

Farnsworth and the Anatomy of Occupation¹

Dr Lynn Churchill, Curtin University of Technology, Perth, Western Australia.

Abstract: In 1953, two years after the completion of her weekend house, on the isolated banks of the Fox River, Plano, Illinois, Dr. Edith Farnsworth complained “[...] I feel like a prowling animal, always on the alert [...] the house is [...] like an X-ray.”² Despite these remarks and intriguingly, Farnsworth lived in her house for nearly twenty years, lodging in an awkward denouncement of it that she expressed through litigation, in published interviews and later in her memoirs. Also intriguing and likely a consequence of her belligerent occupation is Farnsworth’s lingering attachment to the Pantheon of modern architecture. Had she abandoned it, perhaps Farnsworth’s connection would have been lost. Clearly, while admirers revere the ‘look’ of this house as a modern icon, Farnsworth’s lived experience was different. Within the austerity of the glass box she was exposed physically and mentally to the forces of nature, to the critical gaze of the exterior world and to her amplified sense of self all of which affected her sensations. She endured loss: physical, psychological, economic and social. She was publicly humiliated, her reputation became one of a difficult and foolish woman with the concurrent court cases of 1951, which Mies won, leaving Farnsworth tarnished. Driven by the question of ‘why’ Farnsworth ‘suffered’ the house for so long, and informed by Georges Bataille’s theory of the General Economy, this paper speculates on ‘what’ it was that Farnsworth, an intelligent, professional, middle aged (in 1945) and single woman gained from her occupation: the relationship between Farnsworth’s body and the house in terms of bodily sacrifice, transformation and glory.

Farnsworth and the Anatomy of Occupation

To last, a construction [...] must be animated, that is, must receive both life and a soul. The ‘transference’ of the soul is possible only by means of a sacrifice; in other words, by a violent death. We may even say that the victim continues its existence after death, no longer in its physical body but in the new body – the construction – which it has ‘animated’ by its immolation; we may even speak of an ‘architectonic body’ substituted for a body of flesh.³

Sacrifice

So often, when Dr Edith Farnsworth spoke of her weekend house, she did so in terms of her own physical and mental body. ‘One’s house is almost as personal as one’s skin’⁴, she admitted in her memoirs. ‘I thought you could animate a predetermined glass form like this with your own presence’⁵ she confessed to Joseph Barry when he interviewed her for an article in *House Beautiful*. ‘The truth is that in this house with its four walls of glass I feel like a prowling animal, always on the alert. I am always restless. Even in the evening. I feel like a sentinel on guard day and night. I can rarely stretch out and relax [...] the house is [...] like an xray’⁶, ‘The windows steam up in the winter and drive you crazy. You feel as though you are in a car in the rain with a windscreen wiper that doesn’t work’⁷, ‘Mies [van der Rohe] wanted the partition closet five feet high for reasons of “art and proportion.” Well, I’m six feet tall. Since my house is all “open space,” I needed something to shield me when I had guests. I wanted to be able to change my clothes without my head looking like it was wandering over the top of the partition without a body. It would be grotesque.’⁸ ‘I can’t even put my clothes on a hanger in my house without considering how it affects everything from outside.’⁹ ‘Another thing: [when the fire was to be lit either the only small window or the only door must be open] or we’ll have

smoke everywhere. [...] In winter you let in more cold air than you get warm air from the fire.¹⁰ 'In summer the air gets very hot and stuffy. The only ventilation comes from both ends of the house [...] We need an air filtering system, but there is no room in the utility core. And when everything in the core is in operation, the noise is enormous.'¹¹ She complained the neighbours knew her as 'that woman serving the house, slaving away on the glass and steel all week-end'¹² and that the 'great "freedom" Mies' disciples are always talking about has created nothing but great problems for me. Indeed, there was no thought of me at any time.'¹³ 'Perhaps as a man he is not the clairvoyant primitive that I thought he was, but simply colder and more cruel than anybody I have ever known. Perhaps it was never a friend and collaborator, so to speak, that he wanted, but a dupe and a victim.'¹⁴ Judging from Farnsworth's words, her house was never intended as a place of pleasure and comfortable harbour to accommodate her living body.

Beyond Farnsworth, a number of commentators have read the house in relation to her body. Franz Schulze, for example, retells the story of an occasion on site during the construction of the house when Mies, standing some distance away called to Farnsworth, inviting her to walk up onto the terrace 'so that I can have a look at you'¹⁵, he said. Obviously flattered, Farnsworth obliged only to hear him add: 'Good, I just wanted to check the scale'¹⁶. Almost anybody reading this would feel the humiliation. Schultz went on to describe Farnsworth as 'no beauty. [...] Six feet tall, ungainly of carriage, and, as witnesses agreed, rather equine in features, she was sensitive about her physical person and may very well have compensated for it by cultivating her considerable mental powers.'¹⁷ However, despite Farnsworth's sensitivity to her physical appearance in particular her height, Mies designed her closet and dressing area such that Farnsworth's experiences of these aspects of herself were exacerbated within the intimate daily rituals of dressing and undressing. Furthermore, Farnsworth's position as a professional, middle-aged, single and childless woman at the conclusion of World War II, living in a one-room glass box was in dissonance with the direction in which America was rapidly heading. Alice Friedman observed, 'The way the house foregrounded Farnsworth's single life and her middle-aged woman's body struck at the heart of American anxiety.'¹⁸ Her lack of contribution to both family life and to the advancement of capitalism through increased consumerism in domestic life contradicted the post war juggernaut that was America. Beatriz Colomina wrote: 'War does not go away. Rather it is carried out in the consumption of mass-produced spinoffs of military technology and efficiency.

The museum's [Museum of Modern Art New York] sustained attempt to produce an idealised image of post-war domesticity was, in a way, a military campaign'¹⁹. In the climate of the cold war, there was a push towards a new domestic life for the American worker and his family with new expectations and an increasingly competitive environment towards consuming and accommodating more and more material possessions: the car, electrical appliances, cleaning products and equipment for the kitchen and laundry which elevated the standard and speed of production of homemade food, newness, freshness and cleanliness in every aspect of the home. Expectations of domestic life rose steeply, coercing the average suburban American housewife to make beds, shop, sew, cook, chauffeur and generally facilitate her husband and children's activities, sacrificing her own life. But she lay by her husband at night and silently asked 'Is this all?'²⁰ The women lay silently because, as Friedan explained in 1962, they 'were taught to pity the neurotic, unfeminine, unhappy women who wanted to be poets or physicists or presidents.'²¹ In this context, alongside these ideals for domestic life, Farnsworth's occupation of her transparent and virtually empty glass box was a perversion. In contrast to

the average American housewife, Farnsworth had invested in a house '[s]o unconventional [...] that every move and every activity in it assumed an aesthetic quality which challenges behaviour patterns formed in different surroundings'²² and this was made possible by her perverted life as a single, professional, independently wealthy, middle-aged woman, who existed outside the enclave of the idealised norm. However, as Farnsworth's memoirs recall from her time at Chicago University, being an outsider was a familiar feeling:

Among the other students there seemed to be a good bit of talent and self-assurance. I had no assurance and was aware of no talents; moreover I was ashamed of my sheltered life and rapidly developed an exaggerated respect for my classmates whom I fancied to be less privileged than I, and longed to have been in the gather which I thought of as the cradle of all that was really authentic.²³

Following her meeting with Farnsworth in 1953 Elizabeth Gordon wrote: 'I have talked to a highly intelligent, now disillusioned, woman who spent more than \$70.000.00 building a 1 - room house that is nothing but a glass cage on stilts'²⁴ almost completely divorced from the ground. Later, in 1994, Paulette Singley likened Farnsworth's body in the house to entrapment and objectification of the female body in a display case elevated on a podium. Singley's study of the female figure within Mies' domestic architecture found a body of work that blurred the distinction between life and art. According to Singley, Mies conflated the architecture of a house with that of a museum, acting as a curator of the body's occupation of domestic space. She reminds the reader that after designing the glass skyscraper in 1921, some 25 years passed before Mies designed the first all-glass house in which the woman was displayed as 'an object captured in glass.'²⁵ Earlier, in 1992, Alice Friedman had touched on the idea of the architect as a curator of domestic space when she wrote:

Not only can architecture control, and limit, physical movement (and inevitably, of course, control the faculty of sight as part of this physical experience), it can also create an arena and a frame for those who inhabit its spaces. Through screening, sightlines, contrasts of scale, lighting and other devices, architecture literally stages the value system of a culture, foregrounding certain activities and persons and obscuring others.²⁶

As critics have recognised, Mies designed a house that framed Farnsworth, distinguishing her from the prevailing system of the late 1940s and 1950s American culture and its values. Farnsworth was indeed foregrounded as being in opposition to the modern American view of the ideal woman occupying the ideal domestic space.

General Economics: Transference of the Soul from Body to Building

Georges Bataille, who was interested in sacrifice, in particular, the extent to which humans will invest in suffering and loss as a means to elevating their status in this life or the next (according to belief), has contributed to an understanding of Farnsworth and her enduring relationship to her house. Bataille's theory of the general economy that was based on his reading of Marcel Mauss' study of archaic forms of contract, in particular 'potlatch', takes account of sacrifice and loss including humiliation as part of an economy, the flow of resources between people or groups of people. As with many architectural works, it was sacrifice and humiliation that ultimately enabled both the manifestation of the house as a revered icon of modern architecture and also, by association, the endurance of the Farnsworth name. Unlike the more limited fiscal economy of capitalism, Mauss' found potlatch to be a broader and lasting contract of 'total services' and 'counter services' constituting 'the economic and legal

systems that have preceded our own²⁷. Exchanges included 'acts of politeness: banquets, rituals, military services, women, children, dances, festivals and fairs'²⁸ because the general economy is not restricted to the pecuniary or utilitarian. Rather, it is an inclusive system of accounting. A further distinction is explained by defining the term 'potlatch', a Chinook word meaning 'to feed' or 'to consume,' the object being to consume rather than produce. Potlatch, as practiced by tribes of the American Northwest, was a series of exchanges, initiated by a gift, which was the first move in a series of obligatory and sacrificial exchanges: to give, to receive and then to reciprocate. Mauss explained:

the principle of rivalry and hostility [...] prevails in all these practices [...] [t]hey go as far as to fight and kill [...] they even go as far as the purely sumptuary destruction of wealth [...] It is a struggle between nobles to establish a hierarchy amongst themselves from which their clan may benefit later.²⁹

New momentums generated by acquisitions and re-distributions of power, in particular the potential to shift religious and economic power through sacrifice and consumption were of interest to Bataille. The problem, as he defined it was: 'We need to give away, lose or destroy. But the gift would be senseless (and so we would never decide to give) if it did not take on the meaning of an acquisition. Hence giving must become acquiring a power.'³⁰ Therefore, following Bataille's logic, because the act of giving is in itself greater than the person who gives, through giving, a person may acquire the greatness of the act as is exemplified by people, who are motivated by religious beliefs to give everything away, keeping nothing other than a loincloth. For Bataille, an example of the power of the gift is the wealthy merchants of Mexico for whom it would have been regarded ignoble to die 'without having made some splendid expenditure that might add lustre to his person'. However, according to Bataille, acquiring power from giving is only possible when there is public recognition of the giver's capacity for loss. Therefore, spectators are essential to complete the performance of giving. Having witnesses to affirm the giver's capacity for loss is fundamental to gaining power that will ultimately be held over the recipient of the gift. Finally, it is the object given that carries the lingering weight of the loss, which is also the burden of reciprocity that radiates with glory. Fundamental to flow of the general economy is a redistribution of power, with the gift having the power to place the rival in the shadow of the giver's name, thus elevating the giver.

Sacrifice and its potential to catalyse transformation was of particular interest to Bataille who wrote: '[s]acrifice restores to the sacred world that which servile use has degraded, rendered profane [...] In his strange myths, in his cruel rites, man is in search of a lost intimacy [...].'³¹ He explained how a victim may be drawn through an experience of sacrifice towards transformation, which is interesting when considering Farnsworth in 1945, her position and aspirations: '[Being chosen] gives him a recognizable figure, which now radiates intimacy, anguish, the profundity of living beings.'³²

Nothing is more striking than the attention that is lavished on him [...] As soon as he is consecrated and during the time between consecration and death, he enters into the closeness of the sacrificers and participates in their consumptions: He is one of their own and in the festival in which he will perish, he sings, dances and enjoys all the pleasures with them. There is no servility in him [...] He is lost in the immense confusion of the festival. And that is precisely his undoing.³³

The power of human sacrifice is central to a widespread Eastern European folkloric tradition

concerning the entombment of a still living body, often human and female within the matter of a building during its construction. According to the myth both the building and the body benefit from this violent union: through consumption of the body the building becomes animated, a characteristic not usually possible for an inanimate object, while at the same time once sacrificed, the body whose ultimate limitation is mortality, gains the more enduring corporeality of the building. The Ballad of Master Manole³⁴ and the Monastery of Arges is one version of the myth in which the protagonists receive a message from another reality, perhaps a dream, the primary victim is usually a woman, often the wife of the stonemason and finally, the woman's body always becomes incorporated into the building. The ballad begins when the master, his apprentices and the Black Prince search the countryside for most suitable site for a 'monastery worthy to be remembered'³⁵. Eventually, an abandoned unfinished wall is found and the Black Prince contracts Master Manole to build 'a high monastery, unequalled on earth'³⁶ in return for gold and the status of noblemen. However, should they fail to build 'a high monastery, unequalled on earth' they will be buried alive at the base of the construction. Construction begins immediately, but the first four attempts end with the day's work collapsing during the following night. Then the Master had a dream in which a voice tells him the building will only be secure after the body of the first wife or sister to arrive at the construction site the following morning with food for her husband or brother is embedded into the wall. Swearing secrecy, the workers promise to sacrifice the first woman to appear the very next morning. Unfortunately despite his pleading with the heavens to divert her as she appears in the distance, the first woman was the Master's beautiful young wife Anna. Nevertheless, on her arrival, in honour of his promise and no doubt mindful of the prize, the Master playfully tricks her into standing in place while he works furiously to construct the wall around her. Although in the beginning Anna plays along with her husband because she trusts him, the wall grows steadily higher pressing hard on her fragile body and she begins weeping and calling out for release but the construction continues until finally the monastery is complete and so high, that it is unequalled on earth. As the dream foretold, with the young woman's body embedded within the walls, the building remains firmly in place, even though Anna's voice can still be heard, calling faintly. Meanwhile the workers sit proudly, high on the roof of their masterpiece. Then the Black Prince arrives. When he sees the beautiful shining monastery, he appeals to them, 'could they make another, even more beautiful?'³⁷ The exuberant workers boast yes, yes they can build 'another monastery [...] far more shining and far more beautiful'³⁸. But of course then the prince knows instantly that the workers have failed to build an unequalled monastery and so, in accordance with the contract, he dismantles the scaffolding, abandoning them on the roof. Eventually, they leap to their deaths at the monastery's base.

She Enters into the Closeness of the Sacrificers and Participates in Their Consumptions

The tale of the Farnsworth House somewhat resembles that of The Ballad of Master Manole. It began in 1945 when Farnsworth invited the Museum of Modern Art New York, at a time when Philip Johnson was the Director, to recommend an architect to design a weekend house in the country.³⁹ Shortly after, Farnsworth was introduced to Ludwig Mies van der Rohe when they met at the apartment of mutual friends, Georgia and Ruth. Farnsworth's memoirs recall the momentous occasion in the following way: 'Also invited that evening was the massive stranger whom Georgia, with her peculiarly sweet smile, introduced, as I slipped off my coat: "This is Mies, darling."⁴⁰ Farnsworth described how, on that night, the small party had chatted around 'the granite form' of Mies and his lack of conversation until the moment her plan to build a house on the banks of the Fox River was mentioned:

The response [from Mies] was the more dramatic for having been preceded by two hours of [his] unbroken silence. 'I would love to build any kind of house for you.' The effect was tremendous, like a storm, a flood or other act of God. We planned a trip to Plano together, so that I could show him the property.⁴¹

When I got home that night, I collected books I had on modern architecture, the 'international school' and the Bauhaus and looked through them for references to Mies. There was mention of the German pavilion at the Barcelona Exposition of 1929, and of the Tugendhatt House in Brno with its free-standing interior wall of onyx, rather brief allusion to an architect who seemed to have a singular predilection for luxury materials.⁴²

From the beginning, the house was destined to be extraordinary, Farnsworth longed for something more for herself and so her project for a weekend house in the country was born. After finding a site she:

[...]took to leafing through books [...] on modern architecture [...] [where she] saw houses [...] hanging over cliffs and ravines or built out over water [...] for example] the Bear Run house of Wright; the Savoye house of Le Corbusier. And [she] began to reflect on [...] architecture as an art, as a monument, a shelter, a machine for living [...] [I]t would be unbearably stupid of me to 'put up' some contractor's cottage which could only ruin the site and remain as a token of empirical mediocrity.⁴³

Farnsworth's engagement of Mies, ensured her investment in 'art as architecture', a manifestation of the *Zeitgeist*⁴⁴: the art, architecture, culture, politics, economics and technology of her time and place. Over several decades Mies had demonstrated his philosophical position through works on paper, a few constructed buildings and his writings, much of which were published in 1947 in Philip Johnson's monograph titled Mies van der Rohe and launched on the occasion of an exhibition of Mies' work at the Museum of Modern Art, New York. Mies' opportunity to build in America had arisen when Farnsworth approached the Museum of Modern Art. The museum's patronage of Mies, the Americanisation of his European heritage, his philosophy of architecture and his need for a client all suggest that even before being introduced to Mies, Farnsworth's project was heading in a particular direction. Her architect and his supporters had been awaiting her arrival.

Following Mies' introduction to Farnsworth, their 'collaboration' began immediately with frequent visits to the site on the wooded banks of the Fox River 47 miles west of Chicago. There was no apparent hurry. A preliminary design surfaced in 1946, and then in 1947, a scaled-model was included in Mies' exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art and construction of the house eventually commenced in 1949 when Farnsworth received her inheritance. Her memoirs convey the exhilaration of the moment: 'Notwithstanding a few disagreements and tensions, the summer of 1949 was brilliant and exciting. [...] The drafting room became a club room [...] and the boys vied for the privilege of contributing to the realization of the 'most important house in the world'.⁴⁵ However, by then, the original budget of \$40,000.00 had escalated to \$60,000.00. Nevertheless Farnsworth submitted to her architect's direction while he worked around her. She trusted him:

By the summer of 1950, the Fox River house had a roof, and the slabs of travertine waited in rows outside the hen brooding house. Students of all callings arrive in busloads to mill around

open-mouthed and to drop a line in the river in the hope of carp. Architects came from various European countries and we brought one of two of them from town with us almost every weekend. Most of them were fulsome in their words of praise and wonderment at the miracle which was taking form in that rural spot; one or two of the German ones exclaimed, "Master!" and crawled across the terrace to the latter's feet where he sat on a low aluminium deck chair, impassively auditing the throaty plaudits of the visitors.⁴⁶

However, on Mies' insistence, and despite Farnsworth's protests, the master piece was effectively draining her resources and restricting her freedom: her own furniture, her familiar heirlooms, was rejected, deemed unsuitable in favour of modern furniture designed by the architect himself? Farnsworth was being squeezed. What was she to think when Mies insisted she be extremely restrained in her occupation of her own house? By the time the house was completed in 1951, Farnsworth was being asked to pay \$74,000.00 for a one-roomed house with an intense connection to nature. Her calls for heating and cooling systems were ignored or remained under-designed while higher objectives of the design were privileged.⁴⁷ Despite Farnsworth's pleas, Mies was against enclosing the terrace with insect screening because the effect of the mesh would diminish the transparency of the house. Eventually, however, after moving-in, the reality of 'the tormenting clouds of mosquitoes rising from the riverside meadow every summer'⁴⁸ forced Farnsworth to have stainless steel screening designed and erected. For Farnsworth, everyday occupation was constrained by her own body often being observed by sightseeing tourists who pushed their noses up to the glass walls to view the interior of the modern icon within which there was no privacy, her body was always visible unless she was in the bathroom.⁴⁹

The Glory

Nonetheless, Farnsworth remained in the house until 1972 when Peter Palumbo, an aficionado of Mies, finally persuaded her to sell. Palumbo's memorable first encounter with Farnsworth is as follows:

When admirers of Mies's work came to see the house [...], she sometimes chased them off with a shotgun [...] In the summer of 1968, he says he 'crept under the fence to look at the house and decided there and then to make her an offer.' Risking limb, if not life, he resolutely approached the house and rang the doorbell. 'I essentially bought the house that afternoon,' he says, 'but she was a ferocious, difficult woman, and we didn't really complete the deal until 1972.'⁵⁰

Like Palumbo, many have fallen for the various evocations of the house's mysterious powers, for example that it floats or levitates above the ground.⁵¹ In conversation with James Ingo Freed, Shulze claimed the Farnsworth House to be a 'shrine'. Freed responded: 'Or a temple. Or a metaphor for a house, not a house in the psychological or physical sense [...] It really is an icon of our age'.⁵² Clearly, in terms of the general economy, this was Farnsworth's gift. Ultimately, she sacrificed a great deal of herself to enable a significant work of architecture.⁵³ Having initiated the gift it is important to consider the recipient, who, in the flow and redistribution of power, is at the same time Farnsworth's rival. Therefore, who was the recipient of her gift? Of course Mies and his disciples stood to gain but there was someone else, someone to whom Farnsworth needed to restore her degraded self. It was the onlooker - post war America. The event that was the appearance of the transparent Farnsworth House, layered with Farnsworth's personal exposure and losses, offered America a vision of self in the context of, in Miesian terms, the *Zeitgeist* or spirit of the epoch. In this way, the house acts

as a memorial to the fundamental questions of 'Who am I?' and 'Where am I?' This was Farnsworth's gift. Identifying the recipient identifies the rival, the object of humiliation that for Farnsworth was a composite of forces pushing new post war American ideals that opposed her life. Farnsworth was marginalised for not being the ideal American woman who was younger, more domesticated and less ambitious. Society had turned away from the woman she was. However, Farnsworth's investment in the house served to alter the distribution of power. By investing so much of herself in what she always knew would be significant modern architecture to linger beyond the limitations of her own mortality and having captured the agglomeration of forces acting upon American domestic life in the 1950s, Farnsworth had embarked upon a transformation of self. Making more of her life in this way proved to be a timely speculation on the questions 'Who am I?' and 'Where am I?' through which Farnsworth gained glory and a lingering attachment to the Pantheon of modern architecture. Farnsworth orchestrated her own public transformation of self into architecture and the spectator, the American public, was vital to her success.

Endnotes

- ¹ The paper is based on a case study, which forms part of the author's PhD thesis.
- ² Barry, (1953), 'Report on the American Battle Between Good and Bad Architecture.'
- ³ Eliade, M, (1972) *Zalmoxiz: The Vanishing God: Comparative Studies in the Religions and Folklore of Dacia and Eastern Europe*.
- ⁴ Chapter 13, Box 26, The Farnsworth Memoirs.
- ⁵ Barry, (1953), 'Report on the American Battle Between Good and Bad Architecture.'
- ⁶ Barry, (1953), 'Report on the American Battle Between Good and Bad Architecture.'
- ⁷ Barry, (1953), 'Report on the American Battle Between Good and Bad Architecture.'
- ⁸ Barry, (1953), 'Report on the American Battle Between Good and Bad Architecture.'
- ⁹ Barry, (1953), 'Report on the American Battle Between Good and Bad Architecture.'
- ¹⁰ Barry, (1953), 'Report on the American Battle Between Good and Bad Architecture.'
- ¹¹ Barry, (1953), 'Report on the American Battle Between Good and Bad Architecture.'
- ¹² Barry, (1953), 'Report on the American Battle Between Good and Bad Architecture.'
- ¹³ Barry, (1953), 'Report on the American Battle Between Good and Bad Architecture.'
- ¹⁴ Chapter 13, Box 26, The Farnsworth Memoirs.
- ¹⁵ Schulze, F. (1985) *Mies van der Rohe: A Critical Biography*. p258.
- ¹⁶ Schulze, F. (1985) *Mies van der Rohe: A Critical Biography*. p258.
- ¹⁷ Schulze, F. (1985) *Mies van der Rohe: A Critical Biography*. p258.
- ¹⁸ Friedman, A. (1998) *Women and the Making of the Modern House*.
- ¹⁹ Colomina, (1994) '1949,' p. 314.
- ²⁰ Friedan, B. (1963) *The Feminine Mystique*.
- ²¹ Friedan, B. (1963) *The Feminine Mystique*.
- ²² Friedman, A. (1998) *Women and the Making of the Modern House*. cites Dirk Logan.
- ²³ Chapter 3, Folder 25, Box 1, The Farnsworth Memoirs.
- ²⁴ Gordon (1953) 'The Threat to the Next America.'
- ²⁵ Singley (1994) 'Living in a Glass Prism: the Female Figure in Ludwig Mies van der Rohe's Domestic Architecture.'
- ²⁶ Friedman, (2000) 'Architecture, Authority and the Female Gaze: Planning and Representation in the Early Modern Country House,' p.338.

-
- ²⁷ Mauss, M. (1990) *The Gift: The Form and reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. p5.
- ²⁸ Mauss, M. (1990) *The Gift: The Form and reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. p5.
- ²⁹ Mauss, M. (1990) *The Gift: The Form and reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. p6.
- ³⁰ Bataille, G. (1988) *The Accursed Share: An Essay on the General Economy*. p69.
- ³¹ Bataille, G. (1988) *The Accursed Share: An Essay on the General Economy*. pp55-61.
- ³² Bataille, G. (1988) *The Accursed Share: An Essay on the General Economy*. pp55-61.
- ³³ Bataille, G. (1988) *The Accursed Share: An Essay on the General Economy*. pp59-60.
- ³⁴ Eliade, M. (1972) *Zalmoxiz: The Vanishing God: Comparative Studies in the Religions and Folklore of Dacia and Eastern Europe*. pp164-190.
- ³⁵ Eliade, M. (1972) *Zalmoxiz: The Vanishing God: Comparative Studies in the Religions and Folklore of Dacia and Eastern Europe*. p166.
- ³⁶ Eliade, M. (1972) *Zalmoxiz: The Vanishing God: Comparative Studies in the Religions and Folklore of Dacia and Eastern Europe*. p166.
- ³⁷ Eliade, M. (1972) *Zalmoxiz: The Vanishing God: Comparative Studies in the Religions and Folklore of Dacia and Eastern Europe*. p168.
- ³⁸ Eliade, M. (1972) *Zalmoxiz: The Vanishing God: Comparative Studies in the Religions and Folklore of Dacia and Eastern Europe*. p168.
- ³⁹ Schulze, F. (1985). *Mies van der Rohe: A Critical Biography*. p252.
- ⁴⁰ Chapter 11, Box 26, The Farnsworth Memoirs.
- ⁴¹ ⁴¹ Chapter 11, Box 26, The Farnsworth Memoirs.
- ⁴² Chapter 11, Box 26, The Farnsworth Memoirs.
- ⁴³ Chapter 11, Box 26, The Farnsworth Memoirs, Farnsworth writes: 'On Sunday afternoons I used to stretch out on the sofa and listen to the N.Y. Philharmonic on the radio. After I dropped to sleep during the program and awakened to the gripping timbre of Mr Sheen as he worked his vineyards. As spring came one year, I came to the conclusion that something would have to be done about the tired, dull Sundays'.
- ⁴⁴ The term *Zeitgeist* is used here to reflect Farnsworth's architect Mies van der Rohe's belief that architecture is the physical manifestation of the supposed spirit of the age. James Ingo Freed argued that while we no longer trust the term, Mies believed without doubt in his particular understanding of *Zeitgeist* and that architecture must be an expression of it. His commitment to this understanding, according to Freed, led Mies to seriously feel 'the obligation to dispose wisely of the surplus economic wealth that accrued to a people already fed and clothed [...] who [...] can entrust an architect with the commission to do buildings for them that may define their cultural and communal being [...] Thus a priesthood of the *Zeitgeist* was created'. Schulze, 'Mies in America: An Interview with James Ingo Freed Conducted by Franz Schulze,' p. 174
- ⁴⁵ Chapter 11, Box 26, The Farnsworth Memoirs.
- ⁴⁶ Chapter 11, Box 26, The Farnsworth Memoirs.
- ⁴⁷ Barry, (1953), 'Report on the American Battle Between Good and Bad Architecture.'
- ⁴⁸ Vandenberg, M. (2003) *Farnsworth house: Mies van der Rohe*. p17.
- ⁴⁹ Chapter 11, Box 26, The Farnsworth Memoirs. Farnsworth wrote of her concern that Mies made allowance for only one door, and it was only on her insistence that he relented to also install a window. Another point of contention was that although the house had only one bedroom, there were two bathrooms. So the guest 'would have a bathroom, but not a bedroom'.

⁵⁰ Flamini is quoting (now Lord) Peter Palumbo who is referring to his first approach to Dr. Edith Farnsworth. Flamini (1999). 'The Farnsworth House Restored: Mies van der Rohe's Illinois Icon Survives the Flood.'

⁵¹ Cohen, (1996), *Mies van der Rohe* p. 92.

⁵² Schulze, (1989), 'Mies in America: an interview conducted with James Ingo Freed conducted by Franz Schulze', p. 196.

⁵³ It must be noted that Philip Johnson's Glass House, New Canaan, Connecticut was actually, when finished in 1949, the first all-glass house. However, in 1950 he publicly acknowledged in an article in *Architectural Review* that the Farnsworth House was the source of his idea. Johnson was curator for Mies' exhibition at the New York Museum of Modern Art in which the model for Farnsworth's glass house was on show. He also acknowledged his conversations with Mies had been influential. Friedman, A. (1998) *Women and the Making of the Modern House: A Social and Architectural History*, pp148 – 49.

References:

Barry, J. (1953). 'Report on the American Battle Between Good and Bad Modern Houses'. *House Beautiful*, May, 172-173, 266-272.

Bataille, G. (1988) *The Accursed Share: An Essay on the General Economy, Volume 1, Consumption*, Zone Books, New York.

Cohen, Jean-Louis. (ed) (1996) *Mies van der Rohe*, 2nd edn, London: E and FN Spon, an imprint of Chapman and Hall.

Colomina, B. (1994) '1949,' in D Mertins (ed), *The Presence of Mies*, New York: Princeton Press, pp. 193-221.

Eliade, M. (1972) *Zalmoxiz: The Vanishing God: Comparative Studies in the Religions and Folklore of Dacia and Eastern Europe*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Farnsworth, E. *Memoirs and Papers*, in the possession of The Newberry Library, Roger and Julie Baskes Department of Special Collections, Midwest Manuscript Collection, Chicago, Illinois, edited transcription in Illinois by Clair Newton, Melbourne University, Melbourne, Australia.

Flamini, R. (1999). 'The Farnsworth House Restored: Mies van der Rohe's Illinois Icon Survives the Flood'. *Architectural Digest*, v. 56, no. 2, Feb, 66-78.

Friedan, B. (1963) *The Feminine Mystique*. Victor Gollancz Ltd, London.

Friedman, A. (1998) *Women and the Making of the Modern House: A Social and Architectural History*. Harry N. Abrams, Inc., Publishers, New York, N.Y.

Friedman, A. (2000) 'Architecture, Authority and the Female Gaze: Planning and Representation in the Early Modern Country House,' in Jane Rendell, Barbara Penner & Iain Borden (eds), *Gender Space Architecture: An interdisciplinary introduction*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 332-341.

Gordon, E (1953). 'The Threat to the Next America'. *House Beautiful*, vol.93, April, 121-131, 250-251.

Mauss, M. (1990) *The Gift: The Form and reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Routledge, London.

Singley, P. (1994). 'Living in a Glass Prism: the female figure in Ludwig Mies van der Rohe's domestic architecture'. *Transitions Journal*, Issue 45/45, 20-35.

Schulze, F. (1985). *Mies van der Rohe: A Critical Biography*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.

Schulze, Franz. (1989) 'Mies in America: An Interview with James Ingo Freed Conducted by Franz Schulze,' in Franz Schulze (ed), Mies van der Rohe: Critical Essays, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Vandenberg, M. (2003) Farnsworth House: Mies van der Rohe. Phaidon Press Limited, London.