
tural literature and bibliography produced in
the English language. As such, the Journal of
the SSAC calls for someone to rise to the chal-
lenge to write a complementary article that
examines the same theme, on the basis of the
French-language writings and publications.

6. Among them the works of Shim-Sutcliffe,
    MacKay-Lyons Sweetapple, and Patkau
    Architects.

7. Boddy, Trevor, 2012, "Mega and Micro.
    Canada, Invention of Extremes," in Luis
    Fernández-Galiano (ed.), *Atlas: Architectures
    of the 21st Century. America*, Madrid,
    Arquitectura Viva, p. 14. Such a reading of
    contemporary practice is manifest in Kapelos,
    George, 1994, *Interpretations of Nature:
    Contemporary Canadian Architecture,
    Landscape and Urbanism*, Kleinburg, ON,
    McMichael Canadian Art Collection.

8. Gruft, Andrew (ed.), 2005, *Substance
    Over Spectacle: Contemporary Canadian
    Architecture*, Vancouver, Arsenal Pulp Press.
    While not focused on links to landscape, this
    text presents Canadian architecture as groun-
    ded. This is telegraphed in the title's pairing
    "substance over spectacle," implying a mate-
    rial and meaningful negation "Spectacle,"
    the Situationist term for the disorienting
    confluence of capitalism and mass media.
    Notably, the description of a particularly
    "Canadian" category of landscape-oriented
    modern architecture seems to carry less reso-
    nance outside of the country.

9. Adams, Annmarie and Martin Bressani, 2003,
    "Canada: The Edge Condition," *Journal of the
    Society of Architectural Historians*, vol. 62,
    no. 1, p. 75-83.

10. Crinson, Mark, 2012, "The Building Without
    a Shadow: National Identity and the
    International Style," in Raymond Quek, Darren

    Deane, and Sarah Butler (eds.), *Nationalism
    and Architecture*, Abingdon-on-Thames,
    UK, Routledge, coll. "Ashgate Studies in
    Architecture," p. 115-134.

11. Viloria, James, 1999, "The Politics of the 'We'
    in the Construction of Collective Identities in
    Histories of Architecture in Canada," *Journal
    of the Society for the Study of Architecture in
    Canada*, vol. 24, no. 4, p. 10-17.

12. Thomas, Christopher, 1997, "'Canadian
    Castles'? The Question of National Styles in
    Architecture Revisited," *Journal of Canadian
    Studies*, vol. 32, no. 1, p. 5-27.

13. Gaboury, Étienne, 1980, "Toward a Prairie
    Architecture," *Prairie Forum*, vol. 5,
    no. 2, p. 237-247; Simpson, Douglas C.,
    1953, "Towards Regionalism in Canadian
    Architecture," *Canadian Art*, vol. 10, no. 3,
    p. 110-113.

14. Kalman, Harold, 1994, *A History of Canadian
    Architecture*, Toronto, Oxford University Press,
    p. 811.

15. Parkin, John C., 1962, "Architecture in Canada
    Since 1945," *RAIC Journal* [Royal Architectural
    Institute of Canada], vol. 39, no. 1, p. 33-40.
    This article was the text of an address by
    Parkin delivered to the American Society of
    Architectural Historians. Here, Parkin argued:
    "If there is to be a significant Canadian archi-
    tectural contribution in the next decade, many
    of us hope it will be in creating lessons in how
    buildings might be skillfully sited with respect
    to other buildings by other authors... central
    problem of the collective environment is the
    immediate task we Canadian architects have
    accepted as a challenge." He also cited Arthur
    Erickson: "Most of our buildings are only half
    buildings... because the other half is the site."

16. McMinn : 22; Osborne, Milton, S., 1937, "The
    Architectural Heritage of Manitoba," in
    Rupert Clendon Lodge (ed.), *Manitoba Essays*,
    Toronto, Macmillan Company of Canada,
    p. 53-88; Enns, Herbert, 2006, "Wide Open
    Spaces: Manitoba's Modernist Landscapes,"
    in Serena Keshavjee and Herbert Enns (eds.),
    Winnipeg Modern, Winnipeg, University of
    Manitoba Press, p. 153-181.

17. Gay, Peter, 1998, *Pleasure Wars. The Bourgeois
    Experience: Victoria to Freud*, New York,
    Norton, 1998; Mansbach, Stephen A., 2006,
    "Modernist Architecture and Nationalist
    Aspiration in the Baltic: Two Case Studies,"
    *Journal of the Society of Architectural
    Historians*, vol. 65, no. 1, p. 92-111; Whyte,
    William, 2009, "The Englishness of English
    Architecture: Modernism and the Making of
    a National International Style, 1927-1957,"

    Journal of British Studies, vol. 48, no. 2,
    p. 441-465.

18. Hvattum, Mari, 2002, *Gottfried Semper and the
    Problem of Historicism*, Cambridge, Cambridge
    University Press; Giedion, Sigfried, 1954, "The
    State of Contemporary Architecture I: The
    Regional Approach," *Architectural Record*,
    vol. 115, no. 1, p. 132-137; Bozdogan, Sibel,
    2011, "The Legacy of an Istanbul Architect,"
    in Jean-Francois Lejeune and Michelangelo
    Sabatino (eds.), *Modern Architecture and
    the Mediterranean: Vernacular Dialogues and
    Contested Identities*, Abingdon-on-Thames,
    UK, Routledge, p. 141-156. It has been argued
    that nineteenth-century concepts of national
    style have led to a modernist manner of thin-
    king about architecture. See: Watkin, David,
    2001, *Morality and Architecture Revisited*,
    Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

19. Goldhagen, Sarah Williams and Réjean
    Legault, 2001, "Introduction," in Sarah
    Williams Goldhagen and Réjean Legault
    (eds.), *Anxious Modernisms: Experimentation
    in Postwar Architectural Culture*, Cambridge,
    MIT Press, p. 11-23; Stirling, James, 1957,
    "Regionalism and Modern Architecture,"
    Architect's Yearbook, vol. 7, p. 62-68; Giedion,
    "The State of Contemporary Architecture...,"
    op. cit.

20. Arthur, Eric, 1951, "Architecture and Town
    Planning," *Massey Royal Commission on the
    National Development in the Arts, Letters and
    Sciences*, Ottawa, Edmond Cloutier, Printer to
    the King's Most Excellent Majesty, p. 216-221;
    Gaboury, "Toward a Prairie Architecture," *op.
    cit.*; and Simpson, "Towards Regionalism in
    Canadian Architecture," *op. cit.*

21. Frampton, Kenneth, 1983, "Towards a Critical
    Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture
    of Resistance," in Hal Foster (ed.), *The Anti-
    Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture*,
    Port Townsend, Bay Press, p. 16-30; McKenna,
    Marianne, 1998, "Critical Globalism," *World
    Architecture*, vol. 7, no. 10, p. 54; McMinn, John
    and Marco Polo, 2008, *41° to 66°: Regional
    Responses to Sustainable Architecture in
    Canada*, Cambridge, ON, Cambridge Galleries,
    Design at Riverside.

22. Rochon : 23; Eggener, Keith L., 2002, "Placing
    Resistance: A Critique of Critical Regionalism,"
    Journal of Architectural Education, vol. 55,
    vol. 4, p. 228-237.

23. McKay, Sherry, 2005, "Ideas of Canadian
    Architecture," in Andrew Gruft (ed.),
    *Substance Over Spectacle: Contemporary
    Canadian Architecture*, Vancouver, Arsenal
    Pulp Press, p. 191-201; Lehr, John C., 2003,

"Ethnicity, Space and Place in Canada's Cultural Archipelago: The Construction of Identity," in Klaus Martens (ed.), *The Canadian Alternative*, Würzburg, Königshausen and Neumann GmbH, p. 23-36.

24. Rochon : 16. Rochon looks to the 1939 B.C. Binning House in West Vancouver as "kick-starting" this tendency.

25. Thomas : 9.

26. This sense is partially addressed in Adams and Bressani's article on Canada's "Edge Condition," *op. cit.*

27. Eggener, Keith L., 2006, "Nationalism, Internationalism and the 'Naturalisation' of Modern Architecture in the United States, 1925-1940," *National Identities*, vol. 8, no. 3, p. 243-258.

28. These themes are well-covered in Crossman, Kelly, 1990, *Architecture in Transition: From Art to Practice, 1885-1906*, Montreal-Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press.

29. McMinn : 22.

30. Gowans, Alan, 1966, *Building Canada: An Architectural History of Canadian Life*, Toronto, Oxford University Press, p. 166 and 198. Prototypical architectural manifestations of this moment might include the 1953 national competition winning scheme for the National Gallery by Winnipeg's Green Blankstein Russell and the 1958 Canadian Pavilion at the Brussels World's Fair.

31. Osborne : 81; Arthur, Eric, 1929, "Architecture in Canada," in Bertram Brooker (ed.), *Yearbook of the Arts*, Toronto, MacMillan Company of Canada, p. 105-112. In contrast to Michelangelo Sabatino's statement that "Arthur chose not to exalt the machine age aesthetic" and "did not celebrate the enginee-ring culture," Arthur's early statements argue the opposite: "I believe it will take a thousand years to develop a national style in Canada, but I do see a light in the west over a grain elevator" and "there is something distinctively original about a grain elevator, but nothing Canadian about the Chateau Frontenac." Sabatino, Michelangelo, 2001, "Eric Arthur: Practical Visions," *Journal of the Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada*, vol. 26, no. 1, p. 33-42.

32. Rochon : 34-35.

33. Parkin : 38.

34. Rosenblum, Robert, 1972, *Modern Painting and the Northern Romantic Tradition*, New York, Harper Collins.

35. Kalman : 811.

36. Frye, Northrop, 1995 [1971], *The Bush Garden: Essays on the Canadian Imagination*, Toronto, House of Anansi Press, p. 219.

37. Lam, Elsa, 2008, "Wilderness Nation: The Myth of Nature in Canadian Architecture," *Journal of the Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada*, vol. 33, no. 2, p. 11-20.

38. Bonnemaison, Sarah and Christine Macy, 2003, *Architecture and Nature: Creating the American Landscape*, Abingdon-on-Thames, Routledge, p. 1. Quote from Roderick Nash.

39. McKay, Ian, 2001, "Handicrafts and the Logic of 'Commercial Antimodernism,'" in Lynda Jessup (ed.), *Antimodernism and Artistic Experience: Policing the Boundaries of Modernism*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, p. 117-129.

40. Harris, R. Cole, 1986, "Regionalism and the Canadian Archipelago," in J.M. Bumstead (ed.), *Interpreting Canada's Past, Volume II: After Confederation*, Toronto, Oxford University Press, p. 455-471. See also: Berger, Carl, 1966, "The True North Strong and Free," in Peter Russell (ed.), *Nationalism in Canada*, Toronto, McGraw-Hill, p. 3-26.

41. See: Myzelev, Alla, 2010, "Canadian Architecture and Nationalism: From Vernacular to Deco," *The Brock Review*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 28-42.

42. Lears, T.J. Jackson, 1981, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920*, New York, Pantheon Books, p. xv. This same sense of modern "rootlessness" is captured well in Berman, Marshall, 1982, *All That Is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity*, New York, Simon and Schuster. Discussed in: Myers, Fred R., 2001, "Around and About Modernity: Some Comments on Themes of Primitivism and Modernism," in Jessup, *Antimodernism and Artistic Experience…*, *op. cit.*, p. 13-25. Jessup, Lynda, 2001, "Bushwhackers in the Gallery: Antimodernism and the Group of Seven," in Jessup, *id.*, p. 130-154.

43. Brockelman, Thomas, 2003, "Lost in Place? On the Virtues and Vices of Edward Casey's Anti-Modernism," *Humanitas*, vol. 16, no. 1, p. 36-55; Anderson, Benedict, 2001, "Staging Antimodernism in the Age of High Capitalist Nationalism," in Jessup, *Antimodernism and Artistic Experience…*, *op. cit.*, p. 97-103.

44. This lens has been considered particularly applicable to the analysis of the Group of Seven, who McKay reads as typical of a "Laurentian" view ("Handicrafts and the Logic of 'Commercial Antimodernism,'" : 117-129), and who Jessup has identified as

demonstrating antimodern inclinations ("Bushwhackers in the Gallery…" : 131). Bentley, D.M.R., 2006, "Chapter 7: Northern Reflections: Architecture, Poetics, and Modernity in the Post-Confederation Period," in D.M.R. Bentley (ed.), *Canadian Architects: Essays on Literature and Architecture in Canada, 1759-2005*, London, ON, Canadian Poetry Press, [http://www.canadianpoetry.ca/architexts/essays/northern_reflections.htm], accessed August 31, 2016.

45. Jessup, "Bushwhackers in the Gallery…" : 131.

46. Stirling, James, 1956, "Ronchamp: Le Corbusier's Chapel and the Crisis of Rationalism," *Architectural Review*, vol. 119, March, p. 161. See also: Rowe, Colin, 1950, "Mannerism and Modern Architecture," *The Architectural Review*, vol. 107, May, p. 29-58; Lapidus, Morris, 1961, "A Quest for Emotion in Architecture," *AIA Journal*, vol. 36, November, p. 55-58; Yamasaki, Minoru, 1961, "A Humanist Tradition for America and its Relation to the Traditional Architecture of Japan," *Zodiac*, vol. 8, p. 142-143; Creighton, Thomas, 1959, "The New Sensualism, I and II," *Progressive Architecture*, vol. 40, September/October, p. 141-147 and 180-187; Hitchcock, Henry Russell, 1951, "The International Style Twenty Years After," *Architectural Record*, vol. 110, August, p. 237-255; Rudolph, Paul, 1959, "The Form and the City," *Canadian Architect*, vol. 4, March, p. 49-67; Goldhagen and Legault : 14; Goldhagen, Sarah Williams, 2005, "Something to Talk About: Modernism, Discourse, Style," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, vol. 64, no. 2, p. 144-167; Lears : xix and 63; Frampton, Kenneth, 1983, "Prospects for a Critical Regionalism," *Perspecta*, vol. 20, p. 147-162.

47. Binning, B.C., 1950, "The Artist and the Architect," *RAIC Journal*, September, p. 320-321; Lasserre, Frederic, 1955, "Viewpoint," *RAIC Journal*, August, quoted in: Bernstein, William and Ruth Cawker, 1981, *Building with Words*, Toronto, Coach House Press, p. 14. See also: Massey, Hart, 1951, "Half an Architecture," *RAIC Journal*, vol. 28, no. 9, p. 257-261.

48. In 1962 Parkin twinned his argument that Canadian architecture represented an embrace of landscape with the case that the nation's practices highlighted the importance of collective context and space. Parkin : 38.

49. Liscombe, Rhodri Windsor, 2015, "Modernist Architecture and Design in Canada and the United States," in Allana Lindgren and Stephen Ross, *The Modernist World*, London, Routledge, p. 509-518. It was such desires that

undergird a number of "prefix" modernist genres which expressed ambitions contrary to those perceived within the hegemonic International Style in the postwar years.

50. Brockelman : 47.

51. Crossman : 137; Frampton, "Towards a Critical Regionalism…" : 27; Hay, William, 1853, "Architecture for the Meridian of Canada," *The Anglo-American Magazine*, vol. 2, p. 253-255.

52. Otero Pailos, Jorge, 2010, *Architecture's Historical Turn: Phenomenology and the Rise of the Postmodern*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

53. Wright, Janet, 1984, *Architecture of the Picturesque in Canada*, Ottawa, National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Parks Canada. While the picturesque involved formal aesthetics, another focus was on natural landscape; the picturesque was proposed as a middle-ground between the serenely beautiful and the awe-inspiring sublime, a position involving the integration of the man-made and the natural. Andrews, Malcolm, 1989, *The Search for the Picturesque: Landscape Aesthetics and Tourism in Britain*, Palo Alto, Stanford University Press, p. viii; Hussey, Christopher, 1927, *The Picturesque: Studies in a Point of View*, London, Putnam. Significantly, the picturesque is a category of interpretation as much as practice, a situation recalling the reading of modern Canadian architecture as landscape-oriented.

54. Macarthur, John, 2000, "Brutalism, Ugliness and the Picturesque Object," in Andrew Leach and Emina Petrovic (ed.), *Formulation Fabrication – The Architecture of History: Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*, Wellington, New Zealand, SAHANZ, p. 259-266. See also: Vidler, Anthony, 2008, *Histories of the Immediate Present: Inventing Architectural Modernism, 1930-1975*, Cambridge, MIT Press. Notably, Hussey has also described picturesque figures such as Knight as prophets "of modernism" in their taking the "first step towards abstract aesthetic values." Hussey, Christopher, 1927, *The Picturesque: Studies in a Point of View*, London, UK, G.P. Putnam's Sons.

55. Grignon, Marc, 2014, "Architecture and 'Environmentality' in the Nineteenth Century," *Journal of the Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada*, vol. 39, no. 2, p. 65-77; Whately, Thomas, 1777, *Observations on Modern Gardening, Illustrated by Descriptions*, London, T. Payne and Son, p. 256, [https://archive.org/details/observationsonmo00what], accessed August 31, 2016. See also: Price, Uvedale, 1796, *Essays on the Picturesque, as Compared with the Sublime and the Beautiful; and on the Use of Studying Pictures, for the Purpose of Improving Real Landscape*, London, UK, J. Robson, p. 348, [https://archive.org/details/essaysonpictures-01priciala], accessed August 31, 2016; and Oerlemans, Onno, 2002, *Romanticism and the Materiality of Nature*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

56. Collins, Peter, 1975, *Changing Ideals in Modern Architecture, 1750-1950*, Montreal-Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press. Hitchcock compares "Wright's worship of nature" to the general "harmony in the direct line of the picturesque of the early Romantics," calling "harmony, the very quality which the incoherent and symbolic functionalism of the eclectic taste made impossible." Hitchcock, Henry Russell, 1929, *Modern Architecture: Romanticism and Reintegration*, New York, Payson and Clarke Limited, p. 116; Conron, John, 2000, *American Picturesque*, University Park, Pennsylvania University Press, p. xxii.

57. Dawn, Leslie, 2007, *National Visions, National Blindness: Canadian Art and Identities in the 1920s*, Vancouver, University of British Columbia Press.

58. Saul, John Ralston, 2008, *A Fair Country: Telling Truths About Canada*, Toronto, Viking Canada, p. 103.

59. Saler, Michael T., 2001, *The Avant-Garde in Interwar England: Medieval Modernism and the London Underground*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 6.

60. Goldhagen and Legault : 11.

61. Liscombe, Rhodri Windsor (ed.), 2011, *Architecture and the Canadian Fabric*, Vancouver, University of British Columbia Press; Careless, J.M.S., 1969, "'Limited Identities' in Canada," *Canadian Historical Review*, vol. 50, no. 1, p. 1-10 [reprinted in Careless, J.M.S., 1990, *Careless at Work: Selected Canadian Historical Studies*, Toronto, Dundurn Press, p. 281-291].