

WHAT IS THE FUTURE OF ACADEMIC PUBLISHING?

Jorge Tárrago Mingo

The Chronicle of Higher Education is a weekly newspaper that gathers news and academic information throughout the United States, job opportunities for university majors, and a section devoted to art and ideas. It is published in Washington D.C. It has around 64,000 subscribers and over 315,000 readers. Its daily digital version adds to the paper issue, among other things, discussion forums and several tools directed to the *academia*. It has over 1,9 million monthly single visits.

'What is the Future of Academic Publishing?' is the title of a recent article in its digital version, part of a series –Digital Challenges to Academic Publishing– with a total of four interviews (to date) to different editors from the editorial world. It collects an interesting conversation with the publishing director of the MIT Press regarding the question. The interviewer begins querying about the fact that some personalities throughout the U.S. encourage researchers to publish their academic works in on-line media –such as blogs– without the need for a later publication on traditional media such as a book or a printed magazine.

The reply, not easy, is perhaps mild but realistic, and could be summoned to economical aspects. As a matter of fact, if we think that publishing previously in the digital realm will imply diminishing the possible audience (instead of increasing it) the costs of producing a book, or a magazine, are unaffordable during the first two years, which is the time the publishing world foresees to retrieve investment. Although, in spite of the lack of studies providing facts –that academic publishers can't risk with their own publications– and above the incidental examples in one sense or another, it is not clear that publishing a paper in 'non classical' means can help or harm the later printed or 'classical' version. We must obviously believe the backdrop statement, which implies that the academic book or magazine, above any other means, must always generate benefits, or at least not generate losses.

Regardless of these issues, truth is that in a broad sense, the media has evolved radically in the last years and research in the fields of architectural history, critique, and theory are no exception. It is not necessary to expand on this issue, it is clear that the communication possibilities have multiplied. It can be said that these can generate a transfer of mere uncritical information and doubtful contents. Further more, we don't have to look back too far to realize that the same methods of academic research are far from the ones only ten years ago. If the rather easy access to databases, libraries, academic deposits, magazines, files or any sort of digital contents provide any researcher with an almost unlimited flow of information, furthermore "internet has set the stage for anyone to become an author being his own publisher".

Thus, there has been an exponential proliferation of non-printed media. It is enough to check the growing project 'Archazines' which selects and files magazines, newspapers and independent fanzines published throughout the world since the year 2000, being an alternative "to the establishment of architectural press". Most of them, specially the most recent ones, have a strictly digital origin against those who appear to complete a previously printed version. However, the on-line ones paradoxically maintain residues of the printed ones in their design, mainly to allow for later printing, whether it is for free or with a fee, 'self service' or 'print on-demand'.

We shall not be captivated by the phenomenon's immediacy and abundance. The atomization of messages, the need to find one's expression and become a publisher is not something new. The means that allow it are. Beatriz Colomina reminds us about the emergence of new publishing means, small independent architectural periodicals that appeared during the 60s and 70s. The apparition of new printing technologies, without the need to specialize and with a relative low cost, was crucial for everyone to be able to publish their own magazine. In the current economic context these means –low cost and accessibility– might be more important than conscious publishing decisions, but truth is that there is a constant increase of printed magazines evolving to digital and brand new digital ones.

On the other hand, the net offers many possibilities for alternative publishing manners, such as 'bottom-up', from base to the top based on crowd sourcing where anyone can add contents overseen by a publisher. The 'academic' or 'scientific' magazine (or book) has however its own peculiarities, as well as several mechanisms to ensure the orthodoxy and quality of its contents. But this debate renders futile since nothing prevents us to resort to these mechanisms in a digital realm as it does

happen. Perhaps what is arguable is measuring the quality of a magazine or books through its 'impact factor' as done today, based on the number of times it is quoted or if it should be considered the number of downloads or visits to websites where it has been published previously or afterwards.

Back to the interview, the question about the future of academic press is answered towards the end. These "will stand as long as they are capable of providing added value to authors and readers, and have the support of institutions. Today and in the near future we will see new models for the academic press including crowd funded and sourced global schemes to develop and spread quality research throughout the whole world".

MIT Press director believes the future lies in the capability to preserve and provide a quicker and broader access to quality research and knowledge. European policies, however, are not proposing 'if' but 'how' to reach the goal of providing open and free access to the scientific information backed by public funding –specially through academic press– until 2020.

Faced by a future we cannot foretell, we must continue promoting debate and reflection, and at the same time turn to Romano Guardini, for example. In 1948 he gave a lecture published three years later. In the preface to *In Praise of the Book*, we read:

I had written a lot and was ready to design the discourse: back in the early post-war years good books were scarce and the ones available were weak. Today everything is different. Many good and important things are available again and we have the right to expect them to be done right. However, some have understood that having books is not something obvious; and it is enough to look towards the close East to realize how being able to freely access books is a signal for the defence of human dignity.

We thus have enough arguments to consider what we can watch over in them and perhaps is sometimes overlooked.

(Now understand 'Book' in the broadest sense of the printed media parallel to the current media).

Well, in short, little objection can be raised to the above reflections in the interview of *The Chronicle*, at least with regard to the focus on the quality of any research that should include the kind of magazines we are discussing. Perhaps this is the 'added value' to be pursued, well ahead of other elements that can always be interpreted as circumstantial or changing.

And although it is true that to facilitate 'fast and widespread' access, even beyond the inner academic circles, as well as the support and collaboration between institutions are some of the characteristics of academic research, at least that of give the reader the best possible academic research in our fields of editorial interest is the firm commitment of *Ra, Revista de Arquitectura*, which is not exhausted in these very brief considerations or in the pages that follow.

NOTES ON RONCHAMP: THE HIDDEN AND THE SACRED

Juan Miguel Hernández León

The Chapel at Notre Dame du Haut, at Ronchamp, greeted with despair by the contemporary critique, gave Le Corbusier the opportunity to accomplish a paradoxically autobiographical work, but at the same time, opening towards a conception of modernity that assumes the postulates of phenomenology and the anthropological dimension of the sacred. Beyond an epidermal rationality it broadens the formal repertoire of new architecture, anticipating architecture's current hybridization.

All moments are our moment, however what is compiled without synthesis it is neither History nor chronology, but merely activates our sense of time. And if this is valid to accelerate the function of memory in the way we interpret a work of art it is also valid to tackle the conceptual scheme constituting what we call today theory of architecture. ¿Or perhaps theories of architecture?

Conceptual transfers that query the internal character of the discipline, its' supposed autonomy as theory and practice, leading us to a hybrid territory where we can ask ourselves about the quality and nature of the architectural reflection. A theory that works with the leftovers (perhaps fragments?) revealed as functional, or critical in the disciplinary realm.

But isn't theory, *thean-óran*, seeing the look of the one who comes to meet us? Anyhow a holistic approach, an extensive and complete way of being in the world. An original meaning that, according to Heidegger disappears in the Latin translation of theory to contemplation, what leads towards a glance that separates, that breaks apart the reality by establishing distances and encloses territories. Observing and contemplating would be an unaffected regard; but this entry is avoided by the function of theory in modern science, aspiring to a reworking of what is real.

Two characteristics thus, of the sense we provide theory with, the separation and elaboration of phenomena and objects, upon which we apparently reflect. Theory delimits the realm of what we observe, which is what surrounds us, in the sense of an acknowledged world, and thus, resisting the violent break up of its development.

Thus, aren't those transfers an acknowledgment of the convenience of being in a place where something was ignored? In Spanish transferring has the meaning of moving or transmitting, keep the Latin origin of the words *transferre* and *ferre* (take), and also from *translatus*, the action of transporting, demanding a will to do.

In 1956, a year after the end of the works, James Stirling published an article on Ronchamp subtitled "Le Corbusier's Chapel and the crisis or Rationalism". Le Corbusier's last work provoked him with a sensation of "an unexpected meeting with a denaturalized configuration of natural elements such as Stonehenge's granite rings or Britannia's dolmens". Stirling considered it a contradiction of the tectonic qualities of those "archaic" references, presented in the ethereal or light qualities of the building, led by the "ambiguous nature" of the walls. Ronchamp, "expression of pure poetry", seems to point out a way beyond the premises of modern rationality accepting the inclusion of heterogeneous fragments, brought in from popular construction, *objects trouvés* or quotes to historical architecture, coexisting with the principles of new architecture.

Most critics coincide in the "brutal and archaic" character of the building, confirming the ambivalence of its significance, oscillating between the presence of primitivism and the will of modernity; but, above all, of the dialectics between the conception of the sacred expressed in the organized ritual, sprouting from individual confrontation.

FROM THE 'ENSANCHE' HOUSE TO MITJANS' "HOUSE"

Félix Solaguren-Beascoa

Francesc Mitjans i Miró is, together with José Antonio Coderch, a leading architect in Barcelona's mid-twentieth century architecture. The majority of his work focuses primarily on the field of bourgeois housing. The locations of which are situated in the upper areas of Barcelona.

Mitjans was fortunate to begin his professional career with one of his most celebrated works: the block of flats built in 1940 at n. 76 calle Amigo. This project signifies an exemplary evolution of the housing floor plan typical of the Eixample district of Barcelona. Here he tried out and established a number of features that he would maintain throughout his career: reduction of building depth, a remarkable effort in the suppression of interior ventilation courtyards, elimination of the corridor, the diagonalization of the floor plan and the search of a volumetric proposal. These mechanisms appear in the first period, the classical period (1940-1953), as well as well as later on (decade of the 50s and 60s).

Despite changing language, the subtlety of composition remains unchanged. Contrasts, together with the main tripartite order of the principal facades, the aesthetics apparently more relaxed but no less intense than in the rear elevations. This duality will give way to the latter, formalized with the same rigor as the first, only to submerge itself in the language of international architecture.

Pilaster bases, tight bodies of brickwork and the finishing one are replaced by low porticoes, glass walls and higher pergolas that embrace the higher empty space of the coronation. The ventilation courtyards are progressively displaced to become important rents, empty exterior spaces, which shape, organize and define the composition of the rear facades.

The final formalization is carried out through unitary volumes thanks to the continuation of the tight horizontal lines which allow achieving results of a highly expressive force filled with subtle details.

LUCIA MOHOLY-NAGY. CORRESPONDANCE AROUND GATCPAC

Alfons Puigarnau / Oriol Vaz-Romero Trueba

In this article the authors analyse the letters crossed in 1933 between Lucia Moholy, Walter Gropius and the Catalan architect Josep Lluís Sert (1902-1983), founder of the GATCPAC (Group of Catalan Architects and Technicians for the Progress of Contemporary Architecture) and director of the Journal *AC Documents d'Activitat Contemporània* (Barcelona, 1931-1937).

Lucia Moholy, born Lucia Schulz, (1894-1989) was a photographer and first wife of artist and fellow photographer László Moholy-Nagy. After studying philosophy, philology, and art history, she worked as an editor and lecturer in Prague and, as of 1918, in Germany. In 1920 she met the Hungarian artist László Moholy-Nagy in Berlin and married him in January 1921. From 1923 to 1924, Lucia studied photography in Leipzig, and when her husband secured a position as master at the Bauhaus, lived in Weimar and Dessau and produced many of the iconic images and portraits associated with that school. She arrived at the Bauhaus in Dessau in 1923 with her husband. There, Lucia worked as László's assistant on his experimental photography projects. Having already received training in Berlin, Moholy was familiar with the technical aspects of photography and set up a photo studio in the faculty house they were assigned.

Between 1924 and 1928, Moholy formulated her own creative ideas and conceived of a manner to document the Bauhaus' architecture and design, while also producing portraits of the school's teachers and their friends, some of them reviewed in this article. Her extensive photo series depict the new buildings built by Walter Gropius in 1925-1926 (published *Bauhausbauten Dessau* in Munich, 1930), as well as products designed in the school's studios.

Commissioned by the School, Lucia decided to photograph the buildings in an objective, precise manner. The photographs are either frontal or three-quarter perspectives. Moholy sometimes used diffuse lighting to accentuate specific details and highlight signature Bauhaus traits. Whether highlighting the transparency of the studio building's glass façade, or the articulation of the volumes and white surfaces of the Walter Gropius house, the clarity of Moholy's architectural interpretation is evident. Her photographs of interiors document the living spaces of the school's teachers and highlight furniture prototypes designed to serve everyday needs, further disseminating the ideas of Gropius and other Bauhaus designers.

The unpublished letters used in this text show the artistic personality of Lucia Moholy during the oppressive atmosphere years close to the 30th of January 1933 when Hitler was named chancellor of Germany in a brief and simple ceremony in Hindenburg's office. On the 11th of January 1933 Gropius wrote Sert asking for a position of photographer on behalf of Lucia Moholy, separated from Laszlo in 1928. In replay to Gropius, Sert evaluates Lucia Moholy's aesthetic sensitivity and professional skills and she answers about her motivations as well as showing feelings of social isolation and loneliness.

In 1933, she emigrated via Prague, Vienna and Paris to London and worked there as a portrait photographer and author. In the following years, she directed documentary films for numerous important archives and UNESCO projects in the Near and Middle East. After relocating to Switzerland in 1959, she worked in publishing, focusing on art criticism and art education, and participated in many exhibitions.

RAFAEL LEOZ HELE MODULE, A HISTORY OF CONTRADICTIONS: FROM INTERNATIONAL SUCCESS TO THE DIFFICULT RELATIONSHIP WITH SPANISH ARCHITECTURE

Jesús López Díaz

The Spanish architect Rafael Leoz de la Fuente (1921-1976; graduated, 1955) participated in the construction of Poblado Dirigido de Orcasitas (along with Joaquín Ruiz Hervás), one of the earliest examples of Spanish rationalism applied to social housing, gateway of modernity in Spanish architecture led by names like Oiza or Fisac. However, the experience of Orcasitas (3,000 homes) motivated Leoz to leave the practice for the research in social architecture through theories and laws based on geometric modulation towards prefabrication and industrialization, not only in the field of housing, but in architecture in general. His theories were internationally

recognized, first in the Sao Paulo Biennial in 1961, and later through countless lectures in different countries and awards. His thoughts were highly regarded by architects such as Le Corbusier and Jean Prouve among others, who expressly supported his work. But Leoz failed in Spain the same prestige and understanding of its work among the Spanish architects for various reasons, although his international reputation earned him to obtain the support of the Franco regime to create the Rafael Leoz Foundation for Research in Social Architecture (1969) from which emerged the two unique works based on their theoretical principles: the experimental housing in Las Fronteras (Torrejón de Ardoz, Madrid) and the Spanish Embassy in Brasilia.

MARCEL BREUER AND THE AMERICAN DREAM COTTAGE

Aurora Fernández / Luis de Fontcuberta

Marcel Breuer, Hungarian architect and famed to furniture's designer of the Bauhaus emigrated to America in 1937, invited by Gropius as a professor at Harvard. Breuer and Gropius, there begin a new stage based on the experimentation of the house as a revision to the postulates of modern architecture: the house as a dwell machine proposed by Le Corbusier from old Europe; versus the humanization of the machine through the effect of material on the structure and form extended and in contact with the territory, proposed by Frank L.I. Wright from the new America.

His experiments on the house-cottage approached traditional methods of the American construction methods to a new vision, abstract and pure, where ways of life, and basic, practical and functional requirements became the connection to "Art of Building" through the material and its placing.

The search for a clear answer of dwelling that satisfied conflicting objectives and human needs, led to the architecture of abstraction to reconcile man with nature, endow it with life and art, an architecture and a landscape that became the modern ideals of American cottage.

FUTURE FINLAND HOUSE IN THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA

Mónica Mateo García / Carlos Pérez-Carramiñana

This article reveals the existence of a Venturo House on the coast of Alicante, unnoticed until today by architectural critics. This building, a paradigm of the Houses of the Future, icons of the rise of plastic in the architecture of the 60s and 70s, is one of the few Venturos designed by the Finnish architect Matti Suuronen still existing in the world.

Due to the study and analysis of the building, and the elaboration of original documentation, its main architectural features may be highlighted with the aim of its valorisation and to contribute to its necessary renovation.

REVISITING SCHINDLER, UNDERSTANDING GEHRY, LOS ANGELES 1921-1978

Carlos Labarta Aizpún

Studying the work of Schindler is interesting not only to recall the teachings of the most forgotten modern architecture pioneers but it basically comes out from the perception that his work anticipates and coincides with certain postulates that contemporary vanguard and critique have attributed as original to Canadian-Californian architect Frank Gehry. The beginning of his best known career, climaxing with his own house in Santa Monica, 1978, is directly linked with Schindler's attitudes, search and buildings to the point that is no longer possible to believe the myth supported by specialized critique of a supposed vanguard hiding its sources.

The first one of the coincidences sprouts out of the condition of both as foreign architects in Los Angeles as well as the link to the Mexican tradition exemplified in Schindler's Martin House (1915) and Gehry's Danzinger's House (1964). The Austrian

born architect maintains a search for the spatial possibilities of architecture since his first works specially the house at Kings Road (1921), avoiding any stylistic classification. This independence and placing space as the main goal of his buildings, such as the Tischler, Kallis, Armon, Lechner or Skolnik Houses from the 40s, foresees the visual techniques used by Gehry, introducing a spatial complexity based in the loss of orthogonality, in the variety of sections and the leading role of diagonal lines producing an apparently formal randomness as well as the acceptance of ambiguity and experimentation as project characteristics alternative to established manners.

The similarities in both architect's interests extend towards the expressive use of conventional materials such as metal mesh, corrugated metal or plywood beginning a new glance upon the architecture of second materiality in the second half of last century. Gehry and Schindler participate in a similar evolution of their language from two common realities: the use of wood and the attention to California's tradition understood as Los Angeles urban landscape and incorporating to architecture what others considered banal.

The permanence of fragility demonstrated in Janson's House (1949) magnifies Schindler's presence among contemporary vanguards. Schindler was in that sense, the first one to include a new formality beyond the symbolic image of the *machina* while including popular expressions from South California. This fusion implies an unquestionable contribution that Gehry will spread among contemporary clamours.

PACO GÓMEZ: ARQUITECTURA MAGAZINE PHOTOGRAPHER

Amparo Bernal López-Sanvicente

Francisco Gómez Martínez's (Pamplona 1918-Madrid 1998) career has provoked a great deal of thought and reflections. A self-taught photographer, he came close to photography when he was almost 40 years old finding the right medium for his artistic vocation. Gomez began his public life when he entered the Royal Photographic Society in 1956, joining Madrid's intellectual gatherings and discussions. Meeting other authors allowed him to direct the spreading and acknowledgement of his work thus fulfilling his intellectual need of growing and sharing his creative talent. His artistic concerns lead him to create La Palangana group together with Cualladó, Rubio Camín, Masats, Cantero and Ontañón. All of them belonged to a renovating generation of the School of Madrid and shared photographic discussions. A year later he joined AFAL, bounding together the most dynamic photographers in the country.

Rafael Alfonso Corral, an architect friend of his introduced him to Carlos de Miguel who discovered in Paco's first portfolio the right material for *Arquitectura* magazine. His contributions to the magazine were closely linked to his personal relationship with the publishing team, ending in 1973 when Carlos de Miguel abandoned his position. During the 15 year collaboration period there are many different stages combining the artist's professional goals and *Arquitectura's* publishing requirements. This mutual enrichment relationship allowed him to explore other ranges and his vocabulary evolved from the graphic abstractions of his first works towards the journalistic approach that turned Paco Gómez into an architectural photographer. His career as a whole had an evolution converse to other architecture photography professionals such as Kindel or Català Roca, who had turned journalistic photography into art.

Arquitectura became his true patron on contemporary photography. His contributions to the magazine allowed him to develop a professional photography career finding in journalistic work, what would turn into one of the most important trademarks of his work; his sensibility to portray the social reality, the urban landscape and the beauty of vernacular architecture.

His professional engagement offered him the opportunity to face the challenge of documenting architecture making him one of the most valued photographers for Spanish architects during those years. His thoughtful character that had made him known as the photographer of the walls and history footprints lead him to the abstract representation of architectural space, thus keeping the conceptual coherence in his work.

NOTES ON THE APPRAISAL OF THE ARCHITECT'S PHOTOGRAPHIC PORTRAIT: PACO GÓMEZ AND JUAN DANIEL FULLAONDO

Iñaki Bergera Serrano / Lucía C. Pérez Moreno

As it somehow happens when we deal with the photography of architecture, in any portrait there is a first substantial interest on documentation on an attempt to capturing the qualities of any person. During the 1960s, the Spanish Architectural magazine *Nueva Forma* used portraits on its covers. A criterion that contrasts with its contemporary magazine *Arquitectura* whose photographer, Paco Gómez, made a significant number of portraits of well-known Spanish architects of the period. Both cases are used in this text to analyze this genre under the scope of Spanish Architecture and, along with other references, articulate a reflection on critical aspects related to photography and, particularly, on the portraits of architects.

From 1959 to 1974, Paco Gómez was the official photographer of *Arquitectura*, the main journal of Spanish architecture based in Madrid. Along with Joaquín del Palacio –Kindel–, or Francesc Català-Roca, he was the visual reporter of that brilliant modern architecture of the period. In editorial line with Carlos Miguel, he illustrated the magazine with photographs of an imaginary alternative: chips walls, boxes, graffiti, wasteland with people, suburbs, and everything that extracted from its context and dotted with plastic counterpoint of a detail brought a new neorealist visual poetics. Also, his portraits show an emphatic and selective concentration of the essential qualities of the character. The portrait is understood as a visual essay of literary court, where stage, clothing, drawings or models are also a narrative element. Armed with the camera, the photographer “assaults” the portrayed and forces him to unfold himself into reality and appearance.

Juan Daniel Fullaondo used photographs of Numay, Català Roca, Carlos Jiménez or Pérez Aparisi, among others, to document the pages of *Nueva Forma*, the magazine he ran from 1967 to 1975. Therein, he opted to enhance the character of the architects using portraits as the key graphic feature on many covers. His impulsive rejection to histories based on series of buildings selected by the writer in favor of accounts written through the authors' career, led him to a biographical and psychological approach to the characters published in the journal. The need to classify and ‘face’ modern Spanish architects led him to use portraits as the best visual narrative to vindicate a certain model of professional.

The photographer Richard Avedon says that the best photos are those of people who met at the very moment of shooting them. Meanwhile, Dorothea Lange affirms that a portrait is always a self-portrait of the photographer, whereas a portrait could be alienating and dishonest. Between an honest portrait and an alienated one, or between Paco Gómez and *Nueva Forma*, there is a paradoxical tension that could denote suggestive interpretations when they are used by stories of architecture.

ARCHITECTURAL MAGAZINES (1900-1975): CHRONICLES, MANIFESTOS, PROPAGANDA

Héctor García-Diego

Under the title *Architectural magazines (1900-1975): chronicles, manifestos, propaganda* was held last spring (2012) the eighth edition of the *International Congress The History of Modern Spanish Architecture* at the University of Navarra. The School of Architecture was ready to receive the large number of researchers and historians who chose to participate in this forum, the greater ever assembled for this event. What it is a proof that the congresses of Pamplona have achieved to occupy a significant space in the architecture historian calendar, both nationally and internationally, on its own merit. Prior to this final phase, it was organized a preliminary symposium in October of the previous year (2011) in cooperation with the School of Architecture of the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Santiago de Chile; and one more in New York in November of the same year, this time in collaboration with the GSAPP at Columbia University. Therefore, the sessions at the School of Architecture at the University of Navarra between May 4th and 6th turn out to be the culmination of a long process of maturation, developed through a period of almost two years, being able to involve a great number of architectural historians of international prestige.

Despite being quite difficult to draw specific conclusions on such a broad topic, the different sessions and conferences has shown that the transcendental condition of journals –either as a channel for the expression of new concepts, or for the exposure of new aesthetic principles and goals, or the spread of certain ideals– has remained constant through the seventy-five years period proposed by the Congress. Although the magazines role has tilted towards a position, perhaps, less committed –or of a minor historical leadership–, his contribution is undeniable, and inalienable of the same history they both form part and aspire to represent.

NOTES OF BRITISH ARCHITECTURAL CULTURE 1945-1965

Kenneth Frampton

The abstract, white architecture of the inter-war British avant garde comes to a decisive end with the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939. As a result the postwar period emerges somewhat divided as to what should become the new architecture of the moment with which to accommodate the needs and express the values of a newly progressive society. Although the allocation of certain stylistic tropes to different, socio-cultural situations was not so categorical as in the pre-war totalitarian societies, there were nonetheless comparable semantic inflections in British architecture over the twenty-year period which followed the end of the war. This is perhaps first evident in the prefabricated, lightweight modular building systems adopted for both emergency housing and school building; respectively, for the accommodation of the bombed out population in the first instance and for the production of some 2500 schools in the second, most of which were built over the fifteen years between 1945 and 1960 as a consequence of the *Education Act*, put in place by the socialist government in 1946. Emergency housing needs were met by the minimalist, single story, prefabricated Portal house which was extensively built on vacant sites in major cities after the end of the war. The equally modular, prefabricated school system developed by the Ministry of Education came into being initially through the architect's department of the Hertfordshire County Council, under the direction of C. H. Aslin. In both instances what one effectively encountered was a lightweight, steel panel system, bereft of any recognizable iconography apart from the fact the internal walls of the schools were finished in primary colors and were furnished with stackable Scandinavian wood and metal furniture plus indoor plants; the whole often being set in diminutive picturesque landscape.

However this modular *lingua franca* could not be extended to the domestic environment. Here the heritage of the Garden City movement, dating back to the turn of the century, was pressed into service in a discretely modified form to constitute the two-story housing stock that made up the bulk of the residential fabric in the fourteen new towns established by the Labor government after the War as a result of the New Towns Act of 1948. This accounts for the single and semi-detached houses that became the vehicle so to speak, to which the so-called ‘peoples detailing’ was to be applied. This last comprised a repertoire of shallow-pitched, tile roofs, load-bearing, cavity walls in brick, along with casement opening lights and fixed picture windows in either steel or wood, which were invariably painted white. This amiable, unchallenging, anti-street, garden city aesthetic accessed through winding roads invariably engendered a somewhat informal site layout which, together with the detailing, came under the rubric of ‘contemporary’ as opposed to the received prewar idea of a severely abstract modern architecture. This conciliatory everyday style was favored by the left-wing architects of the London County Council who occupied mid-level positions within this 300 man architects department. I have in mind such figures as Oliver Cox and Graham Shankland both of whom were very influenced by the socially democratic architecture of the Swedish Welfare State. However this low-rise *heimatstil* principle of ‘people's detailing’ would be modified in the case of high-rise housing since flat roofs were deemed to be more appropriate for the capping of such forms. As it happens the preferred high-rise type was also of Swedish origin; namely, a 10-story tower block with a square footprint and a central access core, serving four apartments per floor, as this type occupy a large sector of the LCC Roehampton Estate dating from 1958.

The influence of local authorities at this time was very pervasive given that almost half of the registered architects in the country were employed by local governments and the remainder who were in private practice received most of their commissions from

the same source. As Reyner Banham would observe in his canonical study *The New Brutalism* of 1966, Cox and Shankland had close personal contacts with Sweden at the time, moreover as he reveals the term 'brutalist' originated as a qualifying adjective in Sweden. Banham cites a letter from 1956 written by Hans Asplund to Eric de Maré of *The Architectural Review*.

In January 1950 I shared offices with my esteemed colleagues Bengt Edman and Lennart Holm. These architects were at the time designing a house at Uppsala. Judging from their drawings I called them in a mildly sarcastic way 'Neo-Brutalists'. (The Swedish word for 'New Brutalists'!) The following summer, at jollification with some English friends, among whom were Michael Ventris, Oliver Cox and Graeme Shankland, the term was mentioned again in a jocular fashion. When I visited the same friends in London last year, they told me that they had brought the word back with them to England, and that it had spread like wildfire, and that it had, somewhat astoundingly, been adopted by a certain faction of younger English architects.

It is hard to imagine something more ironic than that the categorically anti-Swedish British Brutalist line should have at least part of its origin as a style in Sweden itself.

Despite the eclipse of the abstract British "international style" a certain vestige of a pre-war Neo-Corbusian syntax was carried over into the postwar period, most notably in the work of Lubetkin and Tecton, particularly as this applied to the rather formalistic medium-rise apartment blocks that the firm designed for the East End of London between 1945 and 1955. Typified by their Spa Green Estate built in Finsbury in 1956, this ornamental manner could hardly be more removed from the aforementioned 'peoples detailing'. The Tecton slab blocks were invariably animated by syncopated faience screens running across the balconied face of each block. Lubetkin's syntax was also evident in the plan articulation and detailing of the Royal Festival Hall realized under the direction of Leslie Martin who was then chief architect of the LCC and designed by Peter Moro who had worked for Tecton prior to the Second World War.

A second figure, from the prewar era, was David du R. Aberdeen, who also seems to have cultivated a 'baroque' Neo-Corbusian manner as we find this elaborated in his Trades Union Headquarters built near Bedford Square in 1951 and faced in polished stone. This New Monumentality *après la lettre* could hardly be made to jibe with the pitched roof populism of the New Town vernacular or with the lightweight modular manner of the prefabricated schools.

In many respects 1951 is the *annus mirabilis* of postwar recovery as far as British architecture is concerned, for this not only sees the realization of the Festival of Britain and the Royal Festival Hall, but also the Coventry Cathedral Competition for which Alison and Peter Smithson submitted a totally radical shell concrete form encompassing the entire plan of a diamond ecclesiastical space.

It is clear that the inspiration behind the Festival of Britain was the social democratic Stockholm Exhibition of 1930 which under the direction of the architect Gunnar Asplund and the critical intellectual Gregor Paulson would effectively inaugurate a new egalitarian middle class culture, closely linked fields of architecture and industrial design. As far as the propagation of popular good taste was concerned the Festival of Britain followed Stockholm to the letter with its playful tubular metal chairs, in primary colors designed by Ernest Race and the popular slogan of Black Eyes and Lemonade which summed up the playful spirit of the occasion. Like Stockholm, the Festival conveyed a mixed message as far as received taste in architecture was concerned in as much as both exhibitions celebrated Constructivist architecture as a built manifestation of a newly emergent techno-scientific society. I have in mind in the case of Stockholm Asplund's stressed skin control cabin elevated on stilts and capped by a latticework publicity mast while the parallel engineering rhetoric in the Festival was patently the Skylon; a latticework, cigar-shaped pylon stayed by wire cables designed by Powell and Moya in collaboration with the engineer Felix Samuely equally dematerialized stressed-skin dome of the Dome of Discovery by Ralph Tubbs supported at its rim by steel latticework struts as a kind of tethered flying saucer. Overall however what Alvar Aalto wrote about the Stockholm Exhibition in 1930 could have been applied just as easily to the Festival of Britain twenty years later, to the effect that:

... This is not a composition of glass, stone and steel, as a visitor who despises functionalism might imagine; it is a composition of houses, flags, floodlights, flowers, fireworks, happy people and clean table cloths.

Be this as it may, a discernible schism emerged not only between the left wing 'peoples detailing' of the low-rise domestic architecture such as find in Frederick

Gibberd's Harlow New Town, but also between those who would look to pure engineering technique as the source for a new unprecedented tectonic language as this is attempted in the shell concrete Brynmawr Rubber Factory designed by the Architect's Co-partnership in 1952 in collaboration with the engineer Ove Arup. The main alternative was to look for an authentic form of expression in the street culture of the then still extant British working class. This split is already discernible in the early work of Alison and Peter Smithson which served to oscillate between heroic engineering form on the one hand as we find this in the competition entries for their Neo-Miesian Hunstanton School Norfolk of 1949 and their Nervi-like Coventry Cathedral of 1951 and, on the other, the as found sociological 'otherness' of the nineteenth century two-story worker's row housing which, comprised of brick walls and slate roofs, made up the fabric and provided the setting for everyday life in the Bye Law streets of Bethnal Green. The Smithsons first experienced this culture through visiting the Bethnal Green home of Nigel and Judith Henderson; the one a photographer and the other a sociologist and where the one captured the street life of the arena on film, the other studied its kinship structure. *The Lore and Language of School Children* published in 1959 by the sociologists Iona and Peter Opie documented the role played by the culture of the street in the evolution of this society.

That Henderson and the sculptor Eduardo Paolozzi were crucial to the evolution of the sensibility of the Smithsons would be borne out by the patio and pavilion which made up their joint contribution to the seminal White Chapel Gallery exhibition *This is Tomorrow* of 1956. This 'anti-consumerist' reworking of the Abbé Langier's primitive hut plus a double spread image of all four of them incongruously seated in the middle of Limmerson Street in London, running across the spiral binding of the catalogue, eloquently summed up their *l'art brut* approach. This ethos was reinforced by a poetic inscription in 'child-like' script asserting the anti-idealistic ethnographic archaism of the content.

Patio & pavilion represents the fundamental necessities of the human habitat in a series of symbols. The first necessity is for a piece of the world –the patio; the second necessity is for an enclosed space –the pavilion. These two spaces are furnished with symbols for all human needs. The head –for man himself– his brain and his machines. The tree –for nature. The rocks and natural objects for stability and the decoration of man-made space. The light box for the hearth and family. Artifacts and pin ups –for his irrational urges. The frog and the dog –for the other animals. The wheel and aeroplane for locomotion and the machine.

Although James Stirling and the Smithsons would rival each other throughout the trajectory of their separate careers it is of the utmost significance as far as Brutalism is concerned that they would both cultivate a 'smokestack' aesthetic in their varied iterations of a native brick vernacular irrespective of whether the location was urban and rural. This mutual sensibility surely accounts for the similarity between a number of 'degree zero' works projected and realized by these separate practices during the first half of the 50's. I have in mind as far as the Smithsons are concerned the small warehouse-like four-story infill terrace house in brick and concrete projected for the Soho area of London in 1952. Of this work they wrote: "had this been built, it would have been the first exponent of 'the new brutalism' in England".

And equally primitive syncopated exercise in load-bearing brickwork also characterizes the remarkable housing projects realized by Stirling and Gowan in 1955 and 1957; respectively, their 3-story Ham Common flats built on a verdant site in Richmond in 1955 and the 3 to 4 story terrace housing built as a fragmented block in Preston, Lancashire in 1957. The overall cultural intention informing the latter sets forth even more explicitly than any text by the Smithsons the common sensibility of the moment as far as their mutual essays in low-rise, low-cost housing was concerned. Thus we read:

In 19th century industrial 'by-law' towns you pass perhaps twenty or more front doors before coming to your own, with children playing in the roads, parents chatting on the pavement and sitting in doorways, and the old peering through windows. This horizontal approach through the neighborhood to get to your house seems to be a reason for the friendliness and sense of community which exists in these work towns and the 19th century solution seems more dynamic than the latter planning solutions for urban mass housing...

In the initial *oeuvre complete* published in 1975, Stirling and Gowan make it clear that this 'nostalgia for the slums' was a broad postwar British sensibility that extended well beyond architecture and could be found in artists as diverse as the novelist Somerset Maugham, the painter L.S. Lowry and George Orwell for his 1945 working

class epic *On the Road to Wigan Pier*. This was also the environment that the Smithsons wished to evoke in their 10-story 'street-in-the-air' Golden Lane Housing competition entry of 1952, the span-deck access of which would be realized at a more exposed scale in the Parkhill Housing built to the designs of Jack Lynn and Ivor Smith for the Sheffield City Council in 1961. This achievement proved at a larger, more windswept scale, the truth of the cryptically critical observation that: "above the 6th floor it can be accepted that the old forms of contact with the ground are no longer valid".

This mutual nostalgia for a declining 'vernacular' would also have its rural version in the work of both of these practices in the early 50's as we may judge from Stirling's village infill housing prototype exhibited at the CIAM X congress at Aix-en-Provence in 1953 which was inspired by Thomas Sharp's 1945 study *The English Village*. A more or less identical theme expressly designed for the same occasion made up the substance of the Smithsons' 'fold houses' ostensibly designed for West Burton in Yorkshire of which they wrote in *Uppercase 3* of 1955.

The new is placed over the old like a new plant growing through old branches—or new fruit on old twigs. The fold is a windbreak. Each house has its back to the prevailing wind. Instead of the 'housing Manual' type of house, sent down from the suburbs—a barrow boy on the fells.

Sixty years later the oblique references in this statement may be easily missed (i.e. the contempt of the authors for the bureaucratic imposition of petit bourgeois) for what is conjoined in their predilection for 'barrow bow' street culture as a means for revitalizing the existing rural vernacular of the Yorkshire hills.

In a resume of the "Parallel Life and Art" exhibition staged by the Smithsons, Paolozzi, and Henderson at the Institute for Contemporary Arts (ICA) in London in 1953, the Smithsons openly acknowledge how both themselves and Stirling & Gowan were equally involved with the so-called 'brutalist' ideology emerging out of the Independent Group that met at the ICA in the early 50's, comprising such figures as Reyner Banham, Theo Crosby, Colin St John Wilson, Richard Hamilton and Laurence Alloway, this last being the critic/curator of the exhibition *This is Tomorrow*. Two canonical buildings of the mid 60's respectively already suggest how these two practices will evolve from their mutual beginnings over the next decade as we may judge from the Smithsons' Economist Building realized in St James Street, London in 1963 and Stirling and Gowan's Engineering Faculty Building, Leicester University completed in 1964. Although both buildings comprise medium-rise towers with The Economist topping out at 17 stories and Leicester rising for 11 floors, the first inserted into dense urban fabric is unequivocally Sittesque and Neo-Miesian in character, while the second is a free-standing, Neo-Constructivist work. By this date quite different positions seem to have been established with the Smithsons opting for modular tectonic pieces having latent classical affinities and Stirling going for more strenuously organic assemblies with partial references to Louis Kahn and Alvar Aalto, with last affinity coming more fully into its own with Stirling's dormitories for St. Andrew's University in Scotland also realized in the 60's. The British 19th century engineering tradition is present as a key expressive element as far as the Leicester Engineering Building is concerned (shades of the Crystal Palace and Brunel) while in St. Andrews while we are witness to a concrete and glass essay surprisingly reminiscent of the Smithsons in their Sheffield University competition entry of 1953. At the same time there are faint traces of the Gothic Revival evident in both Leicester and The Economist. In the first instance, on Stirling's own admission, Leicester makes an allusion to William Butterfield's All Saints Margaret Street, London of 1849-59, while in the case of the Economist Gothic is latent in the structural mullions of the building which step back like attenuated buttresses in order to express the diminution of the load as they rise upwards as in the stepped piers of Mies van de Rohe's Promontory Apartments of 1949.

As opposed to The Economist which, as fate would have it, brought the Smithsons' building career to a virtual close in terms of achieving works of comparable status and size, the Leicester Engineering Building gave Stirling and Gowan a run of university commissions culminating in leading to what has more recently recognized as the Red Trilogy on account of the fact that they were all faced in red brick and tile, namely in sequence after Leicester the History Faculty Building at Cambridge University (1964) and the Florey Dormitory at Queen's College, Oxford (1966). All of these major works by the Smithsons and Stirling involved the creative participation of the brilliant structural engineers Ron Jenkins of Ove Arup and Partners in the case the Hunstanton

School in Norfolk of 1949-54, and Frank Newby of Felix Samuely and Partners in the case of the Red Trilogy and St Andrews University.

With the appointment of Leslie Martin to the professorship of architecture at Cambridge University in 1956 the creative patronage of the 'brutalist' sensibility shifted from London to Cambridge and with this change in leadership and focus the so-called movement entered its maturity. However before turning to the exceptionally fertile studio set up in Cambridge by Martin and Colin St. John it is necessary to comment in passing on the importance of certain training offices on the London scene in the 50's and the 60's above all the practice of Lyons Israel and Ellis which served as a proving ground for the next generation, namely, John Miller and Neave Brown, both of whom worked closely with Tom Ellis; in the first instance on an annex to the Old Vic Theatre (1958) and in the second on a stacked lecture theatres in fair-faced, reinforced (white) concrete, for the Wolfson Institute at Hammersmith Hospital (1961). Patrick Hodgkinson was the third architect of exceptional talent from the same year at the AA School. As it happens Hodgkinson would play a seminal role in the development of a normative modern Aaltoesque brick aesthetic appropriate to the British climate as this would issue from the Martin/St. Wilson Studio from 1956 onwards; most notably in terms of Hodgkinson's direct involvement, load bearing brick 3-story terrace housing projected for St. Pancras, London in 1959 and the student hostel for Caius College, dating from 1962. That Hodgkinson was the decisive behind these works is testified to by the house in Burrel's Field, Cambridge that Hodgkinson realized for the retiring master of Trinity College, Lord Adrian, in 1964. Hodgkinson would assert his ultimate prowess as an independent architect with his monumental urban set-piece known as the Brunswick Centre under development and re-development between 1965 and 1973.

It is possible to argue that the Brunswick Centre is an ultimate Neo-Brutalist work at an urban scale since executed throughout in *béton brut* establishes itself as a city-in-miniature, that is as a micro-cosmic city with the city, one which breaks totally within the traditional Georgian square and street patten by which it is confronted on the Marchmont Street side. It has the problematic character of being conceived in section rather than in plan in as much as it comprises two stepped five-story housing blocks facing each other across a central promenade axis, flanked with shops throughout its length plus a cinema at the point of a monumental transverse axis lead to a nearby park.

Like Hodgkinson Miller was also working in the Martin/St. John Wilson in Cambridge before opening up his own practice with Alan Colquhoun in 1960 with a commission to design a secondary school in Stratford in East London which is completed in 1964. Like Caius College, it is significant that this two story, load-bearing structure occupies a perfect square in plan from into which voids are 'excavated' as it were in order to produce the figure of the school which in its turn is wrapped a central square double-height assembly hall.

It is obvious in retrospect that the plan of this school is closely related to the interlocking square top-lit reading rooms that Martin and St. John Wilson designed for the new Oxford University library complex under construction from 1959 to 1979. It is possibly fair to say that that the British 'neo-brutalist' sensibility much influenced by Aalto plays itself out in the work of Martin and his colleagues, throughout the 70's in what was one final effort to create a normative modern architecture for the British Isles to be executed primarily in brick.

