A SYMBIOTIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MID-CENTURY MODERN MASTERS:
THE COLLABORATIVE WORKS OF ARTHUR AND MARIE BERGER,
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS, AND
O’NEIL FORD, ARCHITECT

by

DIANNE SUSAN DUFFNER LAURENCE

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

MASTER OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

December 2007
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere thanks go to my Committee Chairman, Gary Robinette, who inspired this research with his enthusiasm for the documentation of the profession of landscape architecture, as well as my committee members and professors Dr. Pat D. Taylor and David Hopman. Instrumental in the research were Preservation Dallas, (especially the ever-resourceful Sue Roebuck), Katherine Seale, San Antonio Conservation Society, Trinity University Archive Library, ‘marvelous’ Megan McKinnis (a Trinity graduate and friend for forty years), and The University of Texas at Austin Architectural Archive Library. Special thanks to the Berger family members, Mrs. Betty Fulgham, LoVeta Berger and her son Gillett Berger and all the gracious present owners of Ford homes who allowed me access to their property. Also, several practicing architects and landscape architects were very generous with their time for interviews: Bill Booziotis, Frank Welch, John Armstrong, Linda Smith, and Patrick Boyd.

Most of all, I want to thank my best champions: children Jason, Lawton and Haley who probably can’t remember their mother not being a part-time college student. In addition, I’d like to thank my supportive friends, especially Mona Baker and Grace Christophine. Last but not least, to Donald, who offered endless encouragement and support for the completion of this work for which I will be forever thankful.

October 30, 2007
ABSTRACT

A SYMBIOTIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MID CENTURY MODERN MASTERS:
THE COLLABORATIVE WORKS OF MARIE AND ARTHUR BERGER,
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS, AND
O’NEIL FORD, ARCHITECT

Publication No. ______

Dianne Susan Duffner Laurence, MLA

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2007

Supervising Professor: Gary O. Robinette

Landscape Architects Marie and Arthur Berger were partners as well as husband and wife. The pair began practicing in Dallas, Texas after their marriage in 1946. Marie Monica Harbeck graduated from the University of Oregon and Arthur from the University of Kansas and Harvard Graduate School and met while they were sequestered as civilian employees by the Army Engineer Board at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, conducting camouflage research during World War II. After the war and after completing significant projects in Dallas, Texas, such as the DeGolyer Estate at White Rock Lake (now the Dallas Arboretum), the Bergers embarked on a decade-long professional relationship.
with renowned Texas architect O’Neal Ford. Together, architect and landscape architect completed many notable institutional projects such as Texas Instruments Headquarters in Dallas, The Trinity University campus in San Antonio, and numerous Texas Modern residential projects mainly in Dallas and San Antonio, Texas.

The goal of this research was to identify the collaborative efforts of the Berger’s and Ford during the World War II post-war period until 1960 in the study areas of Dallas and San Antonio. The team created a unique Texas modern landscape and architecture style that resulted in distinctive design contributions to the field of landscape architecture.

Publications about O’Neil Ford were reviewed, a survey of the projects where the Bergers and Ford worked together was conducted, most of their projects were visited, and persons and practicing professionals who knew the subjects were interviewed. Publications from professional organizations such as the American Society of Landscape Architects, (ASLA) the American Institute of Architects, (AIA), academic resources at the University of Texas at Arlington, Texas, (UTA) and the University of Texas at Austin, (UT) were also reviewed. The literature review reaffirmed the lack of comprehensive research and the absence of formal publications on the professional careers of Marie and Arthur Berger. Consequently, a bibliographical research on the work of architects O’Neil Ford and Howard Meyer was conducted in order to locate the projects where the Bergers collaborated with these renowned mid-century modern architects. The name of the persons and the address of the projects where the Bergers collaborated with the above mentioned architects were revealed by the research. Site visits were conducted in Dallas, San Antonio, Salado and Fort Worth and the landscapes
linked to the Bergers were photographed and inventoried. Readings revealed that the
territory of activity of the Berger’s work spanned from local to regional to national to
international and that most of their work done with O’Neil Ford was in the North Texas
area and in San Antonio, Texas.

Interviews, literature reviews and site surveys initiated the formulation of a
hypothesis that suggested that the collaborative work of the Bergers and Ford established
the unique relationship that created a distinctive Texas mid-century modern landscape
designs that shared a common language with the architectural designs of Ford. The
research also located some of the limited biographical information about Arthur and
Marie that helped to reinforce the above mentioned hypothesis and supported the thought
that something very special was created and became noted by scholars and patrons.
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PREMISE

“Gardens are extremely fragile works of art, subject to freaks of nature, man’s indifference to his ancestors’ creations and finally vandalism. To maintain them is a costly and time-consuming endeavor. As work of art, gardens are rarely studied.”

(Chatfield, p. 8)

Arthur Berger (1903-1960) and Marie Harbeck Berger (1898-1963) as landscape architects developed a unique style in Texas that emphasized the use of native plants and materials in their gardens. O’Neil Ford (1905-1982) pioneered Modern Architecture in Texas and introduced in his architectural proposals, his other concerns: environmental considerations and the historic buildings of the Southwest and Texas. The three were born and educated in different regions of the United States and once the Bergers and Ford met in Texas, the team initiated a personal and professional relationship that created a distinctive combination of architecture and landscape architecture that was appreciated by patrons in Texas. The work and life of O’Neil Ford has been documented in two publications entitled The Architecture of O’Neil Ford; Celebrating Place and O’Neil Ford, Architect and informed that the concentration of his work was done in North Texas, San Antonio and Houston, Texas, and that also completed works in New York, Illinois, Oklahoma, Arizona, Wyoming, Switzerland and Peru. In comparison, the work of Arthur and Marie Berger has not been systematically documented except in national circulation magazines that featured their work during the late 1940s and 1950s. These articles were brief and included photographs.
The work and life of Arthur and Marie Berger and O’Neil Ford as professional landscape architects and architect followed an intimate, intellectual and friendly path. Besides having work with O’Neil Ford, The Bergers also completed landscape projects with other prominent mid-century Texas architects like Howard Meyer, Scott Lyons, William Wurster, Arch Swank, and Richard Colley. The importance of the landscape architecture of Arthur and Marie Berger existed basically in the memory of colleagues, and clients who were admirers of their work, and selected residents of Highland Park, University Park, Preston Hollow in Dallas, and Alamo Heights, in San Antonio, Texas. Other repositories were surviving architects and landscape architects from the mid-century era, a few board members of the Dallas Arboretum, elder members of the Dallas Native Plant Society, the Berger’s surviving relatives, and selected professors at The University of Texas at Arlington (UTA) Architecture Program in Landscape Architecture,

Professor of Landscape Architecture, Gary O. Robinette, FASLA, from UTA’s Program of Landscape Architecture stated “the Bergers were doing significant residential and commercial projects during the mid-century in Dallas. They were featured in numerous national publications during the 1950s – just doing prolific work with very prestigious names and locations.” Robinette stressed in both History of Landscape Architecture and Professional Practice courses that “it would be important to the profession of Landscape Architecture to document these important regional works, and someone would write a thesis about the Bergers” (Robinette, 2005).
The theme for the thesis was discussed with Robinette after realizing how important the work of Arthur and Marie Berger was and finding out that their trend-setting landscape design in the Mid-century Modern Texas architecture related intimately with architecture. He responded, “Fantastic! That will be marvelous, and will be such important documentation for landscape architecture. More of this should be done by our students here at UTA” (Robinette, 2007). The academic guidance offered by UTA’s Professors Robinette and Pat D. Taylor of the Landscape Architecture Program provoked a sense of responsibility on this researcher to acknowledge and study the Bergers’ largely uncelebrated landscape work that became a trend-setting regional style in North Texas during the Mid-century Modern period.

Besides documenting the work of Arthur and Marie Berger and demonstrating the fragility of their surviving work, this research intended to validate the professional relationship that existed between the Mid-century Modern architectural design of O’Neil Ford and the masterfully landscape designs developed by the Bergers that once they were integrated, created innovative returns to the natural landscape and the Texas traditional architecture. Coincidently, it was also revealed that the surviving landscapes were maturing, selected plant species were old and tired and proper maintenance was lacking in some properties and that some of the surviving Mid-century Modern houses built by Ford or his associates that were landscaped by the Bergers were in severe danger of becoming victims of the late trend of ‘teardowns’ in Dallas.

An approximated answer to why these three professionals became prominent pioneers in their own and collaborative art and why a hypothesis that a symbiotic
relationship existed between the Bergers and Ford could be considered, was found in Giovanni Giaconi in his book *The Villas of Palladio* where he wrote about how the Renaissance returned to the then native conditions and abandoned previous architectural styles and became a thought-provoking process that was discussed in elite circles (Giaconi, p. 13). A similar process occurred in Texas when O’Neil Ford and his colleagues discussed modernist architectural theory and later joined forces with the Bergers. Transposing the words ‘architects and landscape architects’ in Giaconi’s text, and replacing them with *O’Neil and Arthur and Marie*, and ‘Venetian’ for *North Texas*, the Giaconi’s text can be modified as follow:

“Renaissance architecture, (read: Renaissance of the North Texas native Landscape) with its reinvention or ‘rebirth’ of classical forms, had begun in Florence in the early Fifteenth century, before spreading to Rome. Architects [and landscape architects] brought with them their knowledge of the forms and values of antiquity; and Venetian [North Texas] patrons, eager to commission prestigious palaces in the latest style, abandoned the Gothic-and Byzantine-influenced architecture (read: traditional landscaping schemes) that had characterized Venice (insert Texas), up to that point for the new architecture *all’antica*, (‘as the ancients did’).…Villa Trissino [an early villa in Vicenza, Italy] housed an intellectual academy of the kind so in vogue at the time, modeled after the Platonic academies of antiquity, where the sons of the elite would gather to study disciplines such as rhetoric, grammar, logic, astronomy, mathematics and geography…composed and performed music, and discussed philosophy [so like the Bergers and independently Ford did]” (Giaconi, p. 13).

By analogy and paraphrasing the passage quoted from Giaconi’s book, it can be stated that;

‘Landscape architecture in North Texas with its reinvention or ‘rebirth’ of natural forms began in San Antonio in the 1930’s before spreading to Dallas in the forties. Architects [and landscape architects Ford and the Bergers] brought with them their knowledge of the forms and values of antiquity. [The natural Texas landscape and the Texas farm houses] and patrons, eager to commission prestigious palaces in the latest style,
[prominent members of the Dallas elite] abandoned the [landscape architecture that had characterized Dallas], up to that point for the new [landscape] architecture *all’antica* (‘as the ancients did’)…[In the houses and the landscapes created by Ford and the Bergers, intellectual personalities and patrons discussed issues] so in vogue at the time, modeled after the Platonic academies of antiquity, where the sons of the elite would gather to study disciplines such as [writing, travel, music, art and the classics. Ford did it at ‘The Studio’ with David Williams and friends (Dillon, p. 14) and the Bergers did it at home with their friends that included William Wurster]’ (Welch, p. 07).

The above superposition or transposing of philosophical principles indicated how prominent Italian architects and landscape architects, by returning to the classic or natural settings, gave birth to an important stylistic and philosophical movement called the Renaissance. It also allowed the understanding of how the Bergers having been professionally trained in other regions of the United States, brought their knowledge to Texas and embarked in revolutionary explorations and design solutions that introduced the use of the ‘sinuous lines’ and the ‘natural’ landscape to the Dallas and San Antonio cultural elite. Once the Bergers became associated with O’Neil Ford, the combined architectural and landscape designs resulted (as their counterparts in the Italian Renaissance) became pioneers in the new Modern Architectural style in Texas. Basically, what was known as Modern Architecture in the late 1930s, after the Second World War and during the 50s and the early 1960s, later became known as Mid-century Modern architecture.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

"Man and nature must work hand in hand - the throwing out of balance of the resources of nature, throws out of balance also the lives of men."
(Roosevelt, 1935)

1.1 Research Objectives

The objective of this research was to identify, compare and analyze the collaborative work of the Berger’s and Ford during the World War II post-war period until 1960 in the study areas of Dallas and San Antonio. The team composed by Arthur and Marie Berger working together with architect O’Neil Ford created a unique Texas style that rendered distinctive design contributions to the field of landscape architecture.

The professional career of the Bergers needed to be formally recognized. Robinette noted that, “The recent history of landscape architecture has been composed largely of individual personalities and offices… Additions to the body of knowledge continue to occur through an investigation and understanding of prominent practitioners” (Robinette 2005).

Additional objectives were: a- to compile the conceptual design philosophy of architect O’Neil Ford and then apply his principles to the work of the Bergers since they shared similar principles of design and practice (Respondent A and Lynn Chapman
Harper: interviews 2007), b- to create the first listing or catalogue of the Bergers’ known work to this date, and c- to assemble a comparable biography of the Bergers and Ford.

1.2 Definition of Terms

Artifact: “A physical object that can be handled and observed; it usually has a temporal quality, meaning that it ‘speaks’ of actions at a particular time and place” (Cole and Knowles, 2001).

ASLA: American Society of Landscape Architects.

Biography: A structured account of a life written by another, usually according to literary conventions (Cole and Knowles, 2001).

Chiaroscuro: In Italian translates to “clear-dark”, meaning the interplay of light and shade and of brightness and shadow.

Civilian Corps of the Army Engineer Board: The Engineer Officer Candidate School (EOCS) was responsible for the Corps' research and development activities and was established at Fort Belvoir in July of 1941. [It was organized] due to the demands of the [World War II] global conflict that created personnel shortages [and became the way to allow civilians to participate in the war effort]. World War II also brought women into the Armed Forces on a regular basis for the first time in American history. The first detachment of Women's Auxiliary Army Corps (WAAC) personnel arrived at Fort Belvoir in March of 1943 (Online, November 7, 2007).

Constant Comparison: A systematic method for recording, coding and analyzing data. The goal of this technique is to maximize credibility through comparison of groups and data (Henderson, 1991).
**Content Analysis:** The process used in analyzing documents, records, transcribed conversations, letters or anything in a textual form (Henderson, 1991).

**In-depth Interview:** Repeated face-to-face encounters between the researcher and informants directed toward understanding informants’ perspectives on their lives, experiences, or situations as expressed in their own words (Taylor and Bogdon, 1998).

**Key Informant:** People who provide more in-depth information about what is occurring because the researcher has established an element of trust with them (Henderson, 1991).

**Methodology:** Refers to the way in which one approach problems and seeks answers (Taylor and Bogdon, p. 3).

**Mid-century modern:** Can be defined as modern design characteristics prevalent in architecture that started during the postwar period immediately following the Second World War (WWII) until approximately 1970. This style marked a departure from the more formal International Style of the Bauhaus School. Homes featured open floor plans and emphasized the relationship between indoors and out. Additional Modern characteristics incorporated in both architecture and design in general included simplification and abstraction of form with an emphasis on structural elements, utilization of new and natural materials. Most importantly there is a focus on form, function and context (Peabody, 2007).

**Open Space:** Embraces and separates the various land uses and activity nodes. I will provide background, base, and breathing room, and when so arranged as to preserve the best of the landscape features, it will give each region its unique character (Simonds, p.370).
Qualitative Methodology: Research that produces descriptive data. People’s own written or spoken words and observable behavior (Taylor and Bogdan, 1998).

Sinuous: A compound curve [that] uses various s-size circles without a straight line in between them (Lin, p. 165).

Symbiosis: An intimate association of two or more different organisms, regardless if the relationship is beneficial or not…a contiguous association of two or more morphologically distinct organisms, not of the same kind… both associates could lead independent existences (Sapp, p. 32).

Standardized Open-ended Interview: A method of interviewing that uses the exact wording and sequence of questions for each interview although the interviewee may respond in whatever way she/he wishes (Henderson, 1991).

Thesis: A document that reflects the scholarly rigor necessary for conducting original research and presenting its findings prior to publication (Taylor, Pp 8).

1.3 Summary

The philosophical and technological concerns that were germinating the modernistic ideas and the designs in landscape and architecture prior to the war had to be placed on-hold during the Second World War period. The ideas of modernism were founded at the end of the nineteenth century and Jellicoe considered that:

“almost alone the Scandinavian countries, unharassed by a nineteenth-century type of industrial revolution and by war, had achieved an elegant synthesis between environment and mode of living…[that] arose from the Constructivist movement in art before the First World War [as] the so-called ‘functional’ and ‘international’ architecture [that was] based on machine production…but containing within a profound search by individuals for a new liberalization” (p. 285).
The war brought Arthur and Marie together and the aftermath brought them to Dallas were together with Ford forged a successful relationship between architecture and landscape design and allowed the suspended ideas of modern design to continue and progress after the war. The limited academic knowledge of the Bergers’ accomplishments provoked researcher and advisors to launch a research to incorporate the Bergers work into the annals of landscape architecture in Texas.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

A search of published literature regarding Arthur and Marie Berger’s work was conducted and by not finding published books, the research turned to publications from professional societies like San Antonio Conservation Society, Preservation Dallas, professional organizations like the American Society of Landscape Architects, (ASLA), the American Institute of Architects, (AIA), and furthermore, from academic resources at The University of Texas at Arlington, Texas, (UTA), and The University of Texas at Austin, (UT). Landscape related national circulation magazines from the 1940’s and 1950’s that featured articles regarding the Bergers’ work were located and reviewed.

2.2 Representative Literature

Biographies, journals, guides, catalogs, periodicals, historical documents and non-fiction best sellers of the mid-century era about O’Neil Ford, Howard Meyer, Scott Lyons, Arch Swank, Richard Colley, and William Wurster were reviewed in order to establish comparisons or similarities between Ford, his associates and the Bergers.

2.2.1 Book Review: O’Neil Ford, Architect

Lindsey in George’s 1998 book about O’Neil Ford summarized Ford’s work and his character as:

“…designated a National Historic Landmark by the National Council on the Arts; O’Neil Ford with his associates designed some of the most
famous architectural landmarks in Texas and elsewhere in the nation: The Texas Instruments Semiconductor Building in Dallas (TI), the Little Chapel in the Woods at Texas Women’s University (TWU) in Denton, Texas, campuses at The University of Texas at San Antonio, Skidmore College in New York, and The Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas. The list of credits goes on and on for this remarkable architect who brought an indigenous flair to homes, public buildings and businesses. From the mid-1930s until his death in 1982, Ford was a pied piper for young architects from the message he piped was always the same: sensitivity to the nature of materials the earth provided; concern for timelessness, and the performance of a building over the long haul; adaptability to changing needs; and innovative approaches to budget constraints. O’Neil Ford was controversial, paradoxical, and contradictory…His close and eventually prominent friends contributed immensely to not only to his own development but to the artistic milieu of a budding southwestern regionalism” (Dust Cover).

George continued:

“For Ford met one of his most loyal early clients in 1937. T. Frank Murchison and his wife Norine selected him to design their residence…in San Antonio… The house was a continuation of Ford’s earlier work, and yet it marked a new era for him. G.W. Mitchell, a building contractor…remembered that there was perfect cooperation between the architect, builder and client; the latter was so pleased with the plans that he wanted no changes made. It is significant that this was Ford’s initial collaboration with Dallas landscape architects Arthur and Marie Berger, who also allocated the indigenous approach and used native plants and trees in Texas gardens. The most intricate types of landscaping materials that could be used in San Antonio’s sub-tropical planting zone were effectively displayed against the plain surfaces of the building and garden walls of limestone quarried on the site. The Bergers utilized broad-leafed evergreens that looked well the year round and also provided a tempering effect in the hot summers” (George, pp. 43-44).
George’s book enabled the identification of the Bergers’ work. The initial information that linked the work of Arthur and Marie Berger with Ford was found in Appendix B as Ford’s compendium and catalog of completed projects from 1929 to 1970. The catalog repetitively named the Bergers as the landscape architects in O’Neil Ford’s projects and offered the addresses of the projects, thus enabling visits to the referenced projects and sites.

2.2.2 Book Review: *The Architecture of O’Neil Ford, Celebrating Place*

Dillon’s 1999 book describes Ford as:

“...the most influential architect of the twentieth century. A technological innovator, who bridged Texas ‘rural past’ and urban future; he taught three generations of architects how to adapt vernacular forms and materials to
modern conditions. Widely known as a designer or restorer of such San Antonio landmarks as La Villita, HemisFair Plaza and Trinity University, Ford also designed buildings from Laredo in deep south Texas to Saratoga Springs in upstate New York…Quotes from the author’s wide-ranging interviews with O’Neil Ford in the last years of his life, as well as with his partners, relatives friends, and critics give the text first hand vividness” (Dust Cover).

Dillon also stated “O’Neil Ford’s career spanned a rich and volatile period in Texas history when urban values overtook rural ones, yet in which the state’s remoteness from the capitals of fashion sustained a softer more indigenous modern architecture. Ford helped launch Texas architecture on a new path by showing that its roots were deep and often beautiful” (Dillon, p. 4). Dillon also provided one of the earliest references to the Bergers:

“The Frank Murchison house in San Antonio, completed in 1937, was their first serious attempt at combining modernism and the Texas Vernacular. With its standing seam copper roof, cantilevered porches and rugged end chimneys, the house possesses the texture and rootedness of many of Hill Country prototypes without mimicking a particular one…The landscape, by Arthur and Marie Berger, of Dallas, enhanced the intimate and fluid connections between interior and exterior spaces by means of patios, terraces, and long galleries…The Bergers were ahead of their time in using such low-maintenance indigenous in hot dry climate. They always included water in their designs and knew how to manipulate the dramatic Texas light for maximum aesthetic effect. “Drama in the garden, as elsewhere, is achieved by contrast,” Arthur [Berger] explained in the March 1949 issue of House and Garden” (Ibid., p. 35).

The hypothesis of a successful symbiotic relationship between Ford and the Bergers started with this project when as equal participants in the proposal intimately integrated the exterior landscape in the courtyards with the interior spaces.
2.2.3 Professional Magazine Review: Interiors

Arthur and Marie Bergers personal residence and studio on Stonebridge Drive in Dallas, (completed in 1955) was featured in the February 1956 issue of *Interiors* in the article ‘The Berger’s Dallas hilltop; Carefree Living among the strung-out shelters of an idyllic domicile’. The article stated, “the Bergers were landscape architects for the Decorative Center in Dallas. He is a native Texan; she is a transplanted Californian who worked for Thomas Church” (*Interiors*, p. 78). The article’s introduction also mentioned that “Interiors and landscaping were done by Arthur and Marie Berger and the architecture was done by O’Neil Ford and Associates with consulting architect William W. Wurster” (*Ibid.*, p.78). This article was dedicated primarily to the Bergers’ work on their personal property and briefly mentioned O’Neil Ford participation.

“The architecture of the Berger home, however [was] almost impossible to find even if you stumble along plan in hand. Yet the Bergers, though they are landscape architects, were not mean about their projects, the architects with whom they collaborated are among the best. The reason for the virtual invisibility of the structural frame lies:

1. In their insistence on using a difficult site
2. Questioning every standard practice in keeping up with the Joneses
3. They used their considerable knowledge of wind, weather and plants to achieve pleasant conditions in their many outdoor living rooms

The hilly, precarious, rocky site in the heart of Dallas gives them one of the city’s few cliff views, one of the few naturally protected woods” (*Ibid.*, p.79).

The article included a complete listing of the Bergers design theories and practice and also a displayed a good analysis of the inter-relationship between the architectural plan, and the intimate relationship of the interior and exterior landscapes.
“The strung-out plan makes the most of every nook and cranny of the site for a view, living, or wandering around – which makes the small site seem much less confining than it might. Post-and-beam construction and glass framing are of the simplest, but comforts of life abound in objects d’art, some fine old furniture, music both canned and real, plants, sunshine, privacy, and quiet” (Ibid., p. 81).

Upon analyzing the floor plan of the house, it was easy to understand how the Bergers influenced or demanded the architect to create a house where every space had a dramatic view towards the outside, as well as the inside. Even thought the geometry of the house was orthogonal, at its landscaped perimeter, nature was allowed to follow curvilinear edges and sinuous boundaries.
Fig. 2.4- Berger House and Landscape Plan

The Berger’s house and gardens have been destroyed. A new large Tudor-style house stands in its place and their magnificent gardens have been replaced with grandiose walks, terraces, a pool and a motor court.
2.2.4 Professional Magazine Review: Architectural Forum

The residence of Mr. and Mrs. Patrick Haggerty, built in the Preston Hollow area of Dallas, Texas, was featured in the July, 1958 issue of Architectural Forum. The article was entitled ‘Contrast in Texas: Two New Dallas Houses’ with the caption describing, “These two new Dallas houses are both ‘modern’ - yet as different as marble is from mud-brick” (82). The article compared the two houses, which were completely different in nature, organization, style and landscape. One was the Bruno Graf house, which was designed by architect Edward D. Stone and Thomas Church as his landscape consultant (Interestingly, Church was the landscape architect that employed Marie Berger in California before she arrived to Texas). The second home, the Haggerty house, was designed by O’Neil Ford and landscaped by Arthur and Marie Berger. While in the Graf house, Church designed landscaping around quadrangle spaces designed by the architect, the Bergers integrated a free-flowing landscape schemes on both sides of the house that followed the basic successful scheme used at the Murchison residence.

The Bergers landscape plan encircled O’Neil Ford’s Haggerty house, with a continuum boundary formed with fluid sinuous and curvilinear edges around lawns, terraces, walkways, driveways, swimming pool, etc. The article addressed the outdoor courts in both houses:

“Outdoor courts are important adjuncts of each house. In the Graf House, they are elegant outdoor rooms, walled-in or screened from viewing-in. At the Haggerty House, the courts are tucked into corners or recesses formed by the ‘cottage’ wings. Sheltering overhangs form passages and walkways connecting various outdoor spaces” (Ibid., p.83).
Ford created a sequence of cottages or wings, creating flexible recessed spaces in between said cottages that allowed the Bergers to complement the intervals and located landscaped terraces adjoining these links. The article explained, “at the Haggerty house, the terrace joins the garden at the sinuously curved retaining wall. Thick-branching trees overhang the terrace”, (Ibid., p. 85). The houses and its landscape are in excellent condition today; photographs included in the article were black and white.
2.2.5 Magazine Review: *House & Garden*

T. Frank Murchison Residence was featured in the March 1950 issue of *House and Garden*. The article was entitled ‘Prevailing southeast breezes dictate the use of porches on many Texas houses’ and reported that “both house and gardens are rooted in Texas idiom” (*House and Garden*, p. 100). The author continued to explain “the house crowns a steep slope above a lovely wooded valley…Garden and house were shaped to the land; stone walls were quarried on the spot; bright sun and etched shadows made part of the plan” (*Ibid.*, p. 100). The house sat following the contour of the hillside. Architect O’Neil Ford designed a longitudinal house in plan where every room faces gardens on both sides: one side faces the hillside; the other side faces the view. The article explained, “architect O’Neil Ford and landscape architect, Arthur S. Berger are both avid students of indigenous forms. By analyzing both, the old and the new, they have developed an unaffected style that speaks of Texas at every turn. …The plan is long and narrow with almost every room a breezeway for cooling winds off the Gulf” (*Ibid.*, p. 101).

*House and Garden* continued to inform that “the landscape architect, used steps, low walls, a Live Oak tree for shade and foliage in the grassy courtyard near the Garden Room (*Ibid.*, p. 141). In this case

“…the architect developed a floor plan, aimed to capture the southeast breezes and run across the main axis of the house refreshing all the rooms. The landscape architect was shading the house accentuating the view from every room through large windows to dramatic landscape schemes integrated into the contour of the terrain and dressing the areas with lawns, Live Oaks towering over a shrub planting of *Daubentonia*, Gardenias, Camellias, Lantana and Plumbago ago along the terrace wall. At the entrance, [they planted] lacy *Pithecellobium* (cat’s-claw) shrubs
silhouetted against the whitewashed brick and wood. In spring, pale yellow, mimosa-like blossoms tip their branches” (Ibid., p. 100).

**Fig. 2.7 – T. Frank Murchison Landscape**

The referred article enforced the hypothesis that Arthur Berger and O’Neil Ford established a strong professional relationship and worked in symbiosis since every space for this particular house was designed in unison and created dual view towards the outside, one facing the uphill garden and the other towards the down sloping portion of the garden and panoramic view. Arthur was there to intimately produce a garden, which was unique to each segment of the house.
2.2.6 Magazine Review: House Beautiful

The residence of Arthur and Marie Berger built in Dallas, Texas, was featured also in *House Beautiful*. The August 1957 issue included an article entitled “Five years ago, this house was out in the hot Texas sun. Now, a leafy canopy of trees and vines, which were trained into high-flat growth to make a ceiling over the entire area, shelters both house and surroundings. Real climate control!” (House Beautiful, p. 87). The lot was flanked on the north by a creek in the Turtle Creek area of Dallas and originally had native trees. Lawson wrote:

“…perched on the edge of a seventy-foot cliff, with a view of a park below and the view of the horizon beyond, the house in integrated with and bisected by gardens to make the best use of the irregular ledge. [A] Glass-walled gallery, which is also the entrance to the house, makes full visual use of lush greenery. Because of the steep, unmovable slopes and the desire for heavy shade and low upkeep, all of the one and a half-acre property is either paved or planted with evergreen groundcovers…paved areas gained interest in differences of materials (Mexican brick, Oklahoma stone), paving patterns, and definition of broad, graceful steps” (*Ibid.*, p. 88).

Lawson continued:

“Marie and Arthur Berger knew the comfort value of leafy sunshade, so they planted and pruned with shade as their goal. Groundcover is shade tolerant Lilly turf…to shield the house and its surroundings from Texas sun and drying winds and to take advantage of the cooling effect of evaporation from leaf surfaces, the Bergers worked to develop a vast overhead layer of foliage, so the house and its surroundings will be totally shaded” (*Ibid.*, p. 87).
The article included a detailed floor plan displaying the complex landscape design that was executed by the Bergers. The floor plan included a variety and types of paving patterns in the driveways that became landmarks in their work. Research revealed other surviving gardens in Dallas and San Antonio and observed the same patterns and materials shown in the above-mentioned plan. The images displayed of the setting that the Berger’s created, were photographs from 1957 and were printed in black & white.

**Fig. 2.8 - Berger Terrace Brick Patterns**
2.2.7 Magazine Review: *House & Home*

The 1952 residence of Frederick C. “Colonel” Hixon built in San Antonio, Texas, by O’Neil Ford was featured in *House and Home* in the March 1952 issue. The article was entitled ‘The Vented House: Opens its Windows to Favorable Breezes, Uses its Air Conditioning Only When Necessary’ (p. 89). The thrust of the article was based on the early days when air conditioning was being introduced to residences and explained how architects Ford and Rogers, had the house designed adequately for the San Antonio climate with an air conditioning system. The article explained, “this house was planned so that it could be cooled either by natural ventilation or by mechanical refrigeration. In this house…they have made window openings big and east facing, [and] when possible always shielding them with porch roofs, sun shades or plantings” (House and Home, p. 90). The Hixon house, as the Murchison house was also built on a sloping terrain, thus having gardens facing the uphill on the north side and valley views towards the south. Arthur Berger was named as the landscape architect in the article; Marie there was not mentioned as a collaborator.

![Fig 2.9 - Hixon Terrace](image1.png)

![Fig. 2.10 - Hixon Terrace from Inside](image2.png)
The landscape plan included a relatively small but complex garden design at the sheltered entry walk protected by a deep porch facing south. This entrance garden was linked to a terrace located on the east side of the house. Arthur Berger used a combination of in-situ stone on the terrace, as well as on the exterior walkways. The entrance garden and the Terrace were flanked by low retaining walls designed as a combination of a rigid ninety-degree boundary wall, and a doglegged section along the east boundary (see Fig. 2.11). The garden court located at the entrance and shown in one of the article’s photographs depicted the Berger’s fluid sinuous landscape design that included trees shading the south porch and loosely laid flagstone quarried at the site. This particular feature became a commonly incorporated detail and system in the Berger’s designs.
Fig. 2.12 - Hixon Residence Plan
2.2.8 Magazine Review: House Beautiful

The residence of Mr. and Mrs. Lewis McNaughton, built in the Preston Hollow area of Dallas, Texas, was featured in *House Beautiful*. The March 1959 issue contained the article entitled ‘A Typical American House’. One of the houses featured in the article was the McNaughton House, designed by O’Neil Ford (Nancy Sparrow, June 2007). The article concentrated on the landscape theme instead of the architecture. According to the article the McNaughton’s stated “…we like spaciousness with a free and easy feeling…Our extensive use of motor cars give a different sense of scale and movement to the make-up of our lives” (*House Beautiful*, p. 90). The landscape architect responded with the following theoretical statement “our practical approach to the solution of problems can and does produce handsome results” (*Ibid.*, 155). Regarding the landscape, this article further explained:

“...there is a certain fluid easiness in the organization of the architectural elements (terraces, walls, walks, and steps) which extend the form of the house and loosely interweave it with the landscape. Instead of the gentle-rolling tree-covered site being changed or concealed to a pre-conceived image, its quality is suddenly revealed and played up to make the observer more aware of it. The flowing lines of walls and walks lead the eye and mind indefinitely on instead of setting up defined limits…Serpentine retaining walls [are] less officious than a straight wall [and it] … effects the height change with gentle casualness”, (*Ibid*, pp. 91, 155).

The house and gardens have been destroyed. The photographs in the article displayed elaborated curvilinear and sinuous raised planters, walks and retaining walls enhancing the architectural design of Ford who integrated the house into the spacious and wooded site. The photographs (found at the Architectural Archive Library at The
University of Texas and published in the above referenced magazine) were all black and white images.

2.2.9 Magazine Review: *House and Garden*

The residence of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Perkins, built in Dallas, Texas, was featured in *House Beautiful*. In the March 1949 issue the article entitled: ‘Plan the shadows in your garden; Chiaroscurro, the interplay of light and shade, will give mood and movement to your garden’ was included (House and Garden p.118). A photograph caption read, “An overhanging Redbud casts dappled shade on the flagstone terrace and pool of Mr.
and Mrs. Harry Perkins, Dallas. Arthur S. Berger was landscape architect” (Ibid., p. 118). The article thoroughly described and displayed images that informed the readers on how the Berger’s gardens emphasized the dramatic effects that they employed profusely in their work: the *chiaroscuro* (see Fig. 5.11).

![Fig. 2.16 - Perkins Residence](image)

The author explained:

“...the average gardener takes the interplay of light and shadow in nature for granted, seldom stops to realize how much it adds to the pleasure of his garden. All too few of us plan consciously to create it. Yet, the *chiaroscuro* of sun and shade adds sparkle to terraces, lawn and flower beds which might otherwise be drab and uninviting...Bold shadows result from objects like arbors, walls or seats repeating their outline in silhouette. The crisp edge of these shadows gives definitions to their form. A quite different shadow pattern results from light filtering through the foliage of a tree, shrub or overhead vine. Since shadows blend
their pattern with that of the surface on which they fall, they are always most effective on plain surfaces, where their shapes do not have the competition of other fixtures” (Ibid., p. 118).

The house is still in existence but the gardens have been completely renovated.

2.2.10 Magazine Review: House and Garden

The Everett DeGolyer Residence built in 1940 was featured in the March 1950 issue of House and Garden. The article entitled ‘Every room of Mr. and Mrs. Everett DeGolyer’s house overlooks a garden’ (House and Garden, p. 102) stated that “…native and exotic plant materials have been skillfully blended by Arthur S. Berger, landscape architect in the various gardens that surround the house…[located] on White Rock Lake in Dallas, Texas” (Ibid., p. 104). Schutte Scott from Beverly Hills, California, designed the house. The DeGolyer property was one of two estates purchased in the 1970s by the City of Dallas and converted into the Dallas Arboretum.

Fig. 2.17 - DeGolyer Courtyard              Fig. 2.18 - DeGolyer Estate Crepe Myrtle Allee

Furthermore, the article stated “Owners of small gardens can get ideas from each of the individual gardens on this large place” (Ibid., p. 104). Each of the several gardens designed and integrated to the architectural design by Arthur Berger for the DeGolyer’s
property had a special purpose and use. The property was a large estate that encompassed many acres and the house occupied a prominent place. The article included a site plan that named specific areas of the gardens and gave an idea about the size of the site. The plan included named features such as: ‘Entrance Court, Flower Garden, Grass Terrace, The Circle, the Rose Garden, The Mall, Vista across Woodland to define all the interconnected gardens’ (Ibid., pp. 104-105). The article also stated “good garden design is rooted in appropriate and pleasing materials artfully combined for the owners enjoyment…Architectural principles of proportion [were] applied to plant groupings and other garden features [to] play an important part [in the designs]” (Ibid. p. 105).
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This research developed a rationale about the life of the three subjects under study and proposed a hypothesis on how their professional work developed in symbiosis. Taylor and Harwood stated that “examples of qualitative methods commonly used in landscape architecture research shall include: content analysis,…individual interviews,…historical inquiry, critical analysis… and techniques for generating data. Qualitative methods rely primarily on words rather than numbers” (p. 6). The research included quantitative methods that converted data into numerical values.

This research reviewed the existing literature about the Bergers and Ford and then surveyed persons and landscaped associated with them. The researcher interviewed renowned architects, co-workers, colleagues and friends that knew the subjects and visited surviving landscapes. A survey form was created, tested and annotated with the gathered information. The information was compiled using face-to-face and remote interviews, visits to sites, recording of images graphically, exchanging mailings, and gathering architectural and landscape plans that were produced by the team. The obtained data allowed inquiry such as: ‘Who were the Bergers; what did the Bergers do; where were the Bergers’ projects; when were they done; and, why they became nationally renowned.’
3.2 Qualitative Interviewing – Discovering the Partnership

The research of the life history of the three subjects plus background and elite interviewing became the three types of qualitative interviews that were used. Taylor explained, “the analysis of this research will be qualitative because of language and descriptions” (Taylor 2007).

The life history interview focused on experiences and descriptions of the Bergers and Ford’s professional careers. The background interview method created a picture of the Bergers with the information that was systematically acquired from interviewees who knew the three subjects professionally and personally.

Elite interviewing became the most well suited qualitative research technique during the investigation of the life, career and special relationship of the Bergers and Ford. The data collected through in-depth interviews of an elite nature was contained in completed interview forms (see Appendix C). McRee stated:

“Marshall and Rosman define ‘elite interview’ as a specialized treatment of interviewing which focuses on a particular kind of respondent. Elites are considered to be the influential, the prominent, and the well-informed people in an organization or community. Elite interviews are conducted within these guidelines:

1. Stressing the interviewee’s definition of the situation.
2. Encouraging the interviewee to structure the account of the situation
3. Letting the interviewee introduce to a considerable extent his/her notions of what he/she regards as relevant, instead of relying on the investigator’s notions of relevance” (McRee, pp. 18-19).

3.3 The Purpose of Interviewing

According to Lincoln and Guba, “Developing the logic that will solidly defend the thesis proposal entails two large domains: responding to criteria for the soundness of the project and demonstrating the usefulness of the proposed work to the conceptual
framework and research questions posed initially” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). They also posit that:

“...trustworthiness of a research study is important to evaluating its worth. Trustworthiness involves establishing:

- **Credibility** - confidence in the 'truth' of the findings
- **Transferability** - showing that the findings have applicability in other contexts
- **Dependability** - showing that the findings are consistent and could be repeated
- **Conformability** - a degree of neutrality or the extent to which the findings of a study are shaped by the respondents and not researcher bias, motivation, or interest” (*Ibid.*, pp. 145-147).

### 3.4 Selection of Interview Participants

Relatives and acquaintances of the Bergers and Ford were selected as interviewees and they substantiated the biographical information and defined their personal character. Taylor and Bogdon stated, “…character witnesses provide verification of the subject’s behavior, beliefs and mannerisms extracted from interview data of actors in the professional group” (Taylor and Bogdon, pp. 92-95). Owners of Ford designed homes with Berger landscapes were interviewed to gather information about the client-and-designer relationship; contemporary architects and landscape architects were interviewed for design, theory and history related issues.

### 3.5 Interviewing Protocol

A consent form following The University of Texas at Arlington’s Office of Research Compliance was prepared and offered to interview participants requesting their permission to participate in the survey. Interviewees were allowed the choice of
remaining anonymous or having their names included in the research. Participants who
preferred to remain anonymous were designated as ‘respondents’. At any time during the
interview, the participant was able to terminate the questioning. These safeguards
“prevent retaliatory actions from occurring while giving the informant the ability to speak
freely and honestly” (Taylor, pp. 96-97).

Different sets of informed questions were developed in order to give the interview an
adequate framework and to appeal to the various groups of interviewees. Introduction
letters were written, mailed and followed-through and explained the nature of the
research and requested interviews and/or site visits. Telephone calls were made to assess
the input capability of some participants.

3.6 Importance of Recorded History

Kashuba (2007) stated that “the written work allows first-hand knowledge to be
stored and retrieved with accuracy, rather than be passed down by word of mouth. From
the written word, the accounts of people, events and places were enriched and
enlightened by this knowledge that can be revisited at any time” (Kashuba, p. 1).

The information regarding the theoretical component of the Bergers’ designs was
extracted from the published books about O’Neil Ford since their conceptual frame
regarding modern design, environment and use of native materials coincided. Direct
information about the Bergers’ attitudes were found in a limited amount of recorded
history that was located in the archive library at Trinity University in San Antonio, and at
Temple Emanu-El in Dallas. The documents recorded situations when the designers
executed their landscape projects at Trinity University and at Temple Emanu-El.
3.7 Research Questions

A survey form (see Appendix A) was developed and used during the interviews and recorded the answers that became relevant data about the Bergers, Ford and their clients (see Appendix B). Taylor explained that “[a] survey form be used as ‘an analytical tool’, which is dynamic in how it evolves. The information compiled from the survey forms can be used for quantitative analysis” (Taylor 2007). The research categorized the requested information into three different realms:

A) Questions for individuals who were both friends and clients of the Bergers

B) Questions for owners of Ford built homes with Berger landscapes

C) Questions for architects and landscape architects

A listing of the entire set of questions for each form follows.

‘Questionnaire Form A’- for individuals who were both friends and clients of the Bergers

1) Can you share a brief history of the Bergers career?
2) How did you come to know the Bergers?
3) How/why did they (individually) come to Dallas?
4) What do you know of their relationship with O’Neil Ford?
5) What were the Berger’s doing in the field of landscape architecture that was different?
6) What were the design trends in Dallas at the time (post-WW II – 1960)?
7) What was the Berger’s professional circle like?
8) What was their social circle?
9) What did people think about their practice?
10) Why did people hire them?
11) What was each of the Berger’s roles in their partnership?
12) Do you know when they began working together?
13) Tell me about your personal landscape plan.
14) Do you know of the Bergers travels to Europe?
15) Did the Berger’s want to leave a legacy?
16) Would you like to tell me anything additional about the Bergers that we have not covered?
17) Do you know what happened to the Berger’s residence on Stonebridge Dr. in Dallas?

‘Questionnaire Form B’- for owners of Ford built homes with Berger landscapes

1) Are you the original owner of this home?
2) If not, how many owners in between?
3) Do you know of Marie and Arthur Berger?
4) How did you hear about them?
5) If original owner, why did you choose the Bergers?
6) If original owner, did you work with them on the landscape plan?
7) If original owner and you did not choose them, do you know if the architect recommended them?
8) If you worked with the Bergers, please explain the process.
9) If you worked with the Bergers, did you have a good experience?
10) Have you changed the landscape?
11) If yes, who did the updated plan?
12) Do you have any photos of the original landscape?
13) Do you have the original plan?
14) If yes to #12 and #13, may I copy them?

‘Questionnaire Form C’ - for currently practicing landscape architects and architects

1) Are you familiar with the work of O’Neil Ford or Marie and Arthur Berger?
2) What do you think of their collaborative work
3) How would you describe their style?
4) Do you think the preservation and documentation of their work would be of benefit
to practicing architects and landscape architects today?
5) If so, why?

3.8 Survey Form – Acquisition of Quantitative Data

3.8.1 Genesis of the Form

Once a preliminary survey of bibliographical data that listed the projects where the Bergers collaborated with O’Neil Ford was conducted and the addresses of the sites became known, visits to projects in Dallas, Salado and San Antonio were conducted. The data gathered from the literature review, interviews and site visits were graphically
displayed and categorized on a wall-size marker board. Patterns emerged and were used to design a survey form (see Figure 3.2).

![Fig. 3.1 - Data Analysis Exercise](image)

3.8.2 Development of the Survey Form

The *survey form* evolved based on the information processed on the marker board as a tool that compiled information about the house, its owners, the features of the landscape, the source if they were referenced in publications, relevant dates, and the existing graphic information that pertained to each site.

3.8.3 The Survey Form

The Survey form was designed to record and organize the quantitative information gathered through interviews and visits (see Appendix A). The format was laid out in three vertical columns and recorded the following:
• The first column contained the original project client (owners) name and address, the current owner (if applicable), date built, architect, landscape architect, Sources: Bibliographical Source (magazine, book, etc., publication title, page location of articles).

• The second column included the location of the research information; participating architects, participating landscape architects, existence of Bergers’ plan, photographic source (existing, black and white, color, title of photo, photographer), archival source/item (name, location, contact name at source) and personal correspondence (type, title, date, description).

• The third column related to context followed by the existing conditions of the site; (Excellent, Good, Fair, and Poor), modified (one hundred per cent, seventy five per cent, fifty per contend and twenty five per cent), destroyed (Completely, Partial, (one hundred per cent, seventy five per cent, fifty per cent, and twenty five per cent) and information regarding newspaper clippings (Existing, present, source and date).

• The remainder of the form included blank spaces that were left to describe architectural components and additional comments (See Appendix A: survey form).

3.8.4 Testing the Survey Form

Five survey forms were completed and then evaluated for format and contents. An analysis of the way that entries were made and the way that some preliminary
information was recorded, demonstrated the need to modify the design of the survey form and allow extra spaces for additional information.

The following revisions were done:

- The first vertical column needed to include only the names of the categories of the information searched. This was modified to include site identification followed by architect, landscape architect, bibliographical source, photographic source, archival source/item, personal correspondence, architectural components (as part of landscape design) and comments.

- The second column was left the same as the tested original survey form, except that the bibliographical source was extracted from the first column and moved to the second; the newspaper clippings (originally included in the third column), were moved to the second column.

- The third column, under context, seven categories were added: estate, residential, guest house, creek-side lot, institutional, business and religious. The second part of the third column included landscape conditions and the category ‘good’ was included. The category ‘modified’ was changed to ‘modifications’. Under the ‘destroyed’ section, the word ‘partial’ was removed because the indicator of the percentage provided such information. The third column ‘newspaper clippings’ was removed and relocated in the ‘architectural source’. The preliminary survey form was edited to reflect the comments stated above (see Appendix A).
3.8.5 Quantification and Analysis of the Survey Form

Visits were made to thirty-five properties and conducted a visual survey and completed the form (See Appendix A for the compendium of the completed survey forms). After visiting thirty-five properties and comparing the information entered in the forms the resulting data was tabulated. A table was created and entitled: ‘Tabulation of Compendium of Research Surveys; Arthur and Marie Berber/O’Neal Ford Symbiosis’ (See Appendix D).

3.8.6 Interpretation of the Tabulated Information: Survey Form

Once the information recorded in the survey forms was tabulated and compared, an interpretation of the compendium of research survey forms was made:

- The names of the surveyed properties were written in alphabetical order.
- The table indicated that thirty-five properties were surveyed and their data was recorded.
- The first three columns identified if the property was either a Berger design, or not; if it was a Ford design, or not; and if it was a project were the Bergers collaborated with Ford or not.

The indicators in percentages indicated that:

- Out of the thirty five properties surveyed, ninety five percent of the landscapes designs were executed by the Bergers; only five per cent were not.
- Out of all of these properties, sixty-eight percent were designed by Ford, while thirty one percent were designed by others.
• In sixty-two percent of the surveyed properties, the Bergers were the landscape architects and Ford was the architectural designer.

The following five columns were dedicated to indicate the context where the Bergers designed the landscape. The tally was as follows:

• Five categories of context were included: residential, school, church, public and commercial.

• Out of the thirty five surveyed projects:
  o Seventy one per cent were residential.
  o Five per cent were schools.
  o Two per cent were churches.
  o Five per cent were public buildings.
  o Fourteen per cent were commercial complexes.

The survey found that the Bergers and O’Neal Ford designed and built numerous houses located by streams of water, and/or included ponds in the landscape design.

• Forty two percent of the properties fulfilled the conditions stated above.

The following four columns in the table surveyed and quantified the state of condition of the Berger’s landscape designs:

The first two columns recorded if the landscape was still in existence, or if it has been destroyed. The third column recorded the state of conservation of the landscape. The fourth column quantified and indicated the level of integrity that the Berger’s landscape had on the day of the visit. This column recorded and indicated the amount (in percentage) that the landscape has been modified. This indicated that the higher the
percentage was, the more the landscape has been modified. The lower the percentage indicated that the Bergers’ landscape was still in existence and in good condition. The tally was as follows:

- Seventy seven per cent of the executed landscapes were still in existence.
- Twenty per cent of the landscapes have been lost.
- In seventeen per cent of the visited places, the landscape has been destroyed.
- One of said properties, The Dallas City Library closed its doors to the public and a ‘For Sale’ sign has been posted. Since the researcher was not able to enter the building, it was not possible to survey the condition of the roof-top garden designed and executed by the Bergers.
- Out of the thirty five gardens surveyed:
  - Twenty five per cent were in excellent condition.
  - Sixty four per cent were in good condition.
  - Twelve per cent were in fair condition.
- Regarding the level of modifications that these landscapes have been exposed to, the table indicated that:
  - Eight per cent of all the Bergers gardens have been modified; this meant that all the elements that conformed the original landscape has been removed.
  - Eight per cent of the gardens have been modified about seventy five per cent; this indicated that something from the original landscape was still surviving.
Eight per cent have been modified about fifty per cent; this indicated that there was still a balance between what was original in the garden and what has been added.

Seventy three per cent have been modified only about twenty five per cent or less. This meant that the owners of the properties have been diligently maintaining, thus preserving, the original Bergers’ landscapes.

The table included additional indicators expressed as ( * ) or ( ** )’s. This indicators reported that:

- Six of the original houses that were contemporary with the Bergers’ landscape have been demolished. Indicator: ( * )
- Three of the thirty-five properties were not visited during the research; access to the private property was not provided. Indicator: (** )
- One property that was visited was vacant, but the researcher had no opportunity to gain access to conduct the survey. Indicator: (*** )
- Four of the properties were visited and photographed and this research was not able to secure early photographs of the property that illustrated the design of the original landscape. Without earlier illustrations, it was not possible to establish the level of surviving integrity of the original landscape.

3.8.7 Summary

- Most of the Bergers’ landscapes have survived and are being maintained.
- Only a small number have been destroyed.
• The one-rooftop garden design is at high risk being on top of the former Dallas Public Library. The building has been empty for good length of time. At this date, it is not known how the building will be used, or if the gardens have already been lost.

• A good number of projects are located near or at the water’s edge. In some cases, the water feature was integral part of the Berger’s plan.

• Arthur and Marie Berger’s residence and landscape were recognized as icons of mid-century modern architecture and landscape in Texas.

• With the demolition of the Bergers residence, the trend-setting examples of full integration between Ford’s mid-century modern architecture and the Bergers’ innovative landscape design and sophistication were lost forever.

• The research found that the Bergers were participants in thirty-eight properties but only thirty-five were visited. In one case (Tobian residence), access to the property was restricted, and in another (Hixon residence) the address was located but there was no evidence of an existence of a house and a long-time neighbor said that no house was ever at the site. Information on the Urschel residence was found after the visit to San Antonio, thus the visit to this site was not conducted.
CHAPTER 4
THE BERGER PARTNERSHIP

“Dallas is a more beautiful place to live as a result of the work of Arthur and Marie Berger.”
(Ogelsby, President of Dallas Chapter, AIA, 1963)

4.1 Introduction

Architects and landscape architects needed to understand the constraints of the Texas terrain and the weather factors prior to initiating the design process. O’Neil Ford tackled the architectural responsibility to respond to Texas’ environmental conditions while Arthur and Marie Berger undertook the landscape responsibilities. O’Neil Ford was a native Texan, while Arthur and Marie arrived in Texas from Ohio and California, respectively. This meant that in order to become successful landscape architects, Arthur and Marie almost certainly dedicated considerable time and effort to understand the environmental conditions of Texas.

4.2 Life, Design and Philosophy

4.2.1 The Thesis Theme: Development

Robinette, as stated in the Premise, suggested that a scholastic study of the life and work of the Bergers should be undertaken. He stated that “their professional work became exemplary but has not been documented; neither has been the study of their lives” (Robinette, 2005). Robinette further explained, “I was in school, working on my
MLA at Michigan State and would read about the Bergers’ work every time I picked up a national garden magazine, so I thought when I came to live and work here in the Dallas area, that I would finally be able to see all of their work. I couldn’t find anyone who could tell me anything” (Robinette, 2007).

It became significant to interview subjects in regard to the life and work of the Bergers, the majority of the respondents offered generous information on their outstanding landscape work, but little was known or written about their personal lives. A biography of the Bergers and Ford was assembled from the limited amount of information located and from the respondents to the interview who often replied that there was not known much about them personally.

4.2.2. The Symbiotic Players: Arthur & Marie Berger and O’Neil Ford

The Bergers’ life and their gentle manners (as described by many of the persons that knew the Bergers) were compared to the life and professional memory of Andrea Palladio, the Renaissance Italian Master. The personal histories of Palladio and the Bergers’ were not well documented during their life. The Bergers, like Palladio were described as ‘engaging and having charming characters’ by their clients, friends and relatives. Giaconi stated: “The study of Palladio’s life is told through his architecture. We know about his travels, his commissions, his patrons, and his buildings and we [had to] read between the lines to construct his life story… In addition to his many virtues, [Palladio had] such an affable and gentle nature [and] that he [was] most loved by all” (Giaconi, p. 14). Almost identically, every person who was interviewed described how wonderfully matched the Bergers were in their personal relationship and how well
matched they were in their professional lives. Dr. Joseph E. Howland, author of an article published in *Landscape Architecture* magazine titled “Marie & Arthur Berger; A Tribute” stated “Both Marie and Arthur were the gentlest of people. I have never met any designer so beloved by every client I visited” (Howland, p. 266).

The method used to document the life of Palladio according to Giaconi was likewise used to compensate the lack of writing available on the personal lives of Arthur and Marie Berger. Researching the work of O’Neil Ford became the vehicle to find data on the work of the Bergers and through the articles written about the Bergers’ projects and visiting the surviving landscapes, a picture of the Bergers’ professional achievements and their personal life was formed.

4.2.2.1 *Arthur S. Berger; A Biography*

Most of the following biographical information has been compiled from a flyer produced for The Emily Berger Scholarship created in honor of Arthur’s beloved and diseased sister (See References). As stated before, there are not too many other sources were their lives have been documented. Their obituaries recounted some passages of their lives. The source of other bibliographical information obtained and used has been indicated herein.

Arthur was born the youngest of four children to Henry D. Berger and Magdalena Shoene in Halstead, Kansas, on December 19, 1903 (Obituary, *Dallas Morning News*, 1960). According to the University of Kansas’ Emily Berger Scholarship flyer (provided by Gillett Berger, Arthur’s nephew), Arthur’s sister Emily reported that: “He was a rather frail boy, Mother tended to hover over him and encourage the development of the
gentleness for which he was later known. [Arthur developed] antipathy toward athletics and his general interest [turned toward] the arts rather than in physical activities” (Emily Berger Scholarship flyer, p. 4). Emily was the only sibling who seemed to have much faith in this unusual child who preferred books to crowds and music to football. The family members persistently asked: “What shall we do with Arthur?” Emily invariably replied “Leave him alone; Arthur’s all right” (Ibid.).

“It was Emily who directed Arthur’s interests towards the science of plants through the gift of a copy of The Grey’s New Manual of Botany, a book which Arthur kept and occasionally thumbed through long after one would assume it had gone out of date… [Arthur was] shy, almost to the point of being a recluse; his only activity while a student at the University of Kansas was the Botany Club” (Ibid.).

Arthur graduated from the University of Kansas with a degree in Botany and then went on to Harvard Graduate School to take an advanced degree in Landscape Architecture (Obituary, Dallas Morning News, 1960). After graduation, the distinguished landscape architects Ferrucio Vitale and Alfred Gieffert of New York employed Berger (flyer, Loc. cit.) probably based on recognizing the design potential that this young graduate had to offer. In 1927, at age 24, Arthur achieved distinction by making the first autoluminar photograph (Obituary, Loc. cit.). This ability later served him well when he joined the Civilian Corps of the Army engineer Board during World War II while making maps and working on the development of camouflage.

Arthur was named a finalist for the Prix de Rome in 1929 (Loc. cit.). To become a candidate to the Rome Prize, a scholar has to have already distinguished him/herself in a specialized field of academic endeavor. The Rome Prize is a very honorable award
offered only to those few that have elevated their particular field of action and/or knowledge to a relevant level. Arthur evidently had risen to this level in a rather short time after graduation from Harvard University. The Rome Prize probably was offered to him based on his high intellectual values and his outstanding landscape design ability. Arthur was only a finalist, but being named a *finalist* still identified him as someone with sufficient talent to reach the competitive level of *finalist*. The Rome Prize was a scholarship awarded by the French Government for artists to study in Rome. The *GrandsPrix* was established in the 17th century and was awarded until the 20th century (American Academy in Rome, pp. 1-2)

Under the appointment from the Vitale and Gieffert Office of New York, Arthur was assigned in 1932 to plan and supervise the redesigning of the gardens around the Toledo Art Museum in Ohio. After moving to Toledo, new acquaintances encouraged him to settle there and open a landscape firm. Arthur Berger then opened a professional office, and due to his connection with Harvard University and the fact that he was sent there by the prestigious firm Vittale and Gieffert, he was able to initiate an independent career.

While in Toledo, Ohio, Arthur frequently returned to lecture at the University of Kansas. This led to an offer from Chancellor Malott’s administration in 1933 to “accept a position in the Botany Department and to landscape the [University of Kansas] campus” (Emily Berger Scholarship flyer, p. 4). This represented an incredible opportunity for a distinguished young landscape architect to design and oversee the landscape of a complete university campus. Arthur declined the offer based on
previously acquired commitments but accepted a position as a consultant. Several of his
designs were executed in the campus (Ibid., p. 5).

Fig. 4.1 - University of Kansas
*Landscape Plan by Arthur Berger*

Arthur arrived in Dallas in 1939 after practicing in New York and Toledo, Ohio.

“The move south to Dallas was precipitated by two events: the death of
his brother Harry and a hard-won commission to design the gardens for
the newly acquired Texas estate of Everett DeGolyer, internationally
famous petroleum geologist…Mrs. DeGolyer [was] convinced that Arthur
should do her estate and that he should begin at once, …she also decided
that she would recommend him to her friends who might need his
services. Thus, the door was finally opened and the young man was at the
threshold of the most promising part of his career” (Loc. cit., p. 6).
With World War II at hand, Arthur found a way to serve his country by utilizing his assets: special training in landscape, knowledge of Botany, and his experience with photography. The Civilian Corps of the Army Engineer Board hired him to do scale drawings of invasion beachheads. His obituary described that “His specialized knowledge served the Army in World War II when he was stationed at Fort Belvoir,
Virginia, as a civilian and embarked in camouflage research” (Obituary, *Dallas Morning News*, 1960).

The flyer reported, “…it was at Ft. Belvoir, Virginia, where he met [Marie Monica Harbeck] the soft-spoken, talented woman with whom he was to share his life and career” (op. cit. p.6). The Berger partnership had begun.

Fig. 4.3 - Arthur and Marie Berger
Arthur S. Berger and Marie Monica Harbeck were married in 1946 in Dallas, Texas. In addition to becoming Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Berger, the new team began to be known as “The Bergers”. The flyer stated “the two were perfectly suited for each other” (Loc. cit.), while Arthur’s obituary read “…married Miss Marie Harbeck, who holds degrees in both architecture and landscape architecture.” (op. cit.).
Arthur and Marie never had children but they were “interested in the welfare of youth… Arthur, who still vividly remembered his only sister Emily, established an endowed scholarship-loan fund in memory of her in 1948 and later made this fund the primary beneficiary of his will.” (op. cit. p. 7).

The construction on Arthur and Marie Berger’s Stonebridge house over Turtle Creek was begun and upon completion of the house in 1953, they began work on their landscape. Marie’s obituary read:

“The garden of the home at 3906 Stonebridge, which they designed for themselves, overlooking a bluff opposite Jesuit High School along Turtle Creek [in Dallas], was often described nationally as a model of taste. There, Mr. and Mrs. Berger had welcomed and entertained many of the great names in contemporary architecture, painting, music and writing” (Obituary, *Dallas Morning News*, 1963).

The Bergers’ work became internationally known in the late 1950s (op. cit. p. 7). After having accomplished a successful career and recognition in Dallas, in Texas, and in the USA, Arthur and Marie traveled to Europe in 1958 and participated in “the International Landscape Architecture Exposition that was held in Zurich, Switzerland” (Obituary, Loc. cit.).

The scholarship flyer from University of Kansas continues to inform that, “Tragically, Arthur’s brilliant career was cut short by an automobile accident.” The obituary reported: “[Arthur S. Berger] died at age fifty-six as a result of car-truck crash at Beltline and Preston Road in Dallas on August 2, 1960.” The flyer goes on to describe that, “He and his associate Houston Bliss were returning to Dallas after inspecting one of their projects. Their car was struck head-on by a truck attempting to make a turn….For
eleven days he remained in a coma until he died August 13, 1960” (op. cit. p.7). The Obituary informed “Cremation services were held at Restland Memorial Park in Dallas. Survived at the time of his death, in addition to his wife, was his brother, Dr. B. J. Berger (Benjamin), also of Dallas” (Obituary, Loc. cit.).

4.2.2.2 Marie M. Berger; A Biography

Mrs. Arthur Berger was born Marie Monica Harbeck in the City of Grants Pass, Oregon in 1898; the second child of five born to ‘Axxx’ (name not decipherable in US Census form) Harbeck, born in Germany, and Caroline, his wife, born in Canada. The other siblings’ names were: Claire - the first born, followed by Marie, Evelyn, ‘Axxx’ (not legible) and Lester (U.S. Population Census 1920, sheet # 11).

Marie’s obituary in the Dallas Morning News reported that she “graduated with degrees in both Architecture and Landscape Architecture” (Obituary, Dallas Morning News, 1963). Cindy Lundeen, an employee from the University of Kansas, in an email dated April 10, 2007, informed that:

“Marie studied landscape architecture in part under Fred A. Cuthbert, who was a professor at Oregon Agricultural College (now Oregon State University [OSU] in Corvallis, Oregon). Marie completed her studies there and graduated in 1932 with a major in landscape architecture, the last year that OSU offered that major. [Ms. Harbeck], Mrs. Berger followed [Professor Cuthbert’s] development of the program at University of Oregon… [after he moved there and became] the department head of the landscape architecture department” (Lundeen, 2007).

After graduation Marie resided in San Francisco, California. Her obituary in The Dallas Morning News reported “her earliest work was in San Francisco with the noted Bay Area architect Gardner Daily, and later with the famous California landscape
architect Thomas Church. In addition, she also specialized in designing fabrics.” To corroborate, The Emily Berger Scholarship flyer also informs that Marie “also a landscape architect...worked for the distinguished San Francisco Bay area architect Gardner Dailey and then for the nationally known landscape architect Thomas Church” (Emily Berger Scholarship flyer, p. 6).

Marie was sequestered to work as a civilian during the war and according to the Emily Berger Scholarship flyer: “With war, aesthetic concerns were put aside...[and Marie, as Arthur did] find a way to serve [their] country [with their] specialized training in landscape...[Their] knowledge in [landscape] and [her] experience in [fabrics design] were the assets that make him [her] vital to the Army Engineer Board who hired him [them]” (Ibid.). Her obituary further described that “While doing camouflage work for the armed services during World War II at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, she met [Arthur] Berger” (Loc. cit.).

Professionally, her obituary stated that” Most of her gardens, before her marriage had been designed in California and on the Pacific Coast...before joining the war effort as a civilian employee for the Army Engineer Board. It was at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, [where] she met Berger.” As stated previously in Arthur’s biography, it was in Virginia where the Berger partnership began.
Fig. 4.6 – Example of Camouflage Stamped on Fabric

Observe the sinuous lines, light and shadow patterns and colors in the design. Compare with the patterns created by the ‘chiaroscuro’ in the gardens designed by the Bergers in the following figure.

Fig. 4.7 – Chiaroscuro at the Haggerty residence.

Design created by the Bergers.
At this date, it is not known if Arthur and Marie came together to Dallas after the end of the war from Virginia, or if they separated and each went to live in some other place and later reunited in Dallas to work and wed. Marie Monica Harbeck – (Marie Berger) became Mrs. Arthur Berger at their marriage in Dallas, Texas, on July 5, 1946. Marie and Arthur later established and endowed a scholarship-loan fund in 1948 in memory of Emily, (Arthur’s deceased sister who inspired him so much), and arranged for it to be offered primarily to aid female students. The flyer reported, “This was the first, and eventually by far the largest, of the scholarship funds Arthur and Marie established” (op. cit. p. 7).

The construction of Marie and Arthur’s house begun in 1950 and they subsequently initiated the installation of their newly designed landscape plans. Jean Lawson, in her article entitled “Five Years Ago This House was out in the Texas Sun” published in the August, 1957, issue of House Beautiful magazine, stated:

“In a Texas seared by sun and arid with drought, this green oasis came into being. Its speedy success – a story of man surmounting climate – offers an inspiration to all gardeners beset with unbroken months of heat. To shield this house……and to take advantage of the cooling effect of evaporation from leaf surfaces, the Bergers worked to develop a vast overhead layer of foliage” (p. 87). It is easy to imagine Marie spending considerable time attending to her new installation. Jean Lawson continues to note that, “To encourage rapid growth, all of the land is heavily fed…All trees were encouraged, by pruning, to grow high first, then spread wide into umbrella-like canopies” (p. 89).

The work of Marie and Arthur Berger was internationally celebrated during the 1950s. The Emily Berger Scholarship flyer reports that in 1958 “Joseph Howland, who composed The House Beautiful Book of Gardens and Outdoor Living, wrote in the flyleaf
Fortunate owners of Berger gardens know the real joy of gardening” (p. 7).

Arthur died tragically in a car accident in 1960 in Dallas. Arthur’s obituary reported “He and Marie had just completed plans to leave for a three-week tour of Europe” (Obituary, *Dallas Morning News*, 1960). By this time, their fame had grown to national and international levels, which meant they were very busy professionally. After Arthur’s death, the flyer sadly reported, “Marie could not recover from the shock of her loss, despite all the efforts of her loyal friends and family” (*op. cit.*).

Marie returned to Eugene, Oregon, seat of the University of Oregon, where she was planning to relocate after the death of Arthur in 1960. The flyer reported “[Marie] seemed to recover some of her lost spirit after moving to Oregon…to live with her sister, and even made plans to return to Dallas in order to settle her affairs there before moving permanently to Eugene” (*Ibid.*).

Marie’s obituary in *The Dallas Morning News* reported “Mrs. Berger had been visiting her sister Mrs. Fred Hall, a member of the staff of the University of Oregon at Eugene. While there, the brain tumor which she had suffered for a number of years became progressively worse” (Obituary, *Dallas Morning News*, 1963). The flyer added, “…on the eve of her departure [to Dallas to settle her affairs], she suffered a stroke. She was taken to the hospital but did not recover from the coma before dying on April 5, 1963” (Loc.cit.). Her obituary mentioned “Mrs. Arthur Berger, internationally famed Dallas landscape architect, died April 5, 1963, of a cerebral tumor in Eugene, Oregon” (Obituary, *Dallas Morning News*, 1963).
O’Neil Ford’s life has been documented in a series of essays but published mainly in two large-format books entitled *The Architecture of O’Neil Ford: Celebrating Place* by David Dillon, and *O’Neil Ford, Architect* by Mary Carolyn Hollers George. The following accounting of O’Neil Ford’s life has been compiled primarily from the two preceding sources.

O’Neil Ford was born in Pink Hill, Texas, (population 42) east of Sherman on December 3, 1905, (p. 5) to Bert Ford and Belle Sinclair. O’Neal was the second child; Malcolm, the first-born, died eight months later. Lynn was his younger brother and his sister Authella was the youngest child (George, p. 3). O’Neil grew up in this town surrounded by railroad scenes in an austere corner of North Texas (p. 5). The Ford family moved to Denton in 1917 after the death of O’Neil’s father (p. 8). In 1923, O’Neil and his uncle, Homer Jordan, left San Angelo, Texas, on a driving trip through the Rio Grande Valley, the Hill Country and to San Antonio. O’Neil described later how the architecture that he witnessed during this trip impressed him for life. “I was astonished by the beauty and the simplicity of those early Texas houses. They were real, straight to the point, not copied from anything. They fit the land as naturally as the trees” O’Neal stated (p. 11).

O’Neil enrolled at North Texas State Teacher’s College in 1924 and mastered machine drafting and architectural drawing (p. 10). The next year, in 1925, Ford enrolled in The Architectural Drawing and Design course offered by the International Correspondence Schools (ICS) of Scranton, Pennsylvania, and received his certificate in
March of the same year (George, p. 15). It was to be his only formal architecture training. For architectural inspiration, Ford had only to glance around turn-of-the-century brick and stone buildings in Sherman and Denton, [Texas] (p. 11).

Ford arrived in Dallas, Texas, in 1926 to work for David Williams, another agrarian and graduate from The International Correspondence Schools (ICS). Williams, who was also interested in vernacular architecture, established ‘The Studio’ a self-consciously bohemian retreat that became a rendezvous for Dallas’ fledging avant-garde (p. 14). Williams and Ford made numerous sketching and photographing expeditions to the Hill Country [in southwest Texas] and the Rio Grande Valley. They both admired the simplicity and solidity of these houses (pp. 16-17) and later they incorporated these basic principles into their modernistic designs.

Williams and Ford wrote in 1928 for the professional magazines Southwestern Architect and Southwest Review. Williams urged the Texas architects to “renounce foreign borrowing in favor of native building traditions. Eclecticism was the devil, epitomized by the Italianate Villas and the half-timbered Tudor manses that were turning Texas into operatic stage set” (p. 17). By 1932 Ford and Williams were not only writing in said magazines, but they were building in Dallas, Corsicana and Wichita Falls (p. 20).

A decade after arriving in Dallas with his architectural formation derived from The International Correspondence Schools (ICS), Ford was designing houses for Frank Murchison and Sid Richardson and was soon to start work on The Little Chapel in the Woods and was being recognized as one of the leading modernists in the Southwest.
(Dillon, p 25). His ability as a designer, coupled with his Irish charm, attracted influential clients and journalists (George, p. 60). In 1936 Ford’s career began to expand and 1937 marked the completion of the construction of the Frank Murchinson house in San Antonio, Texas, that was recognized as…their first serious attempt at combining modernism and the Texas Vernacular (p. 33). Dillon described that this house had “a rectilinear plan and in most areas the house is only one room deep. The landscaping was by Arthur and Marie Berger of Dallas, and [it] enhanced the intimate and fluid connections between interior and exterior spaces by means of patios, terraces, and long galleries” (p. 35).

Fig 4.8 - T. Frank Murchison Residence Floor Plan

Note that the ‘single-loaded’ plan moved in-and-out along the rectilinear scheme and allowed the Bergers not only to place landscape designs in alcoves, inward corners and patios, but also incorporated a Garden Room in the house fulfilling the modern principle of bringing the outdoors into the indoor.

Ford left Williams in 1938 and formed a partnership with Arch Swank (p. 31). The firm was called O’Neil Ford and Arch Swank, Architects (Dallas, Texas) (George, p.
In 1939 Maury Maverick, Mayor of San Antonio, nominated Ford as Consulting Architect for the reconstruction of La Villita [a historic setting in Old San Antonio, Texas] (George, p. 62). O’Neil met Wanda Graham in 1939 at a luncheon organized by the Witte Museum director and later married her on August 29, 1940, at the San Antonio Cathedral (George, p. 75). They established their residence in Willow Way estate [near the San Antonio River and near the ruins of the Spanish colonial Mission Espada] (George, p. 78). Wanda and O’Neil had four children (Handbook of Texas).

Entering the World War II, the Civilian Pilot Training Program accepted Ford’s application in mid-1942 and trained at The University of Texas at Austin, where he gained status of Flight Instructor (George, p. 80). He became a civilian pilot trainer during the war and while in flight, Ford used to spot old buildings or locals to which he later returned on land for closer investigation (p. 82).

Jerry Rogers and O’Neil Ford resumed their architectural practice in 1946. After the war Texas was growing due to the large investments related to aviation. Almost everyone who had a decent job was able to afford a house. Optimism was high. Architects participated in this growth. Texas patrons and entrepreneurs believed in the liberating power of technology, and in architecture’s power to enhance the American Dream (p. 55).
Ford initiated his relationship in 1948 with Trinity University in San Antonio following enthusiastic recommendations from his friend William Wurster, Dean of The Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and included landscape architects Arthur and Marie Berger in the landscape team (p. 60).
Ford began to collaborate with Felix Candela, a Mexican designer-engineer and developer of concrete shells that were able to cover large areas of space. Together they worked at Texas Instruments in Dallas, Great Southwest Industrial Park in Arlington, Texas, and the First Christian Church in Denton, Texas where Ford again engaged the
Bergers as the landscape architects. Ford participated with Richard Colley in the competition for the Texas Instruments projects (p. 75) as the team ‘Ford and Colley’.

In 1960 Ford established his firm under the name O’Neil Ford and Associates (p. 101) and was included in the election to the American Institute of Architects College of Fellows (Handbook of Texas). Later in the mid-sixties, the partnership of Ford-Colley
participated in the majority of the buildings at Texas Instruments (Dillon, p. 82) and 1968 demarked the final dissolution of the architectural firm (Dillon, p. 83).

Ford’s office was later commissioned in 1965 to prepare a Master Plan to preserve the San Antonio Spanish Missions (Dillon, p. 124) built in the mid-1700s. Then in 1967, Ford was awarded an Honorary Doctoral Degree by Trinity University of San Antonio, Texas, and in 1968 he was commissioned as the supervising architect for HemisFair, an event that commemorated the founding of San Antonio, Texas (p. 112). On the same year, President Lyndon Johnson appointed Ford to the National Council of the Arts (Dillon, p. 117).

The firm Ford, Powel and Carson became a successful mainstream commercial firm in the 1970’s with partners, associate partners, an interiors department, a landscape division, and anything else needed to compete for hotels, office buildings, and other large commercial work (Dillon, p. 128). Later, O’Neil Ford, Richard Colley, Arch Swank, and Samuel B. Zisman founded a new firm named Associated Architects and Land Planners of Dallas, Texas (George, p. 224).

Ford was awarded an honorary doctoral degree by Southern Methodist University (Handbook of Texas, 2007) in 1973 and honorary doctoral degrees by The University of Dallas, and Skidmore College of New York (Handbook of Texas, 2007). O’Neil Ford died July 20, 1982, of a heart attack (p. 134) and was buried in San Antonio, Texas, near Mission Espada not too far from the San Antonio River (George, p. 1).
4.2.3 Summary

The war united Arthur and Marie; William Wurster united the Bergers with Ford. Even though the three subjects (the Bergers and Ford) trained differently and were influenced by different persons and places, the three developed strong ties to the native and natural conditions. The biographical research helped to place the three subjects at one time in Texas and helped to develop an understanding of why the Bergers and Ford developed together a Texas Modern style where the architecture and the landscape worked in unison.
CHAPTER 5
DATA ANALYSIS

5.1 Introduction

The research of the historical base offered a frame-of-reference to this study and set the information of the players that allowed the understanding of their background, their training, and their collaborative activities. The importance of the close relationship between the Bergers and Ford, was established when the available data linked the philosophy of design with the new modern style of landscape and architecture.

5.2 Design Philosophy

Again, quoting from Giaconi’s book entitled The Villas of Palladio, and exchanging the names ‘Palladio’ for The Bergers in the following quote:

“…we can understand that, ‘writing a succinct account of Palladio’s villas (The Bergers’ landscapes) is no easy task… [and if] all the works of Palladio (the Bergers and O’Neil Ford’s) catalogue of works (See Appendix D) [can be analyzed],…it would have been a very long story if I wanted to recount the particulars of the beautiful and strange inventions and caprices… Palladio [the Bergers and O’Neil Ford]) show remarkably flexibility …inventiveness and willingness to derive new formal solutions for the different requirements [established by] the clients or [the] different…restrain or features [of the sites]. It becomes evident that his architecture [landscape forged in symbiosis with Ford’s architecture], is far from being the result of a formula, though certain principles of landscape and architecture…constitute an underlying regulating system” (p. 16).

Giaconi continued to express, “Palladio (The Bergers/Ford team) often used their villas (landscapes) as a testing ground for other kinds of architecture (landscape) as he
(they) apparently felt that he (they) had greater freedom with a country residence than with a city palace” (p. 16). Most of O’Neil’s work done in conjunction with the Bergers was either in the outskirts of the then-urban areas, and the buildings (houses, offices, churches, etc.) were located in suburban plots, not in the tight grid of the inner city.

Researching the undocumented design philosophy of the Bergers was achieved by analyzing Ford’s design philosophy documented in the published books, because they shared the same design principles that were used by treating architectural design in symbiosis with the landscape proposals. To this date, comprehensive or analytical writings about the Bergers have not been found (it is not known if they kept diaries, or if said documents have been located or made available by the relatives, etc.). In order to analyze the Bergers’ design philosophy, the research turned to the published analysis of Ford’s architectural conceptual base and design philosophy.

“Ford, [as the Bergers], started their practice of architecture [and landscape] in the 1930’s with the emergence of the modern house. His (their) first designs reinterpreted the Texas Ranch House into simple, contemporary designs that kept their indigenous flavor” (Stubbins; George’s Foreword, p. xi). The team developed basic design principles that were shared between Ford and the Bergers. Further, George explained:

“From the mid-1930’s until his (their) death, Ford [and the Bergers] were pied pipers for young architects [and landscape architects], and the message he (they) piped was always the same: sensitivity to the nature of materials (and plants) the earth provided; concern for timelessness and the performance of a building (garden) over the long haul; adaptability to changing needs; and innovative approaches to budgetary constraints. In short, advocated and practiced the building of
structures (and gardens) that are expressions of something real and lasting.” (George, dust cover).

During the developing years, when the synthesis of the vernacular Texas Ranch House and the surrounding native landscape was being applied to Ford’s designs of new houses in Texas along with the Bergers’ ahead-of-their-time (avant-garde) landscaping, Ford returned to his humble roots in North Texas and to the conceptual studies that evolved from his early travels with his uncle Homer Jordan, and later with David Williams. Williams was Ford’s most influential architect and has been considered the’ father of Modern Texas Architecture’ (Dillon, p. 22). Young Ford was side-by-side with Williams when the process of abstraction was being applied. Meanwhile, the Bergers were developing their own conceptual bases completely independently from each other and from O’Neil Ford. Arthur did it through academic studies and his passion for botany; Marie through her association with the San Francisco Bay area’s innovative landscape architects. Somehow the team cemented their principles by returning to the basics of the natural landscape and by using indigenous plants while manipulating the project/site environment and respecting nature.

More philosophical affinities between Ford and the Bergers were found; for example: Authors writing about Ford documented that he “traveled a great deal, [Ford traveled abroad more than the Berger’s did] and being an engaging personality surrounded himself (themselves) with many important people….He (They) shared experience, knowledge, and philosophy generously… (Stubbins, George’s Foreword, p. xi). The Bergers traveled within the United States, as well as residing in different parts of
the nation. They, like Ford, surrounded themselves with important people and spread the word about their landscape design principles regarding the natural and the improved.

Regarding intimate life styles, they also shared interesting affinities: The Berger’s house in Dallas, as well as Ford’s residence in San Antonio, shared a philosophy of life and life styles expressed in their surroundings by having in their homes elements that were important to them. The Bergers did it with landscape features and elements inside and outside their house, and Ford did it as Hugh Stubbins described: “some of their mutual friends who went to his house told of its wonders. Peacocks and Mexican children running about in the yard, a monkey, and parrots in the house, and in his own studio so filled with magazines and journals…He (They) were free spirits, full of life and Texas ‘pizzazz’” (Stubbins, George Foreword, p. xi).
Professionally they also shared attitudes and design philosophies that were considered affinities. For example, Sam Zisman (Ford’s friend in the Texas A&M faculty) wrote:

“[O’Neil Ford] has emerged as the planner of shelter, concerned with the street that passes the house, as well as, the house itself. He has achieved the mastery of materials without prejudice for neither the old, native resources or the new synthetics of modern industry…The beauty of his houses results naturally from the honest craftsman’s use of materials, the ingenious yet direct construction, and the creation of shelter forms particularly adapted to the Texas climate and landscape” (George, p. 60).

After researching the kind of design philosophy, the methodology of design and the complimentary relationship that the Bergers had with each other, reading George’s book on Ford only confirms that he was able to develop design affinities while sharing philosophical principles with his co-workers. For example, George described the kind of relationship that O’Neil Ford had with Richard Colley during the design of Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas, where the Bergers were the landscape architects. Strangely enough, what George describes about Ford and Colley can be applied to Ford and the Bergers. She wrote,

“The strengths of one compensated for the weakness of the other; this is a brilliant complementary match. Their architectural goals were similar; the rationale of the modern movement…. [provoked] functional buildings [and landscaping] that responded to the harsh coastal climate. [Their] designs were characterized by the use of….sun screens that doubled as wind baffles,…the integration of indoor-outdoor spaces, and the strategic use of tropical [native] plant material” (George p. 116).

Regarding commercial and business architectural and landscaping philosophies, the best example found so far is what George described when Ford and his team were preparing the designs for Texas Instruments (TI):
“Ford gave his shining best to the architectural manifestation of the humanistic philosophy of the founding fathers of Texas Instruments. These captains of industry often spoke of decorum and mutual respect and were dedicated to providing enriched cultural surroundings for their employees. There was obvious concern for...scale, proportion, color and detail of the work place. Although, there were no windows in purity-sealed manufacturing areas, numerous landscaped patios offered respite from the closeness of the job” (George, pp. 132-133).

This statement clearly indicated the humanistic and philosophical principles demanded and applied to the designs. The patron, the architect, the landscape architect and the employee, all enjoyed the benefits of these deep premises while becoming one of the most significant examples of Mid-century Modern commercial/business/industrial buildings/complexes, including its landscape.

Something that Arthur and Marie Berger used successfully and Ford shared with his own architectural conception, was the use of The Chiaroscuro. Dr, Joseph E. Howland in his article written in Landscape Architecture in July, 1964, entitled Marie & Arthur Berger; A Tribute mentioned that “Together they created a new kind of garden design, probably best described as “Texas Chiarosuro”. Howland further explained:

“This interplay of light and shade gives mood and movement [to the home and garden. It was] developed simultaneously in Texas with the refrigerated home air conditioning. [It became] the logical post-war answer to the Texas’ summer sun....The Bergers foresaw the universality of the refrigerated air conditioning, and the inevitable moving [of the people from outdoors to] indoors it would bring....The Bergers provided terraces, but small ones, for the use in delightful weather” (p. 266).

The Bergers became the masters of the chiaroscuro. National magazines were reporting their design philosophy and practices in their pages. House and Garden in the March, 1949, issue featured an article entitled Plan the Shadows in your Garden. It read,
“Chiaroscuro, the interplay of light and shade, will give mood and movement to your garden….Shade spells coolness in summertime; make it part of your planting scheme and you will be rewarded with shadow patterns which enliven the whole picture…The shadow pattern of the garden floor [changes] continuously.”

Figure 5.3 - Penson Residence

The magic of chiaroscuro, mastered by the Bergers in their gardens, worked again in symbiosis with O’Neil Ford’s architectural designs. In the post-war era, when air conditioning was being introduced into a residence, there was a concern about the amount of cold air to be used, and the need to open and/or protect the house from the Texas sun, without depending completely on the air conditioning system. Ford solved the problem in the Hixon house in San Antonio, Texas. In 1952, Ford designed the house oriented to North, and House and Home in the June 1952 issue described said house as:
“The Vented House...[where the windows were designed] big and east-facing….always shielding them with porch roofs, sun-shades or planting…[When] light, or cross ventilation or a glimpse of the garden [is required], banks of west windows [were covered by vertical] shutters hung from the overhang, 30 inches from the wall” (p. 90).

The list of affinities between the Bergers and Ford can go on and on. These affinities and similarities observed in their design concepts confirm the premise that these people enjoyed a unique personal and professional relationship that allowed them to work in symbiosis.

5.3 Texas Style Landscapes

If O’Neil Ford and his various partners pioneered the Mid-century Modern house and architecture in Texas, the Bergers definitely also pioneered the Mid-century Modern landscape that is still in use today. Both architect and landscape architects used similar principles that were applied either separately (building process), and conjoined at the same time (the landscape related to the buildings). This was achieved by both practices when they believed in the value of using Texas’ traditional construction materials, understanding of the site and being conscious of the weather in North and South-central Texas. To these principles the following can be added: the use of native plants and the conscious incorporation of construction materials that were quarried from the sites. The common use of these materials by both parties (each one in their own field) is what continues to reinforce the premise that this unique relationship between an architect and the landscape architects created a very particular style of design suited for Texas. The main actors and their end products all enjoyed a very special symbiosis rarely seen since
the era when the Bergers and Ford were forging and applying in unison their unique Texas landscape style and architecture.

Geologically, in the state of Texas, a band of a particular type of soil traverses the state from Paris, Texas, in the northeast to San Antonio in the south and has been called ‘The Blackland Prairie.’ Wasowski referred to ‘The Blackland Prairie’ as follows: “The Blackland Prairies are shaped something like a tornado, with the broad top running from Paris west to Sherman, then narrowing as it runs through Dallas, and through the east sides of Waco and Austin, and the middle of San Antonio.”

![Fig 5.4 - Map of the State of Texas Illustrating the Area of Blackland Prairie](image)

Locations of Ford/Berger project indicated by the red stars.
Wasowski continued:

“...this prairie is calcareous, which means the soil is alkaline and limy...Limestone [is found] beneath the black waxy clay soil just about anywhere you choose to dig, and exposed where the soil has been eroded in creek beds and on hillsides...The soils are mostly clays...and very dark. Some fields actually resemble black velvet when they are freshly plowed and moistened from a good rain... [They] get an average of 30 to 44 inches of rain annually” (Wasowski, p. 33).

This particular type of soil, when combined with the Texas climate (temperature and rainfall), created the ecological forces that defined the regional character of the Texas landscape. The Texas terrain challenged the architectural designer as well as the landscape architects. The landscape architects were forced to create a living landscape that could thrive in the regional soils and climate, as well as complementing the architecture. The ‘Team’ (the Bergers and Ford) took the challenge, analyzed it, and surpassed; this is why they became the Mid-century Modern masters, each one in their own field, and when they combined their efforts in symbiosis they succeeded.

There are few plants that are native to the entire state of Texas due to its large area and different climatic conditions: swampy and humid by the Gulf of Mexico, hilly towards the center, and dry in West Texas. Therefore, the Texas landscape architect must learn to identify and understand each region in order to create a landscape plan that is reasonable and lasting. Once the soil type and climatic conditions are known, then native and the imported species of plants should be selected to create the desired landscape plan.

The Blackland Prairies originally supported tall grass prairies...[and] the terrain was a dramatic 360-degrees sweep of horizon, marked only by occasional ribbons of trees growing alongside limestone streambeds (Wasowski, p. 33). Today the terrain has
changed completely. Early settlers brought with them plants and seeds from their native regions, as well as their idea of features for a garden or landscape. They also imported flowering vines, perennials and trees, which could tolerate the drought conditions in Texas, but not the Texas winters. The German and English immigrants brought with them the concept of clipped hedges and green open spaces, usually consisting of lawn or other grasses. Mexican influences include the outdoor spaces that were created by erecting walls that defined patios and terraces. This combination of imported ideas collectively defines the Texas regional landscape character seen in the study areas of North Texas and San Antonio today.

The Bergers’ contribution to the Texas regional landscape design concept was their ability to imitate nature. Welch, a Ford associate (who worked with the Bergers at the Houston Technical Laboratories) said “You could drive by a Berger landscape project and not really know that it had a landscape plan; it was so natural” (Welch, 2007). The Fix residence at Inwood Road and Walnut Hill Street in Dallas, Texas is an excellent example. Here “Arthur Berger… [created] a canopy of elms with an understory of Redbuds…ground cover is Vinca major” (Wasowski, p.38). Wasowski as well as the Bergers were proponents of the theory that “most people would prefer living beneath shade trees to living in the middle of nose-high grasses” (Wasowski, p. 35). The practice of this type of tree planting is obvious at the Fix residence as well as at Hackberry Creek in Highland Park, where shade canopy is an obvious feature.
The Bergers were fortunate to have clients who were sensitive to the natural environment and possessed the resources to purchase land on interesting (and sometimes challenging) sites. More often than not these sites had a natural creek or pond on-site, with slope and variations in topography. The Bergers were able to create the semblance of woods and meadows out of these sites that over time produced low maintenance environments that are still intact today. Welch stated in an interview “In many instances, like Capability Brown did in the 1700’s…I think this is where the Bergers got their influence” (Welch, 2007). The Bergers used native plants that are indigenous to the Blackland Prairie region and typically created layers with tall shade trees like Live Oaks, Red Oaks and native pecans, plus an understory layer with small trees and shrubs, and finally, ground layers (Asian Jasmine and Vinca major, typically).
Fig. 5.6 – Hackberry Creek, Highland Park, Texas

In today’s landscape, these species are still present: the Live Oaks understory trees of Mexican Plum and Japanese Maple as well as the Vinca ground cover. Ronnie Brown, Director of Parks and Recreation for the City of Highland Park, remarked that “there was no irrigation in place initially, but the plantings have survived. Hackberry Creek was designed and planted in the late 1950s” (Brown, 2007).

In 1950, Arthur and Marie began to build their home. O’Neil was very busy and upon his advice, Scott Lyons, an architect and designer working in Ford’s office, was commissioned to design the house; he became the Project Architect. The house expressed all the characteristics of the Mid-century Modern principles established by Ford years earlier. The landscape design, installed and maintained by the Bergers, became a masterpiece. Soon architects landscape architects were commenting about the success of the intimate relationship between the architecture and the landscaping.
Articles were written in magazines about the house and its landscape; the two components that had become one on one could not exist without the other without sacrificing its integrity. Indeed, this example and of architecture and landscape architecture became symbiotic. The complex became such a renowned and studied subject, that the following quote exemplifies the testimonies of the era:

“Several contemporary architects’ work tends to use elements of the indigenous in continuity with the thirties. The ARTHUR BERGER RESIDENCE 3906 Stonebridge, 1955, O’Neil Ford, Scott Lyon, Resident Architect; Arthur and Marie Berger, Landscape Architects, excel as a statement of the indigenous. A small difficult site between a cliff and a railroad was used to create a milieu of intimate architectural spaces. The three brick and glass buildings occur as the unchanging elements in a complete sculpture of plant forms and topography, beautifully designed by the owners. The entire site is elaborated as an architectural experience in space, texture and seasonal change.” (Creighton, 59-62).

Fig. 5.7 - Entrance Court at the Berger Residence
The task that transformed the Texas terrain into an oasis of peace and greenery reflecting passion and uniqueness was not an easy one. Records described how the Bergers had to move tons of rock while reshaping the original contours to fit the house and its landscape. The Bergers had learned important lessons in Texas and about Texas in order to be able to create their magic worlds of greenery, chiaroscuros, sinuous paths, water features, etc., in previous jobs and sites. Bainbridge explained that:

“…when Paul Moss, a lawyer and rancher who lives in drought-prone west Texas, asked the Bergers to do his garden, he said he wanted fifty-seven acres of lawn. “Easily arranged”, the Bergers said, though the occasional absence of rainfall for a few years at a time might make a maintenance problem. “If you can plant the grass”, Paul Moss said, “I can take care of it.” The Bergers could and did, and so, with a sprinkling system supplied by a half dozen of new wells, Moss [was able to have his garden year round]” (Bainbridge, p. 168).

The Bergers ability to solve landscape problems was demonstrated at the Urschel house, in San Antonio. Bainbridge continued to describe that:

“Thrift was not the first consideration in the assignment handed by Charles F. Urschel, another San Antonio oilman…to the Bergers. [Charles]…decided a few years ago to build a new house, and picked a site that had a splendid view but was otherwise somewhat unpromising, the entire tract being sheer rock. “There wasn’t an ounce of topsoil on it”, Arthur Berger once recalled. “That didn’t bother us – we just bought topsoil in by the ton – but the planting was a little difficult.” Since Urshel had specified a rather large garden, and one that wouldn’t look brand-new, the Bergers first selected a hundred and fifty trees, varying from twenty to thirty feet in height and averaging twenty-five hundred dollars a piece in price. These were planted in holes blasted out of the rock at a cost of six hundred dollars a hole” (Ibid., pp. 168-169).

The Bergers’ patrons facilitated the achievement of these uniquely-Texas landscape prototypes in residential work by covering the cost of the volume of work that
was necessary to build these remarkable landscapes. The Bergers also applied similar concepts and techniques at a much larger scale in the commercial sector like The Exchange Park in Dallas, Texas where:

“The three Modernist office buildings that exist today were intended as just the first phase of a much grander overall plan for the early ‘suburban’ development [and]…changes in ownership, however, and the completion of Stemmons Freeway…meant that [the] garden apartments, a medical center, and additional office towers were never realized. A notable feature of the project is the landscape by Arthur and Marie Berger, which remains in very good condition.” (Fuller, p. 80).

Furthermore, a guide to Dallas architecture described this project as:

“one of the most thoroughly controlled complexes in Dallas. [In] the 120-acre project…completed are two towers connected by a retail mall, parking and central utility plant. The project is notable for its overall plan carried through in carefully detailed materials, use of color, landscape, and signs. Landscape is by Arthur and Marie Berger.” (Dallas Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, p. 50).
A second example of large-size developments in Dallas where the landscape and the architecture became icons and later influenced other national architects was the “[Dallas] Decorative Center [located at] 1500 Oak Lawn, [built in] 1954 [by] Jacob E. Anderson which provided Dallas with a convenient grouping of quality furniture and fabric showrooms” (Dallas Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, p. 51).

A year later, in 1955, a newspaper article entitled “Work of Designers Draws High Praise” mentioned Arthur and Marie Berger as the landscape architects on the project and Trammel Crow as the developer (Dallas Morning News, May, 1955). The original landscape has deteriorated through the years but portions still survive to this day.

Booziotis, an architect in Dallas who knew the Bergers stated:

“I consider that The Bergers were the sole pioneers of Mid-Century Modern parking lot design (good example at TI and Temple Emanu-El). While the rest of the designers were designing and building parking lots that were covered with pavement surrounding the new modern buildings, The Bergers were manipulating the topography, planting trees among the parking islands, and breaking the succession of car-after-car in the lots. The Bergers created ‘terraces’ for the parking of cars while creating tiers that were separated with landscaped areas were the grade changed. Besides, in their designs, a group of parking bays was separated from the next group of parking bays by landscaped islands of green. Soon Saarinen and other relevant architects in the East and North East of the U.S.A. began to apply the Bergers’ design criteria in the design of large scale parking lots” (Booziotis, 2007).

Another example of what Booziotis was referring to applies to the parking lot design at the Temple Emanu-El, in Dallas, Texas. In the case of the Temple, the Bergers created a rhythm in the parking bays by separating the same number of cars with equal amounts of trees. Following is the Bergers landscape plan for said facility.
Fig. 5.9 - Landscape Plan for Temple Emanu-El

A third example of large scale design where the design and the landscape created by the Bergers have survived is the Great National Life Insurance on Mockingbird Lane and Harry Hines Boulevard in Dallas, Texas. This project reflected the principles of parking lot design stated by Booziotis and today the Live Oak trees had matured, the landscape has been maintained, and the landscaped parking bays in front and around the Mid-Century Modern architectural icon have been preserved. The effects are dramatic and the entrance’s driving circle still looks like Arthur and Marie have imagined the
building surrounded by its mature landscaping. The couple is dead, but their legacy and the trees live on. Preservation of these icons should be considered.

Fig. 5.10 - Great National Life Insurance Building

5.4 Masters of Mid-century

The combination of O’Neil Ford (including his associates) and the Berger team designed some of the most famous architectural landmarks in Texas. George explained “The list of credits [is extensive] for this remarkable [team of] architects who brought an indigenous Southwestern flair to homes, public buildings and business, [as well as their innovative surrounding landscape]” (George dustcover). William Caudill, MIT graduate
remembered that Ford “was a far-out architect that would come to A&M to kind of get inspired….He was unquestionably one of the pioneers in this region of what we call Modern Architecture…He was a leader in the revolutionary movement in design going on about that time…Another was Arch Swank” (George, p. 43).

What at that time was called “Modern Architecture” later was called “Mid-century Modern Architecture”. W. Dwayne Jones, Director of Preservation Dallas, wrote:

“[Modern architecture in Dallas]…was the work of a small but powerful group of architects espousing modern design principles and designing important modern houses all over the city. These architects stepped outside of the traditional period revival influences prevalent before and during the war and embraced new material such as steel, plate glass and striated brick to challenge the conventional residential building” (Jones, p. 10).

Jones continued to state:

“[Modern architectural examples share a frankness of materials, straightforward unadorned design, an emphasis on horizontality and an appreciation for complementary and combined interior and exterior living spaces. Many of Dallas’ best modern residences are small with extremely flexible living plans. Altogether, Dallas’ architects and builders, as well as it’s landscape architects, interior designers and furnishing experts, brought to the city from the late 1940s through the 1960s an upbeat and sophisticated aesthetic that began to seep into the inner circles of the city’s elite” (Jones, p. 11).

Within this group, “O’Neil Ford’s name was synonymous with interpretations of architecture but he was first and foremost a modernist” (Newby, p.5). Charles Birnbaum, Director of the Cultural Landscape Foundation, said “A modern landscape is different everywhere, but started after Second World War and cut off in 1976 – the end of an era” (p. 5). Interestingly, William Wilson Wurster, an influential American architect and
architectural professor at the University of California, Berkeley and at MIT was a friend and business associate of the Bergers who previously had built houses using indigenous materials in a direct, simple style suited to the climate. Wurster was also associated with the landscape architect Thomas Church [whom Marie was employed by] and they became part of the early Modern Movement.

Once Marie arrived in Dallas and began work with Arthur, these early ideas of modernism were translated to landscape designs. Having seen their talent, O’Neil Ford probably appreciated the potential of their work. Together the team worked in concert and further developed modernist explorations for landscape and architecture. Scott Lyons (the project architect of the Bergers’ home) “originally worked for O’Neil Ford and continued exploring the same architectural themes... He designed important Highland Park residences and country homes using indigenous materials, screened-in porches and sprawling houses that created courtyards” (Newby, 2007).

The Bergers, with their own interpretation of the modernist movement, continued to design and create sophisticated gardens that were breaking with the then ‘traditional’ design patterns. William Booziotis, during his interview with the author, expressed: “The Bergers were ‘creating’; the other landscapers were ‘adorning’ the gardens of the houses with azaleas” (Booziotis, 2007). Supporting the premise that the Bergers were immersed in the Mid-century Modern design era can be further reinforced by the words of Mr. John Janik, [current owner of the Merritt house - a Ford and Berger project]: “The Bergers were incredibly talented, and very much focused on keeping the house in scale
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with nature; when you’re out in the gardens by the creek, the structure almost tries to disappear into the landscape” (*Ibid.*).

Fig. 5.11 - Merritt Residence

“The effect is deliberate” says Jones, [former] Executive Director of Preservation Dallas. “It’s a relatively small house, but is oriented toward the nearby creek instead of the road to create a setting that feels very separate and private. The house stays connected to its environment and keeps a strong relationship between the interior and exterior…” (*Ibid.*). “It is impossible to understand this home without appreciating its connection to the surrounding environment. Ford worked in conjunction with noted Mid-century environmental landscapers Arthur and Marie Berger to literally sculpt the
surrounding pathways, plantings and gardens. The effect is subtle and unobtrusive, with much of the landscape mimicking the low, horizontal lines of the home itself” (Ibid.).

Regarding design and integration of the environment into their work, which was what both participants were developing and using in their conjunction projects, Berger, [Gillett] said: “They created a Texas regional style of outdoor (patio) living” (Berger, 2007). Smith said: “They were innovative, using their ‘Texas style’ with sound principles for the environment. Courtyards were designed to fit the Texas climate. The ‘single loaded’ house layout worked well to created views on either side” (Smith, 2007). Dillon added “Ford was a Texas original, an honest, unaffected native son, who understood materials and construction and created buildings that were adapted to the Texas landscape and climate” (Dillon p. 57). Both parties were consolidating their design philosophies and applying their principles in their individual and collaborative work.

5.5 The Bergers and Ford: A Symbiotic Relationship

Jellicoe and Jellicoe in their book The Landscape of Man offered a chronologic description of man’s attitude toward its modified natural environment. The history of landscape design informed that mankind, from its early days, began to manipulate its immediate environment in order to establish a relationship utilizing mainly two intrinsic components: its intellect [can specifically be labeled ‘rational design’], and its profound ability to develop and use basic geometry.

Some of their descriptions of the emergence of landscape design were compiled and interestingly enough, the number of variables that became common to each one of
the selected time segments was two. In each description consistently two were the components that identified the philosophy, or the principles, or the elements involved. Jellicoe stated:

- “Primitive man set his mark on the landscape by raising hills or rearranging stones [Carnac, Brittany, France, 2500 BC, Stonehenge, Wiltshire, England, 1500 BC]” (p. 16).
- “The first designed garden rose from the contemplation of the miraculous effect of irrigation on a dead world. [Valley of the Nile, 3200 BC and between the Tigris and the Euphrates, 2250 BC]. They were laid out geometrically within protecting walls …[containing] channels of irrigation and trees” (p. 23).
- “Gardens were a decisive extension of architecture [Ancient Rome] ...Agrippa encouraged the synthesis of engineering, architecture and natural beauty into a single art of landscape, 12 BC” (pp. 129, 130).
- “The garden was made for man and dignified him. The proportions gave him peace: the form was therefore crucial [Renaissance Rome, early 1500s]” (p. 155).
- “Thomas Jefferson…endeavored to lay the foundations of a national landscape art that wavered between French and English influence [United States, early 1800s]” (p. 279).
• “The landscape scene on the American continent was quietly but determinedly transforming itself from the traditional to a new way of thought [United States, 1909]” (p. 307).

• “Domestic landscape architecture [development is] owed to Edgar J. Kaufmann when he commissioned …Wright to build Fallingwater, Pennsylvania, 1936 [and]… Desert House, Palm Springs, California, 1946…[where] the site was desert with outcrops of rocks interspersed with cedar, citrus, yucca and oleander… Richard Neutra…planned an integration of free geometry with natural form. Such freedom was possible only through the new [irrigation] technology, including refrigerated water circulation [United States]” (p. 312).
“Private gardens make up a large part of the total area of humanized landscape...The private garden remains constant as the peculiar expression of the individual...The swimming pool at Sonoma, California designed by Thomas Church in 1948, is a study in relationship of biological form, geometry and natural landscape [United States 1940s]” (p. 336).

Fig. 5.13 - Donnell Pool, by Thomas Church

From these excerpts can be deducted that man consistently related two components in each action: raising hills or rearranging stones; contemplation of the miraculous effect of irrigation; gardens were a decisive extension of architecture; The proportions gave him peace: the form was therefore crucial; landscape art that wavered between French and English; Neutra...planned an integration of free geometry with natural form; Thomas Church...a study in relationship of biological form [and] geometry. The relationship between the last two excerpts and the previous ones were the
ones that lead to the formulation of a premise indicating that because a strong relationship between the Bergers and Ford existed, and based on the rest of the excerpts, it can be deducted that unless these coupled actions worked in a kind of symbiosis, the final product could not have been achieved.

The Bergers and Ford believed in equal principles when they related their designs to Texas vernacular, to their adaptation to climate and natural landscape, and to the successful integration of both as one. After achieving the total amalgam of their individual designs in the Frank Murchison house, the designs of the architect and the landscape architect were consolidated into a unique professional symbiosis in which the designs of Ford and the Bergers stopped being individual contributions and became one entity. It became easy to envision how Ford could propose a kind of rectilinear single-loaded house that related to the site, to the sun orientation and to the wind. Based on previous architectural designs such as the Smith residence (Ford and Arch Swank, ca. 1936), the process that culminated with the Frank Murchison residence was analyzed considering first the Smith residence, (see Fig. 5.13) combining it with the Clark residence (Ford and David Williams, 1931) where the house began to search for a linear continuity with some perimeter movement (see Fig. 5.14), next, they rotated the ‘detached but connected’ living room that created some interior/exterior spaces and the end-product became the linear Murchison house (see Fig. 5.15).
Fig. 5.14 - Smith Residence Floor Plan

Fig. 5.15 - Clark Residence Floor Plan
It was easy to envision the Bergers working together with Ford where they may have suggested, or could have sketched the plan, adding movement toward the east and west expressing further the difference between areas and functions of the house. The garage was moved toward the east, the kitchen/breakfast toward the west, the social areas (living, dining, library, entrance hall) toward the east, and finally the recreation areas (garden room, bar and game room) returning toward the west again (see Fig. 5.15).

**Fig. 5.16 - Design Development of Ford’s Texas Modern House**
*The Bergers participated in the Murchison Residence design.*
Fig. 5.17 - Ford's Residential Designs and Trinity University Women’s Dorm
The addition of the garden room, as a separator of the social area and the game room (linked to the swimming pool), can easily be assumed to have been a direct suggestion of the Bergers to accentuate further the literal introduction of the outdoors into the indoors. By creating recesses and protrusions at the perimeter of the house, the Bergers were able to design their landscape intimately associated to the function of the rooms, the locations and the size of the large windows, as well as the location of the sinuous retaining walls that held the trees that shaded the portions of the house exposed to the sun. This exercise in analysis helped to determine that indeed the Bergers and Ford from this project forward worked in symbiosis.

Fig. 5.18 - T. Frank Murchison Residence and Landscape
Their architectural/landscape design scheme became so successful that soon friends of the Murchison’s commissioned Ford to design their homes and businesses, with the Bergers as landscape architects. The Murchison residence was so masterfully integrated to the natural landscape that, as Welch stated, their work “was a Texas native new style. It was native and unpretentious” (Welch, 2007). Once the landscape was completed and matured, it became almost unrecognizable from the natural surroundings (See aerial view, Fig. 5.18).

![Fig. 5.19 –T. Frank Murchison Residence Aerial View](image)

Following are statements expressed by interviewees that reinforced that a symbiotic relationship between the Mid-century Modern master, as a collaborative work of Arthur and Marie Berger landscape architects and O’Neil Ford architect, did exist.
• “It is clean and simple. Architect and landscape architect as ‘one’. The use of all the glass in Ford houses – opened up into the garden” (Boyd, 2007).

• “They were equals – on the same plane with O’Neil Ford”, (Respondent A, 2007)

• “They were innovative, using their ‘Texas Style’ …The ‘single-loaded’ house layout worked well to create views on either side”, (Smith, 2007).

The symbiotic work of Ford and the Bergers became renowned in Texas and soon the high social circles were requesting their work. Half a century later, Dallas landscape architect John Armstrong began restoration landscape work at the Haggerty and affirmed that the Bergers’ work there was “A beautiful blending of the indoor/outdoor relationship on this site - magical. Natural. Integrated and emotional. Their work helps me to determine how to use it [the indoor/outdoor relationship] in my own career. [They accomplished] integration of site, architecture and budget” (Armstrong, 2007).
The Bergers also collaborated with other renowned firms of the era like Marco Engineering Company of Los Angeles, on the LA TUNISIA RESTAURANT [at Exchange Park]. The Dallas Architectural Guide refers to this restaurant as “...off the handsome mall is the most exotic interior in Dallas, 1959” (Dallas Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, p. 50).

Fig. 5.21 - La Tunisia Restaurant at Exchange Park
“Trinity University and Texas Instruments were the high points of the 1950s for Ford and in many respects the high points of his career” (Dillon, p. 90). Coincidentally, these two projects were done in conjunction with the Bergers where they encountered challenges of their own: the terrain at Trinity University, since the site used to be a stone quarry, and the latter, Texas Instruments, an industrial-windowless, clean building where the only openings were through the roof, creating interior courtyards. These courtyards were not necessary for light, but for humanistic concerns; to allow the workers solace (as described in Chapter 5, Section 5.1).
5.6 Summary

The Bergers, as Palladio, died without having completed a catalog of their work. The sudden death of Arthur and the returning of Marie to Oregon prevented the couple from writing about their accomplishments. The Bergers’ signatures, the use of the Chiaroscuro, the use of the sinuous line and the use of patterns in patios, terraces and driveways, interacted intimately with Ford’s linear designs. Ford’s flexibility to accept all the designers’ concepts and philosophies resulted in a successful integration of architecture and landscape. The symbiotic relationship was further confirmed when the analysis turned into the history of the landscape design which demonstrated that mankind manipulated his environment with two intrinsic components: its intellect and its natural ability to understand and use geometric knowledge to create measure and design. Every time that mankind engaged in a design exercise, the need to use and have two elements to create a third one became the successful method. An example of this: the grafting of two different species of plants created a third unique variety. The Bergers and Ford did it masterfully in their collaborative works.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSION

6.1 The Encounter

William Booziotis explained how O’Neil Ford became acquainted with the high-end society in Texas. William Wurster explained how he introduced Ford to the oil and technology barons of Dallas, and George informed when Ford began to collaborate with the Bergers on the Murchison residence. Respondent ‘A’ informed that “Mr. And Mrs. Everett DeGolyer introduced Arthur to Dallas entrepreneurs such as Eugene McDermott, Patrick Haggerty, Cecil Green, McNaughton and Eric Johnsson [all involved with Texas Instruments” (Respondent A, September 21, 2007).

6.2 Verification of the Hypothesis

The biographical research conducted on the Bergers and Ford, as well as the research on their design philosophy, indicated that their basic design principles were compatible and complementary which allowed a fructiferous symbiotic relationship. Using a graft as an example, if the contributors do not share intrinsic and basic elements between the donors, the graft would not be successful and the end product (a new biological entity) would not develop and would not succeed. Consequently, since the Bergers and Ford did share similar conditions like design philosophies, common quests for using and integrating the Texas native forms and materials into a new end-product, their designs became successful. The buildings they designed in Texas obtained the
proper ventilation from elements introduced by the architectural design and also from the wise landscape design that provided evaporation, coolness and shade. Because the symbiosis between the architect and the landscape architects was successful, the new ‘entity’ (the house and gardens designed in intimate collaboration), succeeded and became ‘icons of Mid-century modern architecture.’

Examples where architecture related intimately with its landscape were subsequently published, adopted by other designers and repeatedly used by Ford’s associates, as well as the Bergers’ admirers and followers. Ford’s avant-garde home designs were considered important icons by the patrons and architectural critics and were considered ‘one ensemble’ with the Bergers’ landscape architecture. The trio achieved success as symbiotic designers because their products worked in unison, so that if one of the two components (home or landscape) was altered, the complex would have lost its value and its sense of place. The Mid-century modern houses designed by Ford and associates, if deprived of their landscape installations would not have been able to perform climatically correct and/or neither could have accomplished the visual, spatial and integral functions required to link the exterior environment with the interior.

Confirmation of the value of the work of the Bergers-Ford Team was established when the current owner (Janik) of the Merritt residence in Dallas (built in 1958) placed the property on the market. The local realtor featured the property in Leading Estates of the World, a prominent real estate network publication that specializes in companies of the world having annual sales of over four hundred billion dollars. Janik stated “Ford worked in conjunction with noted mid-century environmental landscapers, Arthur and
Marie Berger to literally sculpt the surrounding pathways, plantings and gardens. The Bergers were …very much focused on keeping the house in scale with nature. When you are out in the gardens by the creek, the structure almost tries to disappear in the landscape” (Janik, p. 10). The marketing material states that the property is one of the most significant modernist homes in Dallas…including its one and two-tenths acres of mature landscaping. The multi-million dollar value of the property was based on the fact that the landscaping and the architecture designs were done by Ford and the Bergers. The sale price was listed at nearly four times the price when purchased by Janik.

6.3 Quantification of the Data Supporting the Symbiotic Relationship

The rate of success of the symbiotic relationship between the Bergers and Ford was computed in the Tabulation of Compendium of Research Site Surveys (see Appendix A). The results informed that thirty-five properties were catalogued. The Bergers designed the landscape in ninety-five per cent of the surveyed properties, while Ford designed eighty-six per cent of the projects. In sixty-two per cent of the projects, the Bergers provided the landscape design. This means that out of the thirty-five properties investigated, successful symbiosis occurred in twenty-two projects. These numbers reflected the appreciation that Texas patrons had for the Bergers-Ford design team, and probably, if Arthur and Marie had not died prematurely (compared to Ford), the number of successful projects could have been higher.

6.4 Honors and Awards

The Bergers achieved a very high level of sophistication and design acknowledgement as modernists but it is not known at this date if the Bergers received
any kind of academic awards like Ford received. Members of the Dallas Chapter of the American Institute of Architects presented a post-mortem tribute to Arthur when three Dallas architects (Duane Jarvis, Enslie Oglesby and Houston Bliss) planted a live oak tree on St. John’s Drive, between Lexington and Alice Circle, as a present to the City of Highland Park. The plaque at the bottom of the tree stated: “Planted in appreciation and acknowledgement of the landscape designs of Arthur and Marie Berger” (Dallas Morning News, April, 1963).

Fig. 6.1 - Commemorative Tree at St. John’s Drive, Dallas, Texas
6.5 Importance of the Bergers’ Legacy on Landscape Architecture

Booziotis remarked that with the arrival of the Bergers’ landscape designs, Texas experienced a landscape architecture ‘Renaissance’. The process in Texas followed almost identically the Italian path described by Giaconi on how the Italian Renaissance developed. Creighton believed that with the participation of the Bergers designs “the entire site became an architectural experience in space, texture and seasonal change” (Creighton, p. 62).

The concepts of the Bergers’ landscape designs renounced the trends that were in-vogue in Texas. Their designs were successful using landscape installations which were appropriate using selections of native plants and proposals met project budgets.
Contemporary practitioners and students of landscape architecture should study and apply the successful designs that rendered the Bergers masters of Mid-century modern landscape architecture. With the incorporation of the ‘green architecture and sustainability’ concepts to the realm of contemporary design, the Bergers designs could be used because their design philosophy corresponds with the new requirements and methods.

6.6 Future Research

The interesting lives and the masterful landscape architecture work developed by Arthur and Marie Berger deserve to be reported in future professional publications. It would be of benefit to the profession of landscape architecture to participate in the effort of discovering, researching and analyzing the Bergers’ work in finer detail. The new research should continue to search for additional sources of historical information and historical illustrations to be compared with current situations for further understanding of the Bergers legacy.

The surviving landscapes are maturing and many have not had professional and adequate maintenance. The original designs have been obscured in some cases by the overgrowth and planting of new species not included in the Bergers palette. Professional landscape architects trained properly in the field of historic preservation should survey, document and restore the gardens to their original condition. Those gardens which have survived without losing the Bergers characteristics should be allowed to be visited by practitioners and students.
The life of Marie Monica Harbeck before she became Marie Berger should be researched in more detail. Persons who knew the Bergers could be requested to further search through their family photograph albums and provide images of the couple, their acquaintances, their work (before-and-after photographs of the site and projects) and any other honor or merits granted or awarded to the Bergers for their life-long crusade of transforming the harsh Texas terrain into magnificent and sophisticated oases of light, water and shade.
### Chapman Survey Form

**SITE IDENTIFICATION**
- Original Client: Chapman, Dr/Mrs John
- Current Owner: Carolyn Poole Harper (Chapman daughter)
- Address: 3606 Lovers Lane
- City, State: University Park, TX
- Date built: 1950
- Residential

**DESIGNER**
- Landscape Architect: Marie and Arthur Berger
- Berger Plan Located: Yes
- Design by others: Yes
- Site Visit: Yes
- Architect: O'Neil Ford
- Date: 9/26/2007
- Photos: Yes

**BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOURCE**
- Magazine, book, etc.: Georg
- Page(s): 107
- Publication Title: O'Neil Ford Architect
- Condition: Excellent
- Photos: Yes

**MODIFICATIONS**
- Magazine, book, etc.: 100%
- Photos: Yes

**PHOTOGRAPHIC SOURCE**
- Name: DL
- B & W: Yes
- Destroyed: Completely
- Title: 100%
- Photographer:

**ARCHIVAL SOURCE/ITEM**
- Archive: Yes
- Name: 75%
- Location:
- Contact:
- Newspaper Clippings: Yes
- Source: 25%
- Date:

**ARCHITECTURAL COMPONENTS**
- Stone Bridges (as part of landscape design)

**COMMENTS**
- Understory trees - Redbud, Crepe Myrtles, Magnolia, Vinca

### DeGolyer Estate Survey Form

**SITE IDENTIFICATION**
- Original Client: City of Highland Park
- Current Owner: Residential
- Address: HACKBERRY CREEK
- City, State: Highland Park, TX
- Date built: ??
- Institutional

**DESIGNER**
- Landscape Architect: Marie and Arthur Berger
- Berger Plan Located: Yes
- Design by others: Yes
- Architect: O'Neil Ford
- Existing: Yes
- Howard Meyer
- Condition: Excellent
- Other: Good

**BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOURCE**
- Magazine, book, etc.: Dallas Morning News
- Page(s): Fair
- Publication Title: Poor
- Photos: Yes

**MODIFICATIONS**
- Magazine, book, etc.: 100%
- Photos: Yes

**PHOTOGRAPHIC SOURCE**
- Name: 75%
- B & W: Yes
- Color: Yes
- Title: 100%
- Photographer:

**ARCHIVAL SOURCE/ITEM**
- Archive: Yes
- Name: 25%
- Location:
- Contact:
- Newspaper Clippings: Yes
- Source: 50%
- Date:

**ARCHITECTURAL COMPONENTS**
- Stone Bridges (as part of landscape design)

**COMMENTS**
- Understory trees - Redbud, Crepe Myrtles, Magnolia, Vinca
**Geophysical Services (Texas Instruments) Survey Form**

**SITE IDENTIFICATION**

**Original Client:** Geophysical Services

**Current Owner:** Texas Instruments

**Address:** 12500 Ti Blvd Dallas, TX

**City, State:** Dallas, TX

**Date built:** 1955

**Architect:** O'Neil Ford

**Photos:** Yes

**Landscape Architect:** Marie and Arthur Berger

**Plan Located:** Yes

**Name:**

**DESIGNER**

**Religious**

**Business**

**Landscaping**

**Architectural**

**Garden**

**Landscape**

**Construction**

**Structures**

**Photographic Source**

**B & W**

**Color**

**Name:**

**Publication Title:**

**Magazine, book.etc.:**

**Page(s):**

**ARCHIVAL SOURCE/ITEM**

**Name:**

**Location:**

**Contact:**

**Newspaper Clippings:**

**Personal Correspondence:**

**Type:**

**Title:**

**Description:**

**ARCHITECTURAL COMPONENTS:**

- Stacked stone retaining walls, gravel islands, shaded shuttle stops, 3-tiered design, raised planters, Cedar Elms, Live Oaks, Red Oaks, Crepe Myrtles, Cleyera, Holly Fern, Liriope, Asian Jasmine, and Photenia along security fence along 1-75, Nandinas

---

**Haggerty Survey Form**

**SITE IDENTIFICATION**

**Original Client:** Haggarty, M/M Patrick (Bea)

**Current Owner:** Tim and Nancy Hanley

**Address:** 5455 Northbrook

**City, State:** Dallas, TX

**Date built:** 1956-7

**Architect:** O'Neil Ford

**Photos:** Yes

**Landscape Architect:** Marie and Arthur Berger

**Plan Located:** Yes

**Name:**

**DESIGNER**

**Religious**

**Business**

**Landscaping**

**Architectural**

**Garden**

**Landscape**

**Construction**

**Structures**

**Photographic Source**

**B & W**

**Color**

**Name:**

**Publication Title:**

**Magazine, book.etc.:**

**Page(s):**

**ARCHIVAL SOURCE/ITEM**

**Name:**

**Location:**

**Contact:**

**Newspaper Clippings:**

**PERSONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

**Type:**

**Title:**

**Description:**

**ARCHITECTURAL COMPONENTS:**

- Sloping grounds with shady woodland, curved brick terrace, brick walkways, private pond, indoor swimming pool (added)

---

**COMMENTS:**

- Current owner is an avid art collector with numerous paintings and sculptures
- Ground cover has replaced lawn in shady areas. Trees have been replaced with low-maintenance shrubs and ground cover

---

**ARCHITECTURAL COMPONENTS:**

- Building grounds with steep terraces, curved brick terrace, brick walkways, and landscaped planters

---

**COMMENTS:**

- Garden design includes a mix of native and non-native plants

---
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### Hixon Survey Form

**SITE IDENTIFICATION**
- **Original Client:** Hixon, M/M Fred (Elizabeth)
- **Owner Name:** Estate
- **Current Owner:** Residential
- **Address:** 112 Mt. Erin Way
- **City, State:** San Antonio, TX
- **Date built:** 1951

**DESIGNER**
- **Landscape Architect:** Marie and Arthur Berger
- **Berger Plan Located:** Yes
- **Design by others:** Yes
- **Site Visit:** Yes
- **Architect:** O’Neil Ford
- **Date:** 10-27-07

**PHOTOGRAPHIC SOURCE**
- **B & W:** Yes
- **Color:** Yes

**ARCHIVAL SOURCE/ITEM**
- **Magazine, book, etc.**
  - **Publication Title:** "The Vented House: Opens its Windows to Favorable Breezes, Uses its Air Conditioning Only When Necessary"
  - **Condition:** Photos: Excellent

**ARCHITECTURAL COMPONENTS**
- **Landscape Architect:** Marie and Arthur Berger
- **Spa and (canna) planter:** New
- **Brick on sand paving:** Original

**COMMENTS:**
- Neighbors did not know of this house. One neighbor said her husband would know as he worked for Ford!

### Leake Survey Form

**SITE IDENTIFICATION**
- **Original Client:** Leake, M/M Sam
- **Owner Name:** Estate
- **Current Owner:** McGuire, Peter and June
- **Address:** 3831 Windsor Parkway
- **City, State:** University Park, TX
- **Date built:** 1953

**DESIGNER**
- **Landscape Architect:** Marie and Arthur Berger
- **Berger Plan Located:** Yes
- **Design by others:** Yes
- **Site Visit:** Yes
- **Architect:** O’Neil Ford
- **Date:** 9-31-07

**PHOTOGRAPHIC SOURCE**
- **B & W:** Yes
- **Color:** Yes

**ARCHIVAL SOURCE/ITEM**
- **Magazine, book, etc.**
  - **Publication Title:** "The Vented House: Opens its Windows to Favorable Breezes, Uses its Air Conditioning Only When Necessary"
  - **Condition:** Photos: Excellent

**ARCHITECTURAL COMPONENTS**
- **Landscape Architect:** Marie and Arthur Berger
- **Spa and (canna) planter:** New
- **Brick on sand paving:** Original

**COMMENTS:**
- A large tree in the back SE corner was removed by current owners, the McGuire’s.
- Large trees exist now that Berger design
**McDermott Guest House Survey Form**

**SITE IDENTIFICATION**
- Original Client: McDermott, Margaret
- Owner Name: McDermott, Margaret Estate
- Current Owner: same
- Residential X
- Address: 4701 Drexel
- City, State: Highland Park, TX
- Date built: 1959
- Institutional X
- Landscape Architect: Marie and Arthur Berger
- Berger Plan Located: YES NO X
- Design by others: YES NO
- Site Visit: YES X NO
- Architect: O'Neil Ford
- Date: 9/21/2007
- Photos: YES X NO

**DESIGNER**
- Religious X

**BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOURCE**
- Magazine, book.etc: Dallas Morning News
- Page(s): 9, 10, 11

**PHOTOGRAPHIC SOURCE**
- B & W: YES NO
- Destroyed: Color YES X NO
- Title: 75% Photographer: DL

**ARCHIVAL SOURCE/ITEM**
- Archive: YES NO
- Name: 
- Location: 
- Contact: 
- Newspaper Clippings: YES NO

**PERSONAL CORRESPONDENCE**
- Documents: YES NO
- Date: 
- Type: 
- Title: 
- Description: 

**ARCHITECTURAL COMPONENTS:**
- Raised Mexican brick planters, curved banded bed borders, (as part of landscape design) Curved Mexican brick seat walls
- Green screening ‘wall’, open green space

**COMMENTS:**
- Site visit with Janik 4- 2007
- Plantings: Burford Holly, Waxleaf Ligustrum, Banana, Abelia, Live Oak, Tree Yaupon, Mimosa, Texas Honeysuckle, Clematis, Carolina Jessamine, English Ivy, Lilyturf, Liriope

---

**Merritt Survey Form**

**SITE IDENTIFICATION**
- Original Client: Merritt, M/M Charles (Dale)
- Owner Name: Estate
- Current Owner: Janik, John
- Residential X
- Address: 11535 Hillcrest Rd.
- City, State: Dallas, TX
- Date built: 1955
- Institutional X
- Landscape Architect: Marie and Arthur Berger
- Berger Plan Located: YES NO X
- Design by others: YES
- Site Visit: YES X NO
- Architect: O'Neil Ford
- Date: APRIL, 2007
- Photos: YES X NO

**DESIGNER**
- Religious X

**BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOURCE**
- Magazine, book.etc: By Design
- Page(s): 9, 10, 11

**PHOTOGRAPHIC SOURCE**
- B & W: YES NO
- Destroyed: Color YES X NO
- Title: 75% Photographer: DL

**ARCHIVAL SOURCE/ITEM**
- Archive: YES NO
- Name: 
- Location: 
- Contact: 
- Newspaper Clippings: YES NO

**PERSONAL CORRESPONDENCE**
- Documents: YES NO
- Date: 
- Type: 
- Title: 
- Description: 

**ARCHITECTURAL COMPONENTS:**
- Creekside 2400 SF house on 50,000 sf lot, settled into surroundings (as part of landscape design) Built of Douglas Fir, brick, steel, and glass
- “A 1958 modernist “H” house built by Ford

**COMMENTS:**
- Site visit with Janik 4- 2007
- Plantings: Burford Holly, Waxleaf Ligustrum, Banana, Abelia, Live Oak, Tree Yaupon, Mimosa, Texas Honeysuckle, Clematis, Carolina Jessamine, English Ivy, Lilyturf, Liriope
# Miller Survey Form

## Site Identification

**Original Client:** Miller, Earl Hart  
**Current Owner:** Crow, Howard  
**Address:** 4107 Park Lane, Highland Park, TX  
**Date Built:** 1939  

### Designer

- **Landscape Architect:** Marie and Arthur Berger  
- **Architect:** O'Neil Ford  
- **Site Visit:** Yes  
- **Architect:** Yes  
- **Photos:** Yes  

### Bibliographical Source

- **Publication Title:**  
  - **Condition:** Excellent  
  - **Page(s):** 59  
- **Magazine, book, etc.:**  
  - **Condition:** Good  
  - **Page(s):**  
- **Photographs:**  
  - **Condition:** 100%  
  - **Page(s):**  

### Photographic Source

- **Title:**  
  - **Condition:** 100%  
  - **Photographer:** DL  
- **B & W:** Yes  
- **Color:** Yes  
- **Destroyed:** Yes  

### Archival Source/Item

- **Archived:** Yes  
- **Location:**  
- **Contact:**  
- **Newspaper Clippings:** Yes  
- **Documents:** Yes  

### Personal Correspondence

- **Document:**  
- **Date:**  
- **Type:**  
- **Title:**  

### Architectural Components

As part of landscape design.

### Comments

- Home demolished - new home built on site

---

# McNaughton Survey Form

---
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### Murchison, (John) Survey Form

#### SITE IDENTIFICATION
- **Original Client:** Murchison, John
- **CONTEXT:**
  - **Owner Name:** Estate X
  - **Current Owner:** Barrett, Marcus T. and Mary
  - **Residential**
  - **Address:**
    - **City, State:** Highland Park, TX Creekside Lot
    - **Date built:** 1942
  - **Institutional**
    - **Business**
  - **DESIGNER:**
    - **Landscape Architect:** Marie and Arthur Berger
    - **Berger Plan Located:** X
    - **Design by others:** YES
  - **Architect:** O'Neil Ford
  - **Date:** 8-3-07
  - **Photos:** YES
  - **Other**

#### BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOURCE
- **Magazine, book.etc.:**
  - **Page(s):**
    - **Existing:**
      - **Publication Title:**
        - **Condition:**
          - **Photo:** YES
        - **Page(s):**
          - **Excellent:**
          - **Good:**
  - **Publication Title:**
  - **Prevailing south east breezes dictate the use of porches on ma...**
  - **Condition:**
    - **Photo:** YES
    - **Page(s):**
      - **Good:**
      - **50%:**
      - **25%:**

#### PHOTOGRAPHIC SOURCE
- **Name:** B & W
  - **Destroyed:** Color
  - **Title:**
    - **Photographer:** DL

#### ARCHIVAL SOURCE/ITEM
- **Archive:** X
  - **Name:**
  - **Location:**
  - **Contact:**
  - **Newspaper Clippings:**
  - **Source:**
  - **Date:**

#### PERSONAL CORRESPONDENCE
- **Documents:**
  - **Date:**
  - **Type:**
  - **Title:**
  - **Description:**

#### ARCHITECTURAL COMPONENTS
- **Garden Pavilion, Garden Court, curved walkways, curved terrace walls, intricate brick paving patterns**
- **Ha-Ha walls**

#### COMMENTS
- **Property has been sub-divided**
- **Main area around house well preserved.**
- **Some new plantings noted**

### Murchison, (T. Frank) Survey Form

#### SITE IDENTIFICATION
- **Original Client:** Murchison, T. Frank and Noreen
- **CONTEXT:**
  - **Owner Name:** Estate X
  - **Current Owner:** Gonzaba William & Isabel D
  - **Residential**
  - **Address:**
    - **City, State:** San Antonio, TX Creekside Lot
    - **Date built:** 1937
  - **Institutional**
    - **Business**
  - **DESIGNER:**
    - **Landscape Architect:** Marie and Arthur Berger
    - **Berger Plan Located:** X
    - **Design by others:** YES
  - **Architect:** O'Neil Ford
  - **Date:** 8-3-2007
  - **Photos:** YES
  - **Other**

#### BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOURCE
- **Magazine, book.etc.:**
  - **Page(s):**
    - **Existing:**
      - **Publication Title:**
        - **Condition:**
          - **Photo:** YES
        - **Page(s):**
          - **Excellent:**
          - **Good:**
  - **Publication Title:**
  - **Prevailing south east breezes dictate the use of porches on m...**
  - **Condition:**
    - **Photo:** YES
    - **Page(s):**
      - **Good:**
      - **50%:**
      - **25%:**

#### PHOTOGRAPHIC SOURCE
- **Name:** B & W
  - **Destroyed:** Color
  - **Title:**
    - **Photographer:** DL

#### ARCHIVAL SOURCE/ITEM
- **Archive:**
  - **Name:**
  - **Location:**
  - **Contact:**
  - **Newspaper Clippings:**
  - **Source:**
  - **Date:**

#### PERSONAL CORRESPONDENCE
- **Documents:**
  - **Date:**
  - **Type:**
  - **Title:**
  - **Description:**

#### ARCHITECTURAL COMPONENTS
- **Garden Pavillion, Garden Court, curved walkways, curved terrace walls, intricate brick paving patterns**
- **Ha-Ha walls**

#### COMMENTS
- **Site is on a steep slope above a wooded valley**
### Penson Survey Form

**SITE IDENTIFICATION**
- **Original Client:** Penson, John and Nancy
- **Residential Address:** 3756 Armstrong Parkway
- **City, State:** Highland Park, TX
- **Date built:** 1954
- **Architect:** O'Neil Ford
- **Site Visit:** Yes
- **Photos:** Yes

**DESIGNER**
- **Landscape Architect:** Marie and Arthur Berger
- **Berger Plan Located:** Yes
- **Design by others:** Yes

**BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOURCE**
- **Magazine, book, etc.:** 
  - Fuller - AIA Guidebook
    - Page(s): Fair

**PHOTOGRAPHIC SOURCE**
- **B & W:** Yes

**ARCHIVAL SOURCE/ITEM**
- **Publication Title:** O'Neil Ford, Architect
  - Page(s): 118-119

**ARCHITECTURAL COMPONENTS:**
- **Slatted fence (original):**
- **Curved Mexican brick planters:**
- **Curved banded paving borders:**
- **Green screening 'wall', open green space:**
- **Curved serpentine beds:**

**COMMENTS:**
"...Modernist gentility grants this home a hilltop serenity. Mexican brick gently sets off giant trees on all faces. Climbing ivy grounds the house into its lofty site. Delicate trellises and sunscreens protect sunny exposures and emphasize its demure appeal," (Fuller, p. 118).

### Phillips Survey Form

**SITE IDENTIFICATION**
- **Original Client:** Phillips, M/M B.F.
- **Residential Address:** 4815 Brookview
- **City, State:** Dallas, TX
- **Date built:** 1950
- **Architect:** O'Neil Ford
- **Site Visit:** Yes
- **Photos:** Yes

**DESIGNER**
- **Landscape Architect:** Marie and Arthur Berger
- **Berger Plan Located:** Yes
- **Design by others:** Yes

**BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOURCE**
- **Magazine, book, etc.:** 
  - Dallas Morning News
    - Page(s): Sec. 3 p. 1

**PHOTOGRAPHIC SOURCE**
- **B & W:** Yes

**ARCHIVAL SOURCE/ITEM**
- **Publication Title:** Garden: Beauty for Family, Friends
  - Page(s): Good

**ARCHITECTURAL COMPONENTS:**
- **Curved Mexican brick serpentine privacy walls existing today:**

**COMMENTS:**
"Mexican brick gently sets off giant trees on all faces. Climbing ivy grounds the house into its lofty site. Delicate trellises and sunscreens protect sunny exposures and emphasize its demure appeal." (Fuller, p. 118).
### Sanford Survey Form

**SITE IDENTIFICATION**
- Original Client: Sanford, M/M
- CONTEXT: Owner Name: Estate
- Current Owner: STEWART S VAN & SUSAN T
- Residential X
- Address: 218 Canyon Road Guest House
- City, State: San Antonio, TX Creekside Lot
- Date built: 1951
- Institutional Business
- DESIGNER Religious
- Landscape Architect: Marie and Arthur Berger YES X NO Other
- Berger Plan Located YES NO X Design by others: YES
- Site Visit: YES X NO
- Architect: O'Neil Ford X
- Photos: YES X NO
- Other

**LANDSCAPE CONDITIONS**
- **BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOURCE**
  - Magazine, book.etc.
  - Page(s):
  - Publication Title:
  - Condition Photos YES NO
  - Excellent
  - Publication Title:
  - Good Photos YES NO
  - Fair
  - Publication Title:
  - Poor Photos YES NO
  - **PHOTOGRAPHIC SOURCE**
    - Name:
    - B & W YES NO
    - Color YES X NO
    - Title:
    - Photographer: DL
    - **ARCHIVAL SOURCE/ITEM**
      - Archive YES NO
      - Name:
      - Location:
      - Contact:
      - Newspaper Clippings YES NO
      - Source
      - Date
    - **PERSONAL CORRESPONDENCE**
      - Documents: YES NO
      - Date:
      - Type:
      - Title:
      - Description:

### Slick Survey Form

**SITE IDENTIFICATION**
- Original Client: Slick, Mr. Tom
- CONTEXT: Owner Name: N/A
- Current Owner: Unknown
- Residential
- Address: 400 Devine Road Guest House
- City, State: San Antonio, TX Creekside Lot?
- Date built: 1956
- Institutional Business
- DESIGNER Religious
- Landscape Architect: Marie and Arthur Berger YES X NO Other
- Berger Plan Located YES NO X Design by others: YES
- Site Visit: YES X NO
- Architect: O'Neil Ford X
- Photos: YES X NO
- Other

**LANDSCAPE CONDITIONS**
- **BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOURCE**
  - Magazine, book.etc.
  - Page(s):
  - Publication Title:
  - Condition Photos YES NO
  - Excellent
  - Publication Title:
  - Good Photos YES NO
  - Fair
  - Publication Title:
  - Poor Photos YES NO
  - **PHOTOGRAPHIC SOURCE**
    - Name:
    - B & W YES NO
    - Color YES X NO
    - Title:
    - Photographer: DL
    - **ARCHIVAL SOURCE/ITEM**
      - Archive YES NO
      - Name:
      - Location:
      - Contact:
      - Newspaper Clippings YES NO
      - Source
      - Date
    - **PERSONAL CORRESPONDENCE**
      - Documents: YES NO
      - Date:
      - Type:
      - Title:
      - Description:

### Architectural Components
- Street has mostly Spanish Colonial homes (as part of landscape design)
- High Hedges surrounding for privacy
- Magnolias, Live Oaks, Cast Iron Plant, Ferns
SITE IDENTIFICATION

Original Client: Trinity University, Northrup Hall, dorms, student union, George Storch Memorial library, Science bldg

Current Owner: same

Residential

Address: Guest House
City, State: San Antonio, Texas

Date built: 1950-55

Institutional X (school)

DESIGNER

Landscape Architect: Marie and Arthur Berger

YES X NO Other

Berger Plan Located

Design by others: YES

Name

Site Visit:

YES X NO

Architect:

O'Neil Ford X

Date: 8-3-07

Howard Meyer

Photos:

YES X NO

Other

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOURCE

Magazine, book.etc. George, MCH

Page(s): 95-99

Existing

YES NO

Publication Title:

Condition

Excellent

Good X

Magazine, book.etc.

Page(s): 75%

Publication Title:

50%

Photos

YES NO

25% X

PHOTOGRAPHIC SOURCE

Name:

B & W

YES NO

Destroyed

Color

YES NO

Title: Completely

PHOTOGRAPHIC SOURCE

Name:

Location:

Photographer

Correspondence

Yes, type/title:

Description:

Date:

Newspaper Clippings

ARCHIVAL SOURCE/ITEM

Archive

YES NO

25%

Name

Location

Photographer

Correspondence

If yes, type/title:

Description:

Date:

ARCHITECTURAL COMPONENTS

Live Oaks for shade, expansive open lawns, stacked stone serpentine garden wall bed walls

COMMENTS:

Survey Form 1 (Blank)

(Original)

Surveyor Name:

Date built: ______________

City, State

Residential

Context:

Address: ______________

Current Owner:

Existing?

Architect:

O'Neil Ford

Condition

Excellent

Fair

Landscape Architect:

Marie and Arthur Berger

Modified

Source (magazine, book.etc.):

Publication Title:

Page(s):

Photos

YES NO

Color

YES NO

Title:

Archive?

YES NO

Name

Page

Location

Photographer

Correspondence

If yes, type/title:

Description:

Date:

Newspaper Clippings

ARCHIVAL SOURCE/ITEM

Archive

YES NO

25%

Name

Location

Photographer

Correspondence

If yes, type/title:

Description:

Date:

ARCHITECTURAL COMPONENTS:

Live Oaks for shade, expansive open lawns, stacked stone serpentine garden wall bed walls

COMMENTS:

118
## Survey Form 2 (Blank)

### SITE IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Client</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Owner</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date built</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DESIGNER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
<td>Marie and Arthur Berger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Howard Meyer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONTEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Visit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LANDSCAPE CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication Title</td>
<td>GARDEN: Beauty for Family, Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ARCHIVAL SOURCE/ITEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERSONAL CORRESPONDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ARCHITECTURAL COMPONENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(as part of landscape design)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT</td>
<td>Berger Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OF PROJECTS - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excellent = 24% 100 - 8%
Good = 64% 75 - 8%
Fair = 12% 50 - 8%
Site not visited for research = 25 - 73%
Vacant, but no access = >25% 73%
Not available = ** ** * * *
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
FORM A

A) Questions for friends and relatives of the Bergers.

1) Can you share a general history of the Bergers career?

2) How did you come to know the Bergers?

3) How/why did they (individually) come to Dallas?

4) What do you know of their relationship with O’Neil Ford?

5) What were the Berger’s doing in the field of Landscape Architecture that was different?

6) What were the design trends in Dallas at the time (post-WW II – 1960)?

7) What was the Berger’s professional circle like?

8) What was their social circle?

9) What did people think about their practice?

10) Why did people hire them?

11) What was each of the Berger’s roles in their partnership?

12) Do you know when they began working together?

13) Tell me about your personal landscape plan.

14) Do you know of the Bergers travels to Europe?

15) Did the Berger’s want to leave a legacy?

16) Would you like to tell me anything additional about the Bergers that we have not covered?

17) Do you know what happened to their residence on Stonebridge?
FORM B

B) Questions for owners of Ford built homes with Berger landscapes

1) Are you the original owner of this home?
2) If not, how many owners in between?
3) Do you know of Marie and Arthur Berger?
4) How did you hear about them?
5) If original owner, why did you choose the Bergers?
6) If original owner, did you work with them on the landscape plan?
7) If original owner and you did not choose them, do you know if the architect recommended them?
8) If you worked with the Bergers, please explain the process.
9) If you worked with the Bergers, did you have a good experience?
10) Have you changed the landscape?
11) If yes, who did the updated plan?
12) Do you have any photos of the original landscape?
13) Do you have the original plan?
14) If yes to #12 and #13, may I copy them?
FORM C

C) Questions for architects and landscape architects

1) Are you familiar with the work of O’Neil Ford or Marie and Arthur Berger?

2) What do you think of their collaborative work?

3) How would you describe their style?

4) Do you think the preservation and documentation of their work would be of benefit to practicing Architects and Landscape Architects today?

5) If so, why?
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW RESPONSES
**Interview Responses**

**Gillett Berger**  
**Interview Form A**  
**October 3, 2007**

*Research Questions for Gilett Berger, great nephew of Arthur and Marie Berger. His father, Gilett, was a veterinarian and they moved to Odessa during his childhood. His grandfather, Ben had an Iris garden in between Ben and Arthur’s house – Arthur built the connecting garden.*

1) Can you share a general history of the Bergers career?
   *They were in the service at Ft. Belvoir. Marie worked in CA with Thomas Church. Arthur did estate work in Ohio. Trinity in San Antonio. Hackberry Creek.*

2) (N/A)

3) How/why did they (individually) come to Dallas?
   *Grandfather was the first pediatrician in Dallas. Lived at 3916 Stonebridge.*

4) What do you know of their relationship with O’Neil Ford?
   *He built A & M house – Scott Lyons was project architect. Gilette did a paper on their house at 3906 Stonebridge for a design class at A & M.*

5) What were the Berger’s doing in the field of Landscape Architecture that was different?
   *The created the Texas regional style of outdoor (patio) living. They used a lot of fan patterns in their paving plans – this idea came from their travels in Europe.*

6) What were the design trends in Dallas at the time (post-WW II – 1960)?
   *N/A*

7) What was the Berger’s professional circle like?
   *Ask Emily*

8) What was their social circle?
   *Went with McNaughton’s to Evergreen Valley in New Mexico.*

9) What did people think about their practice?
   *They were highly respected, on the cutting edge. They enjoyed their clients and they became their friends.*

10) Why did people hire them?
    *Same reason stated above.*
11) What was each of the Berger’s roles in their partnership?
   Ask Scott Lyons

12) Do you know when they began working together?
   No

13) N/A

14) Do you know of the Bergers travels to Europe?
   Just that they brought things back with them.

15) Did the Berger’s want to leave a legacy? N/A

16) Would you like to tell me anything additional about the Bergers that we have not covered?
   Annual trips to Evergreen valley near Las Vegas NM (pictures on the CD)
   Emily Walker’s son, Judd Walker – lives in San Antonio. Other son Trey lives in Seattle. He is the oldest grandson and might remember more.

17) N/A
18) Can you share a general history of the Bergers career?  
They were pacesetters in quality who could relate to the owner client using nature.

19) How did you come to know the Bergers?  
They were good friends introduced to us by the DeGolyers.

20) How/why did they (individually) come to Dallas?  
Arthur came to do the DeGolyer Estate (E McD was brought to Texas through the seismograph invention and then started TI), then the McNaughtons’ (partner of DeGolyer) had them do their landscape. They also had relatives here.

21) What do you know of their relationship with O’Neil Ford?  
They were equals on the same plane

22) What were the Berger’s doing in the field of Landscape Architecture that was different?  
They were after a more natural look and used wildflowers.

23) What were the design trends in Dallas at the time (post-WW II – 1960)?  
Joe Lambert was planting masses of azaleas!

24) What was the Berger’s professional circle like?  
William Wurster, Houston Bliss, Ford, Howard Meyer, Thomas Church

25) What was their social circle?  
People who were compatible in architecture and L.A., classics, music, art. They were charming and had fabulous parties with wonderful dinners, good wine and food. They maintained a studio separate from their house.

26) What did people think about their practice?  
They were well thought of, sought out

27) Why did people hire them?  
They created a natural look; beauty achieved with views, and ‘borrowed views’ – like Mt. Fuji.
28) What was each of the Berger’s roles in their partnership?
   *They loved to work and live together. They did everything together.*

29) Do you know when they began working together?
   *N/A*

30) Tell me about your personal landscape plan.
   *Mrs. McD loves her garden and loved the Bergers.*

31) Do you know of the Bergers travels to Europe?
   *N/A*

32) Did the Berger’s want to leave a legacy?
   *N/A*

33) Would you like to tell me anything additional about the Bergers that we have not covered?
   *Marie came to our house for Thanksgiving after Arthur died. Houston Bliss took over a lot of their work. The Seligson’s in Tulsa had a Ford house built with Berger landscape. There is an O’Neil Ford chair at UT Austin.*

34) Do you know what happened to their residence on Stonebridge?
   *N/A*
Interview Responses

Tim Hanley Interview Form B October 28, 2007
(Haggerty house current owner, 5455 Northbrook)

1) Are you the original owner of this home? No

2) If not, how many owners in between?
   None, we purchased it from Bea Haggerty – she lived here 20 years after
   Patrick Haggerty died.

3) Do you know of Marie and Arthur Berger?
   I never met them but I knew of them.

4) How did you hear about them?
   After we bought the house in 1993 and began to look into the history – read
   the Ford books.

5) If original owner, why did you choose the Bergers? N/A

6) If original owner, did you work with them on the landscape plan? N/A

7) If original owner, and you did not choose them, do you know if the architect
   recommended them? N/A

8) If you worked with the Bergers, please explain the process. N/A

9) If you worked with the Bergers, did you have a good experience? N/A

10) Have you changed the landscape?
    Yes, we had to remove about 15% of the trees that either died or fell down. We
    also added mondo grass and other ground cover where grass would not grow.
    We took out bamboo by the creek edge [and put in a bench, rocks and
    minimalist plantings]. We’re really trying to restore it, not change it.

11) If yes, who did the updated plan?
    Robert Bellamy (Kelly Mills) at Robert’s office. She comes back in town
    occasionally to do some additional work [seasonal color]. Working with John
    Armstrong now, but he hasn’t really done much yet.

12) Do you have any photos of the original landscape? No.
13) Do you have the original plan? No

14) N/A
1) Are you the original owner of this home?

Yes, it was designed by Arch and Patsy Swank, a partner of Neil’s [that’s what Arch and Patsy called O’Neil]. We bought the lot from the Tinkle’s, next door. Lon Tinkle was professor of French at SMU, and there was a student/professor relationship that went back to college days with Jerry Bywater and Ed [Bearden]. Ed was asked by Jerry to be the assistant director at the Dallas Art Museum (it was at Fair Park then). Ed was also teaching at SMU in the art department.

3) Do you know of Marie and Arthur Berger?

Yes, they were friends of ours and made a landscape plan for us and Dr. Chapman’s connecting yard, but we never installed the plan. Arthur Berger was very eloquent about his work, they both were very charming and tasteful. They were interesting people. We were 8-10 years younger than the rest of the group (Chapman’s, Tinkle’s, Bywaters and Bergers), but we know them all and it was a time of a lot of activity – after the war.
Interview Responses

Lynn Chapman Harper
Interview Form B
September 26, 2007
(Current owner of 3606 Lovers Lane and daughter of original owner, Dr. Chapman)

1) Can you please share a general history of the Bergers career? (see #9)

2) How did you come to know the Bergers? Parents knew them socially

3) How/why did they (individually) come to Dallas? (ask Mrs. Tinkle)

4) What do you know of their relationship with O’Neil Ford?
   They collaborated on projects

5) What were the Berger’s doing in the field of Landscape Architecture that was different?
   They designed to ‘fit into the landscape’. Away for formality, more natural.
   Casual living. Native plants.

6) What were the design trends in Dallas at the time (post-WW II – 1960)?
   Ranch style, foundation plantings with trees plowed down.

7) What was the Berger’s professional circle like? It was a large, tight group. Artist, writers, doctors, oilmen, cultural elite. Frank Dobie wrote about this.

8) What was their social circle?
   “Culture gulch” – a burgeoning cultural renaissance going on in Dallas. New cultural awareness in Dallas. The group of friends who built around the pond (at the headwaters of Turtle Creek north of Lover’s Lane) was friends and colleagues. Joe Lambert, who owned the property to the west of the Chapman’s, across the pond on Lover’s Lane, was the original owner of all the property around the pond. On Christmas Eve in 1945, Lambert agreed to sell off the lots and gave first choice to Bywaters. In addition to the Chapman’s, there were the Bearden’s, who lived directly behind them. The Bergers created a landscape plan that connected the two yards. The Tinkle’s were to the west of the Bearden’s on Amherst, then the Jerry Bywaters across the pond and again west of the Tinkles. Ed Bearden was an artist and professor at SMU, Tinkle taught English Literature at SMU and was the Literary reviewer of the Dallas Morning News, Bywaters was the Director of the Dallas Museum of Art and Mrs. Bywaters taught piano. The inland in the middle of the pond was named “McDermott Island as a tribute to Eugene McDermott. On Amherst, across the street from the Tinkles and Bywaters,
lived the hat buyer for NM (Bert De Winter). She had a garage apt. and renovated and connected the Dilbeck house in 1953. O’Neil Ford lived with Bywaters for a year when he was getting started in Dallas. Ford designed the Bywaters and Tinkle homes, Dale designed the Bearden house, and he Chapman house was a Ford/Swank design.

9) What did people think about their practice? They were well thought of. Very busy practice. Studio at the house. Sought out.

10) Why did people hire them?
   Their work was well regarded, and they were good socially.
   They created a movement of building with a respect for nature, creating little impact but reaping benefits.

11) What was each of the Berger’s roles in their partnership?

12) Do you know when they began working together?

13) Tell me about your personal landscape plan. Bergers created a connection between the Bearden’s and the Chapman’s by uniting the 2 yards but adding walls for privacy.

14) Do you know of the Bergers travels to Europe?

15) Did the Berger’s want to leave a legacy?

16) Would you like to tell me anything additional about the Bergers that we have not covered? Arthur Berger gave her an orange tree. Virginia McAllister is writing a book about Dallas neighborhoods – (suggested I call her)

17) Do you know what happened to their residence on Stonebridge? Maria Tinkle’s son, John bought the Berger’s house and lived there for some time after their death.
Interview Responses

June and Peter McGuire

Interview Form B

September 29, 2007

1) Are you the original owner of this home?
   No, 4th owner. Betty and Sam Leake were the original owners, then the Buck
   and Val Pascal, then Erv Deal.

2) If not, how many owners in between? 3

3) Do you know of Marie and Arthur Berger? …had heard of them

4) How did you hear about them? Reading in the Ford books.

5) If original owner, why did you choose the Bergers? N/A

6) If original owner, did you work with them on the landscape plan? N/A

7) If original owner, and ou did not choose them, do you know if the architect
    recommended them? N/A

8) If you worked with the Bergers, please explain the process. N/A

9) If you worked with the Bergers, did you have a good experience? N/A

10) Have you changed the landscape? Yes, several times. Mainly because of the
    addition to the house and then because of shade. Two courtyards were
    partially eliminated because of a growing family and the need for more
    interior space.

11) If yes, who did the updated plan? Robert Bellamy (the atrium), Carol
    Feldman, Naud Burnette and a friend from New Orleans.

12) Do you have any photos of the original landscape? Possibly

13) Do you have the original plan? (looked but did not have it)

14) If yes to #12 and #13, may I copy them? N/A
COMMENTS:
Spa and canna planter are new. Brick on sand is original. Limestone terrace is original as well as the brick raised planters. Mature trees were done by Bergers. Removed a large tree in the SE corner (too big, messy, took out a Crepe Myrtle also).
Interview Responses

Nancy Penson     Interview Form B     September 24, 2007

1) Are you the original owner of this home?
   Yes

2) If not, how many owners in between? N/A

3) Do you know of Marie and Arthur Berger?
   Yes, used them for a landscape plan for a house on McFarlin.

4) How did you hear about them?
   Mother was going to use them if she built a house on the lot that we live on now.

5) If original owner, why did you choose the Bergers?
   Ford suggested using the Bergers.

6) If original owner, did you work with them on the landscape plan?
   Basically, we just approved the plan suggested by the Bergers.

7) If original owner, and you did not choose them, do you know if the architect
   recommended them?
   Ford recommended them.

8) If you worked with the Bergers, please explain the process.
   Houston Bliss oversaw the work.

9) If you worked with the Bergers, did you have a good experience?
   Yes, we liked them a lot. They came together for meetings and were very charming.

10) Have you changed the landscape?
    Yes, we added the pool and color beds.

11) If yes, who did the updated plan?
    Houston Bliss.

12) Do you have any photos of the original landscape?
    It was in a magazine...
13) Do you have the original plan?
   *Maybe, I will look.*

14) If yes to #12 and #13, may I copy them? *N/A*
1) Are you familiar with the work of O’Neil Ford or Marie and Arthur Berger?

Yes, I did not actually know them personally, but I was very much aware of their work. They did TI, Temple Emanu-El and the office building at Westside and Lemmon (4310 Westside Dr.). The parking lot of the semiconductor building is impressive to see as well as the parking at the Temple. The trees looked ‘funny’ at first (at the Temple) but
the Bergers had the vision to project the landscape plan into the future to anticipate [ultimate] growth. The Live Oaks planted there help soften the parking lot. The Bergers also did the McDermott’s house and farm in Allen. Arthur told them ‘You can pave or not pave the road (to the house from McDermott freeway, but driving on the dirt in Texas will cause a lot of dust’’. The retaining walls are intentional on the site.

There was an article in the Dallas News or Herald about the artwork at TI – tile work by Thomas Stell.

I had an office at the Westside building when the Bergers were working on the landscape. They said that it was installed to ‘look good now’ and was overplanted but would have to be ‘weeded out’ when it grows up.

2) What do you think of their collaborative work (with O’Neil Ford)?

Ford would not have been as well known if it had not been for the work with the Bergers. ‘Ev’ (Everett) DeGolyer, the primary backer of TI, loaned the money to Cecil Green, McDermott, and Eric Jonsson – the deal was sealed the day before the bombing of Pearl Harbor. TI was formerly called Geophysical Services. The Bergers house was built by Ford and it was a fantastic house – small but wonderful. IT was left to the Dallas Museum of Art and later torn down. It had a natural landscape.

3) How would you describe their style?

They were really great people – team players that worked with architects and interiors. They were the first to get involved with native materials and drought tolerant plantings. They worked to enhance the environment in a practical way. They were parallel with the leading people in the country and the precursors in handling of parking lots. They allowed for more landscaping that helped handle the slope (at TI). The Bergers concepts for parking lots were used a decade later by Kiley, Olin and Peter Walker and by international architects of the era like Saarinen. Joe Lambert was doing exactly the opposite – planting azaleas as decoration where the Bergers actually shaped and formed the landscape.
4) Do you think the preservation and documentation of their work would be of benefit to practicing architects and landscape architects today?

I think the documentation is more important than the preservation. Landscape is a growing, changing and extremely important feature. The Temple Emanu-el is a good example of a project that is intact and in good condition and should be preserved, but there is nothing really different about Exchange Park.

Call Jane and Duane Landry - they used to own the Haggerty house and did a major expansion. They are in Dallas in the winter.

Houston Bliss installed all the landscape projects for the Bergers.
1) Are you familiar with the work of O’Neil Ford or Marie and Arthur Berger?
   Yes. They did everything with Ford. Houston Bliss was their designer.
   I worked on the Houston Technical Labs (formerly TI, now sold) and had an
occasion to drive down to Houston with Arthur to choose Tropical plants. I
remember something Arthur said, that I will never forget! “Be careful of house
plants – they will take over your life!”
   “I had a house going up in the Memorial district of Houston and Arthur
remarked
   That, “If you build in a forest, you have to take down trees.” I’ll never forget
that one either!
   [On another occasion], I had no car but was dropping off Ford at Love Field
[Dallas airport] to go to Dubai and recognized William Wurster. He said that Arthur
and Marie were supposed to have picked him up but must have forgotten, so I took
him to their Stonebridge house. Wurster and the Bergers were old friends. I felt
honored to be entertained by the Bergers. I think that Wurster was the thread that
linked them all he was a hero of Ford’s. Ford emulated his style – unpretentious
design.
   They weren’t as colorful as Ford, more retiring and reserved. Arthur was a
bit warmer, but Marie was very reserved, not stern, but reserved.

2) What do you think of their collaborative work (with O’Neil Ford)?

   They did everything with Ford – all his work. Stewart King did some , in San
Antonio. He was a relative of Wanda Ford. They were very well known and highly
respected.
   They did St. Mary’s Hall [girls prep school in San Antonio], an insurance
company on Broadway; a six or seven story building.
   The Bergers worked together with Ford on their house on Stonebridge. Wurster
also consulted and added a ‘bump’ out in the bedroom to enlarge the space (now, it’s
referred to as ‘Wurster’s bump’).

3) How would you describe their style?

   It was a Texas native style. You could drive by a Berger job and you would not
know that it was landscaped. It was native and unpretentious. They were the absolute
leading landscape architects in town (not including Lamberts, but that was a different
kind of work). The Bergers work was notable for its restraint.
Chris Carson (of Ford Powell and Carson) said that “Arthur said that the color of foliage was important”, and I had never thought about that, but it is”. In the late 40’s and 50’s there was a lot of activity going on, but most of the landscaping was conventional and ‘overdressed’. Ford hated foundation plantings. I think what is really great are the old 17th century English homes made out of limestone with nothing right around the house – instead of ‘ruffles and parsley’. A starker look. I think Arthur and Marie got some of their influence from Capability Brown.

4) Do you think the preservation and documentation of their work would be of benefit to practicing architects and landscape architects today?

You bet, especially to people like me, Max Levy and Bill Booziotis. Their work shows exemplified restraint. People like Boyd & Heidrich overplanted, everything got thick and then it had to be thinned out. I remember Arthur telling me that it takes about 6 years for a landscape design to become mature.

5) If so, why?
1) Are you familiar with the work of O’Neil Ford or Marie and Arthur Berger?
   Yes, I was on staff at the Dallas Arboretum when Richard Myrick was doing the 1991 DeGolyer Gardens Master Plan. He was the landscape architect of record. I had heard of the Bergers but did not know of any other specific work with Ford. This could be considered adaptive re-use because the former DeGolyer Estate is now a public arboretum.
   Through association with the Arboretum, I also knew of Margaret McDermott’s landscape that had been done by the Bergers and knew that she was very fond of it – to the point that she did not want to change anything about it.

2) What do you think of their collaborative work?
   They were innovative, using their ‘Texas Style’ with sound principles for the environment. Courtyards were designed to fit with the Texas climate; the outdoor rooms of today with loggia. The ‘single-loaded’ house layout worked well to create views on either side.
   They were on the cutting edge – dealing with art collectors [to enhance their designs]. They incorporated clean lines to create nice, private, outdoor environments. They were sensitive to the environment and the character of the house, creating shade. Their sense of scale is very appropriate – this is a hard thing to learn.

3) How would you describe their style?
   There was not a precedence to what the Bergers were doing in L.A. They were able to successfully relate the visual quality of the indoor/outdoor living spaces that included open lawn spaces, green screens and clipped hedges that defined the ‘room edge’. There was not much ornamentation, no color or fussiness, but ‘good bones’ were used to create shade, frame views and define vistas. The result was creation of space, without ornamentation. A good example is the Magnolia Allee at the Arboretum, that was designed by the Bergers: strong architectural elements are there. There is a judicious planting of the trees to define views and create privacy.

4) Do you think the preservation and documentation of their work would be of benefit to practicing architects and landscape architects today?
   Yes, because the Bergers were ahead of their time in their style and also because of the important associations with their clients (oilmen and philanthropists of the day).
Early interaction between architect and landscape architect is beneficial to offer [a premium product] if the early site planning with both design professionals involvement. It would be a good idea for architects to take a landscape architecture class, and it would be also good for landscape architects to take architecture classes – they should be forced to take classes together.

5) If so, why?

Because it is relevant in how we approach design today. We should look at past designs to help understand what works to help in designing today.
Interview Responses

**John Armstrong, ASLA**  
*Interview Form C*  
*November 3, 2007*

1) Are you familiar with the work of O’Neil Ford or Marie and Arthur Berger?
   Yes, as a student, in 1976 I knew about the house on Stonebridge on top of the bluff. There was a big ‘to-do’ about it again in the 80’s and it got torn down and now there’s a ‘McMansion’ there. It was a beautiful example of respect of the site and scale. It was a magical site.

2) What do you think of their collaborative work (with Ford)?
   Together they created some of the most respectful work produced in the last century. It was sensitive to the site and to client programs. The interiors were blended with the exteriors. They were respectful of scale – they were ‘one’ (not to be trite). To walk onto one of their landscapes, you are inspired. It’s overwhelming; it lifts you up!

3) How would you describe their style?
   A beautiful blending of the indoor/outdoor relationship on this site. Magical. Natural. Integrated and emotional. Their work helps me to determine how to use in my own career. The total integration of site, architecture and budget.

4) Do you think the preservation and documentation of their work would be of benefit to practicing Architects and Landscape Architects today?
   Yes, they were successful for the very reasons stated before (of their style and work with Ford). You can’t be lost in time- there is a value to what they did, who they were and how they did it. This is a different world than it was in 1960, but the reality of the work is that you have to not only have the passion and the talent, but the ability to relate to the clients and that is what they did well. There are lots of talented people but you have to have the gift of socialization and communication to make it fun for the client (be able to talk about art, history, etc.).

5) If so, why?
   It’s a shame what happens over time – the works of these people (Bergers, Houston Bliss, Heidrich and Boyd...). There are no great masters teaching with new practitioners any more. There needs to me more hands on. Times have changes and everything is fast-paced, glitz, spectacle (as in Las Vegas), and a “show & go” society. You have to have a passion about what you do, you have to be a good listener, and be able to read body language. [The Bergers connected with their clients].
1) Are you familiar with the work of O’Neil Ford or Marie and Arthur Berger?  
Yes, but not with any documentation of their work. (Is there anything?)

2) What do you think of their collaborative work (with Ford)?  
It is clean and simple. Architect and landscape architect as ‘one’ – working in tandem. The use of all the glass in Ford houses – opened up into the garden.

3) How would you describe their style?  
It’s the opposite of say, ‘Lambert’s [Landscape Company, Dallas Texas]. Instead of all the boxed hedges, there is quietness in the design – lets the house’s architecture ‘read’. There was a ‘blurring’ of the exterior and interior spaces. Ford and the Bergers were at the forefront of this movement. It became important to use outdoor sculpture in the landscape. The Bergers created woodland settings that were amorphic. The only other major players in the 1950’s were Lamberts and Naud Burnett (who worked for Lamberts) and the Bergers were doing the opposite of what they were doing.

4) Do you think the preservation and documentation of their work would be of benefit to practicing Architects and Landscape Architects today?  
Absolutely, 100%! There was so much written prior to modern. And, there is a lot written on modern architects. With Philip Johnson’s house opening up, modern architects and landscape architects are becoming more recognized - especially with the 50 year mark on so many projects. Documentation of regional landscape architecture is especially important, because landscapes deteriorate and it takes a lot of work to keep them up. Typically in the ‘valleys’, after a style becomes passe’, that’s when all the alterations take place.

5) If so, why?  
Landscape architecture has not been appreciated and documented as much as architecture. There were so many tear-downs but now there seems to be more respect [gaining]. The appreciation and respect for mid-century era designs is more recognized now.
Interview Responses

McDermott Farm  Interview/Visit  September 28, 2007

LOCATION: Allen, Texas – 600+/- acres. Highest point in the county located within the farm.

PLANTS:
Hackberry, Red Oak, Live Oak, Eastern Red Cedar, Thistle, Sumac, Goldenrod, Broomweed, Wild Plum, Mulberry, Pecan, Pear, Photenia

FEATURES:
• Berms, bands
• Stacked stone wall
• Patterned mowing
• Subtle, natural, unobtrusive plantings
• Natural stone retaining walls used, bridges, culverts, entrance markers (pylons), species
• Entrance gate flanked by opposite/alternating trees

HISTORY:
• Property acquired in early 1950s
• New ‘Respondent A-2’ house, designed by Scott Lyons in 1951
• Then, Allan population was about 200 people. Now, 95,000
• Original farmhouse is the oldest house in Collin County – 100+ years old (looks like Hoppers houses)

Fig. C-1 - Original Farm House at McDermott Farm
Sited on highest point in the county
Respondent A-2 reported that “Arthur Berger advised us in locating and purchasing properties. It was cold when they were out looking and we all had on boots. This was fifty years ago. We considered four to five farms and he recommended that we purchase this one. Arthur drove with us along the road to the bald hilltop to place markers for the future roads, future trees and located areas for wildflowers plots to cohabitate with native plants. Arthur recommended the property and put in the road. The ranch was in a wild state back then; ranchers dealt with wolves in those days. Today, coyotes, rabbits and skunks still can be found on the property. Hay and wheat are grown in the farm fields with partners,” (Respondent A-2, September 28, 2007).

Within the property a spring-fed lake can be found. Arthur Berger marked a road that approached the lake from vantage points to experience several ‘vistas’ of the lake. From the road, a canyon that directs run-off rainwater into the lake can be seen. Arthur Berger specified low stone retaining walls to add visual values to the belvedere, the canyon, the lake, the surroundings, and the adjacent areas of native flowers and plants. The lake is full now from the recent rains. In the spring, it is full of wildflowers (different than what is blooming now). Adrian, the farm manager, fetches particular plants requested by Respondent A for the visitors and for her farmhouse. She tenderly trimmed away the
unsightly parts and presented flowers as souvenirs. In duck season, the lake will be loaded with wild fowl.

Fig. C-3 - Goldenrod at Allen Farm  
Fig. C-4. Thistle at Allen Farm

During the site visit in the fall, there was an abundance of shocking purple thistle, yellow goldenrod, and sumac beginning to turn red and orange.

Fig. C-5 - Berger Designed Road at Allen Farm
Based on the site survey and analysis, it became evident that Arthur Berger located the different roads as markers between the wild and the tended pasture.

Fig. C-6 - Bridge at Allen Farm
Designed by Arthur Berger
Stone bridges, stone culverts, and low stone walls were used by Arthur Berger to add to the dramatic views in the property at belvederes, creek crossings, road intersections, as well as, boundaries between improved landscaping and their natural surroundings near the dwellings.
APPENDIX D

TABLES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Client</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>BERGERS</th>
<th>FORD</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950-56 Berger Residence</td>
<td>3906 Stonebridge</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>DEMOLISHED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955 Chapman, Dr. John &amp; Mae</td>
<td>3605 Lover's Lane</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Ford/Spark</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-56 Dallas City Library Roof garden</td>
<td>Commerce adj to Dallas Grand Hotel</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>VACANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-56 Exchange Business Park</td>
<td>Harry Hines at Broadway</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Lane Gerrie Huddleston</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-55 Fitzsimons, M/M Hugh</td>
<td>11 Rock Ridge</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>unable to locate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-55 Post residence</td>
<td>Inwood &amp; Walnut Hill</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NOT A FORD HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Hillsberry Creek</td>
<td>adjacent to St. John’s N of Armstrong</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>(Engineering firm)</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Pickett, M/M Patrick</td>
<td>3685 Northcross Dr</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Pickett, M/M Fred (Elizabeth)</td>
<td>11 Mt. Erith Way</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Unable to locate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-55 Houston Technical Laboratories</td>
<td>3333 Richmond Ave</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>No longer part of TI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Sanford, J.O.</td>
<td>218 Canyon Dr</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Leake, Sam Betty</td>
<td>3631 Windsor Parkway</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Leonard house</td>
<td>Cheston &amp; Milnick</td>
<td>PV</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 McGinnis, M/M (Margaret)</td>
<td>4923 Drexel</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 McNaughton, M/M Lewis</td>
<td>4656 Meadowood Rd</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>DEMOLISHED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Mellor house</td>
<td>11125 Hillcrest</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>excellent condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956 Miller, Earl Hart</td>
<td>4717 Park Lane</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>good condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Murchison, John</td>
<td>939 Canyatta Rd</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Murchison, T. Frank</td>
<td>9 Ironwood Rd</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Person, John/Nancy (Perr)</td>
<td>3756 Armstrong Parkway</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Phillips residence</td>
<td>4815 Brookview</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>DEMOLISHED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Stage Coach Hotel</td>
<td>I-35 in Salado 401 &amp; Stagecoach Rd.</td>
<td>Salado</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Sick, Tom</td>
<td>400 Devine Rd</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 National Life Ins. Co</td>
<td>9300 Central Expressway</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Temple Episcopal Church</td>
<td>13500 N. Central Expressway</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Texas Instruments</td>
<td>3615 Anheral</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Tobian, Millon</td>
<td>9912 Overbrook</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Trinity University</td>
<td>715 Stadium Dr</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Northrup Hall, dorms, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-7 Unruh, M/M</td>
<td>Devine Rd</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Discovered late, did not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. E.1 – Chapman Residence Steps to Turtle Creek

Fig. E.2 - Chapman Residence Backyard
Fig. E.3 - Landscape Plan for Mr. Charles (Dale) Merritt
Fig. E.4 - Landscape Plan for 3525 Turtle Creek
Fig. E.5 - Landscape Plan by Arthur and Marie Berger
For Dr. John Chapman and Mr. and Mrs. Ed Bearden
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