Rudolph Michael Schindler (1887–1953) designed a beach house for Henry Braxton and Viola Brothers Shore in 1930. The house was to have been sited on Ocean Front Walk, Venice, Los Angeles [1]. It was never built, but remains a paper project. In the architectural drawings archives at University of California, Santa Barbara, there are both sketch plans and detailed plans for four levels: the ground floor, the main floor, the balcony floor and the roof level. There are drawings for each of the four elevations as well as sections. Constructional details are provided on five sheets. All told there are 13 extant drawings.1 In his signature upper case, Schindler typed a brief written description of the house [Table 1].

A 1925 photograph shows Ocean Front Walk, to the north of the Braxton-Shore lot, crowded with people enjoying themselves, and an aerial view shows the uninhabited wetlands inshore. These were the two prospects from the Braxton-Shore site: the beach and the Pacific Ocean to the west, and the natural wetlands to the east. Motor access to the house was along Speed Way. This road was paralleled a block inland by Trolley Way, a Pacific Electric streetcar route, later renamed Pacific Avenue. Beyond that, Venice’s Grand Canal found its southern outlet in the Playa Del Rey estuary. Then the pristine wetlands.

**The clients and their cultural ambience**

Henry Braxton was an art dealer. In 1928–29, Schindler had designed the interior and frontage for the Braxton Art Gallery on Vine Street, Hollywood. In 1930, the gallery held an exhibition of new works by the Blue Four – Lyonel Feininger, Alexei Jawlensky, Wassily Kandinsky, and Paul Klee. Their works had recently been brought back from a visit to Germany, including the Bauhaus, by Galka Scheyer, the group’s representative in the United States. The exhibition was sponsored by Mme Scheyer and Josef von Sternberg, the film director.2 In a letter to Klee, Mme Scheyer described Braxton as ‘the typical dealer in the worst sense’ (Glaesemer, 1987, p91).

Mrs Braxton, the writer and lyricist Viola Brothers Shore (1890–1970), is of greater historic interest. She was employed at the West Coast Studios of Paramount Pictures at the time. Oxford University Press in a recent international collection, *Shipboard and Shoreline Mystery Stories*, advertises that it brings together ‘some of the greatest writers in the genre. From Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, Agatha Christie, and Viola Brothers Shore to William Faulkner, Ellery Queen, …’ Her Paramount screenplay credits include *No Limit* (1931), starring the legendary Clara Bow in one of the early talkies, and *Breakfast for Two* (1937), starring Barbara Stanwyck. Several productions of Miss Shore’s plays and musicals hit Broadway.

**The architect**

Schindler had come to Los Angeles to run Frank Lloyd Wright’s office in Wright’s absence in Tokyo for the construction of the Imperial Hotel, the foundations of which had been reworked by

---

**Table 1  Schindler’s written description of the house**

|---|---|

---

1 Reworked drawings and a model reveal this design as an exemplar of the architecture of ‘space forms’ which Schindler believed distinguished his work from that of other contemporaries.
Schindler at Taliesin, Spring Green (March and Futagawa, 1999). The major project that Schindler supervised for Wright in Los Angeles was the Olive Hill estate for the oil heiress, Aline Barnsdall. In 1922, Schindler built the house at 835 Kings Road for himself and his wife, Pauline Schindler, and for two friends, the Chaces. By 1930, his works had been featured in progressive publications in Germany; notably, Bruno Taut had published the 1923 Pueblo Ribera court, La Jolla, in 1927 and the 1925 How house, Silver Lake, in 1929. The Lovell beach house, completed in 1926, which is now secure in the canon of twentieth-century masterworks, was not published until Richard Neutra included a photograph in Wie baut Amerika? (1930).

Richard Neutra had joined Schindler at 835 Kings Road straight from his fringe involvement, as an assistant to Erich Mendelsohn, with the Zehnerring – the Ring-of-Ten progressive architects in Berlin, including Bruno Taut, who met at Mies Van der Rohe’s studio. In 1926, Schindler and Neutra, together with the urban planner Carol Arnovici, established the Architectural Group for Industry and Commerce (AGIC). In the same year, Schindler and Neutra submitted their proposal for the Palace of the League of Nations. Their joint project was selected as one of three chosen from 377 submissions – along with the winning proposal by Le Corbusier and Pierre Jeanneret – for the exhibition which toured Europe.

Coaxed apparently by Galka Scheyer, Neutra separately accepted the commission to design that jewel of Californian Modernism, the steel and glass Lovell Health House (D. Neutra, 1986). Meanwhile, Schindler had completed his remarkable timber-frame structure for the 1928 Wolfe summer residence, demolished 2002. At the time of the Braxton-Shore commission, then, Schindler was receiving international recognition. He was well informed about progressive movements in Europe and the Soviet Union. Galka Scheyer personally gave him international standing when she dubbed Schindler ‘Five’, making him an additional member of her Blue Four.1

Why the project was not built
The Braxton-Shore project is technically in association with AGIC, but documentation shows that it is solely Schindler’s creation. While Gebhard (1971) and others give 1928–1930 as a date for the
A prime example of 'the other tradition' of Modernism. R. M. Schindler: presentation drawing. Braxton-Shore summer residence, 1930. Pencil, watercolour, and paint on linen. 63 x 73cm. (R. M. Schindler Collection, Architecture and Design Collection, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA).

Architectural form as space enclosed
a 1/4 in scale basswood model. From top to bottom: view of the roof; the balcony
b Redrawn plans. From top to bottom: roof plan, balcony floor plan, main floor plan, ground floor plan. Note the 48in Space Reference Frame used by Schindler from about 1920.
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Elevations express the interior spatial organization:

a. West elevation to the Pacific Ocean
b. East elevation to Speedway
c. South-north section
d. South elevation
e. North elevation
f. Model from north-east
g. Model from south-west
house, no surviving material suggests anything but 1930. Miss Shore owned the½ acre lot (95 x 38½ ft) on
the beach at the southern end of Venice Peninsula.
Schindler, who was staying at the Vanderbilt Hotel in
New York at the time, received a letter from her dated
19 May 1930 saying,
‘don’t hurry home on my account, because there’s nothing
stirring yet. There’s some talk about an oil lease, but it
hasn’t come through. I can’t think of building under the
circumstances’.
Five days later, in a letter addressed to Schindler at
835 Kings Road, Miss Shore’s agent writes,
‘to notify you, that under the terms of the Oil and Gas
Lease on her property at Del Rey, Miss Shore is not at
liberty to put any improvements on this property as long
as this lease is in effect’.
Oil was discovered on the Venice peninsula in 1929,
just as Wall Street suffered the Great Crash. Within
two years, 148 oil wells were producing nearly 50 000
barrels of oil and 2 million cubic feet of gas [petrol]
daily. Venice, which had been one man’s dream of a
Pacific paradise, overnight became a hellish
landscape of oil derricks and filthy emissions. The
field was barely profitable beyond 1932, yet the last of
the original derricks was not removed until early
1970 (Stanton, 1993). It is ironic that it was oil
interests that denied Schindler the opportunity of
building this exceptional project, when it was Miss
Barnsdall’s oil money that brought him to Southern
California in the first place.

The ‘space architecture’ of the project
The drawings for the Braxton-Shore project provide
an exemplary illustration of ‘space architecture’. The
term ‘space architecture’ was used by Schindler in a
1930 lecture given in San Francisco and finally
published in his seminal article of that title four
years later (Schindler, 1934). A clear, succinct
statement of ‘space architecture’ was given by
Pauline Schindler (1932):
‘Schindler conceives of the architectural form as the space
enclosed rather than the flat surfaces of wall which encase
it. The feeling of forms so conceived is radically different
from the inverse, and adds a dimension to space
experience.’
The plans, sections and elevations show Schindler’s
‘Space Reference Frame’ which he had consistently
used from around 1920 (Schindler, 1946). In the
plans, a 48in unit module is clearly identified with
numbers (1–24) and letters (A-K) [2b].

Ground floor
Typically, every part of the lot is spatially determined
by the architect. In Schindler’s words:
‘The space house as a space form becomes part of the room
formed by the lot, the surroundings, contours, and the
firmament’ (Sarnitz, p68).
The spatial scheme of the project comprises three
space forms – a garage, the residence itself and the
circulation spine that joins these two along the
length of the lot. This latter space form, on all four
levels, is particularly evident in the iconic
perspective, where it penetrates the oceanside
elevation.’ The open ground between the three space
forms is divided into four outdoor ‘rooms’. To the
north there is the forecourt from Speed Way,
separated from a service yard by a hedge. Along the
southern boundary, beyond the privacy provided by
the west wall of the garage, is a patio of sand. This is
entered through a gate that is located beneath the
terrace linking the garage roof with the main floor
of the residence.

This entrance from the forecourt is constricted,
but once in the patio, the space explodes: straight
ahead, and under the main house, is an
architecturally-framed, tunnel view of the Pacific
Ocean; looking up to the main floor level, is the fully
glazed, two-story elevation of the living room; and to
the right, the highly articulated circulation
structure, stepping four stories to the roof top.
Connected to the patio, and beneath the main house,
is a covered playground, overlooking Ocean Front
Walk and the beach. The playground is bounded to
the south by supporting walls and an outdoor
fireplace. To the north, beyond a screened porch
developed by 4 x 6in structural posts at 48in centres, is a
set of rooms: for a guest, for the maid, the furnace,
and a bathroom. The ground floor accommodation
is raised three steps from the patio.

Main floor
There are two stairways to this level: one is for public
use and the other, narrower, is for service. Both run
parallel to one another on either side of a common
frame wall. The foot of the service stair lands in the
yard, while the foot of the main stair is by the patio
gate under the terrace to the garage roof. Going up,
the main stair arrives at a small entrance hall with a
less wide stair continuing on to the gallery floor to
the right. Directly right, there is a porch area which
also receives the service stair to the kitchen. The
terrace to the garage roof is accessed through this
porch. Straight ahead, on entering the main floor, is
the internal dining area and, through sliding glazed
doors beyond, the Oceanside dining terrace. Both
dining area and terrace are served directly from the
kitchen located along the north wall. To the left, on
entering, a visitor would sense the double-height
space of the living room with its L-shaped balcony to
the north and west. A two-story, fully-glazed wall
faces east, over the patio, with views across the Grand
Canal, the wetlands and the Playa Del Rey estuary,
towards downtown Los Angeles. The west wall of the
living room, under the balcony, is fully glazed with
top hung sliding doors leading to a generous porch
with planters. On the south wall, in the more
intimate single-height area of the living room, is the
family hearth sharing the same chimney stack as the
outdoor fireplace in the playground below.

Balcony floor
The head of the stairs is in the angle of the L-shaped
gallery overlooking the double-height living room.
Three private rooms are reached from the leg of the
balcony that looks to the east and the sunrise. The
three rooms are all fully glazed to the west with views
over the Pacific Ocean and the sunset. ‘Her’ room is
the largest. Located in the north-west corner of the L-
shaped gallery, it opens on to an oceanside balcony,
and is en suite with a dressing area, shower and
lavatory. ‘His’ room shares the same Oceanside balcony. The remaining third bedroom closes off this leg of the gallery. It has an internal window into the living room as well as the fully-glazed openings onto a narrow planted area, shared by ‘his’ room, overlooking the beach. The other leg of the gallery returns past the stairways to a bathroom on the left. Straight ahead a door opens on to a terrace to the second flight of service stairs. To the right is a planter which is half inside and half outside the glazing. The family hearth, in the living room below, is seen from this position.

Roof
The foot of the stairs to the roof is also at this point, making access to the bathroom particularly convenient for people using the main roof terrace. The stairway is protected from the elements by an enclosure under the extended 44 x 8ft roof of the outdoor sleeping porch. The sleeping areas are defined by a pine deck over the composite roofing. A planter runs half the length of the deck on the south side. Climbing plants cover the pergola that overhangs the west elevation as part of the porch roof. In fact, the whole beach-front elevation is a hanging garden, with planting generously provided for at every level. The southern half of the main roof provided a private terrace for nude sunbathing, following the health fad of the day.

From the roof, there would have been a panoramic view of the Los Angeles basin. To the north might be seen Malibu Bay and the sun parched Santa Monica mountains; to the east the wetlands and beyond, possibly, to the Charles A. Lindbergh Airway Beacon flashing atop the 450ft tower of the newly completed City Hall, 1928; to the south, the green peninsula of Rancho Palos Verde and, out to sea, Santa Catalina Island, the site of Schindler’s Wolfe summer house.

Elevations
The spatial organization of the interior is well expressed in the elevations [3a and b, d and e]. On the south, the studio section of the living room is evident from the L-shaped surface of this wall. The chimney stack in relation to the south firewall. Exploded axonometric
the planes sharply. Similarly, the living room floor is cantilevered 16in from the mass of the outdoor fireplace and supporting walls, marking this level with a clean horizontal line.

On the north elevation, all three levels are expressed by the cantilevering of floors. There is an interesting complication where the common bathroom occurs. Again small windows are used to ‘underline’ the separation of planes. These are not windows conventionally punched in the centre of a wall plane.

From Speed Way, the house cannot be said to have an elevation. The Braxton-Shore presents, from the garage to the sleeping porch, a mounting complex of orthogonal planes in a space of some forty or more feet in depth and height. However, the principal elevation as drawn shows, with complete transparency, the double-height living room to the left of the stairways, while three floors – ground, main, balcony – are clearly marked to the right. Minor spaces like the porch on the main floor, or the bathroom on the balcony floor, are defined by being set back from the living-room elevation.

The west elevation is the one that Schindler describes as having been inspired by ‘a movement seen in the ocean waves’. Most probably he had the breaking of waves in mind. The circulation spine might be read as a sea-breaker against which waves crash before losing their momentum. It is surely a common experience to stand on a break-wall and watch a single rolling wave split in two as it reaches the breaker, each half subsequently taking on its own distinctive motion. This is evoked in the projecting structure of the circulation spine, on either side of which the elevations show such asymmetrical dynamic. As one wave rides another, so each floor overhangs the one below. Except for ‘her’ room that comes to the fore, each floor is marked by a projecting low wall, or planter, with full-height glazing, or openings, set behind.

**Circulation spine**

The circulation spine is the purest element of space architecture in the whole project. Little is hidden as the stairways ascend to the roof level in a series of stepped terraces. At each level a person would be conscious of spaces above and spaces below, of aspects to either side, forward and back. Seen from
the patio, or through the double-height living-room window, the play of sunlight, or of electric lighting at night, on this perforated space form can only be imagined.

Construction
The key to the structure is the circulation spine which is a four-story tube, tapering off in height to the roadside. It is supported by wooden posts – mostly 4 x 6in – joined by deep beams in both plan directions on successive floors – often 2 x 16in. This construction alone might make the structure resistant to shear, but the stairways provide diagonal bracing to create a completely rigid frame.

Sections
It is to this rigid frame that Schindler anchors the cantilevers supporting floors on either side. The two side walls, north and south, are the ‘firewalls’ mentioned by Schindler. From the elevations it will be seen that these walls are barely punctured by small openings. In addition, each wall steps out from story to story with the cantilever of the floor beams. This structural device, commonly seen in medieval timber structures, reduces the bending moments in the beams and reduces deflections over the same span as a simple supported beam [5]. The south ‘firewall’ of the Braxton-Shore is framed with 2 x 6in studs and is stabilized by the chimney stack which rises through all three floors [6]. Each floor is cantilevered 16in to receive the load on the wall above. The north ‘firewall’ is more conventionally braced by cross partitions. Again, external walls use 2 x 6in studs; internal walls use mostly 2 x 4in studs. The cantilever at each level is less pronounced at just under 6in and corresponds to the smaller spans on the north side [7].

Despite the structural ingenuity, Schindler eschews the muscular expression of his earlier Lovell beach house. He also leaves behind the direct expression of material. The Braxton-Shore is one of his first projects to make use of the standard methods of wood-frame construction. Schindler in a Directory of Modern Architecture introduced what he termed ‘plaster skin design’ (Sarnitz, p68):

“All surfaces of the structural skeleton are covered by a plaster coating which then speaks with its own form of vocabulary.’

In certain ways, the mass of the building is dematerialized to mere light-reflecting surfaces enveloping spaces. This is key to space architecture. As Schindler put it in the same Directory:

‘In contrast to all architectural styles of the past which modeled “mass” sculpturally, it uses “space” as its own medium’.

Fenestration and other details
The Braxton-Shore shows a shift in Schindler’s architectural approach. Sarnitz (p212) gives 1928 as the year in which Schindler abandoned concrete construction, for cost reasons, and began to adopt and transform the American balloon-frame system to satisfy the demands of the space architect. The Braxton-Shore stands at the beginning of this process of adaptation towards the Schindler Frame of his
later works (Schindler, 1947; Sheine, 1993). Already, the height to the underside of the 16in ceiling beams in the circulation spine hits at the defining 80in header plate of the Schindler Frame. In the sash list, Schindler shows 80in glazed sliding doors suggesting that there would have been a header plate at this height. All other sashes are 64in or 48in high. These dimensions show an adherence, like the floor planning, to Schindler’s Space Reference Frame with its 48in module and half (24in), third (16in), quarter (12in) divisions (Schindler, 1946; Sarnitz, 1988, pp59–60; March and Sheine, 1993, pp57–61). In the Braxon-Shore, the third divisions are used exclusively in the vertical dimension [8].

The structure of firewalls, circulation spine, and cantilevered floors leaves the east and west elevations free of load-bearing requirements. Schindler is at liberty to fully glaze these two elevations as window walls. The east wall is spanned by a 40in high dado above a 16in glazing strip to the floor. Above the dado, fixed glazing is arranged in 16in horizontal bands with a tall 32 x 128in opening light against the south wall frame. The pattern of glazing bars in this opening light mimics the structural cantilevers of the floors. A vertical bar rises the full height of the sash, 4in from the edge of the frame. Sixteen inches down, a horizontal bar is anchored to this vertical and spans to the opposite frame. A vertical bar drops from this horizontal, another 4in across from the vertical bar. This stepping pattern is repeated four times, leaving a clear 16 x 80in pane. This stepping motif, involving different dimensions, is repeated in some of the glazing in the west elevation.

Most of the oceanside wall comprises top hung, sliding, glazed doors on parallel tracks. These are set in from the facade to provide for planters and balconies. Full-height insect screens are arranged in front of the sliding doors to the living room. Schindler was to write (1952):

‘Light must be made to permeate the whole space and not remain a glaring spot area produced by a conventional small window opening in a dark wall, or a free-hanging light fixture. The present fashion of large view windows condemns many a room to assume the character of the cave. This formation allows the light to enter through one opening only and forces the inhabitants to face at all times a glaring light source, unrelieved by light coming from another direction.’

In Braxon-Shore, the 6in width of the firewalls is clearly articulated at each level with a floor-to-ceiling glazed slot allowing daylight to wash unobstructed over interior walls. Schindler placed electric lights in these slots to substitute for daylight at night. The living room obviously has both east and west lighting. But this is also the case in the west-facing bedrooms, where Schindler sets their ceiling level 16in above the living-room roof to create clerestory lighting for the morning sun. In several places, Schindler builds in artificial light boxes. Most strikingly he places two light boxes on either side of the outdoor fireplace.

**Comparison with contemporary work**

Schindler’s work, as is well known, was rejected from the Museum of Modern Art exhibition *International Exposition of Modern Architecture* organized in 1932 by Philip Johnson and Henry-Russell Hitchcock. The grounds for rejection were that his work did not conform to the stylistic conditions demanded by Johnson and Hitchcock and illustrated in the exhibition catalogue, *International Style: Architecture since 1922*. Richard Guy Wilson compares two houses for Dr Philip and Leah Lovell (Wilson, R. G., 2001, pp117–143). The 1927–28 steel and glass ‘Health House’ by Richard Neutra was included in the exhibition, while Schindler’s summer house at Newport Beach, was not. Johnson and Hitchcock did not recognize the beach house as a representative of the International Style. Nor did Schindler. In his letter dated 9 March 1932 to Johnson, Schindler comments on the selection of exhibits (Sarnitz, p209):

‘It seems to me that instead of showing late attempts at creative architecture, it tends towards the so-called “International Style”.

‘If this is the case my work has no place in it. I am not a stylist, nor a functionalist, nor any other sloganist. Each of my buildings deals with a different architectural problem, the existence of which has been entirely forgotten in this period of rational mechanization. The question of whether a house is really a house is more important to me than the fact that it is made of steel, glass, putty, or hot air.’

Sheine (1993) compares aspects of the Lovell beach house with Le Corbusier’s Five Points [Table 2]. In setting out their own criteria, Johnson and Hitchcock clearly failed to appreciate Le Corbusier’s five defining points for a modern architecture, otherwise the Lovell beach house would have been included as an exemplary model. Yet the Lovell’s language is not the same. To satisfy the same principles, it uses a foreign syntax and a different vocabulary of elements than those in the orthodox Le Corbusier grammar. Images of the beach house would not have looked right, with its ‘variety of forms, colors, and textures’, alongside the photographs of ‘tight white boxes that seemed to exude a machine-made air’ (Wilson, R. G., 2001, p119). The Lovell beach house was not white, its materials were left natural, or stained a sand colour (Sarnitz, p21). These are not the Modernist’s palettes of the 1920s and ‘30s, nor the primary hues, ‘poster colours’, of De Stijl cited by Schindler (1952). The colour presentation drawing indicates that the Braxon-Shore would not have been the regulation white of International Style architecture.

What Braxon-Shore’s shares with the How house and the Lovell beach house is a similar sectional design. All have double-height living rooms with galleries. The How has an open sleeping gallery on two sides. The long Lovell gallery provides access to four bedrooms. The Braxon-Shore L-shaped gallery provides access to three. A comparison may be drawn with Le Corbusier’s first design for the Bauveau Villa at Carthage (1928) [Le Corbusier, 1960, pp80–81; Risselada, 1988, pp116–118]. This villa was sited on a low cliff overlooking the Mediterranean. An examination of schematic sections points to the...
diagrammatic nature of Le Corbusier’s proposal in which the Domino floor heights remain inviolate [9]. Schindler’s treatment seems subtler, especially with the lowering of ceilings over the living room to provide clerestory lighting from the roof level. This refinement is a nod, perhaps, to the raumplan of Adolf Loos in whose circles Schindler had moved in Vienna.

Both Le Corbusier and Schindler exploit the structural economy of the cantilever: Le Corbusier in the floor plates of the generic Domino structure, and Schindler in the particular loading of the extremities of the cantilevers in the Braxton-Shore. Unlike the Lovell beach house, or the How residence, the structure is dressed in plaster externally and internally – walls, ceilings and overhangs. Structure is subsumed as a prominent feature and no longer challenges the sovereignty of the space architecture as it does in both the Lovell and the How houses. Schindler was never to return to the beefcake structural expression of the Lovell, nor to the naked framing and interacting cantilevers of the floors and roofs in the How residence.

Gebhard (1971) mentions the Braxton-Shore project at the end of a chapter entitled ‘Schindler’s “de Stijl”’. The chapter starts: ‘The year 1928 marks Schindler’s full commitment to de Stijl’. This seems an exaggeration. Theo Van Doesburg, writing to Oud in 1924, claimed that De Stijl is ‘the whole of creative architecture’ and soon the whole of America! Everyone, without exception, has experienced not only the influence of the De Stijl idea, but also the De Stijl idea as a living source of energy’ (Doig, p223). True that Schindler was touched. A cutting in Schindler’s archive shows the 1923 axonometric drawing of the Maison Particulière by Van Doesburg and Cornélius Van Eesteren (for a colour reproduction, see Friedman (1982), p86). In black and white, Gebhard (pp78–79) reproduces this opposite the 1925 How residence. The former is a graphic image, the latter is a building. The former depicts a sculptural mass of boxes bounded by separately coloured rectangular planes punctuated by conventional openings – an art object. The latter realizes an architectural compartmentalization of space that provides rich opportunities for day-to-day living – space architecture. There is no question that Schindler was aware of De Stijl, but to relate his space architecture, and the Braxton-Shore in particular, to its images is to commit the error of judging and comparing architectural works from pictures and photographs. Schindler enquired of Hitchcock in January 1930 (Sheine, 2001, p68):

‘Why not write a book on architecture after looking at the floor plans and cross sections and forgetting all the good photos you might have seen?’

**Among the most accomplished projects**

Schindler’s work properly finds a place among that ‘other tradition of modern architecture’ outlined by Colin St John Wilson (1995). Until now, the Braxton-Shore has been known largely by Schindler’s presentation perspective. Through reading and modelling the surviving plans, elevations, sections and constructional details, the authors believe the Braxton-Shore beach house deserves a prime international place among the most accomplished residential projects of the early 1930s. At least, in conceptual originality, it surely stands alongside projects by Hugo H’ ring (b1882) such as the 1930 Berhendt project, or his own house of 1932 (Blundell Jones, P. (1999), pp128–131); projects by Hans Scharoun (b1893) for Ferdinand Möller in 1931 and the completed 1932–33 Schminke house (Blundell Jones, P. (1995), pp68–81); or the 1934–36 Alvar Aalto (b1898) residence in Helsinki with Aino Aalto (Yoshida, ed pp34–43).

In the Braxton-Shore, Schindler finds his own distinctive voice. He leaves behind the sculptural tendencies of Wright’s contemporary concrete block projects. There is nothing like the Braxton-Shore before, or at the time, in Wright’s work. While Schindler reflected the influence of his Viennese mentor, Otto Wagner, in projects before 1920, and of Adolf Loos in works in the following decade, especially the How house, the Braxton-Shore is a fresh, peculiarly Californian departure. Schindler had arrived. The Braxton-Shore drawings record exquisite architectural thought at the cutting edge of their time, they illustrate much of what Schindler was later to articulate regarding his expectations for ‘space architecture’. Schindler (1935) envisioned: ‘a symphony of “space forms” – each room a necessary and unavoidable part of the whole. Structural materials, walls, ceilings, are only means to an end: the definition of space forms. They lose their individual importance and are simplified to the utmost – a simple weave of a few materials articulates space into rooms’.

### Table 2: Judith Sheine’s comparison of aspects of the Lovell beach house and Le Corbusier’s Five Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIVE POINTS (1927)</th>
<th>LOVELL BEACH HOUSE (1922/26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Les pilotis</td>
<td>Five concrete frames lift the house above the ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Les toits-jardins</td>
<td>Rooftop sunbath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Le plan libre</td>
<td>2 inch thick interior walls suspended from the frames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. La fenêtre en longueur</td>
<td>Ribbon clerestory fenestration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. La façade libre</td>
<td>The concrete frames free the envelope from any structural consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Notes
2. Schindler had written to Von Sternberg in 1930 concerning a possible commission for a house, but the director left Los Angeles to make his only German film, 'Der blau Engel' (1930), starring Marlene Dietrich and Emil Jannings. On his return, Von Sternberg chose Neutra as his architect in 1933.
3. In a 1949 lecture, at the University of Southern California, recalling his own architectural career as practitioner and lecturer, Schindler paused to record my appreciation of, and respect for, Mme Galka Scheyer, who paralleled my efforts in the interest of modern abstract painting and sculpture, helping much to dispel popular prejudices' (Sarnitz, 1988, p68).
4. Metric equivalents are given below in the order in which they first appear in the text:
   • ¾ acre = 0.033 ha
   • 95 x 381 ft = 28.9 x 11.63 m
   • 48in = 1.219 m
   • 8 x 56in = 102 x 152 mm
   • 44 x 8ft = 13.41 x 2.43 m
   • 2 x 16ft = 51 x 4.06 m
   • 80in = 2.03 m
   • 64in = 1.62 m
   • 24in = 610 mm
   • 12in = 305 mm
   • 40in = 1.02 m
   • 32 x 128in = 0.81 x 3.25 m
5. Schindler was still in New York in late June. His clients there were Helena Rubinstein, for whom he had worked in the 1920s, and the Fifth Avenue store, Bonwit Teller. These commissions did not materialize (Sarnitz, p213).
6. Also see http://nald.spps.uc.edu/Venice/
7. 'Konic' in the sense that two major Schindler exhibitions have chosen this image for the covers of their catalogues: the 1984 show at Sala de Exposiciones del Ministerio de Obras Publicas y Urbanismo, Madrid, and in 2001 at The Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles, later transferred to the National Building Museum, Washington, DC, and then to the…sterreichisches Museum fur Angewandte Kunst, Vienna (ADC/UCSB 1967.100.40.12, Garland 3293).
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