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serving profitability, knowing full well that a bankrupt railroad would not need engineers. To argue, as Aldrich does, that railroad safety developed primarily as a result of the push and pull between railroad companies and the state is to miss one-third of the debate. That said, Aldrich’s work does provide an important corrective to the simplistic notion that railroad companies wanted nothing to do with safety before the era of federal regulation.


They ranged from small private asylums to sprawling country estates, from urban fortresses to cottage retreats. Celebrated architects Calvert Vaux, H. H. Richardson, and Frederick Law Olmsted designed them. Signs of civic accomplishment, moral healing, and architectural grandeur, insane asylums, Carla Yanni argues, exhibit the intersections between medical and material culture. Describing the nineteenth-century asylum as a “place of struggle” over the relationship between space and power, Yanni traces the cultural ideals built into asylum walls. She departs from histories of mental illness that acknowledge collaboration between architects and asylum managers as an interesting facet of psychiatric history in order to examine asylums themselves within U.S. cultural and architectural history.

Yanni begins, as many histories of mental illness do, by explaining how treatment in the United States borrowed from and reacted to the control of the insane in Europe, exemplified by hospitals such as Bethlem (Bedlam) in England. She explores the plan envisioned by psychiatrist Thomas Kirkbride, whose methods relied on categorization, separation, and a healthy atmosphere distinguished by light, ventilation, and distinctions between public and private space. There were many incarnations of this plan; these were marked less by consistency than by adaptations borne of necessity. Yanni highlights struggles to make medical ideals manifest in these enormous constructions as well as the importance of the edifice itself in presenting a public face to supporters. Constraints such as space, money, time, and public perception of mental illness created obstacles, as the ambitious plan was
difficult to implement—even Kirkbride himself was unable to produce it exactly in his own hospital.

The second half of the book focuses on how divisions within the psychiatric profession influenced asylum architecture, as some practitioners advocated separate cottages for the mentally ill rather than sprawling hospitals. This “anti-institutionalism” developed close on the heels of the moral cure and constituted a contest over individuals’ relationships with space. Later in the nineteenth century, psychiatrists began to shift focus from the whole individual to the brain and thus from environmental to neurological forms of treatment. Ironically, Yanni argues, as treatment has changed, the loss of a public edifice has resulted in a lack of public visibility for this population.

The general contours of this history will be familiar to those versed in the history of insanity, but the book makes a valuable contribution to architectural history, particularly in emphasizing forms that occupy the middle ground “between traditional and vernacular architectural histories.” Departing from the conventional association with prisons, Yanni offers valuable comparisons between asylum architecture and forms that more closely approximate the social function of asylums: hospitals and colleges. She also brings a refreshing emphasis on space to medical history, showing, for example, how patients’ “progress” from spatial margin to spatial center—or vice versa—shaped their experiences. One of her most fascinating (but most briefly treated) cases is that of an asylum in Peoria that was destroyed before it was ever completed. Aside from that case, most of her examples are from eastern and urban areas, and an analysis of the importance of region in debates over these deliberately created environments is absent from the study. Whether the meaning of these buildings differed in less urban environments, in which residents may have had a different experience of space, is left unexplored. This study should provide inspiration for teachers or researchers interested in the built environment, and may draw attention to those little-studied public buildings that, left standing or not, are part of the fabric of our material past.
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