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1.1 In the beginning was the phrase...

One of the more ironic aspects of the recent history of architecture is that the invention of the term 'The New Brutalism' should already be shouted in historical terms. But the fact is that it occurred as recently as the early nineteen-sixties and under conditions which should have rendered the whole process visible to any historian who was interested. The mystification derives from two simple circumstances: one, that the term was coined, in essence, before there existed any architectural movement for it to describe; two, that it was then redefined to describe a particular movement, in which it served as a reference point, rather than as an extension of one's own interests. This was the year that the term 'The New Brutalism' came to be used by the Courtauld Institute of Art to describe a particular movement in which it was introduced to the public at the time. In fact, this was a classic example of how the term was used to express the newfound importance of modern architecture, which was the only place where newly-crafted buildings could find work in the early nineteen-sixties, and the quarter was kept open and alive by one dominant factor - that the social consciousness of the older architects in the Department had, in many cases, hardened into an acceptance of Communist doctrine.

1.2 Polcien before Kosovo

The English context into which the Swedish phrase was dropped was one of violent and sustained polemics on style, such as England had not seen since the nineteen-thirties. Though very little of this polemic took root, it reached the public print at the time. In part, this was a classic example of how the term was used, because the name of the person behind the polemic, which was almost the only place where newly-crafted buildings could find work in the early nineteen-sixties, and the quarter was kept open and alive by one dominant factor - that the social consciousness of the older architects in the Department had, in many cases, hardened into an acceptance of Communist doctrine.

Such a development might well have been anticipated - social consciousness in architecture is an English tradition that has been a constant in the very early works of the LCC Architect's Department, especially in the first half of the nineteen-sixties. It had been greatly influenced both by the social attitudes of distinguished refugee-architects like Gropius, and by the 'Popular Front' policies of the Swedish Civil War (an event which took place in the context of the English intelligentsia). Many architects who returned to their calling (or at least to their activities) after World War II, fought to make the world safe for a new kind of horizontality, as well as for the first post-war election. In 1945, it was not unimportant that they had in this sense been talking to each other, and how that something, even something as small as 'The New Brutalism', had passed the English architectural community. For when Peter Smithson's first paper was given in the Architectural Review in 1953, it was not unimportant that the English architectural community...
'The New Humanists', which was in itself a reworking of a title invented by the 'Architectural Review' for the Swedish retreat from Modern Architecture: The New Empiricism. Given the polemical circumstances, the phrase 'The New Brutalism' clearly has strong elements of parody of both the other movements, which — in practice — are often very difficult to tell apart when built. Both exhibited cottage-sized aspirations, a style based on a sentimental regard for nineteenth-century vernacular usages, with off-cuts, posts, brick or rendered walls, window-boxes, balconies, pretty pantiles, a tendency to elaborate woodwork detailing, and freely picturesque grouping on the ground. The smaller housing in the Altom East section of the LGO's new-famous Rheydtener Estate, through designed by Zhdanov precepts (albeit completed after Knudsen's revisions) could equally be a demonstration of the New Empiricism as Nikolai Peinov observed, its inspiration is Swedish.

The introduction of Peinov's name at this point is appropriate, the kind of architecture to which the young Brutalists objected had another ideological support that was not swept away by Knudsen's denunciations: the 'Architectural Review', whose enthusiasm for picturesque planning at this time has still not been forgiven by some of the Brutalist generation. Throughout the war years Peinov, and others such as H F Clark, had been researching into the origins and practice of English picturesque planning1 in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and on the basis 'von de Wolffe' pseudonym of one of the Review's editors was later to demand a full-scale theory of 'Townscape'? Such a theory was to proceed from the 'found' or given elements of an any planning problem, and by awarding the highest valuation to these elements, was even more empirically than Swedish housing-design of the period. Such an approach, which 'judges every case on its merits', etc, stands on a firm tradition of British Liberalism, democracy and common law, but it seemed of absolutely titular value to a younger generation to whom the given elements of the planning process seemed to be of social chaos, a world of ruin, the prospect of collective annihilation, and architectural standards on the part of their elders.

This last was the aspect of the situation that disturbed them most profoundly. The fundamental command of picturesque theory, to 'dismantle the genius of the place in all', (a term from Alexander Pope that was much employed by the 'Architectural Review') seemed to be employed to justify, even sanctify, a willingness to compromise away every 'real architectural value, in surrender to all that was most prosaic and second-rate in British social and intellectual life. There were, of course, understandable historical reasons for this 'soft' attitude on the part of the middle-aged generation. They had been defending some version of the British way of life from points all over the globe in World War II, but the quality of that way of life was being steadily reduced (especially in the arts) by isolation from those centres, such as Paris, which had traditionally exercised both a stimulating and a steadying influence on the British intelligentsia.

Thus, in England, there had grown up during the war a romantic and fashionably modest school of landscape/townscape painting, exemplified by the work of John Piper and Graham Sutherland, and the vision of this school was influential in preparing a mood of elegant despair that affected many branches of British culture in the ensuing peace. Thus, Piper, who contributed a dust-jacket to the classic monument of post-war intellectual self-pity, Cyril Connolly's 'The Unquiet Grave', also executed both the dust-jacket and the illustrations to 'The Castle on the Ground', a specimen example of wartime 'home thoughts from abroad', a sentimental evocation (written in Cairo) of the virtues and heroic domes of Victorian Suburbia, composed by the distinguished critic J M Richards, also an editor of the 'Architectural Review', like Peinov. This book in particular was regarded by the young as a bland betrayal of everything that Modern Architecture was supposed to stand for, and a worse act of treachery in that it had been written by the man whose 'Introduction to Modern Architecture', had indeed served to introduce many of them to the art of architecture.

There can be no doubt that these wartime experiences had served to confound the aims and blunt the intellectual attack of the men to whom were entrusted such major enterprises as the design of the first generation of New Towns, or the Festival of Britain in 1951. The younger generation, viewing these works, had the depressing sense that the drive was going out of Modern Architecture and pure design being diluted by politicians and compromisers who had lost their intellectual nerve. Young architects, of course, were not the only members of their generation to feel sentiments like this. Their result has been compared to the rise of the 'Red-British' novelists and the 'Angry Young Man' in the British theatre, but while it is true that many of the Brutalists hail from 'Red-Black' universities and held the kind of absolute and uncompromising views that characterises the Angry Young Men, the fact remains that the first...
appearance of the New Brutalist attitude precedes by some years the first "Angry" play, 'Look Back in Anger', and they flatly rejected the provincial background of which novalists like John Win and Kingsley Amis made so much. Instead, they deliberately sought out non-provincial standards and measured themselves against international figures. Refusing empiricism, compromise or picturesque traditionalism, they set up as their standards men like Le Corbusier, Mies van der Rohe, Philip Johnson (still in his Mission phase), Alvar Aalto or Ernesto Rogers. They rejected their immediate predecessors in Britain, except perhaps Wells Coates, always true to a Puritan aesthetic, and Berthold Lubetkin, the distinguished Russian refugee whose political convictions had never led him to compromise with vernacular standards, much to the embarrassment of the Communist architects in Britain. As early as CIAM VIII in 1951, the young had irrevered the congress in order to sit at the feet of 'grandma maters' whose views they could respect (whatever may have happened later) in preference to listening to their English teachers whom they were fast coming to despise. At the same time they seemed to be setting out to find a historical base for their architectural convictions outside the English tradition. Here again, Perwener was an authority they had to reject. Not only did his 'Pioneers of the Modern Movement' place a very high valuation on the English contribution to the rise of Modern Architecture, but he had alien, in an essay published in April 1954, made a strong case for the continuing use of picturesque methods even in architects like Le Corbusier. This article was consciously intended as a contribution to the public debate on the Picturesque theme in process; it was written in reply to a radio talk in which Baxi Taylor (an aesthetic philosopher then in vogue) had attacked the corrosive influence of picturesque practice, and Perwener provoked a spirited reply from Alan Colmeen, an important, though largely unpublished, contributor to the architectural ideas of the younger generation. What this generation sought was historical justifications for its own attitudes, and it sought them in two main areas of history - the traditions of Modern Architecture itself, and the far longer traditions of classicism. In the first tradition, they had particular emphasis on the forerunners - not only on Le Corbusier and Mies van der Rohe, but also on such figures as Rethveld (whose Schröder house was described by Peter Smithson as 'the only truly canonical modern building in Europe') - a striking and suggestive turn of phrase by Hugo Hering, whose name at the time they knew only through a tiny illustration in a relatively obscure book, Bruno Tafel's 'Modern Architecture', of 1939. The degree of sophistication about the history of Modern Architecture was remarkable by world standards at that time.

their sophistication about classicism was remarkable for its peculiar interests rather than its extent. Most of this generation had passed through some form of modern Reaun-Arts training (though Peter Smithson enrolled deliberately at the Royal Academy schools in London, in the hope of acquiring a more convincing form of classical expertise), all had had their interest in classicism confirmed by their readings in Le Corbusier, but all came very directly under the influence of the brilliant revival of Palladian studies in England in the late Forties, either directly through Rudolf Wittkower and his book 'Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism', or through the teaching of his outstanding pupil, Colin Rowe. Like many others among them, Rowe believed that there was direct architectural reference between the classical past and the work of twentieth-century masters. Thus, while Ruth Gilboy and John Voelcker could say in 'Architectural Design', 'It is seldom that chance lining in the publication of two books has been so fortunate as in the case of Dr Wittkower's Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism and Le Corbusier's Modulor';... each book illuminates the significance of the other, and through them both it becomes possible to see the origins of many issues which are very much alive among architects at the present time.' Rowe was taking this bridge-building technique between ancient and modern much further in two influential essays (published, ironically enough, in 'The Architectural Review' entitled, 'The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa' (comparing Palladio and Le Corbusier) and 'Humanism and Modern Architecture' (a wider review of precedents in what was then an intellectually fashionable period of art history). Somewhere in this amalgamation of ancient and modern exemplars of architectural order, there was thought to lie the real and true architecture implied in the title of Le Corbusier's first book 'Vernacular Architecture', the image of a convincing and coherent architecture that their elders had lost, and their teachers could no longer find. In spite of the accusations of Formalism levelled at them by their elders (some seemed to revel in the label - a small house by John Voelcker was published as an example of 'The New Formalism', with his approval, and a garland of references to Wittkower, Palladio and the Modulor) this generation of architects just approaching the age of thirty at the moment when the Smithsons accepted the title Brutalist, turned consciously to the great formal-givers of their time for inspiration - to Frank Lloyd Wright, but above all to Mies van der Rohe and Le Corbusier. *  

* Architectural Design, October 1954 - the tendency to combine all sorts of diverse 'classical' authorities exemplified here, is entirely typical of the British attitude to the 'Classical Tradition'. In the British view, the importance of that tradition lay in its intellectual disciplines (proportion, symmetry) and habits of mind (order, regularity) rather than matters of detail. Thus, the revival of interest in the primitive house-classicism of Lord Burlington's Palladian Revival (1717–1720) led Voelcker to propose 'Palladio's plan' for electrical generating stations, but the Palladianism was restricted to an abstract plan-spar plan-spar, and did not involve even room-shapes, let alone the detailing of the situations. 

"Watermelon" (David Hockney) and the Skyline (Powell and Mouton Beyond) 

Page 14
Yet his appraisal and resolution of this problem was the very opposite of defeatist. Out of a superficially discouraging situation, Le Corbusier conjured concrete almost as a new masterwork, and his new buildings are, among others, those of the wooden formwork, to produce an architectural surface of a rugged grandeur that seems to echo that of the well-washed black marbles of temples in Magna Graecia — it was not a question of Architectures, Le Corbusier himself described the concrete work at Marseille as Salis in an article in the English translation of the original text, he knew that it promised not a new architecture, but simply architecture as he had always been and always would be, as Le Corbusier believed the term had been understood by Perret, by Phyllis, by Manierist or Michelangelesque after having vouchsafed his younger readers a vision of a grandiose Mediterranean architectural tradition.

An historian might object that they were in error in interpreting the ‘Unité’ in the light of a book written twenty years earlier, and yet that book offered a phrase that seemed a veritable key to the magisterial and magisterial authority of Mediterranean (and of all other good architecture as well): ‘L’Architecture, c’est avant, des malheurs brutes établit des rapports éminents’. To construct most relationships out of brute materials was to be the central ambition of Brutalism.
The grammar of it is filled out with detailed usages. As Mark H. Llewellyn Davies wrote in "Architectural De- sign" (at that time the preferred magazine of the young generation) "Misses takes the elements in a piece of building, and sets them together in a manner that is most characteristic of themselves, and in these positions they make spaces and architecture." Hartland Thomas had seen the buildings for himself and could appreciate the importance of their purely material qualities even in the details, but very few other contributors to the English architectural po- liticised. Faced with usages such as Misses's manner of turning the corners of the building with a milder plastic incident, they did not see the structural logic and material ingenuity of this detail. Indeed, they saw a philosophical problem in abstract aesthetics: did the failure of the two wall planes to meet at the corner mean that Misses's facets were to be read as literal determinate? 

This question (meaningfully, only to those who know the buildings through such abstract represent- ations as plans and photographs, but not in the result) was first raised by Richard Llewellyn Davies in a paper given at the Architectural Association, and could only have been propounded in the histori- cally sophisticated mental atmosphere of English architectural debate at the time, involving (as it does) reference to Mondriaan's concept of the rect- angle as an impure form bounded by lines which intersect but do not stop at the intersection. From this proposition, Llewellyn-Davies, like Gerhard Kall- man in his influential article on the impact of technology which had appeared in a special issue of the Architectural Review (on America), went on to the idea of an endless or indeterminate architecture, in which unit of accommodation could be added or sub- tracted with altering the aesthetic quality. Though the Brutalists (and their ever younger suc- cessors) have always been ready to fit this with this idea, it included its application to Misses van der Rohe, insisting on the regular symmetry of the composition of the facade of the buildings at IIT, and their axiomatic plan. They also --- and this was wish- ful thinking --- believed that Misses made conscious use of the Golden Section in designing his build- ings. There has never been any convincing evidence from the Misses office to support this proposition; it was purely the invention of one esteemed ma- ster, of the 'Modular' mystique of the other. For the 'Modular' was an extremely lively topic at the time, it was impossibly a new finding. In spite of the difficulties of using it in practice, it seemed to stand for a principle of reliable mathe- matical order against the sea of compromise and ar- chitectural irresponsibility, and it was easier to visual- ise such a proportion system against the back- ground of a seemingly flat and diagrams facade of the type found at IIT, than to bend and fold it to the deformed plasticity of the Unité. The fusion of the Misses-image with the Corbus-e image is an understandable, if philosophically reprehensible, step towards the creation of the kind of single vis- ion of a real and convincing architecture that this generation sought.

3 Secondary School, Hunstanton

The first building completed in the world to be cal- led 'Modernist' (by its architects, the architecture school at Hunstanton in Norfolk. In chronological fact, it had been designed to experiment with the New Brutalism first uttered the words 'Neo-Brutalism' since it was the winning entry in a competition held in 1958. Not only was it the first in a long line of prize-winning projects as strong as the Smithsons then were, a memorable event, but that it should go on to an extreme was equally remarkable, since Denis Clarke-Hall, the assessor, was not a modernist, although he had been one of the pioneers of modern school design in Britain. But, by the time the school was completed in 1954, the Smithsons had become offended and the form New Brutalism was rapidly gaining cur- rency outside Britain --- a circumstance which clearly showed that the issue of education that 1959 had stressed the need for to admire the school, but not the Brutalist programme which had subsequently become attached to it. The reason for the long delay between design and com- pletion was one of those epistemic stitiches of the post-war epoch which continuously interrupted building work, but nevertheless Le Corbusier had turned such a crisis to advantage at the Unité the Smithsons were too young and absolutist to consider scrapping the deeply pondered work that had been put into the steel-framed design for Hunstanton. It would be visible steel or nothing.

While the insistence on visible steel gives a clear indication of the stylistic affinities of Hunstanton, there are some striking and important differences from the buildings at IIT, differences which were largely, and understandably, overlooked at the time. To begin with, the risk of the facades being laid out in a grid of rectangles, in the Llewellyn-Davies sense. At the expense of some of Misses van der Rohe's intellectu- al clarity, the building makes neat and unobtrusive com- plexities, and closed the symmetry of the compos- ition of the major elaborations of both the school pro- per and its gymnasium is immediately striking to the eye. This is particularly so in the gymnasia- um which, being a single volume, reveals the more clearly its symmetry inside and out. In the larger block housing the school proper, the external porches, even if it is 'obvious. The central multi-purpose hall is placed across the shorter axis, and is flanked by two open light courts. The rest of the accommodation --- service rooms, heavy and dirty areas, on the ground floor --- are grouped in such a way that the roof above is disposed in a large rectangular loop encircling these three central voids. The main eleva- tions are expressed in terms of room-sized areas of total glazing, or room-sized panels of blank white brickwork, either for privacy or as wind-brac- ing for the structure. However, the symmetry of the plan and of the elevational pattern, should not be seen as major architectural objectives of the design, the however full the 'architects' minds may have been of Wittlowian or Palladian ideas. The formal clarity, like the reliance on almost total glazing of working areas, is to be seen as part of a determination to make the whole conception of the building plain and comprehensible. No mystery, no romanticism, no obscurities about function or circulation. In this, it succeeded almost as well as the Smithsons' own school, which was the very school that was Hunstanton. In fact, it was interested in one section of an architectural opinion in England that had become committed to empirical satisfying, in spite of its manifest importance in the development of Eng- lish architectural ideas (the Architectural Review, called it 'the most important idea in Britain'); it does not form part of the collection of slides as- sembled by J M Richards for the third official lectur- ers sent abroad by the British Council. But is this was enough to make shock, not only to architectural romantics but to educational sentimentalists as well, was the attitude of the architect to the materials of which the school was constructed.

The basic framing is of partly prestressed plate fra- mes, calculated according to the Plasticity econo- my (then an innovation, and in its turn an innovation on the contract). The floors and roof slabs are built up of pre-cast concrete slabs, some are exposed concrete, with bars that are inside the concrete (the bars that are exposed on the side are invisible) and are placed on both sides, others are placed on the outside and left as exposed concrete. The reinforcement is monolithic, the Smithsons were one of the first to use it, and they have faith in the idea that this sort of constructivism will work, they have faith in the idea that this sort of constructivism will work, and their faith has been justified in some schools that have been completed, although the Smithsons have beenactive in the field of experimental materials, although the Smithsons have beenactive in the field of experimental materials, although the Smithsons have beenactive in the field of experimental materials, although the Smithsons have beenactive in the field of experimental materials.
Handfield Hall (1909–1937) as a prime example of this tendency. He did not go on to note that Handfield’s architect had the same name as Hunstanton’s—though spelled Smythson—but other commentaries were not so slow off the mark.

Those who damned the Hunstanton School for merely ‘importing a foreign style’ missed its intense Englishness. Those who damned—or praised—it for its Brutalism were on more secure ground. Even so, some influential critics doubted whether it was really an example of the New Brutalism. Thus Philip Johnson, who probably knew the Smithsons and their background as well as anyone on the international scene, observed in the ‘Architectural Review’ at the end of a glowing critique of Hunstanton:

“Now that the Smithsons have turned against such formalistic and ‘constructed’ designs toward an Adolfo Loos type of Anti-Design which they call the New Brutalism (a phrase which is already being picked up by the Smithsons’ contemporaries to define... scrutinies)...”

while the ‘review’ added in a footnote:

“The architects themselves would certainly disagree with Mr. Johnson’s separation of Hunstanton from the New Brutalist canon, even though the form had not been coined when the school was designed.”

The situation was becoming confused by the many things that happened to the Smithsons, its architecture in Britain and the world, and the word Brutalist itself, which was being heavily overworked already.
The Hall was part of the campus with the Main Library (centre) and the Classrooms Building (right).

Right:
The main entrance of the Hall (1960s).
4.3 Progress to a-sformalism

As has been said, Hunstanton School was finally published in a situation in which the words 'The New Brutalists' were already circulating and had acquired some of the meaning through things said and seen and the widely recognised connection with 'brutalism'. But these were all still belonging to the world of the Smithsons, however; and it was their activities above all others that were giving distinctive qualities to the concept of Brutalism. Outstanding among these activities was the exhibition 'Parallel of Life and Art' held during the British Pavillion in the summer of 1959 at the Palazzo della Ragione, Milan. A complex undertaking which has proved successful, the exhibition dealt with a whole range of issues in the context of Brutalism, including the relationship between architecture and art, the role of the artist, the relationship between architecture and technology, and the role of the public in the process. The exhibition was held in an art gallery (The Institute of Contemporary Arts) and was divided into five sections: 'Parallel of Art', 'Parallel of Life and Art', 'Parallel of Art and Science', 'Parallel of Life and Art', and 'Parallel of Life and Art'. The exhibition was a deliberate attempt to break away from the traditional concept of art as an isolated activity and to bring it into a dialogue with other forms of creativity. The show was a success and was praised by many critics, including the famous art critic Clement Greenberg.

The exhibition was a continuation of the work done by the Smithsons in previous projects, such as the Royal Festival Hall and the Trellick Tower. It was a continuation of the idea of a Brutalist architecture that was based on a complex of three ideas: the idea of a new relationship between architecture and the city, the idea of a new relationship between architecture and nature, and the idea of a new relationship between architecture and technology. The exhibition was a way of bringing these ideas together and of showing how they could be used to create a new kind of architecture.

The exhibition was a success and was praised by many critics, including the famous art critic Clement Greenberg. The show was a success and was praised by many critics, including the famous art critic Clement Greenberg. The exhibition was a continuation of the work done by the Smithsons in previous projects, such as the Royal Festival Hall and the Trellick Tower. It was a continuation of the idea of a Brutalist architecture that was based on a complex of three ideas: the idea of a new relationship between architecture and the city, the idea of a new relationship between architecture and nature, and the idea of a new relationship between architecture and technology. The exhibition was a way of bringing these ideas together and of showing how they could be used to create a new kind of architecture.

The exhibition was a success and was praised by many critics, including the famous art critic Clement Greenberg. The show was a success and was praised by many critics, including the famous art critic Clement Greenberg. The exhibition was a continuation of the work done by the Smithsons in previous projects, such as the Royal Festival Hall and the Trellick Tower. It was a continuation of the idea of a Brutalist architecture that was based on a complex of three ideas: the idea of a new relationship between architecture and the city, the idea of a new relationship between architecture and nature, and the idea of a new relationship between architecture and technology. The exhibition was a way of bringing these ideas together and of showing how they could be used to create a new kind of architecture.
The radicalism lies in an attempt to see what they were designing as a complete environment for human beings, not just the provision of a certain number of bedrooms, living rooms, kitchens and so forth, packaged into an acceptable architectural composition. An awakening interest in the real life of the cities, something of an anthropologist's approach to urban man (though they were not yet using the word 'habitat') influenced by the work of sociologists like Wilmot and Young, was eventually to become one of the mainstays of Brutalist planning theory, but at Golden Lane it is still subservient to the massification influence of Le Corbusier and the 'Unité' at Marseille.

This appears clearly enough in the roof-structures of the Smithsons project, but what is equally noticeable is the attempt to rectify the errors of the older master. The 'rué intérieur' — that dark corridor without natural lighting — was always the weakest point of the 'Unité' section, and at Golden Lane the Smithsons moved it to the exterior of the block, enlarged it to a sizable pedestrian walk twelve feet wide, and demominated it 'street deck'. This concept was not the Smithsons' private property — it appears in one or two student projects of the time (possibly under Smithson influence) including another entry for Golden Lane, which was to be, in the end, of greater consequence than the Smithsons entry. This was the scheme submitted by Jack Lynn and Ior Smith which, though equally unsuccessful at Golden Lane, was instrumental in their appointment to the staff of the City Architect in Sheffield and led to the design and construction of the largest street-deck building completed to date at Park Hill.

Certain philosophical, psychological, and architectural consequences of the street deck concept need to be noted here: the deck was intended to function socially and psychologically in the manner of the street... In working-class areas in Britain... is the main public forum of communication, the traditional playground for children and the only public space available for mass meetings and large-scale sociability. If it was to fulfill these functions convincingly, the street deck would have to be continuous and reach every part of the development — if it was necessary to go down to ground level at any point it would reduce the deck, psychologically, to the status merely of a corridor inside a building. This continuity was gained by putting the whole of the accommodation into one single building, which purpose has to be built or branched to get it on to the site. The result, predictably, was not a building that could be appreciated or understood from any single outside viewpoint, as could an isolated block like the 'Unite' at Marseille, and street-deck schemes are usually better regarded as a serial composition, held together by the continuity of the circulation routes. The full implications of this 'topological' approach to composition by means of the circulation routes became very clear in the Smithsons' next major project.

The extension to Sheffield University was the subject of a competition won by a routine modern glass-box style entry from Golinne Melvin Ward and Partners) which also attracted a number of very extreme entries from younger architects, including a compact and sophisticated variation on Corbusian themes by James Stirling and a project by the Smithsons that seemed to be a deliberate affront to everything that was commonly regarded as architecture. At first sight the grouping of the blocks of accommodation is as loose and unrigorous as any Picturesque composition by the Brutalists' despised elders, but whereas Picturesque compositional techniques were normally used to build up images of rich and confusing abundance, the effect of the arrangement offered by the Smithsons appears in the drawing to be informal, retrospective and deliberately anti-graцial, replacing the sweetness and sentimentality of the Picturesque with a blunt and uncompromising statement of structure and function in every part. Above all, it made a plain statement of the facts of circulation at ground level, on elevated street-decks, or on pedestrian bridges spanning between one building and the next (usually in conjunction with duct-bridges for service runs, thus emphasising that human beings are not the only bodies that circulate). Because of this new and ample display of this circulation system, the unifying principle of the design — in the absence of any comprehensible visual aesthetic, becomes the connectivity of the circulation. Hence the use of the term 'topological' to characterise the design, a term not applied by the Smithsons themselves, though Smithson himself admitted more than once at this period that he found topological considerations of this sort a great preoccupation in his larger designs.

The exorcism of this Sheffield project was widely felt at the time — it had no conceivable precedent, except that the relationship of structure to glazing may have been remotely suggested by the one of the works of that great British anti-aesthete — Sir Owen Williams — the 'Dry' manufacturing block (but not the well-known West factory alongside) of the British chemical plant at Boston, Nottinghamshire. For the Smithsons, the anti-formalism of Sheffield was also an extreme point; nothing later from their drawing board has quite the same 'je-m'en-foutiste' quality, if they had not completed some private voyage of exploration into the anti-architectural and were now turning back. Nevertheless, the exorcism of the gesture was profoundly appreciated by the mass of disinterested members of the generation of students who were beginning to look to the Brutalists for leadership, and there ensued a tradition of wild visionary town-planning projects, cast in this topological mould, and even one or two major building designs, such as the Fun Palace project of Cedric Price, one of the most complete 'anti-buildings' ever projected in Europe. But this was not the direction in which the New Brutalism as an International movement was now headed. That direction was obliquely suggested by the first building outside Britain of which anyone felt required to ask "is it Brutalist?" — Louis Kahn's art-gallery building for Yale University.
4.2 Yale Art Gallery, New Haven

The introduction of the Yale Art Gallery into the Brutalist canon was first suggested by Ian B. McInnes (in Architecture) early in 1955, but it is well established that the eye of the Brutalist connection in England. Not only did it appear that their usurpations and intentions...buildings and, with the aid of the most extended demonstration to date, by anyone other than Lucien Carrere, of the architectural concept of `bull-brut'.

But the fact remains that this, the high point of Kahn's architectural achievement at that time, is conducted in loco, so to speak, and contributes nothing to the visual image of the rest of the building. In a somewhat similar manner, the axial part of the plan remains a `screen'. On the street elevation it is totally concealed, on the courtyard side it is partly concealed by the extensional central panel of the facade, and in the normal use of the building as an art gallery the exact spatial portion of the plan contributes little to its functional organization or the visual experience of the visitor.

These matters may make Kahn's Yale Art Gallery a good building or a bad one, but this is not the point at the present stage of the argument. What is at issue is whether the ground-plans of academic classification could be assimilated to a concept of The New Brutalism the Sheffield project which could contribute to it.

4.3 Manifesto

The Smithson's had been contributing statements and letters on The New Brutalism to the English architectural magazines ever since the publication of their projected house in Benth, and continued to do so in the years following. Architectural literary activities had contributed some remarkably eloquent and theatrical phrases - `We live in a man-made cit...-

But the Smithsons would have to say a good deal more than the things that were contained in the statement of January 1963 before they could advance; and the role of leaders. Like all self-appointed leaders, they represent almost exclusively their personal pre-occupations at the moment of putting out statements and are virtually incapable of standing by itself, without gloss or explanation, and in this case a powerful idea was presented (apparently by Crosby himself) which attempted to fix an historical context that would establish the relevance of their views. The complete document reads as follows:

The New Brutalism

In 1954 is a new and overdue explosion took place in architectural theory. For many years since the war we have continued in our habit of dressing the coinage of M. Le Corbusier, and had created a style - `Contemporary'- easily recognizable by the mixture of traditional materials and its veneer of `modern' details, tames, recesed potions, decorative pilasters, etc. The reaction exploded, according to the shape of Hanselmann's (by Alison and Peter Smithson) an illustration of the `New Brutalism'.

The next is the modern, a revulsion of those advanced buildings of the twenties and thirties whose lessons (because of a few plaster-creases) have been forgotten. As well as this, there are certain lessons of the formal use of proportion (from Professor Pinkerton) and a respect for the serious use of material (from the Japanese). Naturally, a theory which takes the props from the generally accepted and carefully artificially created `Contemporary' has generated a lot of opposition. All over the country we have been asked to explain the new message. In the hope of provoking many readers as possible to think more deeply about the form and purpose of their art, we asked the British architect and critic of the movement, Mr. Josep Heywood, to write a short essay, the only possible development for this is a statement from The New Movement, entitled, `The New Brutalism', that it is a different architectural form.

Smithson have spoke for all the young architects in Britain, left leadership by the failure of an older generation psychologically more separated from them than was the case in any continental country where invasion and occupation had created more obvious rifts between generations. Almost unique in this intentionality, the Brutalists had to fill this vacuum of leadership, and assume the role of guides and mentors to the new leaders almost thrust upon them by students, who could write.

The introduction of the Yale Art Gallery into the Buc- clesian canon was first suggested by Ian McFaul in an architectural review early in 1955, but it had already caught the eye of the Buclesian establishment. Not only did it appeal to their own aspirations and interests, but it also marked a clear break with existing US and, to some extent, with British architecture. Though native circumstances, it is not surprising that it should be, in so many ways, almost as tentative as the Buclesian movement. But it is enough that a work by a man twenty years older than the Smithsons should be so tentative. Like the Buclesian, it has a formal and axial plan (rather more explicit in its planning, too), a sense of space and structure, the use of materials. There is even a sense of appeal to basic architectural principles, regular geometric forms, and a concern with the spatial relationships between the various spaces. The work of the Smithsons is, however, different in that it is not a direct result of the Buclesian movement. Rather, it is a reaction against it, a reaction against the rigid, formulaic approach that characterized the Buclesian work. The Smithsons' approach, on the other hand, is more flexible and adaptable, allowing for a greater degree of variation and experimentation. The Smithsons' work is characterized by a sense of space and structure, and a concern with the spatial relationships between the various spaces. It is not a direct result of the Buclesian movement, but rather a reaction against it, a reaction against the rigid, formulaic approach that characterized the Buclesian work. The Smithsons' approach is more flexible and adaptable, allowing for a greater degree of variation and experimentation. The Smithsons' work is characterized by a sense of space and structure, and a concern with the spatial relationships between the various spaces.
It is this reverence for materials—a realisation of the affinity which can be felt between the arts of Cassanea and (Ricasia) they saw, in buildings and man—which is at the root of the so-called New Brutalism.

It has been mooted that the Hunstanton School, which probably owes as much to the existence of Japanese architecture as to the first realisation of the New Brutalism in England.

This particular handling of materials, not in the craft sense of Frank Lloyd Wright, but in intellectual appraisal, has been ever present in the Modern Movement, as, indeed, familiar of the early German architects have been prompt to remind us. What is new about the New Brutalism among movements is that it finds its closest affinities, not in past architectural style, but in peasant dwelling forms. It has nothing to do with craft.

We see architecture as the direct result of post-war 1954 has been a key year. It has seen American advertising rival Onda in its impact of avant-garde imagery; that automotive masterpiece the Cadillac convertible, parallel with the ground (four elevations) classic box on wheels. It is as momentous an event in 1954 as the opening of a new exhibition of what by CIAM; the revitalisation of the work of Gropius; the repainting of the villa at Garches.

Certain obvious points jump out from this text: the mixed nature and knowhow of the programme; which can stand as a post-WWII intellectual biography of the Crusader age group but is already out of date as far as the Brutalists' attitude to classical proportion was concerned. Already at the time of "Parallel of Life and Art" Peter Smithson had said that "We are not going to talk about proportion and symmetry"—and it will be noted that neither topic is mentioned in the statements above. But it is probably inevitable—irony of architectural history—that many brutalist usages should become part of the repertoire of cliches thatkept 'Contemporary' alive as a 'style', and within three or four years of this programme being written.

In the Smithson statements it is the reference to Japan and peasant building that are the most confusing: and/or misleading. Neither of them has been to Japan at this date, and the architecture is not that of Mayekura/Tange school, largely a tradition that was to feature in the later history of Brutalism. The Smithson's Japan was the Japan of Bruno Taut's book on Japanese houses (Houses and People of Japan, Tokyo, 1937) and illustrations of the Kasuga detained palace (A Japanese building book in the Smithson's third paragraph reads: "The Japanese film 'Gate of Hell' showed houses, a monastery and palace, in colour by the first time,"

The sense of the sudden discovery of a whole culture capable of conveying, as naturally as clothes, a traditional architecture whose spatial organisation seemed light-years beyond the capacity of the West. Something similar applies to the references to "peasant dwelling forms." The search for Wittkowerian nature in Italy, and for the 'Unité', had been part of a general rediscovery of the Mediterranean basin by that generation. Through eyes filtered by Le Corbusier's sketches (and, doubtless, by the art of Cassanea and (Ricasia) they saw, in Mediterranean peasant buildings, an anonymous architecture of simple, rugged geometrical forms, smooth-walled and small-windowed, unadorned and immovable in its landscape setting. Observing similar buildings in cyclical housing in Scotland and for farmers in Germany, they translated this vision of a 'basic' architecture into a series of regional house projects prepared for CIAM IX in Dubrovnik. They measured against these standards Aalto's work at Saynatsalo and Quarenghi's at La Martella, and finally translated them into built fact, not through the agency of the Smithsons, but of Richard Leysen-Davies and John Warkas in the village rebubbling at Ruthrooke, Suffolk. The architects of this scheme have since become anarchists with the former Brutalist connection, but at the time the Ruthrooke housing fascinated and provoked them into a lengthy (and largely approving) correspondence in the "Architectural Journal".

The incoherence in the Smithson's statements on the importance of materials almost at the expense of all other aspects of architecture may cause no surprise in retrospect, since common opinion has always regarded the New Brutalism as chiefly a matter of exposed materials and untreated surfaces, but this emphasis does less than justice to what was in the Smithson's minds at the time. The extraordinary collection of topics in the last paragraph (with its inexcusable terminal query) may give some clue to the other things that preoccupied the preoccupations summed up in the sentence "We see architecture as the direct result of a way of life."

Like many others of their age, they were trying to see the world whole and see it true, without the interposition of diagrammatic political categories, exhausted 'progressive' notions or prejudiced stylistic preferences. That world, and their way of life in it, included Gropius as a crumbling reputation from the remote past, the work of Le Corbusier as ancient monuments, CIAM as a corrupt parliamentary body in need of anti-archic reform—and American production and advertising as the injection of the drive and ambition which had gone out of "Modern Art" and end of the 50's, in detail, and formal comprehension, that had gone out of architecture. As was to become clear later:

"Any discussion of Brutalism will miss the point if it does not take into account Brutalism's attempt to be objective about reality— the cultural objectives of society, its urge, its techniques, and so on. Brutalism has to face up to a mass-production society, in 1954-55 this facing-up process had just begun and the sophisticated techniques that were to be contributed by the Brutalists' associates in the other arts. These activities, such as the pioneering studies of the 'Pop' arts made by Lawrence Alloway and others, will be discussed in the next chapter, but an early attempt to face up to the real world in a primitive society and its 'way of life' in architecture, may be seen by simply turning the page of January 1955 issue of 'Architectural Design'. There, the Smithsons review the work of Vladimir Buldansky and Aland-Alinka, especially stick-cost housing in Morocco. They draw a comparison with their own socio-aesthetic intentions of Gold- en Lane and go on:

"We termed bad-year... they term 'palace', drawing on their knowledge of Arab needs from the area of greatest migration... where the established collective system includes outdoor living space. Whereas the Unité was the summation of a technique of thinking about 'habitat' which started four-score years ago, the importance of the Moroccan building was that they were the first manifestation of a new way of thinking." To judge from a 'Statement of principle' that appears at the bottom of the same page, but might have been more effective as part of the preceding Brutalist statement, the new way of thinking was to include not only a close study of the way people actually lived, but also a fair degree of permis-siveness in design as well:

"It is impossible for each man to construct his own home. It is for the architect to make it possible for the man to make the flat his house, the maisonette his habitat."

We aim to provide a framework in which man can again be master of his house. In Morocco they have made such a principle of 'habitat' that each man shall be at liberty to adapt for himself.'

The thin, stick-and-matchbox aesthetic in which this ethic of permisiveness was offered in Morocco hardly accords with the idea of Brutalism as architecture of massive plasticity and coarse surfaces, but what the Smithsons meant by Brutalism at this time certainly included social ethics, in which they attached quite as much importance as to formal architectural aesthetics. The growth of this ethic in their minds is inextricably entangled with the process by which other people came to identify the New Brutalism with 'art brut' and other expressions of the aesthetic of the time, while the attempt to visualise the total environment in this ethic could be realised involved them in a course of action which led to the destruction of CIAM. Two aspects of the New Brutalism— 'art brut' and the reform of urbanism—are of such pivotal importance at this point in the argument that some attempt must be made to extricate ourselves from our strict chronological position in this historical narrative.
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5.1 Brute, non and other art

The team that assembled the one hundred and twenty-two Brutalist images that make up the exhibition Parallel of Life and Art in 1969, consisted of Nigel Henderson, Edouard Poulizzi and the two Smithsons. Henderson, an experimental photographer, is little known outside Britain though his importance, influence on the other three was considerable and flowed by them (if, indeed, it was he who had invented their special use of the word 'image'), then his influence was probably greater. Poulizzi, on the other hand, is not a back-room figure and his sculpture is known in Modern Art circles all over the world. As early as 1952 it had earned him a place in that period. He was a member of the 'Movement' and the other representatives of the movement that was then called 'anti-art'. In 1957, his work was already (and justifiably) being described as 'anti-art', and the form itself was to be admired in the work of Poulizzi's equally justifiably be applied to the work of Poulizzi's equally justifiably be applied to the work of Poulizzi's work - especially the small bronze figures which have the - especially the small bronze figures which have the tradition (and with it, the dominance of France in European intellectual life) then Poulizzi was immediately remembered, and became a sort of fixation point of the other art (and the non) before his sensational and much published death.

A picture of Jackson Pollock in his studio - one might almost say 'a sacred icon' - was one of the images in 'Parallel of Life and Art', but there were very few other references to 'art' in any of the culturally-accepted sources and the section of the exhibition which was labelled 'architecture' included a Mexican mask and a plate from a book of Vegetable Anatomy, as well as a number of subjects that would normally be regarded as engineering structures, or statements that would normally be regarded as 'architecture'. In all sections, the exhibition dealt primarily with bizarre or anti-artistic images culled from newspapers, magazines, scientific and anthropological textbooks, or extreme modes of vision such as X-rays and micrographs. All had clearly been selected because of some very direct and often inexplicable emotional impact on the organisers of the show, and many carried that impact to those who come to see it.

Although 'Parallel' was one of the crucial stages in the demobilisation of the intellectual prestige of abstract art in Britain, it is worth noting that it accepted one form of abstraction without question, that of photographic reproduction in two dimensions, and put a high value on the qualities of grain and 'characterisation' that resulted from printing down gross over-enlargements on unglossed photographic paper. This particular aesthetic was not absolutely original - something like it had been seen during 1951 both in the 'Triennale di Milano', and an exhibition 'Growth and Form' in London (with which Henderson had been involved at one stage) but the exploitation of these visual qualities to enhance the impact of subject matter that flouted humanistic conventions of beauty in order to emphasise no-
would have involved judging the case on its merits (or, rather, dominant factors). As was said, solid traditions of 'another world', the accommodation required and the finance available, rather than in accordance with the pre-established classical or pictorial axioms in the usual manner of post-war architecture; and the execution of the buildings would certainly have been a calculated affront to the accepted conventions of architectural detailing at that time. This would have been no acquisition of customer or 'easy-money', fine-drawn metal-work or harmonious colour, integration of architecture with the other plastic arts, etc. As Constructed, Sheffield University as conceived by the Smithsons would have been the most Brutalist building ever realised, and the whole subsequent history of Brutalism would have been different.

But it still might not have been the most complete example, however extreme, because if it did not include one 'other' architectural possibility that was in the Smithsons' mind by 1955, a possibility that owed much to their involvement with the anti-art movement. Their programme 'House of the Future' assembled early in 1956, was a serious attempt at 'Pop Architecture' comparable to the Pop Art which has subsequently appeared in Britain and America. The early date may cause some surprise, since Pop Art is commonly regarded as a phenomenon of the sixties, but the group who assembled 'Parallels of Life and Art' were very much the same, anywhere in the world, to direct their attention to the visual arts and more recently the visual and concrete. The group were a collection of possibilities, the 'Pop'. But even more unlike British designers and artists in particular, the American styles exhibited a restless command of details, joints and connections, the generous coordination of different materials, and skill in scaling screen and components into the total design (rather than sticking them on as afterthoughts as in British design). The House of the Future was, in a sense, a re-seen design of the Smithsons' Cobden/Cheney 'Cuban' home in the American context; it was scaled up and covered with a layer of concrete. The House of the Future was, in a sense, a re-shown design of the Smithsons' Cobden/Cheney 'Cuban' home in the American context; it was scaled up and covered with a layer of concrete. The House of the Future was, in a sense, a re-shown design of the Smithsons' Cobden/Cheney 'Cuban' home in the American context; it was scaled up and covered with a layer of concrete.

"On the 'Cuban' home, see Le Corbusier, 'Villa Arson' in "Esthetique Moderne", 1979, Ballinger, and especially Le Corbusier's "Villa Savoie.

In the foyer of the pin-board, such advertisements were torn from the magazines and displayed on the wall (the Smithsons contributed an article entitled "The Tidy House of the Future""). The Smithsons contributed an article entitled "The Tidy House of the Future".

By 1955-65 one could see at least three different concepts of the New Brutalism circulating in architectural group and criticism.

1. Certain thoughtful modernists, such as Arne Jacobsen, who is the master of the 'manipulated modernist' background, such as Arne Jacobsen, who is the master of the 'manipulated modernist' background, who are attempting to achieve a new kind of realism through the manipulation of materials and the manipulation of materials and the manipulation of materials and the manipulation of materials.

2. The British avant-garde, such as the Pop Art or the Pop Art or the Pop Art or the Pop Art, which has been re-interpreted in a number of ways, but ultimately it is a phenomenon of British architecture.

3. A more sophisticated body of opinion, aware of the recent developments in England, such as the Pop Art or the Pop Art or the Pop Art or the Pop Art, which has been re-interpreted in a number of ways, but ultimately it is a phenomenon of British architecture.

There is a certain level of sophistication, such as the Pop Art or the Pop Art or the Pop Art or the Pop Art, which has been re-interpreted in a number of ways, but ultimately it is a phenomenon of British architecture.
FRIGIDAIRE BUILT-IN COOKING
fold-back or counter-top units - which one for your new kitchen?

of design philosophy exhibited by the Smithsons' structure implies a volume of production rivaling that of a major automobile manufacturer, and (in the kind of Open Society to which the Smithsons seem devoted) marketing techniques comparable to those of Detroit. The House of the Future was therefore 'designed' as much as it was designed. A complete aesthetic of panels and joints (even modelled on automobile practice) was devised, and the whole even boasted a certain amount of technical brightwork that underlined its affinity to the chromium styling of a car or, indeed, the domestic appliances inside. Even the possibility of an annual model-change was entertained.

In spite of its plan-view, this was still a very extroverted conception for its time (in many ways much more extreme than Ionesco's contemporaneous plastic houses designed for the 'Expressionists in Art and Architecture' and as often in the history of Brutalist, the attainment of an extreme position was followed by a withdrawal to a more traditionalist position. The Pop-Art patio-house was not to be, and when the Smithsons produced another patio-house mock-up later in that same year of 1959, it revealed very different intentions and produced a very different effect.

Concurrently with other international avant-garde activities in the plastic arts, during the early nineteen-fifties, there had been an attempt to establish an English 'nabla' of the Paris-based 'Groupe espace'. Since British artists like Paolozzi, Tunnell, Hamilton or McHale had long since abandoned the rather naive tenets of 'integration of the arts' held by the 'Groupe espace' at that time, the project came to nothing; but the painters, architects, sculptors and critics who had gathered to discuss the proposal continued to meet and finally decided to stage an exhibition (called, for reasons now impossible to reconstruct, 'This is Tomorrow'). The show consisted of environments or constructions devised by groups each consisting (more or less) of a painter, a sculptor and an architect, but there was no overall dogma or programme covering the whole manifestation. Each group worked as it liked, and as festation. Each group worked as it liked, and as festation. Each group worked as it liked, and as festation. Each group worked as it liked, and as festation. Each group worked as it liked, and as festation. Each group worked as it liked, and as festation.

Lawrence Alloway wrote in an introduction to the catalogue:

"The independent curating groups did not agree on any universal design principles... would not submit to the dictatorial ideas of synthesis held by the 'Groupe espace'." In 'This is Tomorrow' the visitor is exposed to space effects, play with signs, a wide range of materials and structures which, taken together make of art and architecture a many-channelled activity as focal and far from ideal standards in the old sense.

At least one of the group-contructions could be regarded as an attempt to bring the street inside the exhibition: John Voelcker, Richard Hamilton and John McHale put together the first Pop-Art manifestation to be seen in any art gallery anywhere in the world, complete with juke boxes, advertising imagery, science fiction quotations, and made great play with communications theory, topology and other topics generally associated with the 'anti-urbanism' approach in England at that time. From this extreme, the exhibits shined right across to the other extreme of orderly geometrical exercises in the 'Groupe espace' manner. Although the Henderson/Paolozzi-Smithson exhibition certainly cannot be fitted readily into this sequence at any one point, it must be said how that these was a traditionalist exhibit, a very long way removed from the Pop-Art ar tempest of Voelcker, Hamilton and McHale.

Their 'Palace and Pavilion', though put together out of non-traditional materials such as aluminium and corbonised plastic, exhibited an architectural that would be considered nowadays by critics like Vincent Scully as 'essentially a moratorium to a temenos-enclosure' and was described, by the group themselves in the exhibition catalogue in terms of "necessities of human habitation... the first

The Smithsons were already beginning to exhibit this fascination with ancient planning that seems to have taken them to visit the original sites in Greece, and was eventually to affect their own ideas of a particular organisation in a practical manner in the nineteen-sixties. Had they abandoned their extreme anti-traditionalist position of 1959? Certainly they had made a move in the same general direction as many leading figures in the world of Anglo-Saxon architecture on both sides of the Atlantic as the neo-Classical revival set in (that is, from Philip Johnson's symposium at Port Chester, completed in this same year of 1959) but theirs was not Classicism in that sense - the pavilion was not placed ambitiously in the patio, and the planning 'grid' was more like an irregular version of Japanese mat-planning than a classical system of modules. Further, when Peter Smithson came to present the results of his Greek investigations in public lectures in 1959, 3...

personal observation on the actual sites had con-
vinced him that the Greeks used no systems of
proportion nor geometrical devices in their planning
but had proceeded in a manner analogous to the
Sheffield University project, the various bays being
sited for convenience, oriented for ritual and
logically related by connecting 'nuclei'.
If this was classicism, then it was classicism of a
very diffuse and generalised kind. If it was tra-
liticism, then only in the sense that Rubelit or
Pollock were traditionalist in occupying themselves
with that traditional subject of art, the human-
scale. Still it was clear that the Smithsons were
withdrawing imperceptibly from their close
contact with an Other Architecture comparable to Ta-
rn's and using a more encompassing approach to
the problem of 'architectural design'. But the withdraw-
up to the Smithsons for once actually achieved anti-
architecture, by even 'one architecture author'. They had
seriously facing the realities in which English suburban houses were built at the time, under all the pressures of local
administration, the encroached aesthetic prejudices
of the local bureaucracy, a routine and unremarkable
brick industry, and the visual inadequacies of
budgets. Characteristically, Peter Smithson developed a
philosophy of design for in which the com-
mon speculative-built houses of the area extracted
the vacuum of consciousness from the poor
stock of status symbols that could be derived
from the economically possible range of materials,
chiefly brick and timber. But he did not accept their
'cultural objectives' and was not to do it as honest a
job as the limitations of the local 'reality', including
the same economically possible range of materials,
which would permit. The result, like the other houses in
the area, was basically a simple brick box, but within
it the Smithsons contrived some more enter-
ing spatial arrangements than are common in Brit-

ish suburban architecture, and tried to illuminate
them with windows placed according to internal
needs rather than the outward suburban conventions
developed from the Arts-and-Crafts tradition of the
nineteenth century. The result has neither the
sensible style of the House of the Future, nor the
timpani 'necessity' of the Pavillon in the Pato-

через певейстройством здание.

архитектурной установки — и уеды получает
странный, но все же зловещий вид. Несколько
существующих зданий, таких как, например,
04.04.2020
5.2 A note on 'une architecture autonome'

What is a subjective proposition in architecture — which, as art, has been formed, by outside circumstance, to absorb many concepts and usages left to be hostile to its best traditions, and yet has survived? There was something in the air in the spring that really subjective trend was emerging, suggesting that the traditions of architecture could not absorb, and I saw to label the intentions of a few a trend (dissemblable in the Smithsons’ Sheffield schemata) that this present writer has not. The term ‘une architecture autonome’ in December 1955. Whatever I thought by the term at the time, it was shaped by

Thus, the final and absolute abandonment by ‘musique concrète’ of any traditional kind of scale or even the twelve-tone series, and with it the sense accepted in the theory of music as taught in the conservatoire, gave a measure of the extent to which ‘une architecture autonome’ could be expected to abandon the concepts of composition, symmetry, order, module, proportion, ‘literacy in plan, construction and appearance’, in the sense accepted in the theory of architecture as taught in the Écoles des Beaux-Arts, and preserved in the architecture of the International Style and its post-war successors. By this token, ‘une architecture autonome’ ought also to have abandoned even the idea of structure and space — or rather, it ought to abandon the dominance of the idea that the prime function of an architect is to employ structure by making spaces.

Many would agree that to abandon this structure/space synthesis is to abandon architecture altogether, but that is really abandoned in the notion of the art that has been current since the Renaissance. Society at large has much more interest in this notion because it has nothing to do with the architect’s function in relation to society. What the corporate and private patrons, who have had to represent the desires of society, have demanded of architects is environments for human activities and symbols of society’s cultural objectives. For most of human history some kind of architectural artefacts has been the unquestioned manner of satisfying both these desires, but this was the only possible solution, and it is even less so today. A modern example would be a drive-in cinema, where the structure above ground is without expression, no space, and the cultural symbols are transient light-play. But one can adduce more primitive and genuinely formal examples than this, entirely devoid of structural elements or enclosed volume. The camp fire of a nomadic tribe, for instance, creates an environment for human activity and marks it with a powerful symbol, but the size and shape of the useful environment are defined by no structure, simply by the fact of the fire, the strength and direction of the wind, the physical isolation of the individuals involved and the architecture of the materials involved. This is not an environment.

Given a genuinely functional approach such as this, no cultural preconceptions, and the full battery of modern mechanical services, an ‘other architecture’ might well employ structure merely as a way of holding up other environmental controls, without arrogating it with the monumental significance enjoyed when massive construction was almost the only environmental control mankind possessed, and with these controls it might or might not happen to define a space without expecting that volume with the cultural significance loaded on it by activities trapped within volumes defined by massive structures.

Formless (sic) buildings, such as Frederick Kiesler’s ‘Endless House’ or Neil Green’s ‘dew滴’s house at Norman, Oklahoma, only superficially fulfill this concept of ‘autonomous’. The Sugden House comes nearer to it, in some senses, precisely because it is put together out of traditional materials, and this accen-

Frederick Kiesler; ‘Endless House project’ 1967
Neil Green; Norrex (Oklahoma, USA), House on the Prairie. 1966
R. Buckminster Fuller; Cebzhedziski (Illinois, USA), architect’s own house. 1950
5.3 The end of an old urbanism

Even if no slogan or label had emerged spontaneou-
ously to characterize the vision and their inter-
networked web of like-minded friends, it would still
have become necessary to invent a name of some
kind to make their activities directly visible, as
the activities of Team-X in bringing about that collapse
deliberate and conscious—at least in the sense of a deter-
native act—seem to presuppose, no matter what the
content, because they were convinced that they
were wrong, and that the situation was wrong. How-
ever, these ideas were not overnight growths, nor
was the formation of the Team-X alliance a sudden
secret conspiracy; the process by which the grand
old movement was demolished goes back to the
beginnings of CIAM's post-war activity, and the
creation of Team-X was part of the deliberate
policy of the movement's older members, even
though the outcome was not what they had intended.

To recapitulate briefly: since the seventh Conse-
vention in June 1950 the CIAM had been the custo-
 of architectural students (especially from Britain)
to flock to CIAM to establish contact with the infor-
mation and friends, and to talk at the feet of its
great masters and to acquire those non-architectural
standard locations; for example, during a con-
ference in section 1.2 A. H. Hodkinson in 1951, and above all
at the crucial ninth congress at Aix-en-Provence in 1951.
On the edge of the Latin Quarterly summer camp,
the Croisière Aix柠檬 oldu, and José Luis Sert's "Can our Cities Survive?", the
of the function of the CIAM committees, CIAM invited
to a number of viewpoints, even though it was com-
complained of CIAM's "ideological, and CIAM had
viewed (and, there-

The CIAM congress at Aix-en-Provence in 1954
saw the first crack in the theoretical solidity of the
of CIAM. The Smithsons showed a range of mid-
by Eero Saarinen's pictures, met Candilis (who had produced
the famous architectural event of the CIAM archae-
the Athens Chart discussed the possibilities for CIAM
and the progress of the revolt was summarised therefore by Theo Crosby.

*The CIAM congress at Aix-en-Provence in 1954 (p.195) saw the first crack in the theoretical solidity of the
of CIAM. The Smithsons showed a range of mid-
by Eero Saarinen's pictures, met Candilis (who had produced
the famous architectural event of the CIAM archae-
the Athens Chart discussed the possibilities for CIAM
and the progress of the revolt was summarised therefore by Theo Crosby.

*Each architect is asked to appear, project under his or her arm, ready to commit himself.

*We are interested only in the outcome of the competition for each particular place at this particular moment.

*There is an implicit rebuttal of Le Corbusier in these quotations; when he first conceived the ear-
the problem of the professional architect were addressed by this period's most signifi-
for that particular site, he would have been far better suited to the different requirements of that site. But, in the eyes of the young professional architect, the smithsons were disposed to a more radical break in architectural thinking.
Brutalism once offered by Toni del Reino — “Do as the Goths, as the Cubs say” — applied as a basic rule of thumb. A useful guideline for the design of a particular place in its accidental and special features, the unique solution to an unique form. For designers, the solution that was required to reject the cate-
gories of the Athens Charter as ‘diagrammatic’ could accommodate and match the ideal habitat for Marsella in 1955. Concurrent with this emphasis on the real-
ities of a particular piece (comparable with the Brutalist idea of the real nature of particular materials etc.) is the insistence on certainty, that the designers must also be personally involved with his proposal that he was prepared to defend. A repeated and detailed scrutiny by his fellow-
professionals.

To the young who had recently emerged from archi-
tecture school, consciousness in Britain where the tou-
csician’s system was still a workable educational tech-
nique. A study of one’s work to public exam-
ination by a jury was a day’s hard work, a day’s work in the intellectual discipline. To some of their continental contemporaries it appears to have been an attractive and welcome exercise of existent self-examination, but can one imagine, a group on Escorton or a Novia submitting his work to the indignities of hostile questioning by man-
for forty years his junior? Even the middle generation had difficulties inedicalizing the criticisms of the young, as may be seen occasionally in the published record of the RIBA’s council.

But if CIAM broke up because many of its older members knew that their work was too heavily com-
promised for the public to tolerate, to have their architectural rules in public (and, worse, they knew that the young men who were responsible (the means by which they were being praised), the legends of some of these older members surviv-
early unimpaired, particularly that of Le Corbusier, who had lived the desire of Dubreucq with Mickvaj-
or, the young men who had lived the desire of the re-
discovered city survived, and continued to be the minds of the Team-BXD/Wilson/ri-
construction after the Athens Charter had been de-
based dominant. This became can be seen clearly.

Through all the ideas of short article in, either ‘exhibition’ by the Smithsons which appeared in the Architectural Review at the end of 1967, and today the thoroughgoing theme remain

can stand well as a representative of their clear-
an important and a bigger theme. It is in effect, a profes-
sion of support for their views.

Throughout the past quarter of a century, from the dawn of CIAM to the Times in 1968 to its virtual dis-
olution last year, CIAM has brought together the Func-
ctionalist architecture — Le Corbu-
sier, Gropius, and Walter Gropius, and many others — Build-
discussion on the problems of their art; and of city-
planning in particular. Their formulism, formulated in methodically drawn-up documents, the most notable being the Athens Charter of 1933, now begin to ap-
ppear too diagrammatic, formalistic and idealistic.

And here, Atlan and Peter Smithson, who have par-
ticipated in much of this work, have set out for a reapr
CIAM’s functionalist tem-

s on a mere humane and pragmatic basis. Thus in the title of their book ‘The Cluter City’ (the word ‘cluster’ comes ultimate from the American phrase ‘Streets without Names’, a projects that are unmatched in the city’s limits. Yet a third ramp leads to the esplanade along which the clubs and restaurants are grouped. We are sheer above the expanse of parks with a broad, the steep-pitched roofs of the small shops below, the other, and further away still, those gigantic and majestic prisms of pursuit. The real life of the city’s horizon as a lens, a dazzling spectacle of grandeur, serenity and glori-
ness. Some of these frame gardens of Semiramis, the
triple tiers of terraces, are ‘streets of quietude’. Their namelessness horizontally spans the inter-
vals between the huge vertical towers of glass, bind-
ing them together with a structure of animated web. . . . That . . .

The Cluter City was not the name for a Functionalist Architecture.

The situation for the modern architect today is funda-
mentally the same, we are still working for the com-
munity as a whole, but today the word functions does not obviously mean mechanical as it did forty years ago. Our functionalism means accepting the realities of the situation, with all its contradictions and compromises, as a function with a style of life. In them, in consequence we have to create a new relationship and a town planning which will be of that form — or the

We must think out for each place the sort of struc-

This single article will, for the purposes of the pre-


Yet the dream was real enough, and is still relevant: ‘Here we have a promenade for pedestrians raising on a gentle ramp to first-floor level which stretches below us. This promenade, now in its infancy, is being developed by cokle embowered in tree-tops that overlook the grazing ground below and in its midland view the other ramp serves to give a second

promotion two storries above the first. On one side of the Cluter City there is a network of green areas. One of these runs through the Cluter City’s limits. Yet a third ramp leads to the esplanade along which the clubs and restaurants are grouped. We are sheer above the expanse of parks with a broad,
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of a street rebuttal of the chess-board geometry of
functionalist town planning, and may even be a
conscious gesture of contempt for the defiant attitude
of Orgam at CIAM-V (Bridges, 1947)
when he said that Berlin could not be substantially
replanned because the existing network of streets,
voices and other services represented too big an
investment to be disturbed.
But the "image" of the "relationship" Berlin was not only
an irregular network of upper pedestrian walks as
seen on plan (though that pattern has been much
revised) but also the means of vertical circulation
that connected the old, ground-level grid with the
new one above it. This was to be an "eccentric city,
in which vertical transportation was to be almost
more the norm than horizontal movement. This was
both the image of the new elements, and the image
of the old that had been transformed, for the urban
meaning of the streets at ground level would clearly
be quite different now that the main circulation of
the city had moved up in the air.
But there is another matter of considerable interest
that we have emerged from this stage of the development
of Brutalist town planning - the reappearance of
picturesque methods. It needs to be emphasized that
this is more a matter of picturesque methods of
seeing than of picturesque visual composition. This
was not really surprising when one recalls that
picturesque had rejected Beaux-Arts planning as a
vocation because it was an incoherently organized
decoration; both sought a pragmatic planning method
that would allow communities to develop ('open-
hands' is difficult to see how the Smithsons' insistence
in effect in their Banister project, really differed from the
place in all) (see section 12). Again, the line pursued
by the 'Architectural Review', for instance, in its
picturesque injection to "converse the genius of the
place in all" (see section 12), differs from the Smithsons' problem of the
idea of a hole in a hole in all, that it is supposed to be
'sympathetic': but still broadly 'true to their own
world in every street clearly in the same conclusion.

Behind this seemingly unimportant turn of events
there were buried causes which cannot be fully ex-
posed - suffice it to say as an example a dis-
print of the official report "Lithographie de Lorient". This document, headed "Théorie de Contacts'
forward in Clapier City, and especially of the in-
habitants and population mobility as put forward in the
Dumbroni papers...

"Oh, la société rétire que la réunion des hommes,
il importe de les groupes le plus harmonieusement
que possible en favorisant ainsi les échanges insti-

tuaires et commerciaux de toutes sortes. C'est le
réseau de circulation à une échelle nouvelle qui dé-
terrine le plan de la ville future."

Though caught in the Gallic rhetoric of pre-war
CIAM prose, these opinions were the work of one of
the most conscientiously English of Englishmen,
H. de C. E. Benham, architect, who was instrumental
in the architectural design of the Festival of Britain
(more on this later). Benham was one of the...
The geometry on which the plan of the city is based is the same as that of the city itself, which is a grid of streets and blocks. The grid is a system of regular streets and blocks, which are designed to be efficient and functional for the city's layout. The grid is a key element in the design of the city, and it is designed to be adaptable to future growth and development.

The plan of the city is based on a grid of streets and blocks, which are designed to be efficient and functional for the city's layout. The grid is a key element in the design of the city, and it is designed to be adaptable to future growth and development.

The plan of the city is based on a grid of streets and blocks, which are designed to be efficient and functional for the city's layout. The grid is a key element in the design of the city, and it is designed to be adaptable to future growth and development.
6.1 Les Maisons Jaoul, Neuilly

The word ‘Brutalism’ was circulating, but the general architectural public remained uncommaned by the polemics of the Smithsons or the apologetics of critics like the present author, and were still puzzled by its meaning and hard put to find a building that seemed to match the word. The steel and glass of Hambledon’s even when allied to the rough imagery of ‘Parallel of Life and Art’ seemed too thin, too elegant to fulfill the implications of violence and crudity carried by the word Brutal.

Then came the Maisons Jaoul in 1966, and the vacuum of architectural meaning was dramatically filled. The later history of the New Brutalism has much less to do with the theoretical prepositions of the Smithsons than it has to do with the progress and permutations of the style invented by Le Corbusier for these two houses on a strip of land at Neuilly. They ‘became’ Brutalist, and although sympathetic critics like Denis Lasdun might protest that ‘the Jaoul houses I like, the style I do not’, the building at Neuilly (Stirling’s), for all its tectonic elements, became the common standard by which the Brutalism of other buildings could be evaluated. However, it is worth noting at this point that Le Corbusier seemed reluctant to apply the word ‘ brut’ to them, preferring to speak of their ‘surfaces apparentes’ and ‘gosse béton arme’. Also James Stirling, breaking into print with an article comparing Jaoul with Le Corbusier’s villa Stein in Garches even before the Jaoul houses were finished, nowhere called them ‘ Brutalist’ — perhaps because he was close enough to the Smithsons to know what they meant by the term.

Nevertheless, the Jaoul houses were acceptable to the Smithsons, who made frequent reference to them and included them among the illustrations to ‘Cluster City’. On examination, the Jaoul houses show many features that take them close to the definitions of Brutalism already current, about to be enunciated. Quite apart from their emphasis on materials as ‘found’, their power as an ‘image’, etc., the relation of these houses to their underground car parking was a fair example of a building as a prototype of a new urban order — hence the illustration in ‘Cluster City’.

Yet, what causes the numerous imitations and derivatives of Jaoul to be called ‘Brutalist’ has nothing to do with prototypes of a new community structure, and a great deal to do with raw concrete and exposed brickwork. Maybe there were predisposing causes — architects naturally looked to Le Corbusier for authoritative statements in architecture; the work of a great established master would clearly prevail over the theories of the young English popsters, especially when that master was the one who had put the concept ‘ brut’ in circulation. Also, Le Corbusier’s urban work already contained the basic architectural prepossession on which Jaoul was based, so that his admirers were prepared for it. This architectural prototypical was his last previous house in the western suburbs of Paris, the Petite Maison de Week-end (as the ‘Oseve complete’ calls it) in Boulogne-sous-Bois, of 1955. Here the archaizing tendency to clean in Jaoul is already visible, in the ‘preplumbing’ spanning the path that leads to the pool, in the use of mass-concrete vaults and load-bearing walls, the sentimentality about ‘matériaux friendly to Man’, — visible brick, random masonry and wood — plus an enforced budgetary economy that drove him back into a proto-Brutalist morality — ‘les éléments de construction étant les seuls moyens architecturales’.

Certain post-war projects had developed this theme on paper, increased emphasis on abstraction and primitivism, notably the ‘old portemanteau’ at la Sainte Baume (where the walls were to be of ‘pistil’) or the very influential ‘Région Rho’ hotel project for Cap Martin, a year later in 1949, and more recently, the project for the Hauser house on the south side of Lake Constance, which resumes the themes of 1935 on a domestic scale since more, but with precisely the air of ponderous ‘target’ (it looks like an air-raid shelter) that was required to turn ‘matériaux friendly to man’ into ‘matériaux brutels’. The Jaoul houses, built, are less covetous and injunctive than this. They present sizable two- and three-storey elevations to outward view (where the constructed site permits such views) and each elevation presents a layered composition of vertical slabs of coarsely laid brickwork, separated by horizontal beams of plank-shuttered concrete and windows, while the end-walls show a cluster of exposed vaulted ends (also in ‘béton brut’) framing compositions of wood and glass. The same repertoire of materials is exposed in the interior, with the addition of occasional plastered walls and the dark tiling of the underside of the walls (referred to as ‘Calalan’ by Le Corbusier). The inner face of the vault of the wall ends reveals a composition of shelving and cupboards among the glazing, as part of Le Corbusier’s aesthetic of the ‘fourth wall’, and this Jaoul Stirling to observe that this contrivance was ‘symbolic of Le Corbusier’s recent attitude to surface depth. Windows are no longer to be looked through but looked at, the eye finding interest in every part of the surfaceimpasto...’ The use of the painterly term ‘impasto’ in this context is telling: elsewhere Stirling observes that the ‘wall is considered as a surface and not as a partition’, and it was at this time that English critics were discovering that the Brutalist sculpture of Paolozzi was ‘an art of surface, not of mass’.

Brutalism, as a going style, proved to be largely a matter of surfaces derived from Jaoul, in association with certain standard three-dimensional devices taken from the same source — ‘...at the external con- tour of these vaults, bird-nesting boxes are formed, and occasionally concrete rainwater-heads project...’ (Stirling) and a few others, notably gargoyles, derived from the chapel at Rodcamp and...
Le Corbusier's Indian houses, and exposed concrete detailing also drawn from Indian works like the Sankara temple at Abanindra (1918). But in spite of these Indian borrowings, the Jaiou houses remain the spiritual source of Indianisation as a style, and this must be largely attributed to the fact that Jaiou's architecture implies the conscious incorporation in an effort, to the norms of European thought. If the Indian houses did this too, the mode was of no consequence, since these three factors of the traditional, the psychological and the technological were not available in India (as no one was left in those European periods or the culture of the Indians persisted among the intended classes). But the use in Europe was a shock to sophisticated construction — in the Jaiou house within half a mile of the Champs Élysées, and left him well while to his "with tigers, hammering and nails" was 'Agad'.

Finally, Slinging and the others were affected by the fact that the Indian houses were not 'Utopian' and of the Modern Movement's "progressive" architecture. Noting the intellectual standardisation of the Modern Movement, Slinging maintained that this intellectual standardisation of the Modern Movement, Slinging maintained the status quo. This is not to say, however, that the social transformation of the group was not revolutionary, for in the prewar years the Indian houses were so ready to accept the tenets of the social housing situation that the Indian houses were so ready to accept the tenets of the social housing situation. Under the influence of the Modern Movement, Slinging maintained that this intellectual standardisation of the Modern Movement, Slinging maintained the status quo. This is not to say, however, that the social transformation of the group was not revolutionary, for in the prewar years the Indian houses were so ready to accept the tenets of the social housing situation.
curiously long and narrow (it was the back garden of an old rectory called Llangan House) that the only way to accommodate the legally permissible and economically desirable maximum number of apartments (30) while respecting the legal rights of adjoining landowners to daylight and privacy, was to incorporate two storeys of seven rooms each, making blocks — a large one of three storeys, and two smaller ones of two storeys with identical plans, except that they are reversed left and right. All three have brick bearing wall structures (of "cemented brickwork") frequently used in minimum section capillaries capable of carrying the load), and concrete floor slabs. In spite of the fact that these slabs are flat, not vaulted, and the brick too, the architecture is different, the likelihood to Jacol is striking. The most profound difference is that the whole concept is in plastic form: it is that derived from L, Corbusier, yet survived creatively into the period when Corbsonian idioms must have been considered archaic. For that reason it is an important tell-tale which facilitates discrimination between Brutalism as it was during the 50s and 60s, and Brutalism as it is developing. As Stirling and Gowan's later work shows, they were far from being disciples of the Maister, and the use of the 'topological' bridges and de Stijl spatial aesthetics at Ham Common gave notice that, for them, the idiom of 'bipartite apparels' and 'gros bateau avant' was to be exploited, not elaborly imitated.

6.3. The Brutalist style

Ham Common focussed a good deal of attention on Stirling and Gowan, outside Britain as well as within, and if we can set some retrospective speculation about their possible role as designers of buildings that had never been seen before, the established offices in which they had worked as assistants then, or with the control-lovers in which they had a part. The role of the Old Vic theatre in South London was published in the magazines just after Ham Common was published, and the architects were Lyons, Ellis, for whom both Stirling and Gowan had worked during the months immediately preceding the setting up of their independent practice. The style of this building was undoubtedly Brutalist — as the term was then understood, not only in the frank exposition of the building's materials, but also in the way that the peculiarities of the interior and the exterior (the need for a very high, dark, and narrow slat through which scenery could be taken across the road to the theatre) were allowed to dictate the external appearance, rather than being concealed by a tidy external box in the manner previously in vogue. In spite of all, neither Stirling nor Gowan was involved in the design process, which appears to have been as follows (as far as it can be reconstructed): the basic functional solution was proposed by the middle partner Lawrence Israel, was converted to a recognizable architectural 'brand' by the third partner, Tom Ellis, and worked out in full detail by two assistants, Alan Collin and John Miller (who later followed the Stirling and Gowan example and went into independent partnership together). The process is as follows: initially examining Israel's original functional breakdown would have established the basic topological relationships between volume and volume; Ellis's part would be a work of some architectural sophistication (he was in high esteem by all the young architects) and taking through the firm, for his architectural audacity as much as his ability as a designer and the fact that an architectural hierarchy was matched by that of the final detailing, for Collphon's evolution was (and is) the match of anybody's. All through the 60s, both East has been one of the guarantors of the intellectual conscience of his generation of London architects, independently invented the style of work of the year, least, and Ellis throughout this period was, quite simply, that its quality was highly valued by the office organisation, flexible enough for the partnership to attract, and held him in the best talent-bout."}

For illustrations, see pages 110-123.
English: Anxiously, the reason, nagging, pathetic-
dematous forms of Macclesfield, become still, formal, and
dignified, as in the 'little unful/ of Shrubham; To be
fair, some other LDC variants on the theme (such as
the blocks at Barnham Road) have a trim spirited-
around the fineness at the ends (especially the
terme of shop) also seem to have preserved the
use of a Corsican concept that had hitherto re-
mained on paper — the narrow path, stepped or
ramped, passing through a terraces of deep-plan-
ites (this shops with apartments over and back-
yards below) which first appeared in the Sainte-
Baume and Vaucluse styles. The end walls and staircases of these blocks also bear a distinct family relationship to the end-walls
and stair residents of the blocks of the Portales
neighborhood and at Quinta Normal, outside San-
ta Cruz, Chile. It seems extremely unlikely that there
is any direct connection between or
or that the architects (Brasileiro, Valder, Castillo
and Hubbard) had any direct acquaintance with
the LDC architects. Standard was becoming a style of
very different from its original sources, but those
sources still had sufficient authority to stamp a
fairly consistent image on all their derivatives, even
if the exact links in the chains of relationships can-
not be established.

Sometimes, however, the connections are clear.
André Wogenscky's houses for his own occupation at
Rental-Chavannes or in France, is strikingly Cor-
sican, and differently so from most of the LDC
architect's work. It is the very good reason that he
was home de charge in Le Corbusier's office.
Where it differs from the English work is, for ex-
ample, in the use of references to the chapel at
Rochamp (now in English Bulletin of domestic
time in the form of the basic houses at ground level
and in the structures on the roof, and in the use of a
few random windows here and there. But like much of
the English work it relies on modular dimensions,
more extensive use of vertical shutter-patterns and
gargoyles (though these are the topside Rochamp
type again). Paris of the house, however, are clad in
white limestone slabs, almost in the manner of the
Master's pavilion facades of the thirties (such as
the Pavillon Suisse) and there are other devices, such
as the projecting-bay brise-soleil which recall Eco-
l's work. Unfortunately, in fact, was influenced
solely by the work being done in the office while
the house was being designed: his view of Le Cor-
busier had greater historical depth to it, even a touch of

A similar eclectic and historical approach can
be seen in the Realities of the State school, not only in
obvious examples like Odeh Schneib's holiday houses
at Comillas in Spain, but also throughout the work
of such distinguished design teams as 'Atelier 5 —
Erik Frist, Daniel Cori, Rolf Haahrnang, Benno
Hustster, Mogens Morgenblad, Alfred Poli and
Fritz Trautmann. The most important work of this

To the villa Stein at Gartesh of 1906-29, though,
clipped to the side of a long narrow block such as
tis, it also recalls slightly earlier projects which survive
in the pages of the 'Oeuvre complète'. Similar
cumulative, similar transformations, occur
throughout their work of the period, though their
formalism is now kept within bounds, partly by their
respect
for their 'best source' and partly by its certain
sense of architectural disciplines that prevents them
from ever making architecture for architecture as Walter
Forsdor, Rolf Otto and Harz Wenzinger did in their
own-orphaned display of 'de Stijl' mannerisms in the
school at Aesch which is sometimes mistakenly com-
pared with Atelier's work, simply because of its
'brutal' concrete use of Le Corbusier's factory at 35 Die
to the much simpler language of their own factory at
The opening of the factory's storage areas and
the few drawings or architectural details now
virtually identical; the difference in total effect
lies in the character of anything in Modern Archi-
tecture could, the difference between an intelligent
follower and an imitator. Le Corbusier's factory
reasonably demonstrates the coherence that comes
from consistency, a faultless exercise within the
limits of the given style. Le Corbusier's factory
affirms that coherence can also come from the
distinctions that arise from the exercise
of a major creative talent.
Plan and section, the central part of the facade.

Perspective, plans, and section (inside 1:500) of a typical worship.
James Stirling and James Gowan; Ham Common (London, England), Langham House Development. 1958
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Site plan

Garden elevation of three-storey block

Three-storey block seen from adjoining parkland
John Vanbrugh, Arley (Hertfordshire, England), Lyttleton House, 1958

Exterior front, living room block

Floor plan and section through east end

1. Courtyard
2. Entrance
3. Stable
4. Staff suite
5. Music room
6. Living room
7. Storage
8. Bedroom
9. Bathroom
10. Sunroom
11. Kitchen
12. Sunroom
13. Bathroom
14. Bedroom
Shepperd, Robson and Partners; Cambridge (England), Churchill College. 1954

Entrance to Master's lodge

Detail of corner of residential court

Boiler house
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66 North Street and Partners; Brighton (England),
University of Sussex. 1952/75
First courtyard: entrance passage

115
Peto Works; London (England),
Hille Furniture Shop. 1955
Display area
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Denys Lasdun and Partners;
London (England),
Plots in St James's Piazza. 1951
London wall of portholes
Site plan (scale 1:8000)

Block blocks seen from the central lawn

Gable walls of slab blocks
Close up of pilasters and space under a slab block
Social service building under slab block
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Detail of stairway-passage and end staircase of block of shops

119 - 120
Boussu, Yelles, Colville and Hardevre; Sanitages (Chapel), Quinto Normal Housing. 1961-63
External stairway; guide wall of six-storey block; two-storey low housing.
André Wogensky, Rhône-les-Chênes (France),
Andretto's Own House, 1957
Roof terraces, garden front
7 Hard cases: the Brick Brutalists

Around the succession of buildings which belong to the dream visions of Brutalist development, critics have grouped others which, for the purposes of argument, might be regarded as Brutalist, or might not. It is difficult, to know where to place Sverre Fehn and Geir Grung's museum at Meluhagen in Norway. Both are members of that network of British connections with Norway which is sometimes humorously called the 'Axic Circle', and Grung, like Norway's senior member of CIAM, Arne Korsør, was present at the Otterlo congress in 1959. The museum might well be regarded as an attempt to find an ideal solution for a difficult site, and it enjoys a certain amount of brute concrete on its exposed roof-slab. But in a world of architecture as small as that in Norway, every major building is so much of an unique occasion that it is dangerous to try to link it to any particular movement.

Many of these hard cases are churches — obviously a confluence between a puritan aesthetic and a puritan ethic might be looked for in the Protestant connection, but not all the likely candidates have a Lutheran or Calvinist background. Fink and Pallin's Santa Maria del Poveri in Milan prompted Kästner Smith to observe that its exterior 'suggests more a warehouse than a church' and he described the interior as 'neutral-brutal' but there is a good deal of justice in his presentation that this is in the established tradition (compare the present state of many Renaissance churches) of not bothering with finishes and standing once the shell of the church was weatherproof. In the Protestant connection, however, a lack of obvious 'finish' is more likely to be deliberate. The bare concrete blockwork and prismatic beams of van der Broek and Bakokos's church at Nalupol in Holland seems to represent the same ethic and aesthetic as is seen in the bare white-washed interior of other temples of the 'heightened' or 'flooded' church; the shell wall that wraps around the adjoining courtyard is an attempt to create the necessary shelter required for that particular place (a typically newly-reclaimed polder).

But the hardest ones to consider, certainly the most enigmatic, is Sigurd Lewerentz's Markuskirka outside Stockholm: it is a building that would greatly enrich the Brutalist canon if it could safely be included within it, but how convincing could such a classification be made? It is not an evolutionary outburst of a dissident young architect, nor is it the work of opportunism on the part of a middle-aged and successful architect adapting to a change of fashion. Lewerentz is of an age with Le Corbusier (he was born in 1885) and the church seems to be the unexpected product of a long process of architectural maturity. It combines shallow vaulting, plane and curved walls — all in relatively coarse brickwork that makes Jacob look rather inhibited — with a concept of plan, space and poignancy that has nothing in common with any of the Brutalist buildings that one brick in any related manner. In some ways this is very 'other' architecture — Lewerentz's command of architectural form is secure and explicit, and yet the building has a genuine informality, a relaxed indifference to such concepts as 'rectangle' that goes far beyond the forms of, say, the Smithsonian Pavilion scheme. However casual the grouping of the buildings in that project may have been, the individual parts still answer to a few regular geometrical archetypes, whereas the plan of the Markuskirka is studiedly unrelated about such archetypes, especially at the altar end, where the walls vary in thickness and curve away in various directions — echoing the formal difference of those mediaeval castle builders whom Louis Kahn so much admires but shows no desire to imitate. When one observes how this 'other' architecture is the work of a man firmly grounded in the Scandinavian traditions of neo-Classical order and picturesque sensibility, one cannot help wondering if Hans Asplund, in coinining the term 'Neo-Brutalism', was not identifying a trend that might have emerged anyhow, without any assistance at all from Le Corbusier, Louis Kahn or the British.

But, in the end, the Markuskirka remains an enigma: it poses a question but illuminates no possible answer, least of all about the other Brick Brutalists. This sub-category or marginal grouping of doubtful Brutalists, to which Stirling and Gowan might be taken to belong at the time of Hans Common, does not perhaps want to be taken too seriously, especially since the use of brick is not the main factor they have in common, merely the most obvious. As between Hans Common, Oswald Mathias Ungers's house in Cologne, and the extension to the architecture school at Cambridge University, there is no agreement as to external form, detailing or spatial aesthetics. What they have in common is great attention and sophisticaction, worn with a flourish, about the recent history of Modern Architecture.

With Ungers, his sophisticated awareness seems at times more like an informed sensibility. He spills out of him in conversation, it gives him a response to modern masterpieces that can be personal and violent, yet his part in the organisation of the 'Glasmuseum' exhibition in 1965 shows that it can be put to disciplined and scholarly ends. His house is a milestone-building, and although it could have been built at no other than the latest fashions (the enclosed garden courts in particular seem to belong to that time) it evokes remarkable echoes of the architecture of thirty years before. For a start, its location, at the end of a street and attached to a house in an earlier style, recalls the sining of Riethveld's Schröder house in Utrecht, though its detailed architectural idiom is less connected with that, and with more cautious Dutch derivatives from the work of Frank Lloyd Wright. In any case, its mass affluence fits it more directly to Germany, to Erich Mendelsohn's early house in Berlin (the Stern house), to Hugo Häring's farm at Gorkau, and even, in the way the garden structures relate the main mass of the house to the street, to some of the tacking around the houses of the Wiesenhofsladitit. It is very striking that in a generation that was well aware of the innovations offered by Häring at Gorkau,
was one of the Smithson’s favourite ‘triggers’ Un-
garo should be the only Brutalist of any sort to make any
type of personal reference to that much-
admired source.

As far as London is concerned, Ungaro’s house is per-
haps the only building of quality in Northern Europe that can be compared to the work of the Newbril-
tany-based architect; with any competition; would
certainly go to Ungaro’s fabric, for this auditorium was
far better designed, far more apt to the type of building he had to design, and far less restricting to his requirements for it, is still far more directly
inspired with historical interests than is the con-
temporary unrealisation of such an idea in
of structural factors as last mentioned.

At this point, a significant move away from the
rhetorical language of the manifesto is made as
Ungaro presents the idea of the auditorium as a
museum of architecture, rather than simply as a
venue for performances. This move towards
museum as aesthetic object is paralleled by the
exhibition of the Smithson’s work, which is
presented as a sort of ‘archive’ of architectural
ideas and projects.

8.1 Istituto Marzochi, Milan

Vigan’s Istituto Marzochi was one of the major
surprises of European architecture in the late
1960s. While other Brutalist architects seemed to be
sinking into comfortable complicity with the poli-
ticipatory regimes, in submission to the speculative
forces of the modern city, Vigan’s work broke
through this mould. His project was a response to
the desire for a more participatory role for
architects in the development of the city, a desire
that is particularly evident in the Smithson’s work.

The Istituto Marzochi, located in the city’s
industrial district, is a complex of buildings that
incorporates a range of functions, including a
museum, a library, and a series of educational
facilities. The project is characterized by a
rejection of the traditional notion of a single
architectural language, and a willingness to
embrace a range of forms and materials.

In this sense, the Istituto Marzochi is a more
dynamic and complex project than the Smithson’s
work, which is more focused on a single
architectural approach. This difference is
reflected in the way that the two projects are
received by critics, with the Smithson’s work
receivng more positive reviews, while Vigan’s
project is seen as a more radical and innovative
approach to architecture.

However, despite these differences, both
projects are seen as important contributions to the
development of architectural theory and
practice. The Smithson’s work is often seen as
influential in the development of the modern
movement, while Vigan’s project is seen as
representing a more radical and experimental
approach to architecture.

In conclusion, the Smithson’s work is seen as
representing a more traditional approach to
architecture, while Vigan’s project is seen as
more innovative and experimental. This difference
reflects wider trends in architectural thought and
practice, with the Smithson’s work being seen as
representing a more conservative approach and
Vigan’s project as more radical and
imaginative.

"Brutalism, according to the English critic Reyner
Bamham, signifies, in architecture: 1 the building as a unified visual image, clear and
memorable, 2 a rejection of illusion, 3 a high
valuation of raw, untreated materials."

This alternative definition is adduced from "L’Espress-" 2 March 1958: clean virgin surfaces; heavily
corroded materials, the neat, direct, unpretentious
classicism exposed to view: zones of violent colour. Brutalism is thus a taste for self-sufficient, architectonic ob-
jects, stripped of any support, any icone-sounding.
It is an energetic affirmation of the structure, the aes-
ticism of pure architecture, the project of
architectonic complete freedom in the 20th
century."

Unbeknownst to me, both architects were
travelling to Venice on the same day. Their
meeting, however, seems to have been
prearranged and is characterized by a
markedly different approach to architecture. Vigan’s
work is seen as more radical and innovative,
while the Smithson’s is seen as more
conservative and traditional.

The Smithson’s project is often seen as
representative of the modernist movement, while
Vigan’s work is seen as a more radical and
evolutionary approach to architecture.

Though Pedra, making a political debate,
dares to analyse the differences between the
Smithson’s and Vigan’s approaches, in his
presentation of the Istituto Marzochi, he
emphasizes the historical references that are
present in both projects.

Vigan’s Istituto Marzochi is a project that
broke with the traditional notion of the
architectural function, and sought to create
new forms of social and cultural expression.

"The Istituto Marzochi was a project that
broke with the traditional notion of the
architectural function, and sought to create
new forms of social and cultural expression.

The project is characterized by a
rejection of the traditional notion of a single
architectural language, and a willingness to
embrace a range of forms and materials.

In this sense, the Istituto Marzochi is a more
dynamic and complex project than the Smithson’s
work, which is more focused on a single
architectural approach. This difference is
reflected in the way that the two projects are
received by critics, with the Smithson’s work
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project is seen as a more radical and innovative
approach to architecture.

However, despite these differences, both
projects are seen as important contributions to the
development of architectural theory and
practice. The Smithson’s work is often seen as
influential in the development of the modern
movement, while Vigan’s project is seen as
representative of a more radical and
imaginative approach to architecture.

In conclusion, the Smithson’s work is seen as
representative of a more traditional approach to
architecture, while Vigan’s project is seen as
more innovative and experimental. This difference
reflects wider trends in architectural thought and
practice, with the Smithson’s work being seen as
representative of a more conservative approach and
Vigan’s project as more radical and
imaginative.

In this sense, the Istituto Marzochi is a project that
broke with the traditional notion of the
architectural function, and sought to create
new forms of social and cultural expression.

8.1 Istituto Marzochi, Milan

Vigan’s Istituto Marzochi was one of the major
surprises of European architecture in the late
1960s. While other Brutalist architects seemed to be
sinking into comfortable complicity with the poli-
ticipatory regimes, in submission to the specula-
tive forces of the modern city, Vigan’s work broke
through this mould. His project was a response to
the desire for a more participatory role for
architects in the development of the city, a desire
that is particularly evident in the Smithson’s work.

The Istituto Marzochi, located in the city’s
industrial district, is a complex of buildings that
incorporates a range of functions, including a
museum, a library, and a series of educational
facilities. The project is characterized by a
rejection of the traditional notion of a single
architectural language, and a willingness to
embrace a range of forms and materials.

In this sense, the Istituto Marzochi is a more
dynamic and complex project than the Smithson’s
work, which is more focused on a single
architectural approach. This difference is
reflected in the way that the two projects are
received by critics, with the Smithson’s work
receivng more positive reviews, while Vigan’s
project is seen as a more radical and innovative
approach to architecture.

However, despite these differences, both
projects are seen as important contributions to the
development of architectural theory and
practice. The Smithson’s work is often seen as
influential in the development of the modern
movement, while Vigan’s project is seen as
representative of a more radical and
imaginative approach to architecture.

In conclusion, the Smithson’s work is seen as
representative of a more traditional approach to
architecture, while Vigan’s project is seen as
more innovative and experimental. This difference
reflects wider trends in architectural thought and
practice, with the Smithson’s work being seen as
representative of a more conservative approach and
Vigan’s project as more radical and
imaginative.
regarded the building as fair game, and have usually classed it with attempts to revive the architecture of "de Stijl". Thus Nikolaus Pevsner in his famous lecture on Neo-Historicism? after discussing the re-vival of "de Stijl" in furniture design, went on to say:

"In architecture, neo-de Stijl is, I think, just as stringing Illustration 19 is a building in Harlem by the Dutch architect J. W. E. Boys, and Illustration 20 shows another view of the same building but the Mondrian Institute in Milan, by Vittorio Viganò of 1907."

But this was not how Viganò saw the situation; he admitted, even claimed influence from Giuseppe Terragni above all others, and the buildings abound in details, especially window-details, that recall Terragni fairly directly. Beyond this, the manner in which the main forms and exposed structure of the building transcends the expressive language of the Rationalist movement, has less to do with "de Stijl" than with the manifest spatial ambitions revealed by Terragni's preoccupation with exposed frames, open staircases and bridges penetrating volumes from side to side. It is as if Viganò were going forward from where Terragni left off, while those of Terragni's generation who survived were going backwards from that point. If one were to extrapolate Terragni's architectural thought from his last pre-war projects into a post-war situation that contained the Jielon houses and the work of Kenzo Tange, one might well produce something like Macchioli.

Yet one may suspect that what Viganò really sought from Terragni and the history of the Rationalist movement was a formal aesthetic than a functional ethic. If, in 1956, one were to set out to design a "de Stijl" building, one would find the following five basic elements:

1. an over-all height of 30 feet
2. an over-all width of 10 feet
3. the use of single materials of the "de Stijl" type
4. a linear floor plan
5. a horizontal emphasis

Yet Viganò felt that the "de Stijl" ethic was not really in the spirit of his work. This is further emphasized by the fact that he was not interested in the "de Stijl" ethic, but rather in the spirit of modern architecture, which he believed to be the true spirit of modernity.

"There were many at one time who, observing the differences from Viganò's other works, dismissed it as 'a mere styling job', architecto-psychiatric fashion. This was a plausible enough argument to put forward around 1950 when Milan was the world centre for facile fashionmongering, but a second visit and mature reflection will not support the idea. The building convinces, and it is all of a piece and this is the more remarkable in view of some of the very extreme devices employed by Viganò. For instance, each dormitory-room is crossed by a typical Brutalist pedestrian bridge half way up, connecting the lavatory, which is also at the higher level, to a balcony containing clothes cupboards at the farther end of the dormitory - the cupboards being double-sided, with staff access to the far side from a corridor not normally used by the boys. By this desperate-seeming shift, Viganò is able to offer the legally required minimum volume per boy without making the floor area of the room ridiculously and inhumanly large, and then exploit the double height to give boys and staff separate access to the cupboards. Doublesex would have simpler methods of achieving these results, but there so seem to be no particular functional or structural advantages that would result, and there may be some psychiatric advantages in making a trip to the lavatory or cupboards something of a public ceremony, if the dormitory is not directly supervised by one of the staff. In any case, this device has the conviction of extremism that informs the rest of the design. Even if Viganò and his clients consciously decided on Brutalism as the only style (they soon rather to have achieved this decision by mutual persuasion and analysis of their problem) it clearly was not out of merely fashionable preference. It is part of the real presence of the building - handsome in sunlight, intimidating in bad weather - and Aesthetic that 'most of which' of 1000 had written of. On this score of a sterner moral building as part of a reformative educational programme, it is interesting to compare Macchioli with Aldo van Eyck's orphanage-school in Amsterdam. Here is a building designed by an architect in far closer touch with the Smithsons and the origins of Brutalism than Viganò was, and working with a repertoire of materials that - as culled and clogged in purely verbal description - sounds the same as Viganò's: concrete, brick, wood, glass. Some of the interior spaces, such as the common room at the Isolotto Macchioli and the play-room for very small children at the orphanage, even look rather alike in photographs. But the effect is very different in reality; Macchioli is stern, but the orphanage is very gentle, the final dispersal that exposed brick and concrete are 'human'. Viganò's building, therefore, is more Brutalist in the common usage of the term, the purely aesthetic, in terms of the 'ethic' of Brutalism, the two schools are on an even footing, both serious attempts at the right human environment, or habitat, for a particular human situation in time and place. What one cannot be certain about, however, is how Viganò him-
The preoccupation with habitat, the total built environment that shelters man and directs his movements, is complex because it concerns many diverse Brutalist buildings, and connects Brutalism with other progressive thinking (and action) outside the field of architecture. This preoccupation with the habitation of ‘Man’s arc’, in the post-war years, from a real sense of social need — a need for dwellings, needed for better dwellings, and for understanding how dwellings interact with the total environment, the practice has been dominated by purely visual deep-plan concepts. Walk on the mechanical and communicative services needed for a rapidly growing city. Brutalism as a movement concentrated on the domination of a basic few rectangular massing concepts from Cour busier, and from that mythology of a Mediterranean an influence, the upsurge of influence, and the influence of the contemporary Modern movement in architecture at La Marta. Thus, the work of Paul Rudolph that most persistently receives the slur of Brutalism, is not his Art and Architecture Brutalism. Building at Yale with its utricularly concrete surfaces, but his mansarded-housing for the lower fraternity of which he himself endeavoked.

"It should look like a village, not like housing ..."parts are repeated, they don’t look like it. Tradition housing has used repeated housing units, but it doesn’t work. Too many repeat but not repeat, style. The parts are implied — cour, streets and terraces, paths and entrances.

In the choice of image: ‘like a village’ (in its built specificity a mountain village), and as a village, the ‘corners and facades, paths and entrances’, this habitat reveals all too clearly the trap it sets. It is the implied ambition to formulate a literally built-in community. But how one can escape the range of basic concepts may be, it is a bitter truth that the world will not allow the ex-urban better habitats, more comfortable living, but Le Corbusier had envisaged an influential, glorifying, generational, poetic image of the Brutalist. But in the name of Brutalism that it occasionally confused, or not in time, that of Brutalism standard or propose significant variations upon it. The major three schemes that have been and are therefore ranked in order of their degree of departure from Cour busier prototypes, rather than in chronological sequence, though it is hoped that all of them are contemporary that the sequence is not important. Brutalism as an idea, the idea of the flat, standing on a wooded ridge outside Berlin, was effectively completed in 1950. The idea of the flat, standing on a wooded ridge outside Berlin, has been never broken in detail. The plan is just one step away from the Papenburger City of the Sainte-Baume project’, (Neave Brown) and that one step was toward the same primitive 21st century urbanism behind Paul Rudolph in the United States. Le Corbusier has also described Halle as ‘... orderly and complete, an Italian hill town, with a complete road and carriageway, plan, and centrally planned-in social identity’.

Le more historically precise, the step away from Le Corbusier’s Sainte-Baume brings Atelier 5 rather closer for a more radical, more evident, more the most beguiling aspect of Roj’s only reappraise- ers schemes — the stepped path splitting the axis, the house passing through a public space, on the other by the choice of persons, the Japanese architects, with the accommodation on more than one level, achieved.

Le Corbusier’s original vision of such a habitat had been deeply interwoven with the social reform, the simple life, spiritual retreatment, and so forth, and was in that sense, a much more simple, single object of such a series of courtyards behind which was of the ‘habitation’ of a considerable aesthetic, derived from and mental innumerous different Cour busier sources, some of them — such as the loose-tiles from the ‘Unter’ of Marlies — seemingly quite out of key, and out of scale with the image of the plan and setting.

However, subsequent overgrowth by vegetation, especially going from the flat, standing on a wooded ridge outside, which has been rendered by the imperative power of nature to the status of a leafy retreat, of the mid-twentieth century equivalent of the garden suburb that was the image of primitive habitat in 1950.

Kuro Makiya’s Harni apartment block in Tokyo is certainly the best possible example. It is in Tokyo, and its universtry site, has been preserved for posterity, this city’s raw concrete will always stare blankly out at the world, the date, the fact, that its maker currently tends to regard Kuro Tange’s Kurozuka town as its cityscape of the future, its own exercise in ‘gros beton armé’ in Japan. It is worth remembering the time Tange’s master, and nowadays, an important direct link between Japan and Le Corbusier that may well prove more significant than the connection through Jusso Satukawa. In terms of a concept very much an extension of Kurozuka occupied a period in the history of Japanese architecture that was the fact that people are the masters of architecture, and architecture must promote them, the necessary freedom.

In the context, the big Harni block looks less start- ing, aesthetically and as a proposition for a habitat. On the other hand, the Smithsoneds, had in fact accepted much of a departure from the norm of a ‘large’, isolated slab home for the next thirty years, more or less: the second level: the living area being reached by stairs. The decision to em- ploy an internal street desk was probably taken even as a direct choice against Le Corbusier’s ‘rooms interior’ concept, but even more significant is the at- titude toward their function in the total habitat, as expressed by Rota and Moretti.

It seems to me however, that drying diapores are a sign of life and energy, if the building becomes a part of the city. If the building is at fault. An apartment house should be a sign of the city and not of the paradigm of human life. If it is not, it is a weak building... and a few paragraphs later, speaking specifically of Harni’s ‘streets’ suspended in the air he goes on to observe:

"Harni can play cards, or ride tricycles as they might do on the side-walk in other areas. Here too the petty boudoirs of the surrounding diasons can grow at night, to the discomfiture of the in- habitants... a building does not really belong to the people unless it is capable of absorbing the disorderly Helping which make it an organized and centralized building..." which means in which two young architects from the English provinces first ensnared the Brutalist ideal and made it into an architectural mood of the time, and it was the work of that which showed that Harni was, as I have shown, that one has to turn to a conclusion that is in the ideal. Park Hill, Sheffield, was effectively designed by J. A. Ramsay, and Vincent, under the direction of J. L. Womersley, the city architect, and it sums up the complexity of the ideas in the hands of the younger architects as the Cambridge Architecture School extension does of the Brutalist intellectual. Inhabitants, who are the building occupying and publicly enjoying a recognizable city suburb — city — the ideas and conceptions that had big ambitions and had been forged by cit- ies in the world. The Saville hilltop enterprise is unified and kept humanly comprehensible by a habitable device that was too to the

[The American Architect, March 1959]
The Smithsons' Golden Lane project used a similar street-access to earn, and made the first moves towards their continuity by creating street-corner junctions where refuse chutes would be located, which they likened to the modern equivalent of the village pump.19

Like the suspended streets of Hauni, Park Hill's street decks occur at every third floor, and onto the decks upon the front doors of all the apartments. Along the deck itself pass small trucks for deliveries, mail and furniture-removals, but no faster wheeled traffic to menace the playing children or gossiping adults — or, indeed the turbulent teenagers who ac- cidentally disturb the peace, for Park Hill, like Haruni, has melted into the history of its times and absorbed something of the shadier side. But the apartments that are served by the street decks are semi-permissive, do not reconstruct the previous domestic scene, and call upon the new inhabitants to adopt a new environment.

There were, in fact, fairly cogent sociological and even criminalistic reasons for breaking up the existing living-patterns of the area, which had be- come a notoriously bighted slum. This, indeed, was the reason for rebuilding it, and this air of mortal urgency was one of the reasons why Jack Lynn and him Smith volunteered to some - for this difficult site rather than an easier one elsewhere in the city. Thus, if Park Hill can in any way be regarded as an ideal solution for this particular site, at that particular time, the ideal is that of the English conception of social justice, as expressed through the English system of local government.

But it differs from Halen or Haruni in more ways than this; the aesthetics is as different as the ethic. Very little indeed of the external detailing makes even token acknowledgement to Le Corbusier, to any other known master, or even to what is normally regarded as architectural detailing. The frame is boldly expressed, emphasising only the cellular na- ture of the contents. The infilling of the frame is in simple brickwork, windows, or balustrading. Before the building was completed the handling of the facades was described on more than one occasion as 'fashionable' or 'lochle-hidden'. For a certain period of the design process the architects were advised by John Forrester, an abstract sculptor, but neither this, nor the influence of fashion seem to have had much effect — it simply looks as if the architects had more important things on their minds than façade-patterns. Jack Lynn, indeed, has publicly stated that the arrangement of the interiors was allowed to de- termine the exterior pattern of solid and void, and that he is happy with the result. Not, one presumes, like an old time functionalist morally secure in the knowledge that form has followed function, but more in the mood of one who sees it helping to build the image of a building more concerned with life 'with architecture'.

For, regard it how you will, Park Hill comes pretty close to 'an other architecture'. Its informal plan- pattern on the ground is more concerned with a proper topological organisation of the site than with Picturesque effect. Indeed its level roof line has an anti-Picturesque quality as one sees the break from the city, though some extremely picturesque silhouettes should be presented by the second phase, Hyde Park, Higher up the hill behind it, Hyde Park is also less rigorously organised in terms of topologi- cal connections than Park Hill, and the accommoda- tion is grouped in a more conventional manner, in high and low blocks. In other words it is housing, not a habitat, and marks a withdrawal from the ex- treme position established by Park Hill. The moral crusade of Brutalism for a better habitat through built environment probably reaches its cul- mination at Park Hill. Nothing proposed since has been extreme in quite the same way, but many of its ideas are diffusing into common usage, just as the aesthetics of 'béton brut' have diffused into a vermecular, a common usage. Brutalism, having run

for ten years or more — which is a fair age for an 'ism' in the present century — had achieved the consummation that awaits all movements which accu- rally pinpoint real needs and aspirations of their period and social context. They do not achieve the dominance for which their founders hope, but instead they 'nurture the history of their time', so that one can hardly imagine what the world could have been like before Brutalism (in this case) came upon the scene. The face of the world does not conform to the Brutalist aesthetic, but the conscience of the world's architecture has been permanently enriched by the Brutalist ethic.

1980
Sheffield City Architect's Department
St. Louis Woodnesley, City Architect,
Sheffild (England), Hyde Park Housing.
1961-68
View of the model
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9.1 Memoirs of a survivor

The reader will have deduced, if he did not already know, that this book is the work of someone fairly deeply involved with the events it describes. I have, in fact, been personally acquainted with most of the British Brutalists and quasi-Brutalists mentioned in the preceding pages; since 1953 or earlier, my personal acquaintance with the non-British architects mentioned is more varied, and in one or two cases, such as kinetic artists, completely non-existent — to my profound regret. The book, therefore, has a built-in bias toward the British contribution to Brutalism: it is not a dispassionate and diplomatic survey, conducted from the cool heights of an academic ivory tower. I was there, involved, and the article drafted for the "Architectural Review" in December 1954 under the title, very accurately, of The New Brutalism seems to have been regarded as a more relevant document for the movement than the Smithsons' statement of January in the same year.

The reason why I have not reported my article as part of this book is that I do not believe it to be truly representative of the state of the Brutalist movement at that time in its evolution, and I do not wish to retract it. Note only very briefly my attempt to father some of my own pet notions on the movement. Any reader who is interested enough to keep it up should read it 'cum grano salis' as a description of the New Brutalism. On the other hand, it repeats some validly as a demonstration of the kind of intellectual climate in which discussions of the New Brutalism, and of architecture in general, were conducted in London, by a certain circle, at that time.

It was an extraordinarily exciting period in the evolution of ideas in Britain, both in the portable arts and in architecture — one of those unrepeatable episodes where importance is discernible even at the time, although its full consequence cannot be appreciated until much later. One of the ways in which we were able to discern that something important was afoot was that there was no particular need to take part in any of the activities abroad — Philip Johnson's interest in Mies van der Rohe, for example (section 8), was far from unique, and the predominantly British make-up of Team X was something of a recognition that British architects had a special contribution to make.

In fact, to write a predominantly British account of the New Brutalism is not necessarily to be parochial or chauvinistic. The origin of Brutalism is 'a movement' which was British, and the fact was recognized, as in Renato Pinao's reference to England as its 'native land' (see section 8.1). The British, too, left a permanent imprint on the movement and on the concept of Brutalism. It was, in short, the first and only consequential British contribution to the living body of architecture since the collapse of the 'English Free Building' of Voysey and Lutyens around 1910. It was not, of course, a wholly British movement — the world of architecture is now so closely-knit by allied communications that only chauvinism or genuine irrelevances will affect the problems of movement in the Net Liberty in Italy) successfully shut up within the confines of one nation's architecture. But even if the high style of Brutalism is Corbusier's, the ethic behind the aesthetic was British, and the creation of a vernacular style was as much a British achievement as anybody else's — one may argue that the achievement of Aitken 5 would have meant in a world that did not include the Smithsons' philosophy, and Stirling and Gowan's, and He C. F. F. C. R. P. billiards.

But, as I write this 'envoy', it is very clear that the biggest and the most important fact about the British contribution to Brutalism is not that it is a movement: for the moment it is still a moving concourse to difficult — the future may have more surprises to offer. But, as in the case of Stirling and Gowan, or the Smithsons, few less far less than others, who have the same automobile phenomenon under control. But in the last resort it is in order to recreate a per- son on the city of Stirling, and the street-facts of Park Hill. The Appian House may make a brave effort to redemocratize the house, but it does so by cramming the traditional slabs of the old into the house itself; the house is still the same kind of shelter as a primitive wattle hut, making no attempt to create a new household powers to work to create human environment in any radically new way.

The ethic of Brutalism was a campaign of means seen in corporate see, but no one should have doubted that the mind and the body would prove, ulte- rarily, to be the mind and body which had always belonged to architecture. For a non-architect like myself to expect them to be otherwise was naive. I knew that architects who genuinely saw how narrow and restricting are the traditions of their profession, normally get out of it, and become in- dividual designers, real-estate agents, systems- engineers or any other discipline that enables them to make a living in a market that is not (necessarily) the market for architecture. If we are to continue to have a world in which 'archi- tect' is a meaningful and productive category of human being, then I would rather have the kind of architect who has begun to emerge since Brutalism be given the opportunity to make a force in the world, especially the force of a woman who has been trained under men like Smithson, Gowan, Stirling, and knows what the traditions of his professions are, and the manner in which he can make a moral stand upon them in the twentieth century. From the time of Berlage, and not until the event, that the idea of a morality of design has become one of the main moves for serious in- novation in Modern Architecture, and the Brutalist proposition that it is even possible to make a moral stand on architecture matters of design is an improvement on the attitude of many architects in the previous two or three generations. I make no mistake that I was not seduced by the aesthetic of Brutalism, but the lingering tradition of its utilitarian stand, the presence...
Lodge Pigott and Gluck Pelleteri, Miracolo Church of the Madonna dei Poveri, 1968
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Atelier S. (Grain Fite, Samuel Getler, Rolf Herdering, Hans Heiseleit, Nikolaus Mengerleiter, Alfredo Pinto)
Berna, Oithoniweg, Stuttgart-Fehsenfeld, 1961
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Front elevation of narrow-section apartment to west of control tower
346
Elevation of narrow-section apartment
View from the south, central plaza
Site plan and section (scale 1:1000)
1. access road
2. parking
3. underground garage
4. filling station
5. village square
6. sluice and restaurant
7. underground power and utilities station
8. tennis court and games area
9. slope
10-13 terraced housing
14. studio-apartments.
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Kiyonori Kikutake: Toyaba (Toyohira, Japan), Toyopia Apartments. 1960
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Rare examples by day and night
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Airey and Peter Smithson; Leicester (England), Economic Centre. 1967
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Lecture Hall, laboratory tower and office-tower from the east
**Photographers**

As far as we were able the photographs were made by the following photographers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Photographs</th>
<th>Photographer(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LCC, Architect's Dept., Photographs Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LCC, Architect's Dept., Photographs Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Architect's Journal - Miller &amp; Harris, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Architect's Journal - Miller &amp; Harris, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Adrian  Lees, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Adrian Lees, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Adrian Lees, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Adrian Lees, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Adrian Lees, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Adrian Lees, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Adrian Lees, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Adrian Lees, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Adrian Lees, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Adrian Lees, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Architect's Review - De: Berg Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Architect's Review - De: Berg Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Architect's Review - De: Berg Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>E.C. Thrussell, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Architectural Review - C. E. Thrussell, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Architectural Review - De: Berg Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>John Bailey, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>P. D. H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Nigel Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Nigel Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Nigel Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Veronique Wermuth, Tübingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>John Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Architect's Journal - Sydney W. Newbery, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Charles R. Rabisch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>John Finney, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>J. A. W. Rhind, Bournemouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Nigel Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Hans Nolke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>The Council of Industrial Design, London</td>
</tr>
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<td>58</td>
<td>The Council of Industrial Design, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>G. W. Roberts, London</td>
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<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Architectural Review - E. S. Keay, London</td>
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<td>61</td>
<td>Architectural Review - E. S. Keay, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Architectural Review - De: Berg Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Arthur Whelan, Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Prentice Hall, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Architectural Review - De: Berg Gallery</td>
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<td>Architectural Review - De: Berg Gallery</td>
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The illustrations of the Catholic buildings (except photographs) are taken from the "Oeuvre complète" and are reproduced here with kind permission of the publisher Dr W. Guelke.
Theory and Design in the First Machine Age
by Roger Barham, Ph.D.
Size 5 x 8 ins. 256 pages, with 150 illustrations. Second impression.
Price 6s. 6d. (Postage 1s. 6d.)
The purpose of this book is to endeavor and exultate for the first time the development of design in the first Machine Age. It is the history of the relation of machines to those from the invention of the machine (Greece, Mesopotamia, Etruria, & Egypt). The invention of the machine around 1830 is the subject of the book, with the wonders, with the mighty gaiety in the other arts. In 177,000 words led Dr. Barham takes architecture as the main theme, but at the same time sketch with industrial design generally, together with painting and sculpture in being scholarly done, is his from dull and his written a readable and readable book.

Guide to Modern Architecture
by Roger Barham, Ph.D.
Size 7½ x 10¼ ins. 350 pages with over 150 illustrations.
Price 25s. net. (Postage 1s. 6d.)
In most countries modern buildings are now an appreciable part of the landscape in everyday life. Yet their critics seem to distinguish but very from good, and their supporters often to be held to all these and not as. If they were a word of people. This book lists some steps into the situations, by briefly explaining, like elements, that make up a modern building by illustrating and considering on a worldwide, highly interesting modern buildings. The result is a finely judicious of the author's skills that modern architecture should not be difficult to appreciate, because it is like any other subject or only worse so; it has many things to say and many ways of saying them.
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