An Encounter with History: the postwar debate between the English Journals of *Architectural Review* and *Architectural Design* (1945-1960)

M. Christine Boyer

Architectural debate in England concerning postwar reconstruction of towns and cities was contained within a language of 'Englishness'. This discourse involved issues of national identity, and the relationship of England to its past and future, as well as to the American present. [1] Adjustment to postwar circumstances was painful for England: it was forced to give up its empire, marginalized with the rise of the USA and USSR as new world powers, and it was deeply troubled over the effects American mass culture might have on its social stability. One observer of postwar England noted "1945 saw the greatest restoration of traditional social values since 1660."[2] Social change – or so it was believed — could be managed by keeping to English 'traditions' which were ordinary and simple. [3] England was 'an unassuming nation,' made up of "quiet, private and ordinary people defined by their modesty, kindness to others, loyalty, truthfulness, straightforwardness, and simplicity." [4]

Townscape analysis, or the English Picturesque, which the editors of *Architectural Review* [*AR*] promoted, was tied to this plain and simple language of 'Englishness'. *AR* argued in its editorials that the man in the street wanted a picture of the postwar world that the planner was designing for him yet he was denied such a visual policy. Even though there existed a national picture-making aptitude embedded within the 18th century Picturesque, this theory had never been applied to the urban scene. Hence *AR* set itself the task to develop a series of townscape principles that would ameliorate the surface antagonisms that appeared along the streets of English towns and cities. The Picturesque was a blend of popular modernism with English traditionalism, an aesthetic theory that enabled people to see functionally incoherent objects in convincing visual relationships. *AR's* editorial policy maintained that the English Picturesque was an art of compromise, a specifically English form of synthesis. Such a compromise gave satisfaction to all tastes, both the amateur in the backyard and the professional in his regional plans.[5]

At the same time as the reinvention of the English Picturesque, and in part as a reaction to its full realization in the Festival of Britain in 1951, as well a rejection of their elders advocating the provincial legacy of 'Englishness' with its stifling stress on tradition, a younger generation of artists and architects developed an alternative method of looking at cities and their commercial environments. Some of their discussions would take place within a small group – known to us today as The Independent Group – that met informally and intermittently at the Institute of Contemporary Design between 1952 and 1954. In their first meeting, the group explored Eduardo Paolozzi's series of images, which he called 'found images' or cut-outs from American magazines and comic books. Their clear fascination with American commercial art and its crash consumer culture was a strong provocation to set against English traditions. These icons from a more consumer oriented mass production society offered an escape as well from postwar austerity and continued rationing and they were hopeful indications for the immediate future. As two members of the group, Alison and Peter Smithson, claimed "[m]ass production advertising is establishing our whole pattern

of life – principles, morals, aims, aspirations, and stand of living. We must somehow get the measure of this intervention if we are to match its powerful and exciting impulses of our own."[6] This bountiful aesthetic would eventually find an expressive outlet in the pages of *Architectural Design* [*AD*].

Besides this debate over the relevant images to exploit in pursuing a postwar policy of design for the built environment, there were more fundamental issues to confront regarding the nature of the newly established welfare state facing the task of reconstruction and planning the good society. Change was to be orchestrated through a series of compromised legislations. For example, the Garden City Movement, a product of the turn of the century, gained a new lease on life with respect to the reconstruction of town and country during the 1940s. This movement culminated in the New Towns Act of 1946 and was the conceptual home for such progressive thinkers as Raymond Unwin and Patrick Abercrombie who mingled traditional forms with modern agendas. Abercrombie appeared to be "a regional gardener, planting New Towns, trimming pre-war housing sites: 'these slabs of housing should be welded into real communities, their ragged edges rounded off, social and shopping centers properly planned, and local green belts provided.'" [7] Here too, architects were not venturing far from English tradition as the conveyor of modern architecture. [8]

Yet architects concerned with aesthetics in postwar England had other reasons for concern.[9] First was the increasing reliance on technological solutions to architectural problems that might potentially lead to the elimination of architects in favor of engineers. And second, the growth of town planning as an independent profession, that relied increasingly on expertise beyond the control of architects. Since 1932, the Town Planning Institute held the authority to examine candidates who no longer needed to first pass examinations set by architects. In either case it was feared, the aesthetic discourse about postwar reconstruction might lead to the marginalization of architects, especially those who advocated a modernist stance.

In addition, architects were outraged over intentions embodied in the language and regulations of the Town and Country Planning Act, framed in 1943, 1944 and 1947. The Act gave final say over all future development to plans conceptualized by local authorities whose interest and training were far from those architects held. In all of the 120 sections of regulations found in the Act, only six dealt with aesthetics: two concerning the preservation of buildings of historic or architectural interest, two focusing on limiting controls of signage on buildings, and the final two referring to trees in developing areas. In summary, then, these are a few of the many concerns that formed the background in which the aesthetic debates about postwar reconstruction took place.

Encounter with history in the Pages of *Architectural Review*

The mouthpiece for English modernism before and after WWII was *Architectural Review* [*AR*] owned by Hubert de Cronin Hasting with an editorial staff that included J. M. Richards and Nikolaus Pevsner, and artists John Piper and Gordon Cullen. Its pages became a forum for advocating the English Picturesque tradition as a critical tool to be used against the government's policy of reconstruction. In 1959 Joseph Rykwert described *AR* as "probably the most striking architectural publication appearing anywhere in the world". [10] With its 'ship-shape look', 'close print', 'colored pages' it offered readers the impression that each and every issue was packed with solid ideas and coverage of recent projects. Its international reputation, was primarily due to the prolific draughtsman, Gordon Cullen whose 'photographic eye' cut the field of vision to the most arresting and striking passages: "the people look like dolls, the buildings like models, the landscapes positively dinky." Rykwert called this style artificial and perverse, albeit catching and attractive. [11]

One of the most important editors of *AR*, was J. M. Richards who began as assistant editor in 1935, and remained in editorial control for nearly four long decades.[12] He announced in 1971, the year after he had been fired as editor by Hastings, that the battle for modernism had been won for "we are all modernists now, through what that means I am not sure that we know, nor whether what it means any longer matters." [13] Richards likened an architectural magazine to "a bridge, carrying traffic in both directions. It can help to span the distance between architects and the public they serve, on the one hand by informing the public about architecture's potentialities, objectives and techniques, and on the other by giving architects a better understanding of the public's needs and discontents."[14] One of the major struggles for or against Modernism with which *AR* engaged was the promotion of the English Picturesque or the development of townscape principles.

AR became an ardent promoter of townscape principles based on the belief that the town was a visual field of operation in which local officials and the general public had more control over the battle than architects did. As a bridge, it fell to *AR* to educate those who did not have an architect's trained eye about the potentialities for compromise and defeat in the built domain. Consequently *AR* published an assortment of guidelines for visual conduct to enlighten the architects' clients. But simultaneously, attention to townscape details was intended to enlarge

> "the architect's range of perception: from the individual building to the relationship between buildings, from the consideration of limited architectural values to the consideration of values related to the whole environment – a conveniently indefinable word recently brought into fashion to express architecture's wider connotations, which has also been officially adopted" [15]

The struggle over townscape analysis had many strands to it. One was training both the clients and the architects to have a 'reconstructed eye'. But the battle over visual effects extended to its many articles on architectural history – the province of Pevsner. In this manner *AR* believed it was offering both architects and clients alike a better understanding of the place old buildings had in the modern town and the vicissitudes a town might experience while maintaining its continuity and identity. At least this was the rationale that lay behind the re-discovery in the 1940s of the 18th century theory of the English Picturesque now applied for the first time to the town and its genius loci. It was hoped that no modern architect would subsequently demand a tabula rasa on which his buildings must rest. Moreover, visual pleasure was not restricted to the application of well-known patterns and forms, but enhanced by chance and surprise as well. Consequently, another aim of *AR* was to sharpen visual perception of architects and clients alike

> "by surprising the eye with unexpected images from the widest variety of sources. "…"The *Review's* continual experiments over the years with layout, type-faces and the treatment of pictures have not been simply pride in its own craft; they have been based on the desirability of using visual images — just as an architect does – to establish moods and reflect the spirit of the occasion; to arrest the eye and accustom it to take nothing for granted." [16]

A specific irritant in the debate over townscape analysis was the role that 'history' held in architectural criticism. John Summerson noted that architectural history made significant advances during WWII

> "Unlike the first World War, the second World War gave great encouragement to new ideas in architecture and the arts. Between 1939 -1945, a great many people found that they had time on their hands…. At the beginning of the war, there was a general shutdown, waiting for air raids, but gradually a mini-Renaissance developed during the war years. Paperbacks, intelligent paper-backs produced especially by Penguin had just been introduced and a considerable section of the population suddenly discovered intellectual values and spheres of thought and activity which never dawned on them. All through the war there was a certain amount of writing and lecturing which kept this interest afloat and, in fact increased it." [17]

For example, Nikolaus Pevsner had been a student at Birmingham University in 1936 where his subject was the English tradition in industrial design. A few years later he was introduced to Allen Lane, who had just set-up Penguin Books in 1937 and there began a long association between the two, which resulted in many fine books, including Pevsner's monumental series of *Buildings of England.* Paperback books persuaded Reyner Banham that he should transfer from being a student of engineering to architectural history. As he recounted, one day while waiting in a blitz-happy queue in Bristol, leaning on a bus stop, he was so absorbed in reading a paperback book that the bus came and went. There he

remained perusing Pevsner's *Outline of European Architecture.* This autobiographical story, Banham asserted, is

> "symbolically relevant" [for the] "whole call-up group who acquired Pelican *Outlines* straight off the press in 1943. We were the first generation to come to the live study of architectural history uncorrupted by previous contact with Banister Fletcher. For us it was never the embalmed death-roll of mislabeled styles that old BF made it; for us it was always a snap-crackle-pop subject. The *Outline* changed the outlook *for good*, and quite as much as cheap colour photographs." [18]

> "The paperback was always an expendable product with me, used to destruction and replaced by a new edition, or a new reprint. But while it was in paperback, it was a sharp-edged weapon, like J. M. Richards's *Introduction to Modern Architecture* or C. H. Waddington's *Scientific Attitude* — all sharp enough to slice through fatigue, mental staleness, the noise of war and transport, the hostile atmosphere of barracks and digs, to slice right through to the heart of all forms of aesthetic fuddy-duddiness. To do that the *Outline* needed those crammed pages of type, where the facts and arguments crowded close after one another, it needed the thin pocket format to go anywhere and be picked up at a moments notice."[19]

So imagine how shocked the younger architects was when Pevsner, their hero of the paperbacks, wrote articles in *AR* and delivered radio talks on the BBC defining a new national style of architecture and town planning, entitled the English Picturesque! This was a group of mature architectural students who had interrupted their training in order to fight a war but they now felt betrayed and abandoned upon returning to their studies in 1948. J. M. Richards and Nicholaus Pevsner were harshly attacked for "their debased English habits of compromise and sentimentality".[20] First of all, Richards published a strange book in 1946, *Castles on the Ground*, a celebration of the English taste for suburban life; while Pevsner, who assumed the editorship of *AR* when Richards joined the war effort in 1942 and would remain on the editorial staff until 1965, began to write in the 1940s and 1950s, a series of articles in the pages of *AR* on the English Picturesque to which he assigned the arcane label of "Sharawaggi' [21]

A war broke out between the architectural 'establishment' who manned the editorial staff of *AR* and a generation of battle-worn, hard-edged, mature students who wanted nothing to do with the visual disarray of the English suburbs or the compromises of the Picturesque. The students, however, did not have a magazine in which to vent their disgust until Theo Crosby joined Monica Pidgeon on the editorial staff of *Architectural Design* [*AD*] in 1953. Consequently little of their early opposition ever appeared in print.[22] Compared to *AR, AD* was poorly financed and understaffed but it was the vehicle for the younger generation to vent their opinions, and it followed more closely the trends of the times.

If *AR's* outspoken advocacy of the Picturesque was not bad enough, in 1954 Pevsner made an infuriating comparison in the pages of *AR* when he proclaimed "the Modern revolution of the early twentieth century and the Picturesque revolution of a hundred years before had all their fundamentals in common." [23] The younger generation was furious, quickly sallying forth behind a letter published in *AR* and signed by Alan Colquhoun.[24] They were deeply offended because Le Corbusier and continental rationalism were the classicizing standards some could march behind in their battle against the compromising and debilitating effects of the English Picturesque. Then followed Pevsner's most vicious attack: his Reith Lectures on the BBC given in October and November of 1955 entitled "The Englishness of English Art".

In the end, however, the anti-Picturesque movement being young and energetic was struggling on too many fronts and moving in too many different directions to wage a prolonged and consistent attack on the bastions of *AR* with their debilitating compromises. One direction followed the classicizing thrusts of Colin Rowe after his inaugural sortie "The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa" was published in *AR* as early as March of 1947. A few years later, another group marched under the banner of science and technology playing with concepts and subjects they half understood such as Heisenberg's 'uncertainty principle', topology, the concept of 'open-endedness', and Karl Popper's *The Open Society.*[25]

The final break with Colin Rowe's position – the classicizing tendencies of the Modern Movement — came

> " when the Smithsons – the bell-wethers of the young throughout the middle fifties – declared their rejection of proportion and symmetry and embarked on a period of very equivocal relationships with such previously admired classical imagery as Poussin's architectural backgrounds or the planning of Greek sacred sites, which Peter Smithson finally decided were organized by function and circulation, and not by any mathematical system." [26]

The Picturesque movement was incredibly strong and nauseatingly repetitive, and its audience, reached through the pages of *AR,* far wider than anything *AD* could envision. Yet Banham blames the eventual revenge of the Picturesque and its triumphant victory entirely on the Smithsons because they were the leaders of the younger group of architects during the 1950s, yet they never advocated a specific position with which to wage a sustained and consistent war against their enemies. Their stylistic development was marked by absolute discontinuity approaching each new design problem with no formalistic preconceptions and solving each problem by taking it back to first principles. As Banham outlined, the Hunstanston school [1949-1954], an uncompromising exercise in the manner of Mies van der Rohe, opened their career and brought them fame. It also brought them the label of arrogance when they announced they hoped to do Mies one better and avoid some of his

excessive formalisms. [27] Within two years, Banham continued, they had abandoned Mies and adopted a more informal approach, stemming from inspirations that ranged from Jackson Pollock's drip paintings, to art brut of Dubuffet and Eduardo Paolozzi. But they soon abandoned this direction as well, and by 1953 were thoroughly immersed in the study of Pop culture. [28] By 1960 they had landed the commission for The Economist Building in London (1959-64). Here too they would follow their principles and Banham concluded: "their aim is always to create an image that will convince and compel. When they demand that every building must be a prototype, an exemplar, for the cities of the future, they intend this not only to be read functionally, but visually too." [29]

Encounters with History in the pages of *Architectural Design*

Armed with a methodology gleaned from the pages of Hitchcock's and Johnson's *International Style,* Pevsner's *Pioneers of the Modern Movement,* Giedion's *Space, Time and Architecture,* the younger generation of postwar architects set out to look for a new set of principles on which modern architecture could stand; principles that reflected the humanistic concerns of the time. Looking back in order to move forward they began to re-evaluate the heroic period of modern architecture in the 1920s and 1930s and to understand that its forms and images were more complex responses to social and cultural concerns. They sought out forgotten architects and little known architectural forms such as Gaudi, the Futurists, and the Berlin Expressionists.

The mouthpiece for this younger generation would be *Architectural Design.* To imply, however, that there were no crossovers between the two journals is to make an erroneous assumption. After all, Reyner Banham wrote primarily for *AR* and Colin Rowe's seminal essay "On the Mathematics of the Ideal Villa," appeared in that journal. While articles on traditional settlements often appeared in the pages of *AR* they turned up in *AD* as well. Several *AD* issues in 1948 carried articles on the "Prospects for British Architects in the Empire" that ranged from Australia to Africa, and special issues were devoted to Tropical Architecture in 1955, to the work of Fry, Drew and partners in West Africa in 1955, and to architecture in the Middle East in 1957.

In the 1930s, *AD* had been known as *Architectural Design & Construction* and it covered pragmatic issues such as housing, office blocks and hospitals. Monica Pidgeon ghosted for its editor Tony Towndrow during WWII, and when he departed for Australia in 1946, she became editor on her own right. While Pidgeon may have seen that professional involvements with CIAM conferences and Union Internationale des Architectes (UIA), were adequately covered, this was balanced by Theo Crosby who was more concerned with the relationship between fine arts and the popular arts and the impact of mass communication and information on architecture.[30] A common theme shared by both magazines, however,

was an encounter with history. Crosby recounts there were many discussions in the early 1950s about the role history held for contemporary architects and their interest in the recent past made them travel throughout Europe to study the buildings of modern architects in situ. "Ours was a history of beginnings", he remembered, so we set out to discover alternative routes to follow.[31] Banham would also reminisce about these early 1950s travels

> "… the kilometers we must have tramped around the suburbs of Paris and Amsterdam, the millions of francs the concierges and caretakers must have accepted in bribes to let us in ! Outside of the business of design itself, history was the most turbulently active of the mental disciplines immediately adjacent to architecture — .." [32]

Due to these travels and the wild imaginations of the younger generation, traditional settlements in the third world countries would erase the sweet nostalgia of the English Picturesque, America would replace Sweden as an idol of admiration, and science and technology would bring a different opening toward the future.

One of the early influences on the *AD* generation came from reading E. A. Gutkind's *Revolution of Environment* published in 1946 and *Community and Environment* published in 1953.[33] Instead of viewing architectural form as solid lumps of stuff, Gutkind suggested taking a process view, thinking about things that were going on such as production, marketing, communication, and human associations. Thinking in processes meant seeing relations between things and understanding how these processes interacted with the consciousness of man.

> "The goal is 'wholeness' and not a mere adding together of details collected at random. How to work out a relationship with the external environment and see it as an every-changing pattern of phenomena and events?" [34]

As an investigator of settlement patterns in different countries, Gutkind hoped to gain a deeper awareness of the strata of transformations through which the world was passing. As the center of gravity shifted from the West to other parts of the world in terms of population growth and the extension of science, technology and industrialization to areas hitherto primarily agricultural, he wondered how world unity would be reformulated and peace maintained in the postwar era. Already he saw seeds of future conflicts and uneven development: slums, unemployment, insufficient social services, dullness of suburban life, ribbon development were among the ills he recounted. "Lasting international cooperation," he argued "is feasible only if we reshape our environment so that it is flexible enough to absorb the impact of forces from outside." [35] His investigations into settlement patterns in different countries had a twofold purpose: to reveal the need for flexible adaptation of the environment throughout the entire world as it adjusted to changing conditions and to show by historical surveys that we need not fear far-reaching changes. He raised the following prob-

lem: how to restore human values to the pattern of the environment and how to move beyond the conditions of uneven development which colonialism bequeathed to the post-war world.

After undertaking a survey of settlement patters throughout the world, Gutkind came to the following resolution. The result of Einstein's space-time relations has a revolutionary impact on spatial conceptions. Architects and planners must now provide a flexible framework for existence that will not break down under the impact of dynamic life. Each unit of the configuration [town, village, street, building or room] must express its functional significance in a distinct fashion. It is important to understand the link between these space-relations, not the dull repetition of static forms. [36] "Housing fulfils a stationary function as opposed to the function of the street which serves the mobile traffic. Each function needs different and even contrasting prerequisites if the most effective results are to be produced." [37] Streets, Gutkind argued, have been given primacy over buildings in the layout of a town, relegating houses to the space between them. This 'cult of the street' has led to traffic congestion, lost time, road accidents, air pollution, noise and uniformity. The solution must break up this traditional relationship and return the street to its basic purpose thus allowing traffic to move along it. Then services to buildings can be reinforced so they adequately provide the stationary elements.

In 1953, Gutkind wrote a series of six articles for *AD* on "How other peoples dwell and live" ranging from the houses of the South Seas, Japan, China, Africa, Arab nations, and Native Americans. [38] He explained that the intent of this series of articles was to examine the interplay of ideas that moved people in different parts of the world to build their homes and to formulate the language of forms in which these ideas were expressed. His was a speculative and selective method questioning the "dogmatic self-righteousness of modern architects', and stimulating them to think afresh about present-day architecture. He did not mean to offer a pattern book of styles that architects could easily mimic, nor did he intend to present superficial stimulation of the fashionably new. There were more serous intentions behind his series of articles: first was the lack of awareness and subsequent neglect of the need for millions of adequate houses around the world and second, to aid architects when they did take up the banner for housing, to take into account the varying needs, customs and aspirations of people who were to be the recipients of such aid. A standard universal solution which modern architects promoted was no longer applicable. While the West may have lost the values which bind people together in a spirit of community, still in primitive and past societies, housing formed a part of the social and spiritual life of the people, of the group and the whole community and this Gutkind warned must be respected.

Yet as Gutkind developed his account, he often drew comparison between traditional settlements and modern architecture and spoke directly to architects. He found the 'membrane-

type of house' of the South Seas and Japan, relevant for modern architects. They too developed 'open-air interiors' not separated from their surrounding environments and formed mere "stepping stones to Modern Architecture'. In the South Seas, houses often constituted a block of flats where all families of the village lived together: a forerunner of Le Corbusier's communal housing experiment at Marseilles but one that would be offensive to Garden City enthusiasts. Gutkind concluded "it is reassuring to know that the use of the third dimension, to build higher in order to reduce the ground-area, is not the personal whim of a few modern architects but one of the elementary ideas of mankind." [39]

Gutkind had utmost praise for the extreme simplicity of the Japanese house, its concentration of functions and elegant proportions, its sliding screens that like a membrane divided the wholeness of the house. "But the really essential factor is the unique perfection with which the illusion of wholeness and infinity has been blended with seclusion and limitation." [40] Gutkind could not make generalizations based on the many different types of African dwellings he studied, although he found Africans in general to be without of a concept of abstract space which they could deploy as an architectural element. Yet he noted "[h]ardly anywhere else have the elementary functions of building been more clearly and more consistently expressed than in the dwellings of the African tribes. Their simplicity is their beauty and the clarity of their form cannot be surpassed: purpose, function, and form are in perfect harmony."[41] He noted that it was unfortunate that anthropologists paid no heed to architecture because it was essential that the physical environment be transformed together with the social and economic structures if "grave tensions are to be avoided which may easily make all efforts on our part illusory." [42]

The many definitions of "New Brutalism"

It is easy to make the connections between Gutkind and A&P Smithson in one of the first articles they wrote for *AD* entitled "The Built World: Urban Re-identification" in June of 1955. The key concepts they used were, 'identity', and 'association'**.** Every form of association, they argued, has an inherent pattern of building that can be used to reinforce identity and community. They were looking for a new sense of order, a structuring system of relationships that would overcome the anonymity and loss of place in the city that destruction of both bombs and reconstruction had created. They, like Gutkind, were also concerned with identity in a mobile society. The core of these ideas had been put into place in their 1952 competition entry for the Golden Lane Housing project. A sense of community they argued could be re-introduced — or re-identified—around the ordering device of 'street decks'. All kinds of communal activities plus individual yard-gardens connected to these streets in the air transformed them into places. Acknowledging their debt to Corbusier's Unité, under construction since 1946, they utilized a similar technique employing a construction rack into which individual dwellings were inserted. Le Corbusier's solution, they proclaimed,

contained the seeds of what they wanted to do
However, the functional city of CIAM that Le Corbusier still advocated, separated space into distinct units of housing, work, leisure and transportation, while the Smithsons sought an order that linked space – it was the relationships and processes that counted. So they stated: "Without links to our fellows we are dead" [43] There were four city elements, or patterns of association, clearly defined in their new system of relationships that structured the city, a system that followed the outlines of Gutkind: the house, street, district and city. They defined the first city element to be the house, the shell that fits man's back, it looks inward to the family and outward to society and its organization should reflect this duality. [44] The street, is the second city element, the new idea being the multi-layered arrangement of streets in the air. The third element is the district where our circle of friends resides, and finally the ultimate community, the city, becomes an arrangement of such districts.
Gutkind's influence on the Smithsons goes further than rethinking the street and the patterns of association, for it helps to unravel the conundrums that swirl around any definition offered of "New Brutalism". If we think back to the series of articles appearing in *AD* on "How other peoples dwell and build." in which Gutkind drew linkages to modern architecture, in hindsight the associations become clear, albeit not to the editors of *AD*. In order to clarify what the meaning of this new label, which appeared in common usage before anyone understood its true associations, the editors of *AD* asked the Smithsons as prophets of this new movement to supply a definition, which was published subsequently in an editorial in January of 1955. [45] The Smithsons offered the following series of considerations: "New Brutalism" is a development of the modern movement – its main practitioner is Le Corbusier starting with the 'béton brût' of the Unité; but fundamentally because he utilized the yardstick of Japanese architecture, its underlying ideas, principles and spirit. They explicitly mention as influence Le Corbusier's purist aesthetic, use of sliding screens, continuous space, and power of white and earth colors. Secondly they note: "It is this reverence for materials – a realizing of the affinity which can be established between building and man — which is at the root of the so-called "New Brutalism"". They draw another lesson from Gutkind: what is 'new' about this movement is that its closest affinities are found not in past architectural styles [in reference to the dastardly policies of *AR* advocating the English Picturesque, New Monumentality, New Empiricism, New Sentimentality, etc. [46]] but instead rests in peasant dwelling forms. "It has nothing to do with craft. We see architecture as the direct result of a way of life." It is as Gutkind outlined the result of how people dwell and build.
Then the Smithsons add a series of considerations to be included in an expanded field of "New Brutalism".

> "1954 has been a key year. It has seen American advertising equal Dada in its impact of overlaid imagery; that automotive masterpiece, the Cadillac convertible, parallel-with-the-ground (four elevations) classic box on wheels; the start of a new way of thinking by CIAM; revaluation of the work of Gropius; the repainting of the Villa at Garches."

By the next December in the pages of *AR*, Banham added his voice to the field of forces attempting to definitively work out the parameters of this new movement around "Brutalism". [47] He opens and closes his article with Le Corbusier's proclamation: « L'Architecture, c'est, avec des Matieres Bruts, établir des rapports émouvants. » But his concern returns us to the issue at hand : what have been the influences of contemporary architectural historians on the field of architecture? Have they introduced as much confusion and distortions as Marx did to capitalism or Freud to psychology? Banham's answer is twofold: they have invented the Modern Movement and they had classify 'isms' into two categories: the first utilizes the label as a descriptive term applied by critics and historians to a body of work while the second is utilized by the members of a movement as a banner or slogan adopted by the group. The trouble is "New Brutalism", Banham allowed, tries to be both at once.

"New Brutalism", he argued, must be understood against the background of the most recent history of architectural studies, particularly that of the Modern Movement. It was a term first used by the left to decry the Modernist vocabulary of flat roofs, glass, exposed structure, and anything that deviated from "the New Humanism" and the Picturesque. Then the term was re-appropriated and took on a degree if precision: it drew Le Corbusier's 'béton brût' and Dubuffet's 'Art Brut' into its purview. As it did however it became confused trying to be both a description of the movement and a banner behind which to march. The trouble for Banham lay in the fact that the Smithsons were talking basically to each other, deploying the term long before anyone else had seen anything of its practice. Not until September of 1954 when the *AR* first published photographs and plans of the Smithsons' Hunstanton School did its readers have visual evidence of what "New Brutalism" was all about.

Banham offered the following definition: "New Brutalism" meant a clear exhibition of structure and plan and an uncompromising treatment of materials 'as found'. Put together these two aspects tell how a building works and what the play of its spaces are. The most important aspect is, however, the ruthless logic, which enables the spectator to grasp the entire entity as a 'visual image'. Here Banham's wit gets the better of him for he calls the Smithsons' a-formal approach merely playing with the idea of topology because relationships are their only concern, and analogously speaking 'beauty' is displaced by the Brutalist 'image'. But now Banham circles back to Le Corbusier and the use of the history of the modern movement. It is Le Corbusier who established that memorability of an image affects the emotions, clear exhibition of structure determines the relationship of its parts, and the use of materials 'as found' are the raw materials. Even though "New Brutalism" follows these definitions offered by Le Corbusier, Banham accedes, it nevertheless is an architecture that speaks not to his time, but to ours.

Things would not remain without further clarification and yet more confusion. *AD* re-entered the field in 1957 by publishing first an opinion piece on "New Brutalism" in April and second, three additional 'Thoughts in Progress" in its October, November and December issues which included anonymous points of view on the subject. [48] *AD* proclaimed that it was difficult to determine the meaning of "New Brutalism" for the movement did not stand still. At first during the time of Hunstanston school and the small house planned for Soho [that is the early 1950s], it seemed to mean a revolt against postwar British architecture and their lack of rigor and clear thinking whether evidenced in romantic Picturesque pastiches of the 1951 Festival of Britain or the free empirical manner borrowed from Sweden. It was a call to order, to a basic classical organization of the parts of a building assembled into an apprehensible image to which nothing could be added or taken away. "The Brutalist method of achieving this classic wholeness was by a close concern with the qualities of materials 'as found' and by a passionate moral earnestness about the clear exhibition of structure." [49]

Banham's 1955 definition of "New Brutalism", however, destroyed this neat definition by implying the movement had abandoned classical symmetry for an a-formal approach based on the high mathematics of topology. But *AD* found there was no evidence that topology, which regards a brick and a billiard ball or a teacup and a gramophone record as being the same shape, has ever been applied to architecture. Moreover, if one sticks to the a-formal aspect of the definition then Hunstanton school does not belong to the Brutalist canon. Such is the inherent problem with a movement that has produced no buildings but only words. The true pioneers of the Modern Movement had been better activitists, they could put behind their words something they or their associates had actually built.

Thus the debate reduced itself to a situation in which the "Brutalists'" ideas were the only things that could be evaluated. Here too, it was felt most of these were derived from *Vers une Architecture* except for a-formalism and topology, which appeared to be new. But the Smithsons' words led to further confusion: what did they mean by the phrase 'to create an architecture of reality' without explaining the 'reality' word? Did the meaning of the statement "the affinity which can be established between building and man is at the root of Brutalism" reduce itself to a watered down version of Humanism? Still further what does a peasant style of life have to say about life in a complex society? Vagueness of terms had not helped the cause of "New Brutalism".

To return to first principles was a helpful and admirable gesture but "New Brutalism" should not have stayed there. Young architects were intent on stripping off all symbols of Church and State to get down to the human being – but to penetrate even deeper to the skeleton, to the fundamental bones was impossible and could be done only when a person was dead. The three 'Brutalist' dogmas: a-formalism, truth to structure, and materials 'as found' only touched the fringe of architecture, leaving the problems of creating specific buildings

unsolved. Thus *AD* summed the situation up: “New Brutalism” was an immature, ill-defined movement at this moment in time and may have reached a dead-end.

AD continued the discussion a few months later introducing a new topic: the gap between technology and inspiration. They understood that architects in general were searching for an architectural ‘philosophy’, for a close connection between theory and practice. Theory gives a sense of security to the practicing architect because it assures him that his work relates to a coherent system of ideas. This is why “New Brutalism” was so troubling as a movement. Yet *AD* allowed that in the beginning architectural theory has to be vague before anyone can write it down and accept it. Within these vagaries, however, there still was need for a few signposts, a few basic maxims, a few accepted ways of looking at things, to come to the aid of architects wandering in the no-man’s-land between blunt technology on the one hand and individual inspiration on the other. Therefore *AD* invited an anonymous panel to continue the discussion “summing up the New Brutalism” in the next three issues.

This would introduced still further questions.

> “In letters to *AD,* the Smithsons said they hoped to drag a rough poetry out of confused and powerful forces; and Mr. Voelcker that the architect must be almost passively receptive to the sequences of situations in which he finds himself. All this is characteristic of our day and, though it is perfectly possible for any individual architect to say ‘What the hell,” to all of it and go his own way, we must recognize that the downgrading of the architect to a modest, anonymous co-operator is something which a great number of architects — and especially those most concerned with contemporary problems — accept as being in the nature of things.”[50]

There is a problem, *AD* assumed, with accepting that anonymity, passivity and modesty are the keynotes of the time. It bestows on society a decadent air. Primal responses become so faint and bonds holding society together so weak that artists have no natural sustenance and either turn to destruction hoping it will be creative or retreat from society searching for something more fundamental to hold onto without knowing what that might be. *AD* warned, architecture is a social, outward-turning art it cannot look to or benefit from the other arts that are inward turning “Architecture must, therefore, it would appear, cut its own way back to the great primordial responses.”[51]

AD was strong in its opinions: architects must provide solutions to specific problems that exist within society and industrial processes. “It should be possible to state the true relation between buildings of a high intensity and vernacular buildings, but there is an unknown term in the equation.” In counter-distinction to the positions that *AD* promoted*, AR* has suggested that in the eighteenth century, “the whole apparatus of classical architecture

was brought into play to balance this equation. It provided not only a grammar, but also social, cultural and historic overtones and a wide range of emotional references." [52] Yet *AD* maintained to the contrary, this grammar narrowed the field of creative decisions by spelling out the rules of vernacular architecture set down in pattern books. Such rules could not be the response to today's unanswered problems. Even though the pages of *AR* revealed that beneath the vernacular of the pattern book there lay another vernacular, that projects executed by unself-conscious craftsmen working within the shared and inherited tradition of wheelwrights and carpenters, nevertheless industrialization had wiped out all craft traditions and allowed no possibility for their re-animation. What we do need, *AD* continued as if following the counter-examples provided by Gutkind, was a set of motivating ideas about how people lived, worked, played, moved and grew: a language derived from the best that could be thought and built assisting in the creation of a decent environment. *AD* reiterated: these motivating ideas must be of a kind different for architecture than they are for the other arts, because architecture is a public art and susceptible to social influences. "Ideas are particularly important in a formative period like the present when the need for a vernacular is generally realized, but the necessary architectural language is not yet there. The only way to advance is through the general acceptance of standards of value and a proper understanding of the role of high intensity, monumental, poetic buildings." [53]

AD suggested that perhaps the younger generation of architects would eventually find certainty by rejecting the canons of the Modern Movement and searching about with sufficient passion and intensity "amid the detritus of our civilization, to which it seems they are bound to stand on a curious love/hate relationship." But even so they cannot escape the "dangerous encounter with machine technology". [54] Certainty will not come from accepting the most outrageous manifestations of industrial society. They must look to the building, to the site, to understand how the problem has been solved, and how the gap that looms between inspiration and the use of modern technology has been bridged. The conclusion then is to "focus on the social, economic, topographical, technical and architectural factors that will affect the building, everyone of what have been called the 'objects found'…. The architect has to be true to this unified and total concept of his building, whether it is hovel or cathedral, and must work in harmony with its laws…. to state as clearly as he can as many as possible of the implications of what it may be convenient to call the 'objects found' philosophy." [55]

Having showed their hand that after-all *AD* was concerned with specifying the set of principles an 'as found' philosophy might include, they continued.

> "Every building has at its heart an image, a generating idea, which must express itself through every part and every detail. Though 'Truth to Structure' may be a limiting fallacy, it can illuminate the basic architectural task if structure is taken to include all the laws of a specific building, derived from all the facts about site, materials, functions, cost, and environment."[56]

However, this cult of simplicity and getting down to brass tacks is not sufficient in itself because it cuts the architect off from other important responses. Technology and its inspirations must also be based on the wishes of a client, the human situation as a whole and the way man's various activities can best be accomplished in a given environment. The architect must question and try out everything, holding on to only that which is good. There must be harmony achieved between the architect and the planner as they both focus on the same processes. No building is absolutely sufficient to itself either in town or village. The links and the spaces between the buildings and the relations of one to the other, of new buildings to old in space and time, are just as important and just as worthy of architectural study as the new building itself. Thus the position advocated in the pages of *AD* may not have been so different from the general framework of 'Englishness' that engendered the townscape discussion in *AR* for *AD* continued:

> "This empirical approach by study and analysis is one that has always been favoured in ENGLAND. We have shown examples of the works of the past partly to remind ourselves of the integral place that architecture has held in English culture. …. The immediate past is there for them to react against as violently as they can, the rest is open for the occasional raid for raw material, not to be pastiched but to be ground up small in the creative process. Only the 'objects found' philosophy can, … regenerate English architecture and create buildings that will solve specific English problems and not merely adapt, as far as possible, something that looks impressive somewhere abroad. For the past thirty years, English architecture has been trying to catch up with what has been going on in Europe and America. It is time that we thought about what we really want ourselves."[57]

AD, however, needed to remind the architectural reader that a gulf existed between the architect and the layman who generally does not understand the 'as found' philosophy. Other arts can survive in a void, but architecture cannot. Architects must remember that architecture is above all an art, an art that constantly affects people's lives.

> "A critic …. [has]to cut a path through all the nebulous talk and theorizing back to the first principles of the modern movement, to re-state them in our terms and to see which if any, are still valid to-day. Moreover, he must see buildings in terms of 'objects found'. It is up to him to show how these disparate objects have been fused into a whole, into a work of architecture. He must penetrate through the communicating elements of a building to its motivating ideas." [58]

> "In fact, architecture is more than an art and more than a science; it takes in the whole of human experience. Almost as soon as a primitive society reaches consciousness, it begins to create architecture. Only the architect has the chance to use the most recent scientific developments in the service of a discipline that was already ancient when the pyramids were built. The architect is the only direct and continuous link between the life of home and market-place, and the most austere and esoteric fast-

> nesses of art. He has no reason to apologize for his existence, no need at all to present himself as a self-effacing assistant in a technological process. He has his work to do and no-one else can do it." [59]

An encounter with America in the pages of *AR* and *AD*

Alongside of "New Brutalism" and the role that architectural history held for modern architects and in spite of the encompassing framework of 'Englishness' they both shared, America would be another battleground in which the two journals found themselves to be on opposite sides. In 1950, *AR* decided to turn its visual eye on the landscape of America, devoting an entire issue to *Machine-made America.* [60] As advocates of the Picturesque, *AR* continued to believe that "the picture a nation creates of itself out of, and upon, its landscape is a more realistic self-portrait than many of us like to admit" [61]

Exhibiting deep European misgivings, *AR* was shocked by what it saw in America: untrammeled visual chaos reigned supreme. This youngest, wealthiest and most powerful nation in the world had not been able to produce a culture that amounted to anything other than a "symbol of promise, the question mark." [62] Americans were moreover alarmingly complacent about their symptoms of disease, exhibiting an audacious failure of will to control the spread of materialism. [63]

Instead of creating a new paradise and experimenting with a new way of life, America was concerned merely with "thinking bigger, going faster, rising higher, than the Old World; without improving on the Old World, ….it has merely raised to the power of 'n' the potential of the old…" [64] This crash materialism and gigantism destroyed the dream that Europeans held of America. Instead, American laissez-faire democracy produced a 'visually scrofulous waste-land', spreading "a combination of automobile graveyard, industrial no-man's land and Usonian Idiot's Delight" across its entire broad continent. [65] Heroic in her handling of postwar European chaos under the Marshall Plan, America nevertheless required everyone to speak her language, reduced to a baby-talk of dollars and technological development. *AR's* survey proved that the American landscape exhibited these same symptoms of infantilism and arrested development and in the end that Americans may have nothing to offer Europeans other than dollars and crooners.[66]

As if the Picturesque theory was not sufficient oil on the fire to enflame the younger generation, *AR's* arrogant treatment of their American dreamland and the outright distain for her popular culture added fuel to an already impossible situation. England in the early 1950s was still climbing out of the debris of WWII, rationing was not over until 1954, and the supply of household appliances and products in short supply. Living in coldwater flats, confined by the educational strictures of how visual design must be taught, the young

generation turned to America as a land of luxury exemplified in the abundant supply of glossy images of consumer products that poured out of the cornucopia of every American magazine. America was the future and the younger generation basked in the images of Hollywood glamour, Detroit styling, Borax designs, comics and westerns adventure stories. If *AR* could praise American Popular art, and consider that "comics were less lethal form of escape than gin", it drew a sharp distinction between the Popular and Fine arts, the 'world' from the 'spirit' proclaiming that America had shown little indication of concern for the latter. Americans were big children, who needed to be constantly reminded that their frontier days were over and that they "no longer galloped in ten-gallon hats after Redskins". They were scolded for not applying themselves to the development of sedentary values and attending to their visible environment. [67]

Some of the younger generation wanted none of this: Banham would recall that

> "[o]ne of the great trainings for the public's eye was reading American magazines. We goggled at the graphics and the colour-work in adverts for appliances that were almost inconceivable in power-short Britain, and food ads so luscious you wanted to eat them. Remember we had spent out teenage years surviving the horrors and deprivations of a six-year war. For us, the fruits of peace had to be tangible, preferably edible. Those ads may look yucky now, to the overfed eyes of today, but to us they looked like Paradise Regained – or at least a paper promise of it." [68]

Lawrence Alloway, an assistant curator of the Institute of Contemporary Art [ICA] and a member of the Independent Group [IG] collective that formed in the spring of 1952 and met intermittently until the summer of 1955, apparently created the term 'Pop Art' in 1954 to refer to the popular imagery two other members of the IG, Eduardo Paolozzi and Richard Hamilton, were exploiting as material. He attributed this popular imagery to a deep interest in the symbol-thick scenes filled with human-activity that busy city streets provided. 'Pop Art' was above all an urban art, the art of the crowd, fashions, and automobile styling. It was an art of representation concerning signs and media images that flowed into Britain from American sources.

Alloway made his debut in *AD* with an article on Paolozzi in April of 1956. He would continue to write about art and exhibitions until he departed for America in 1962. Alloway claimed that Paolozzi more than any other artist in England, "integrates the modern flood of visual symbols, a primary fact of urban culture, with his art." [69] His vision is that of the photographic eye. Like everyone who has grown up with movies, newspapers, and ads, however, Paolozzi combines this material in a new way. The mere quantity of these ephemeral images enables the artist to make connections between unlikes. His images are multi-evocative because they offer a new way of seeing wholes extending the image towards new limits. Thus "the head is a head, a planet, an asteroid, a stone, a blob under a microscope; it is big and small, one and many." [70]

The same year, some members of the IG [now disbanded] participated in the exhibition of "This is Tomorrow" organized by Theo Crosby, the technical editor of *AD* as a collaborative effort between architects, painters, and sculptors. Reviewing the exhibition for *AD,* Theo Crosby proclaimed this is merely a beginning: "Our environment is a mess because most people have eyes that do not see; they do not feel the need for visual organization. The exhibition is evidence of attempts towards a new sort of order, a way towards that integration of the arts that must come if our culture is not merely to survive, but come truly to life." [71] As an exhibition of 'artless things', the manner it mimicked mass reproduction techniques and its promiscuous collages, 'This is Tomorrow' was blasphemous to some artists. But this was the arena the IG had sought out: giving ordinary banalities a new meaning, accepting 'things as they are found' with wonder and curiosity, sometimes irony and fun.

While the exhibition was proclaimed to be a group event dependent on quick glimpses and novel perspectives, Alloway noted that rather than collaboration, the better notion was 'antagonistic co-operation' because the ideal synthesis of artists and architects had yet to be achieved, and hence the focus placed on the future or 'this is tomorrow'. No universal design principles were on display. Each one of the 12 groups suspended their respective specializations in order to experiment with 'several channels of communication" at once yet simultaneously avoid any totalizing idea of a synthesis. Consequently, different channels competed as well as complemented each other. As an exercise in communication, the exhibition was addressed to the spectator who was exposed to "space effects, play with signs, a wide range of materials and structures, which, taken together, make of art and architecture a many-channeled activity, as factual and far from ideal standards as the street outside." It is the responsibility of the spectator to interpret in an open-ended manner the many messages the exhibition delivered over its widely dispersed communication network.[72]

A few years later Alloway tackled the relationship between the fine and popular arts directly. The contemporary situation brought artists face to face with 'hugeness' – mass society, mass housing, and universal mobility. The elite, bound up with a precise set of aesthetic standards, could no longer dominate all aspects of art, especially the arts of the mass media. "It is impossible to see them clearly within a code of aesthetics associated with minorities with pastoral and upper-class ideas because mass art is urban and democratic." [73] High art critics cannot deal with the mass arts – they term them kitsch, ersatz, and commercial.

> "In fact, stylistically, technically, and iconographically the mass arts are anti-academic. Topicality and a rapid rate of change are not academic in any usual sense of the word, which means a system that is static, rigid, self-perpetuating. Sensitiveness to the variables of our life and economy enable the mass arts to accompany the changes in our life far more closely than the fine arts which are a repository of time-binding values." [74]

Popular art is geared to technological change which takes place violently and experimentally. The rise of small screen TV, for example, challenged the cinema, causing the latter to experiment with wide-screen formats [CinemaScope] and depth [Vista Vision]. Color is another technical advance improving the channels of mass communication: color TV, color printing in American magazines, color in a range of paperback books. High redundancy is another communication factor in the mass arts: repetitive and overlapping structures enable marginal attention providing room for other simultaneous activities, and satisfying the desire for intense participation which demands paying attention to discriminating nuances. Fantasy is another realm in which the mass arts excel – it resides for example in the glamour of film stars, perfume ads, and sexy woman. Alloway claimed that at times, this can be tolerated by the high arts if they conceive of it as a substratum of the folk and the primitive. But they misunderstand: this is not evidence of a national vernacular such as 'Englishness'for the mass-produced folk arts have become international. Moreover, fantasy is always dressed in the topical. It "orients the consumer in current styles, even when they seem purely, timelessly erotic and fantastic. The mass media give perpetual lessons in assimilation, instruction in role-taking, the use of new objects, the definition of changing relationships…" [75] They enable acceptance of the increasing number of technical facts produced in the 20th century because everything in this world changes – be it the cybernetic revolution, space travel, the movies, the whole complex of human activities – and this forms the basic material of the popular arts.

Alloway noted that this very complex of activities generates the fear expressed by the high art because they find the popular arts tend to spread and encroach on their high ground. Thus a critic bemoaned "'Shelter, which began as a necessity, has become an industry and now, with its refinements, is a popular art.'" [76] Alloway to the contrary contended that turning West Coast domestic architecture into a symbol of modern living, was not the achievement of artists, but was spread through association with stylish interiors, leisure time activities and the good life that American magazines for women and young marrieds sold. Thus Alloway advised the high arts must understand their role as only one of many different forms of communication in a framework that now included the mass arts.

In the spring of 1958, Alloway made his first trip to America, visiting dozen of cities in the land of wishful fantasies. For many members of the IG collective, this year marked the beginning of direct contact with their icon of modernity: the Smithsons would visit America that year, and Banham in 1961. The trip offered Alloway an opportunity to respond directly to *AR's* scurrilous attacks promulgated in "Man-made America" and he did so in "City Notes" published in *AD* of 1959. [77] He begins his offense by singling out the architect, who is misled by theory to think that he has control over most of the built environment. The architect is mistaken, for in reality, he controls not more than a single building, and occasionally a block. Secondly, the architect is arrogant and thinks of the user of his buildings as interference when he spreads his paraphernalia about, he is reduced to noise in a system the architect has perfected. Alloway allowed, these 'human factors' are obstinate

and may signal a change in the architectural outlook.

Alloway continued his argument: cities are much more than mere buildings, they are a piling up of people's activities. In crowded cities permanent formal principles of architecture, the kind the English Picturesque advocated, are not likely to survive intact. The popular environment is full of neon displays of signage, drug store windows filled with small bright packages, gigantic motor cars that flood the streets – this is far more exciting than the picturesque towns and villages that *AR* was so adamantly supporting. "Architects can never get and keep control of all the factors in a city which exist in the dimensions of patched-up, expendable, and developing forms." [78] Alloway concluded that city images found in the mass-media are more responsive to transmitter-audience feedback than architecture. In other words the mass arts contribute to 'the real environment' of the city in important new ways. A magazine for women presents an article that not only informs an urban bachelorette about serviceable clothes and crisp make-up, offering tips about restaurants, theaters and good books, but also explains the history of technology that has improved her status from sewing machines to the telephone and electric typewriters.

In praise of American cities, Alloway found them geared to technological change not nostalgic retreat. They displayed a series of linkages between different media in their communications-saturated environments. For example, Los Angeles broadcasts at peak hours, "Operation Airwatch' telling motorists from a helicopter the traffic jams to expect on the freeway and what spots of traffic to avoid. The narrow corridor of neon that stretched along American streets was another communication device that enabled strangers to find their way.

> "To the compilers of *Architectural Review's* ´Man-made America' this would be 'unintended squalor', intolerable to people living the architectural way. In fact it is one stretch of lighted street which runs across America. It starts in New York, runs with only marginal regional differentiation across the continent of 3, 000 miles, and ends in San Francisco's Market Street…. The Great White Way, in a sense, belongs to all urban America, just as the hotels … provide a predictable standardized services form coast to coast." [79]

Alloway's icon of leisure environments was Los Angeles with its low, open houses and nature-admitting patios, its diffuse suburban spaces easily accessibile by car from the freeways. "It works and works well for the Los Angeles resident who uses the car like a cowboy used his horse, as a natural adaptive extension of his legs." [80] No matter what the architects of *AR* thought, especially when they made attempts to extend the program of the picturesque to the American city, the latter "seems to be unplanable in popular terms, precisely because of its extension in time and the way people keep moving." [81] It is important for architects to remember that

> "Popular art in the city is a function of the whole city" and if architects try "to adopt its

> playful and odd forms, without their spirit, without their precise functions, [they] will make a solemn travesty of the environment in which pop art naturally thrives."[82]

The Smithsons' romance with automobiles

Returning to the additional items that the Smithson's included in their 1955 definition of "New Brutalism", they singled out 1954 as the year that American advertising struck them with its overlaid imagery, the Cadillac convertible captured their imagination, and Team X began a new way of thinking that would rock the foundation of CIAM. The Smithsons were interested in 'the status of ideas' – taking accepted ideas and reorganizing them, adding to them, or reformulating them. Such, for example, was the new way of thinking that 1954 marked. It brought about a re-definition of the process by which architecture relevant to the contemporary world could be approached and it drew not only on ideas developed by Gutkind, but those advocated by Alloway in his definition of 'Pop Art' as an urban art of mass communication networks.

In 1956 the Smithsons began in the pages of *AD* to clarify their thinking in an article entitled "An Alternative to the Garden City Idea."[83] That year Team X had begun to tackle the problem of 'habitat' and the multiple relationships that existed between the dwelling and its environment. Gutkind must certainly have been one of their guides. Always stressing their 'art-historical' curiosity, however, the Smithsons began by noting that individual housing blocks such as the Weissenhof Siedlung in Stuttgart of 1927 could no longer provide a solution for the problem of housing 'the greatest number'. Now the form of housing must communicate a pattern of life; and the town must provide a pattern of association unique to each people, place and time. Communities were not formal abstractions or patterns on paper, but 'associations' of people. Moreover town planning was about patterns of growth and change, not static plans. The principles that applied to a town as it grew resembled a conch shell, a constant reassessment at each change in its scale. These principles, as Gutkind had shown, gave the evolving organism consistency and unity.

The Smithsons continued their discussion of a new shape for the community the next year, this time in article published in *AR* entitled "Cluster City".[84] They proclaimed that while they were still functionalists this was not the mechanical sense of thirty years ago, and although they still responded to the dream Le Corbusier revealed in his 1925 Voisin Plan for Paris, his city was colossal, an axially organized chessboard, and his starting point that of excitement. To the contrary,

> ["w]hat we are after is something more complex, and less geometric. We are more concerned with 'flow' than with 'measure'. We have to create architecture and town

> planning which, through built form, can make meaningful the change, the growth, the flow, the vitality of the community." [85]

Their new idea was 'cluster" defined as "a close knit, complicated, often moving aggregation, but an aggregation with a distinct structure" that could grow yet still retain a clear legibility at each stage of development.[86]

The Smithsons' interest in mobility extended not just to the car, and individual freedom of movement, but to the entire concept of a fragmented, mobile society. The road system became the generative structure of urban form as Le Corbusier had advocated, an idea that led from street deck housing to urban re-identification as the Smithsons' had shown. But now their concerns extended to the writing-in of automobiles, mechanisms and services within architecture itself. Louis Kahn had shown the way with his vehicular movement studies for the center of Philadelphia, graphically depicting the 'stop-go' system of streets, decks and bridges in the center of the city. But visiting America to the first time, Peter Smithson proclaimed in "Letter to America" published in *AD* in 1958, he had to examine the situation 'as found' and interpret it anew.[87]

Although Americans still held to their basic belief in "square, 'rational' architecture", known as the International Style, Peter Smithson found there was an active socioplastics going on that did not add up to the old rational style.

> "As to its imagery, the magic having flown from the rectangle, it is much freer in its use of form, more rough and ready, and less complete and classical." [88]

> "Its key words are: *cluster, growth, change* and *mobility.* Around which stones you can roll your own snowballs." [89]

Peter Smithson believed that Americans had a deep folk-need for 'squareness' and 'bi-axial symmetry' which he found expressive of metal working peasants such as Mies van der Rohe and Philip Johnson, but Americans seem closer to design truth when it came to their cars than to their buildings.

> "All successful American cars are rectangular in plan and on all four elevations, and are roughly bi-axially symmetrical (projection of the bonnet and boot are more or less equal). From the top of buildings car-lots and streets are a mosaic of coloured rectangles – the origin of 'Broadway Boogie Woogie' is, for sure, the view from the top of the Empire State looking down into the streets and parking lots below." [90]

Just as Alloway suggested, Peter Smithson also found that American values were communicated through imagery without self-consciousness whether it was that of the city, an

automobile, or the paintings of Jackson Pollack, but the same could not be said of their architecture. The most telling landscape for him was the Jersey Flats:

> "a dream world of refineries and factories and marshlands, criss-crossed with Skyways. This is the supra-image of the American landscape – the urban excreta squeezed out from the old city over the last fifty years – and something like this is the industrial landscape norm." [91]

Yet for all his enthrallment with this backyard landscape of waste, he still believed that the American cityscape and its suburbs required an idea of permanence to set against its constant backdrop of movement and flux. Some sort of 'fix' was required, a system of permanent reference points to which transient points could relate. It demanded something 'BIG', a controlled background of forests, agricultural lands, unused space or freeways against which the throw-away immediate environment and transient aesthetic could be set.

Continuing to work on their fascination with movement and cars, and reporting from America as well, Alison presented her thoughts on "Mobility" in *AD* in 1958. [92] Mobility, she argued, must be the key to all town planning, because the symbol of freedom in the new age was the motorcar. Because roads are 'BIG', they are important and have the same power as any big topographical feature. They can create geography or social division, they can become a unifying system or destroy a community's social structure. In their Hauptstadt Plan for Berlin, which the Smithsons developed the same year, they drew together these ideas of motion and motorcars into a system that generated a variety of visual experiences. Cars became the spectacle as pedestrians looked down on their roads; people became the spectacle as passengers looked up to see them moving on escalators and looking over terraces — people and objects in motion and change were both the stuff and decoration of the urban scene. So they argued, in 1949 Jackson Pollack provided a new ordering system in his drip paintings, which were complex, n-dimensional, and multi-vocative. Urban ordering implies "a writing - in of vehicles, mechanisms and services into the idea of the city" — a new sensibility of human patterns and collective built forms.[93]

Conclusion

The debate between *AR* and *AD* not only considered an encounter with history and tradition, Englishness and American culture, but it also encompassed two different models of cognitive mapping based on two different communication theories of how the spectator derives and remembers information received from the city. The conventional model understands cognitive mapping to result from the manipulation of symbols in accordance with pre-existing computational rules. It can be argued that Kevin Lynch's image of the city and the townscape principles advocated by *AR* are based on such symbol manipulating procedures. This traditional form of cognitive mapping assumes that information flows in a linear

and sequential manner. On the other hand, the connectionist model of cognitive mapping, which *AD,* Alloway, and the Smithsons implicitly advocated, produces a cognitive map expressive of the complexities and nonlinear dynamics of image-based urban terrains. In this case, cognitive mapping is the result of activities spread across a communication network of interconnected units. It is the connections or associations between these units, rather than the units per se, which take on the pivotal role.

Assemblages represent this form of associative thinking. Created by the liberal use of photocopy machines, silkscreen printing, Polaroid cameras, an assemblage suggests that categorization is based on human experience and imagination. Thus associative grammars are erected on strategies of analogy and circumlocution facilitating unexpected juxtapositions and overlapping images which make suggestive conjunctions. Associative thinking is not linear, progressive, rational, nor conclusive. It is engendering, utilizing recursive reflexivity, loops, and returns as the many open-ended definitions of “New Brutalism” imply or the multi-vocal images of Pop Art exploit. Furthermore, associative memory is based on storing a given piece of information next to similar information, not the standard pigeonholes of the library grid or a tree-structured encyclopedic recall. Thus embedded within the pages of *AR* and *AD* and long before these computational theories of symbol manipulation or connectionist theories became common currency, these two magazines were staking their claims for the use of history and the physical evidence of the built environment on two very different models of mapping the city, models that would challenge the course of architecture in the subsequent decades to come.

[1] Andrew Law, "English Townscape as Cultural and Symbolic Capital," in Andrew Ballantyne (ed.) *Architectures: Modernism and After* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2004): 202-226. David Matless, *Landscape and Englishness* (London: Reaktion Books, Ltd., 2998). Bill Schwarz, "Englishness and the paradox of modernity," *new formations* 1 (Spring, 1987): 147-54.
[2] Anthony Howard. Quoted by Jeffrey Richards, *Films and British National Identity: From Dickens to Dad's Army* (Manchester University Press, 19997): 129.
[3] "All the culture that is most truly native, centers around things which even when they are communal are not official – the pub, the football match, the back garden, the fireside and the 'nice cup of tea'." George Orwell, "England Your England" (1941). Quoted by Christ Water, "'Dark Strangers' in Our Midst: Discourses of Race and Nation in Britain, 1947-1963," *Journal of British Studies* 36 (April, 1997): 211.
[4] Christ Water, "'Dark Strangers' in Our Midst": 211.
[5] The full discussion of Englishness is cut to the bare bones in this article butis covered in a more extensive version of "An Encounter with History".
[6] A&P Smithson, "But today we collect Ads," *ARK* 18 (November, 1956): 49-50. "Advertising fell into the role the church once played: we had to somehow get the measure of this intervention if we were to match its powerful and exciting impulses with our own." Alison and Peter Smithson, *Without Rhetoric: An Architectural Aesthetic 1955-1972* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1974): 12.
[7] Patrick Abercrombie, *Greater London PlaN 1944* (London: 19454): 13. Quoted by David Matless, *Landscape and Englishness*: 204.
[8] With the passage of the Town and Country Planning Act 1947, many of the younger architects home from the war moved into public service jobs. By 1950, over 50% of all qualified architects worked in the public sector.
[9] Ian Horton, "Pervasion of the Picturesque: English Architectural Aesthetics and Legislation, 1945-1965" in *Non-Plan: Essays on Freedom Participation and Change in Modern Architecture and Urbanism* edited by Jonathan Hughes & Simon Sadler (London: Architectural Pres, 2000): 66 – 78.
[10] Joseph Rykwert "Review of a Review" *Zodiac* 4 (Fall, 1959): 13.
[11] Rykwert "Review of a Review": 13.
[12] *AR* Special Issue "The First 100 Years" *AR* 199 (May, 1996): 54-69. J. M. Richards was editor of *Architectural Review* for more than 30 years – and his flat was filled with his interests that ranged far idea that architecture was not about style, but about people and a commitment to social improvement through design and technology. "J. M. Richards, 1907-1992. Tributes by Mark Girouard, Sir Denys Lasdun and Myfanway Piper," *AA Files* 25 (Summer, 1993): 30-32.
[13] J. M. Richards, "Retrospect" *AR* 149 (Feb., 1971): 69.
[14] Richards, "Retrospect": 70.
[15] Richards, "Retrospect": 70.
[16] Richards, "Retrospect": 71.
[17] Interview with Summerson, quoted in John R. Gold, *The Experience of Modernism*: 168. For example, the 1942 "Living in Cities" traveling exhibition on planning and reconstruction was accompanied by a Penguin paperback that sold 134,000 copies. Gold, *The Experience of Modernism:* 170.
[18] Reyner Banham, "WORLD, the; book to change, a" *The Architects' Journal* 132 (Sept. 8, 1960): 809.
[19] Reyner Banham, "WORLD": 811.
[20] Reyner Banham, "Revenge of the Picturesque": 265.
[21] During WWII, Richards went to Cairo to work for the Ministry of Information. While there he read Hardy and began to write a book about ordinary architecture and the enduring qualities it has, as distinct from architects' architecture. Alone in Cairo, far from England, he wrote what critics have called 'this strange piece' on the virtues and values of suburbia. In *The Castles on the Ground: the anatomy of Suburbia* (1946), Richards wrote "[t]he dog, summoned from the shadowed porch, the cheerful tea table, the quiet between the passing car lights, there is the essence of the modern English domestic scene." His latent humaneness was coming to the fore. So it has been argued by his biographers, this book was

not nostalgic, but contained his modernity, his sense of the future and the past, his knowledge of ultra-modern building and his awareness of the importance in public and domestic buildings of the vernacular. See "J. M. Richards, 1907-1992. Tributes by Mark Girouard, Sir Denys Lasdun and Myfanway Piper," *AA Files* 25 (Summer, 1993): 30-32. The early *AR* articles written by Pevsner on the Picturesque were. "Picturesque = Heritage of Compromise," *AR* (Feb 1942); "Genesis of the Picturesque" *AR* (Nov. 1944]; "Humphry Repton – a Florilegium," *AR* (Feb 1948), and with S. Lang "Sir William Temple and Sharawaggi, *AR (*Dec, 1949).

[22] Monica Pidgeon "Remembered 1941-1975"*AD* 71, 2 (2001); 94-99.

[23] Pevsner, *AR* (April, 1954). Quoted by Banham, "Revenge of the Picturesque": 267.

[24] Alan Colquhoun, *AR* (July, 1954): 4.

[25] Banham, "Revenge of the Picturesque": 270.

[26] Banham, "Revenge of the Picturesque": 270.

[27] Reyner Banham, "A propos the Smithson" *New Statesman* (Sept., 9th, 1961): 317.

[28] Banham, "A propos the Smithson": 317.

[29] Banham, "A propos the Smithson": 317.

[30] Theo Crosby, originally from South Africa, arrived in London in 1947. He worked for time to time with Jane Drew and Maxwell Fry on projects such as Harlow New Town, schools for Ghana, and the Festival of Britain. He was friends with Peter Smithson, whom he met in Florence in 1948, and was associated with the Independent Group at the ICA in 1952. The following year he became technical director of *Architectural Design* with Monica Pidgeon as editor. Theo Crosby, "Night Thoughts of a Faded Utopia," *The Independent Group: Postwar Britain and the Aesthetics of Plenty:* 197-199. Theo Crosby stayed as Technical Editor of *AD* for eight years. He designed the magazine covers: the first contained an image by Eduardo Paolozzi. He started a little magazine called *Upper Case* which ran for five editions. In 1956 he dreamed up "This is Tomorrow" exhibition in which he organized artists and architects into working groups. He also mounted a Le Corbusier exhibition at the Building Centre in London. Monica Pidgeon "Remembered 1941-1975"*AD* 71, 2 (2001); 94-99.

[31] Theo Crosby, "Night Thoughts of a Faded Utopia," 199

[32] Reyner Banham, "The History of the Immediate Future," *JRIBA (*May 1961): 255.

[33] E. A. Gutkind, *Revolution of Environment* (London: Keagan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1946) and E. A. Gutkind, *Community and Environment: a Discourse on Social Ecology* (London: Watts and Co., 1953).

[34] E. A. Gutkind, *Community and Environment:* xii.

[35] E. A. Gutkind, *Revolution of Environment*: 4.

[36] E. A. Gutkind, *Revolution of Environment:* 72.

[37] E. A. Gutkind, *Revolution of Environment*. 76-7.

[38] E. A. Gutkind, "How other peoples dwell and build: 1 Houses of the South Seas," *AD* 23 (Jan. 1953): 2 – 4; "How other peoples dwell and build: 2 Houses of Japan, " *AD* 23 (Feb. 1953): 31-4; "How other peoples dwell and build: 3 Houses of China," *AD* 23 (Mar. 1953): 59-62; "How other peoples dwell and build: 4 Indigenous Houses of Africa," *AD* 23 (May. 1953): 121-34; "How other peoples dwell and build: 5 Mohammedan Houses," *AD* 23 (June. 1953): 159-62; and "How other peoples dwell and build: 6 Houses of North American Indians," *AD* 23 (July. 1953):193-97.

[39] E. A. Gutkind, "How other peoples dwell and build: 1 Houses of the South Seas," *AD* 23 (Jan. 1953):4.

[40] E. A. Gutkind **,** "How other peoples dwell and build. 2: Houses of Japan," *AD* 23 (Feb, 1953): 33.

[41] ." E. A. Gutkind, "How other peoples dwell and build. 4. Indigenous Houses of Africa, " *AD 23* (May, 1953): 124.

[42] ." E. A. Gutkind, "How other peoples dwell and build. 4. Indigenous Houses of Africa, " *AD 23* (May, 1953): 124.

[43] Alison and Peter Smithson, *Ordinariness and Light: Urban Theories 1952-1960* (London: Faber and Faber, 1970):34.

[44] A&P Smithson, *Ordinariness and Light* : 44.

[45] Editorial ,"The "New Brutalism"" in *AD* (Jan., 1955.):1

[46] A&P Smithson, *Without Rhetoric:*

footnote 2, page 2.
[47] Reyner Banham, "The "New Brutalism"," *AR* (Dec., 1955): 354-61.
[48] Opinion :"New Brutalism" and Opinion "Thoughts in Progress: Summing Up 1," "Thoughts in Progress: Summing Up 2," "Thoughts in Progress: Summing Up 3," *AD* (April, October, November, December, 1957): 111-2; 343-4; 395-6, 435-6.
[49] Opinion, "New Brutalism" *AD* (April, 1957): 111.
[50] Opinion "Thoughts in Progress: Summing Up 1": 344.
[51] Opinion "Thoughts in Progress: Summing Up 1": 344.
[52] Opinion "Thoughts in Progress: Summing Up 2" 395.
[53] Opinion "Thoughts in Progress: Summing Up 2" 395.
[54] Opinion "Thoughts in Progress: Summing Up 2": 396.
[55] Opinion "Thoughts in Progress: Summing Up 2": 396
[56] Opinion "Thoughts in Progress: Summing Up 3" 435.
[57] Opinion "Thoughts in Progress: Summing Up 3" 435.
[58] Opinion "Thoughts in Progress: Summing Up 3": 436.
[59] Opinion "Thoughts in Progress: Summing Up 3" 436.
[60] "Introduction" *AR Special Issue man made America* (Dec., 1950): 341.
[61] *AR Special Issue: Man made America*: 341.
[62] *AR Special Issue: Man made America*:: 339-40.
[63] *AR Special Issue*: M*an made America*: 340.
[64] *AR Special Issue: Man made America:* 340-1.
[65] "Conclusion" *AR Special Issue: Man made America*: 414-5.
[66] *AR Special Issue: Man made America* : 416.
[67] *AR Special Issue: Man made America*: 416.
[68] Reyner Banham. Quoted by Anne Massey, *The Independent Group: Modernism and Mass Culture in Britain, 1945-59* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995): 84.
[69] Lawrence Alloway, "Eduardo Paolozzi, " *AD* 26 (April, 1956): 133.
[70] Alloway, "Eduardo Paolozzi,": 133.
[71] Theo Crosby, "Preview: This is Tomorrow" *AD* 26 (September, 1956): 302.
[72] Lawrence Alloway "Design as a human activity" *AD* 26 (September, 1956): 302
[73] Lawrence Alloway, "The arts and the mass media," *AD* 28 (Feb. 1958): 84.
[74] Alloway, "The arts and the mass media": 84.
[75] Alloway, "The arts and the mass media": 85.
[76] Alloway, "The arts and the mass media": 85.
[77] Lawrence Alloway, "City Notes, " *AD* 29 (Jan, 1959): 34-35.
[78] Alloway, "City Notes ": 34.
[79] Alloway, "City Notes": 35.
[80] Alloway, "City Notes ": 35.
[81] Alloway, "City Notes ": 35.
[82] Alloway, "City Notes ": 35.
[83] A. &P Smithson, "An Alternative to the Garden City Idea," *AD* 26 (July, 1956): 229-231
[84] A &P Smithson, "Cluster City: A New Shape for the Community" AR 730 (Nov, 1957):
[85] A& P Smithson, *Ordinariness and Light*: 130.
[86] It created a new image of the city, an idea they borrowed from Kevin Lynch who first mentioned Cluster City in 1954. A& P Smithson, *Ordinariness and Light*: 131.
[87] Peter Smithson "Letter to America" *AD* March 1958 Quoted in A& P Smithson, *Ordinariness and Light:* 135-141.
[88] A& P Smithson, *Ordinariness and Light*: 136.
[89] A& P Smithson, *Ordinariness and Light*: 137.
[90] A& P Smithson, *Ordinariness and Light*: 139.
[91] A& P Smithson, *Ordinariness and Light*: 139.
[92] A, Smithson "Mobility" *AD* October 1958. Quoted in A& P Smithson, *Ordinariness and Light*: 144-153.
[93] A&P Smithson *Without Rhetoric:* 98.