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ABSTRACT


In this period, *AR* ran campaigns in accordance with the program declared in “The Second Half Century.” Articulating a trajectory for the future of the periodical, the editors not only aimed to shape post-war modern architecture in Britain, but also around the world. They reinterpreted British romanticism in order to conceptualize a model of environmental intervention, known under the rubric of “Townscape.” The scope of this program, however, was far larger than the mere urban design methodology that “Townscape” stands for today. It was linked to a project of cultural continuity and renewal. The reinterpretation of British romanticism provided a field of negotiation with the tendencies of modernism—e.g. the ascendance of bureaucratic and technocratic expertise, rationalization of industrial production and increasing specialization—that the editors held responsible for creating an unacceptable uniformity and a sense of alienation.

By analyzing the dialogue between the written works of the editors and the specific selection of material included in the periodical, this study aims to clarify the nature of *AR*’s postwar effort by questioning the conflicting models of progress it harbored. It aims to reveal its complex position with respect to cultural continuity, modernity and avant-gardism. Pointing toward the cultural ideals that underlined this position, it covers an interdisciplinary territory that existed in the background where the editors drew the argumentative core of their polemics; a territory that covers the history of political science, cultural anthropology and art history in order to provide a depth of understanding and to reveal the larger constituency and hybridity of architectural discourse.
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Introduction:

...to those who see only in order to read, or to remember or to promote political propaganda—for those who make use of the process of seeing only as a convenience for other forms of activity—the idea that the same process can serve as a powerful medium of communicating direct emotion sounds like nonsense, and presumptuous nonsense at that. On that presumption, nevertheless is built the whole fabric of the visual arts, with architecture at the base. And to those for whom visual relations matter, the capacity to see represents itself as a way of salvation, just as for those whom social relations matter, forms of political arrangement represent themselves as a way of salvation... it is to architects that mankind will have to look to realize in visible terms a favourable environment for itself. It is thus the architect’s role to become master coordinator, through whom the technicians of the statistical sciences, and the mechanical facts, as well as the painters and poets, must look to translate their raw material into the stuff of which visible civilization is made.¹


With these words, the fiftieth anniversary editorial manifesto of The Architectural Review,² entitled “The Second Half Century,” boldly delineated what its editors hoped would be the central role of architects for post-war reconstruction. Architects would coordinate the efforts to create a new “visible civilization.” The salvation of the modern subject rested just as much on the built environment and architectural quality, as on the political structure of society. But the manifesto also allocated important roles for the scientific and humanistic disciplines in this project of salvation.

“The Second Half Century” is, then, an intriguing document amidst all that has been published in the long history of The Architectural Review, a periodical now 107 years old and still being published.³ (Figures 1.1, 1.2) Foreseeing the drastic consequences of Britain’s reconstruction, as well as investing it with great hope, the editors found it appropriate to make AR’s editorial policy explicit. Articulating a trajectory for the future

² I will mostly use AR or the Review, for the Architectural Review from now on.
³ AR was first published in November 1896.
of the periodical's editorial policies, they not only aimed to shape post-war modern architecture in Britain, but also around the world.

Figure 1. 1 Then Purg'd with euphrasy and rue/ The visual nerve, for he had much to see—Paradise Lost, “The Second Half Century” AR January 1947
This study investigates the history of the British periodical focusing on the quarter century that began by the publication of "The Second Half Century," charting AR’s determined effort to from 1947 to 1971. In this period, the Review was directed by an editorial board which was composed of Hubert De Cronin Hastings (1902-1986), editor and proprietor, Nikolaus Pevsner (1902-1983), the renowned historian, and J. M. Richards (1907-1992), critic and historian, who remained in charge all together until 1971. This editorial board was complemented with other editors in minor roles such as art editor, literary editors, assistant executive editor, townscape editor etc. Hastings, Pevsner, and Richards, were however, the central policy makers and coordinated the division of labor. Even though Hastings largely controlled AR’s overall content behind the scenes, especially with reference to the environment and urban design as well its enticing visual appearance, Richards mostly defined its position with reference to the altering dynamics of contemporary architecture with Pevsner advising the selection of writings on architectural history and theory. I have to emphasize, however, that this division was not a strict one. The editors’ roles interpenetrated following the basic aim of Hastings to make the board function as an incubator of ideas instead of leaving it to the reign of a chief editor. The trio complemented one another in constituting the mind of AR, and in filtering, reframing and appropriating architectural polemics. In this period, the biggest challenge to the board’s editorial rule came by the promotion of Reyner Banham (1922-1988), then Pevsner’s PhD student and now a renowned British architecture historian, to the assistant executive editor position in 1959, which he held until he left the Review in 1964.

---

4 In 1971 the editorial board was disbanded and reorganized by Hastings from younger editors. Hastings himself resigned in 1973. The shifts in the editorial board can be found in the Appendix where I list these changes in detail.
“The Second Half Century” heralded the most influential and powerful campaigns, either in the form of special issues or recurrent inserts, disseminated in the postwar period by AR under the names Townscape (1949), Outrage (1955), Counterattack (1956), The Italian Townscape (1962), the Functional Tradition (1949), Manplan (1969) and finally Civilia (1971). Some of these campaigns were later reproduced in book form and acquired canonical presences in architectural and urban design discourse. These

5 After its start in 1949 Townscape continued as a regular feature, its size depending on the nature of the problems it investigated. Initiated as special issues, Outrage and Counterattack continued sporadically focusing on urban design problems in smaller towns as well as the problems of industrial development in the rural landscape. The Italian Townscape was a special issue solely prepared by the Hastings couple under the pseudonyms Ivor and Ivy de Wolfe, and Kenneth Browne, and published in an enlarged book form in 1962. The Functional Tradition was first produced as a special issue in 1949 and appeared as sporadic articles, either featuring vernacular architecture or modern architecture inspired by vernacular traditions. Manplan started in September 1969, continued monthly for the next four months and changed to bimonthly in response to AR’s financial loss. The series came to an end in September 1970 totaling eight issues.

6 See the selection of canonical texts in Tony Lloyd-Jones and Marion Roberts “An Urban Design Canon” Urban Design Quarterly no. 59, July 1996. The authors regard David Gosling and Barry Maitland’s
campaigns have been represented in postwar architectural histories mostly with a synchronic sense of historicity, supporting arguments that incorporate AR’s journalistic discourse as part of a retrogressive or a reactionary position, which contested the younger generation’s claim for progress. Although this study acknowledges the campaigns’ historicity, it also aims to reveal a diachronic persistence that links all these campaigns under a certain program devised to sustain cultural continuity. A certain holism and a recurrence of themes that attest to this holism characterize the continuous reign of the editorial board, and display the working of this collective mind in the connected and concerted efforts of the editors. Therefore it also intends to point to the disruptions and the continuities to contextualize the discourse of AR in this period that reached from Britain’s reconstruction to the global transformation of modern architecture. Pointing to the dialogue between the written works of the editors and the specific selection of material included in the periodical, this study aims to clarify the nature of AR’s postwar effort by questioning the conflicting models of progress it harbored. It aims to reveal its complex position with respect to cultural continuity, modernity and avant-gardism. It also attempts to point towards the cultural ideals that underlined this position. Hence it covers an interdisciplinary territory that existed in the background where the editors drew the argumentative core of their polemics; a territory that covers the history of political science, cultural anthropology and art history in order to provide a depth of understanding and to reveal the larger constituency and hybridity of architectural discourse.

During this period, I will argue that AR pursued a program which regarded the environment as the expression of “cultural continuity” which fundamentally determined its editorial policies. In trying to preserve “cultural continuity” AR’s editors departed from a multivalent foundation for “Englishness,” with a sphere of implementation not necessarily limited to the boundaries of Great Britain or the dominions of the Commonwealth, but to serve in principle. The editors reinterpreted British romanticism through this foundation in order to conceptualize a model of environmental intervention, today understood under the rubric of “Townscape” as assimilated into the limited

*Concepts of Urban Design* as the best book among others. Gosling was the partner of Gordon Cullen, the assistant art editor of AR between 1946 and 1956 who produced the “Townscape” series in AR, before Kenneth Browne and Ian Nairn took over as townscape editors. Townscape (1959), The Italian Townscape (1962), The Functional Tradition (1957) and Civilia (1971) were published by the Architectural Press, while Outrage and Counter-Attack were made available as offprint special issues.
boundaries of urban design methodology. This foundation also provided a field of negotiation with the tendencies of modernism—e.g. the ascendance of bureaucratic and technocratic expertise, rationalization of industrial production and increasing specialization—that the editors held responsible for creating an unacceptable uniformity and a sense of alienation. AR’s program was simultaneously redefined by the editors in response to the shifting architectural discourse of the British avant-garde. It looked for an alternative in the reevaluation of the vernacular and the notion of anonymity in order to grant agency to users or inhabitants of places in the making of the environment. The editors’ notion of “The Functional Tradition” was just such an attempt to create what they hoped would be a dialogue between local vernaculars and modern architecture.

This study operates along the lines of the recent historiography of British modern architecture which has started to move away from the hagiographic and pro-avant-gardist emphasis that characterized the operative postwar histories of the late 1960s and 1970s produced especially by the second generation pundits such as Reyner Banham and Royston Landau. While the postwar period brought disbelief in the promise of emancipation through technology and science for some, for others there was all the more reason to believe in these ideals with the dawning of a consumerist society and the development of pop culture. In consequence, the progressive roles of avant-garde architecture and urban design as agents of societal transformation became a matter of hot debate. This study participates partially in the effort to deconstruct the binary oppositions constructed by histories that see modernity in opposition to tradition, and understand the

---


8 The specific texts I am referring to here are Reyner Banham’s “Theory and Design in the First Machine Age” (London: Architectural Press, 1960) and Royston Landau’s “New Directions in British Architecture” (G. Braziller: New York, 1968). I have to make an exception here for the more recent histories that try to cover the whole period in a broad social sweep instead of thematic foci, such as the concentration on the history of certain types such as Stephen Muthesius and Miles Glendinning’s “Tower Block” (1994) and “The Post-War University” (2000) and Nicholas Bullock’s “Building the Post-War World: Modern Architecture and Reconstruction in Britain” (London and New York: Routledge, 2002). The first part of Bullock’s book concentrates largely on architectural debate by a survey of journalism, in which the subtlety of ideological positions is overlooked. For instance Bullock’s interpretation of Richards’s article “The Next Step?” represents the Review as an ardent advocate of organicism in the sense that Bruno Zevi advocated it. In my opinion, this is a fundamental misconception of Richards’s position.
history of modern architecture in the linear progression of avant-gardes or stylistic shifts. By clarifying AR’s role in British architectural history through a cultural contextualization, it attempts to reveal the plurality of modernist narratives which competed to hold sway over architectural discourse. A close reading of the editors’ writings and probing the complexities of the cultural context can help better understand the multiple voices that shaped architectural discourse. In pointing to the consequent transformation of AR discourse I aim to gradually address the tension between the post-war avant-garde and the work of the editorial board by referring to the role of different but complementary ideological positions within the board, the opposition to (or the endorsement of) certain institutional power structures in the transformation from the welfare society to that of consumption and mass media. Hence my thesis largely takes its inspiration from histories that investigate the cultural context to see how the so-called ubiquitous tendencies of modernism came to into contact with the cultural scene in Britain. I do not aim to exceptionalize British cultural history in any sense, but aim to point to the particular tensions that modernism created.9

Organization:

The discussion is divided into two main parts that demand to be read in super-imposition. I trace AR’s program that aimed to develop an environmental culture with reference to two separate spheres where it was implemented: a wider environmental framework where urban design was seen as an inseparable part of planning and a respectively narrower one that focuses on its architectural complementary. Although it would risk oversimplification, one can say that if “Townscape” was to develop and sustain an environmental culture as a holistic strategy in order to respond to planning

problems in town and country, “The Functional Tradition” was conceptualized to supply the architects and builders with an idiom to design the architectural expressions of this environmental culture: “The Functional Tradition” was to provide the building-blocks for “Townscape.”

Part 1, entitled “From “Townscape” to “Civilia”: A Neo-Romantic Social Project and the Modern City” investigates the continuity of AR’s campaigns from the early 1940s to the early 1970s. In three connected chapters following a chronological order, I chart out AR’s attempt to sustain cultural continuity in the environment, through the manifestations of “Englishness.” By concentrating mostly on archival evidence gathered from the Nikolaus Pevsner collections at the Getty Center, the personal documents of Hubert De Cronin Hastings and the volumes of the Review, I follow the narrative regarding the modern city.

The key aesthetic component of this project is the editors’ selective enquiry into the theory of the picturesque. I contextualize this enquiry with reference to the campaigns that were published in AR and point to the gradual enlargement of the campaigns’ scope from the confines of urban design in 1940s to their acquisition of an environmentalist agenda in the 1950s and the ultimate expansion into the demand for social reconstruction in the late 1960s. The elevation of the picturesque to the aesthetic expression of an emancipatory ideology in the early 1940s and its repositioning with reference to the genealogy of modern architecture constitutes the early core of this effort as the first chapter. AR’s effort conceived the city as a collection of connected “gestalts,” where alienating and therapeutic urban experiences coexisted.

In the late 1940s “Townscape” assumed a sense of urgency in response to the centralized planning efforts of the Welfare State, especially with reference to the New Towns program, as declaration of editorial policy. In the 1950s “Townscape” had already created alliances and oppositions within the architectural community, by the editors’ efforts to promote this program within the institutional bodies of modern architecture, such as the MARS Group in Britain and its representation within CIAM. The prolific output of “Townscape” within AR and the books published by the Architectural Press, created further resonance for the ideas published in the periodical and attained a pedagogical significance. “Townscape” was connected to a lineage of urban design
thinking and was filtered through the work of Kevin Lynch, Christopher Alexander, Jane Jacobs, David Gosling and others. Although I point to the connections, discussing the work of the mentioned authors and tracing the specific influences of *AR* discourse in their work is beyond the scope of this study. I also do not intend to compare *AR* as a periodical to other periodicals of the time but identify major conflicts of ideology between *AR* and other discourses that dominated postwar architecture culture. On the other hand, I emphasize that the major target audience of *AR*’s environmental campaigns was not necessarily and only architects, but local and national authorities, decision-making bodies, as well as the citizen at large.

The first part concludes with a reading of Hubert de Cronin Hastings’s unpublished manuscript "*The Unnatural History of Man*" (1958) and its revised version "*The Alternative Society*" (1980) as a vision for a neo-romantic British society which, in my opinion, constituted a programmatic palimpsest for *AR*. I illustrate the dialogue between Hastings’s manuscript and the environmental campaigns of *AR*, and especially its formative role on the Manplan campaign (September 1969-September 1970) and the hypothetical new town called “Civilia,” that Hastings designed in collaboration with Priscilla Hastings, Kenneth Browne and planners Michael Rowley and Rodney Carran.

In pointing to the transformation in the nature of these campaigns, I aim to show how *the Review* attempted to transcend the stereotypical clichés of resistance to progress and revivalism by moving towards the necessity to assimilate the means of science and technology into an environmentalist discourse. The inherent tension between the place-based politics of these campaigns and the global ambitions of modernism point to a fundamental conflict that remained unsolved. The products of the campaigns have been largely co-opted by the desire for formal novelty and simplified into a methodology of urban design, the hints of which may have already been contained in “Townscape”’s inception.

In Part 2, entitled “"*Humanizing*" Modern Architecture: Culture and the Call for Anonymity” I explore the relationship of architecture to this larger environmental framework to clarify *AR*’s call for anonymity by means of the devices provided by modern architecture. The first chapter examines the role of Nikolaus Pevsner’s historiography and its formulation of anonymity as the cultural glue that bonds the built
environment to the nation, and his designation of the modern architect’s role in order to create this environment. I discuss the shift in Pevsner’s historiography when his methodology based on “Kunstgeographie” came into contact with liberal paternalism and acquired a reformist emphasis through British Welfare State’s visual education campaign. This particular interaction sheds light on the reformulation of the architect’s responsibility towards the society. I analyze Pevsner’s role in defining the social role of art and architecture by prioritizing the sense of service in the artist and the architect, and also his designating a supportive function for the State by means of providing the necessary infrastructure for cultural activity.

Within this connection, I focus on the opposition between Nikolaus Pevsner’s and Sigfried Giedion’s historiographies, the former partially formulating AR’s take, in rendering two conflicting foundations of progress for modern architecture. I elucidate Pevsner’s aversion to the romantic artist as the precursor of the modern avant-garde and his alternative notion of the genius, in contrast to Giedion’s idea of the avant-garde as one formative component of this conflict. Expanding the dialogue that Pevsner established between “Kunstgeographie” and the discourse of liberal paternalism, I speculate on the post-avant-garde phase that AR formulated for modern architecture, mainly by the collaboration between Richards and Pevsner with the distant support of Hastings. The first chapter concludes with Pevsner’s effort to derive an architectural culture of reconciliation from the opposition between the universal and the particular in the last decade of Britain’s decolonization process. I discuss Pevsner’s interpretation of the “genius loci” as an attribute of Englishness, and his elevation of this to a fundamental and universal concept of modern architecture in order to overcome this opposition.

The second chapter of Part 2 focuses on AR’s effort to realize a post-avant-garde “regime” after reframing early twentieth century modern architecture as a revolution to be consolidated and expanded, with the major emphasis on J.M. Richards’s search for an emergent anonymity. This post-avant-garde regime concerns the “humanization” of modern architecture through the recovery of ornament, color, texture and a specific consciousness of history in relation to place, which, according to the editors, was strongly undermined in the revolutionary phase of modern architecture. I discuss the specific
brand of social realism Richards developed from the late 1930s towards the early 1950s, its impact on modern architecture and his agreement with Pevsner on anonymity.

Concentrating on Richards's writings, I analyze how he attempted to formulate anonymity as a social and cultural ideal in touch with the politics of the Popular Front and the 1940s Marxism in Britain. Underlining "Townscape's" contextualist demand that privileged anonymity, I specify how the editors formulated "The Functional Tradition" as the timeless core of architecture uncovered by the advent of functionalism. By tracing the arguments the editors adopted from the claims of anthropology, especially from the school of cultural particularism defined by the work of Franz Boas and his students, I indicate how the editors sustained their call for cultural continuity. This section also evaluates AR's particular take on popular culture and the popular arts "by people" in connection to participation and production, in opposition to the Independent Group's linking of consumption to an ideology of emancipation.

The call for cultural continuity was reinforced with the editors' demand for disciplinary continuity when AR reformulated its position against the postwar industrial transformation and the rise of popular culture in the 1960s. The second part concludes by analyzing the senior editors' reaction to the debate on technology, which Reyner Banham initiated via the assistant executive editor's post of the Review. In responding to the technology based avant-gardism that Banham formulated and promoted via Archigram, the editors continued the emphasis on the "Functional Tradition" and rivaled Banham's impact via increasing the space that they allocated to his contemporary, Peter Collins. Collins's historiography, privileging an evolutionary disciplinary continuity from the neo-classicism of the enlightenment to the modern, complemented Richards's ultimate categorization of architecture into two interactive but exclusive categories—the monumental/symbolic/communitarian/international vs. the anonymous/background/vernacular/local—in 1971. The study takes this date as its chronological point of conclusion when H. de C. Hastings decided to restructure AR by disbanding the editorial board that reined for a quarter century.

In conclusion, I question the success of AR's effort in sustaining the cultural continuity it attempted and the periodical's impact on the transformation of architectural discourse after the editorial board left AR.
PART I

FROM “TOWNSCAPE” TO “CIVILIA”:

A NEO-ROMANTIC SOCIAL PROJECT AND THE MODERN CITY
Introduction to Part 1:
Environmental manifestations of Englishness

When AR’s editors published “The Second Half Century” in January 1947, they made a projection of principles that they hoped would determine the contents and the attitude of the periodical for another half century. The first part of the thesis deals with how AR formulated an attitude towards the environment, which was characterized by an emphasis on cultural continuity. This part examines AR’s polemics on the city and its relationship to the surrounding rural or natural landscape in order to understand this attitude. The writing of an appropriate history for that environment and its categorical representation was instrumental in establishing such cultural continuity. AR’s effort departed from definitions of Englishness with reference to the urban and the rural environment as well as ways of perceiving it. During this period the Review established a close affiliation with several authors, architects and planners who later took part in governmental and local bodies of decision-making, and helped in disseminating the views of the editorial board. The demand for cultural continuity was manifested in the several campaigns that AR produced, which started with the campaign for “Townscape” in 1949.

The Architectural Review aimed to create an urban design idiom that would rival the dominant city planning paradigms of early twentieth century and that would enable the preservation of existing British cities. The Review also hoped that such an urban design idiom could assure the endurance of the specific “ways-of-life” existing in different cities by being sensitive to its built forms. This campaign was later expanded towards the development of the rural environment, during the second half of the 1950s by the special issues “Outrage” and “Counter-Attack,” when the editors came to believe that only a holistic outlook towards the environment would be able to sustain a balanced relationship between the urban and the rural. The Review’s campaigns were also shaped by the changing historical context, that is by the developments within Britain and around the world. While it remained implicit, a neo-romantic social ideal lurked in the background of these campaigns, which was incorporated into the unpublished work of the Review’s owner and chief editor H. de C. Hastings. The urban and environmental
ramifications of this ideal were directly incorporated into the series of issues that made a call for reform known as Manplan in 1969 and to the call embedded into the new town proposal “Civilia” in 1971. Thus the first part of the text deals with AR’s campaigns which aimed to translate this ideal into the transformation of the environment in terms of urban design and planning.
Chapter A: Romantic Foundations and the Early Interest in the Picturesque

Although this study takes 1947 as a turning point in AR’s history when it declared a program for its next half century, AR’s interest in the picturesque gradually intensified from the late 1930s onward. The earlier interest was in the form of sporadic articles with the publication of which AR wanted to create a sensibility in its readers and the authorities in preparation for postwar reconstruction, when Britain would see its largest concentrated planning effort come to life.

Two years into the war J. M. Richards decided to leave AR to be more involved in the war effort. For his replacement, he trained Nikolaus Pevsner and persuaded Hastings to take a more active part in the Review and to supervise Pevsner’s work. Between 1942 and 1945 Pevsner and Hastings served as acting editors of AR. The partnership of Hastings and Pevsner was to make a big impact on the Review’s urban design and planning campaigns as well as the popularity of the picturesque in Britain. H. de C. Hastings felt the need for a concerted effort of historical research, and knew that he had the right man to do it, in order to ground AR’s earlier interest and to direct it toward the project of Britain’s reconstruction. He commissioned Pevsner to write a book on the history of the “picturesque” and its relationship to city development in Britain. The book aimed to “clarify the English contribution to town planning.” According to what is preserved at the Getty Institute’s Pevsner Collection, the book remained only in

---

10 According to Richards’s memoirs, Pevsner would be the perfect candidate due to his scholarship and that he was not liable to call up for army service as an enemy alien. Richards had introduced Pevsner to the publisher Allen Lane. Lane and Pevsner’s collaboration resulted in a remarkable literary output. Pevsner had been writing for the Review since 1936, had published “Pioneers of the Modern Movement” in 1936 and “An Enquiry into Industrial Art in England” in 1937, “The Academies of Art, Past and Present” in 1940 and “An Outline of European Architecture” (1942) was about to be published. Richards took up an editorial job in the Ministry of Information in the spring of 1942. He joined a group of his colleagues from AR including John Betjeman in the Films Division, Misha Black in Exhibitions and Osbert Lancaster and Reginald Ross-Williamson who were regular contributors to the Review. Lancaster served on the editorial board between 1946 and 1951. See J.M. Richards, Memoirs of an Unjust Fella, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1980).

11 See manuscript in Box 25 titled “Works on the Picturesque” in the Pevsner collections at the Getty Institute.
manuscript form and was never published. Nonetheless elements of Pevsner’s research ended up being published as articles and helped in the commissioning of articles from other historians.

Before reflecting on Pevsner’s manuscript I have to mention another unpublished document that had a role in this partnership. This document, now located among Pevsner's studies for his book, is a three-page note entitled “My Explanation of the Rise of the Romantic Movement.” It briefly explains how Hastings understood the connection between British Romanticism and the emergence of the landscape movement. According to him, what differentiated the rise of the Picturesque movement was the philosophical foundation that defined its outlook towards the environment.

Hastings’s argument can be briefly summarized: The picturesque garden, from its early “naturalist” phase like that of the free-formed parts of Stowe to the formulaic sinuosity, the mown lawns and the placid waters of Capability Brown’s gardens, was understood as a model of the Cosmos. Before the seventeenth century this was a Cosmos in which Nature was a “Fallen Woman… perfectible by God acting through the human mind.” Then Newtonian science absolved it of its status as Chaos and elevated its laws to the level of God's laws. The priority of man’s conscious mind over the “unconscious mind of Nature” was overturned. The apprehension of Nature having a divine order,
obliged man to follow Nature's rules instead of imposing on Nature an inferior order of his own. The Romantic Movement derived this main lesson from the findings of science and tried to formulate its position vis-à-vis Nature. The landscape movement materialized the same awareness in the environment. However, this moral inference did not prevail longer than a century. In the nineteenth century, man employed these very laws to exploit and to dominate Nature. Between this moral turnaround, meaning from man's reverence to Nature's order to his advance to its efficient exploitation through industrialization, the English landscape movement took place. Hastings concluded his note to Pevsner by stating that:

The decision to leave off trying to order nature and instead to learn nature's order was the basis of true Picturesque Theory, the painter being stuck up on a pedestal because he was the chap most sensitive to Nature's order.

Hastings invoked the power of landscape to regulate the urban in a mutually defensive relationship to safeguard the future of the former from the impact of the latter. The contrast of experience between the built environment and the uncultivated landscape would redefine man's relationship to nature. This mutual relation was not to take place simply in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century sense of isolated contemplation, but in a dialectical confrontation that clarifies the intervening, transforming nature of man and the need for shelter that removed him from the impact of such transformation.

The campaigns of AR were to research for the design pedagogy to transform landscape's redeeming power through the experience of the urban environment. The moral lesson that Hastings derived from Romanticism and Picturesque theory would provide him with a powerful analogy for urban intervention and a stimulus for AR's editorial policies regarding the environment. Intended to act as an aid to Pevsner's book, this document also reveals Hastings's own effort to historicize his interest in the picturesque. Testifying to Hastings's influence on Pevsner and the intellectual exchange between the two, the text shows his aim to situate AR's campaign within Britain's cultural history, to construct a possible genealogy for the campaign and to illuminate a trajectory for the future of AR. It also prefures Hastings's thoughts in his unpublished manuscript entitled "The Unnatural History of Man," dated October 1958, the writing of which has acted in the form of a programmatic palimpsest for AR.
The implicit pedagogy of this note and the agenda that determined the commission of Pevsner’s manuscript shaped much of the contents before Townscape was launched as a campaign in 1949, and became an inseparable part of the Review for decades.

We have to return to Pevsner’s manuscript in order to understand how the writing of the manuscript affected the contents of AR and the historiography that shaped the formulation of the “Townscape” campaign. At the very start, Pevsner equated English planning to the theory of the picturesque. In the foreword to the manuscript Pevsner stated the aims and composition of the intended book:

It will consist of three parts. The first is an analysis, mostly pictorial, of England from planning tradition up to 1880, the second a florilegium of English planning theory, that is the theory of the Picturesque, and the third an account of how this theory and this tradition influenced the nineteenth century in England and might influence the twentieth...16

The pictorial part of the intended book was to present a case study of three cities, (Cambridge, Oxford and Bath as the three most important examples of English town planning) and to emphasize the value of the pedestrian experience of the city. Pevsner added that illustrations and descriptions could not “do justice to the visual merits of Oxford and Cambridge [and of] interior and exterior spaces which can reveal their aesthetic qualities only to the moving eye. The immovable eye of the camera cannot catch this.”17 The city, like the picturesque garden, was partially a spectacle to be experienced by the beholder on the move, and partially an object, albeit of artificial nature, for contemplation. Instead of contemplating the cosmos through the “artful artlessness” of the picturesque landscape design, the pedestrian experienced the man-made, the radical transformation of the natural.

16 See the foreword to the manuscript in Box 25 titled “Works on the Picturesque” at the Getty Institute. Italics mine.
17 Ibid. p.2.
The second part of the book was planned as a "florilegium" of the writings of picturesque theory in three phases of chronological development: It started with quotes from Shaftesbury, Addison and Pope as the first attempts at theoretical formulation, continuing with Thomas Whately and Gilpin's works and ending up with the works of Price and Knight, as the culmination of picturesque theory. Pevsner regarded the later phases of landscape theory, such as the work of Repton and Loudon, as a decline from the work of Price and Knight which were written mostly in reaction to and critical of the works of Capability Brown. The third part, however, was left unwritten and, most probably due to lacking collaboration from a coauthor involved in planning, Pevsner did not speculate on the application of Picturesque theory into town planning. His articles that reflected on such an application were only written later, as criticism of the planning developments in Britain.

AR's program to achieve an urban design pedagogy and methodology in relation to the picturesque mirrors the organization of Pevsner's manuscript. The Review first started an intermittent research into the picturesque as part of Britain's intellectual and cultural heritage (roughly from 1936 to 1942). This research developed into a more systematic historical project after Pevsner became editor (starting from 1942). In the late 1940s the Review developed a methodology and pedagogy, known under the name of "Townscape," after the arrival of Gordon Cullen as assistant art editor. The unfinished third part, therefore, was to be completed after the launch of "Townscape" as a campaign and be written by the efforts of all those involved until the retirement of Hastings in 1974.

The most important of the early articles that anticipate the launch of Townscape is "Exterior Furnishing or Sharawaggi: The Art of Making Urban Landscape" published in January 1944 in the AR, signed "The Editor" (Figure 1.1). Given that Richards is not on the editorial board at this time, it was, without a doubt, written by Hastings. The article is loaded with rhetorical twists and cynical remarks common to H. de C. Hastings's idiosyncratic writing style and does not possess the tactful rigor of Pevsner's. On a side

---

18 Hastings is known to have written under more than one pseudonym, the best known being "Ivor de Wolfe." Most of the polemical editorials seems to have been written by him when a comparison of style is made, but it is impossible to ascertain. However, according to an interview that Susan Lasdun made with Hastings, shortly before his death in 1986, Hastings confirmed that he wrote the "Sharawaggi" article.
note here, I have to point out that Hastings was the mastermind of almost all the controversial campaigns of AR, and in coining or selecting the catchphrases that have not lost their effectiveness even today. Pevsner’s style was distant from a polemical tenor such as Hastings’s. The differences in style increased the power of AR’s campaigns since Hastings’s committed and propagandistic rhetoric was brilliantly reinforced with the toned-down, historically erudite writing of Pevsner.

Figure 1.1 “Exterior Furnishing or Sharawaggi: The Art of Making Urban Landscape” AR January 1944.

Hastings started the article by complaining about the fact that England had not lately been thought of as the locus of an aesthetic revolution as it was at the time of William Morris. He assaulted the Garden City, by referring to it as the dream city of the petit-bourgeoisie. He argued that the change of the Garden Cities Association’s name into Town and Country Planning Association indicated that the Garden City idea was
abandoned and found inadequate. He questioned the two existing ideals of city planning at its time, the Garden City vs. the Corbusian city of tomorrow which was almost synonymous with CIAM ideals, in terms of their popularity vis-à-vis the “Little Men” and argued that the “Little Men” would prefer the Garden City by choosing among the two pictures supplied by the two models. Hastings cleverly furthered his argument by asking that whether there existed a “city picture” devised by planners to communicate an alternative city ideal. For planning to achieve its goals, it had to communicate to the public a “visual message,” in other words, a representation legible by the public. It was not that the “Little Men” were dumb; they only picked the “prettier picture.” Any alternative planning ideal had to supercede the popularity of the “Garden City,” by painting an even prettier and more convincing picture. He asserted that the planning profession was also ill-equipped to deal with the matter since it was unable to conceive a “visual reconciliation” of the elements of the city.

What England needed at that point in history, according to Hastings, was to “resurrect the true theory of the picturesque... and apply [it] to a field...which it has not been consciously applied before: the city.” Referring to Christopher Hussey’s book “The Picturesque” (1927) (which was the key influence on the twentieth century revival of interest in the picturesque and also on Hastings), he argued that the picturesque had not only become part of everyone’s visual equipment but also a part of the English temperament due to its popularity. This popularity stemmed from the numerous pattern books of the nineteenth century and from the “great landowners’ contribution” of the eighteenth century. From the gentry to the middle class, the picturesque, according to Hastings, had overcome class boundaries by securing aesthetic “inconsistency” and realizing democracy by safeguarding the coexistence of different tastes. “Inconsistency” simply meant the lack of a dominating aesthetic code over others, such as the possibility of Georgian being next to neo Gothic, next to modern, next to neo-classical etc. The analogy between democracy and landscape was of course made by the Whig landowners,

19 As a physical solution to the problems arising out of the Industrial Revolution, it is about as efficient as the pikes handed out to the Home Guard early in the war to stop Hitler’s Panzers.” See, The Editors “Exterior Furnishing or Sharawaggi: The Art of Making Urban Landscape,” in AR, January 1944, v. 95, p. 3.
20 “We think most planners are themselves puzzled and embarrassed by their lack of realistic vision their inability to reconcile visually in the mind’s eye what appear to be irreconcilable elements in any town plan: quaint bits, new bits, monuments, traffic, tall buildings, short buildings, individual cottages, etc., etc.” ibid.
most importantly by Uvedale Price, and Hastings did not forget to remind the readers that it was not his own creation.²¹

The “true Picturesque theory” mentioned in the article was that advocated in the writings of Sir Uvedale Price and Richard Payne Knight. The theory was, according to the editors, the distillation and the culmination of a century’s development, starting from Sir William Temple’s writings in 1685, with reference to the sensibility of “irregular Chinese gardening” which he termed “sharawaggi,” and followed by the writings of the Earl of Shaftesbury, Joseph Addison, Alexander Pope, Stephen Switzer and Batty Langley. The article also wanted to distinguish the “original” use of the term “picturesque” from its contemporary popular use, which simply meant “quaint,” as indicated in a footnote. It demanded the creation of a “modern day sharawaggi.”

By identifying the particularities of place the “Sharawag”—the name given to the designer who embraced these principles—would aim to create visual unities out of the urban ensemble of differences. The aesthetic quality of the single pieces would not matter since it was the combination that resulted in the urban form and the experience the “Sharawag” was after. The “Sharawag” was an orchestrator of difference.

Most importantly, the article concluded that a “visual policy” that would link modernist functionalism to urban planning, and that would oversee the “desirable” built results of the existing planning policies, did not exist.²² It was also time for AR to state clearly what it had tried to do implicitly by several articles regarding the folly, the pattern books of early nineteenth century bourgeois architects, the earlier suburban developments, roadside and seaside British vernaculars by John Piper and J. M. Richards as well as the articles by painter Paul Nash on the visual relationships that define

²¹ Sir Uvedale Price linked “good government” and “good landscape” in his “Essay on the Picturesque” as the regime that safeguards the coexistence of differences and enables the expression of character: “A good landscape is that in which all the parts are free and unconstrained, but in which, though some are prominent and highly illuminated, and others in shade and retirement; some rough and others more smooth and polished, yet they are all necessary to the beauty, energy, effect and harmony of the whole. I do not see how a good government can be more exactly defined; and as this definition suits every style of landscape, from the plainest and simplest to the most splendid and complicated, and excludes nothing but tameness and confusion, so it equally suits all free governments, and only excludes all anarchy and despotism.” In Uvedale Price, Essays On The Picturesque, As Compared With The Sublime And The Beautiful; And, On The Use Of Studying Pictures, For The Purpose Of Improving Real Landscape, (three volumes.) (J. Mawman: London, 1810). pp. 374-5.

²² “There is an urgent need for a commonly accepted visual standard, a visual policy for urban landscape. Without a visual policy, a planning policy is a monstrosity.” ibid. p. 8.
surrealism, all published since 1936. This statement was the declaration of a “profession of aesthetic faith on the part of...The Architectural Review” and an admission of its earlier intentions. AR aimed to manifest a change in its attitude toward the picturesque, meaning a more deliberate and serious campaign was on its way, methodically and pedagogically better equipped. In my opinion it is worth a lengthy quote here which not only provides a complete bibliography of the diverse array of AR’s visual interest in the earlier shape of this effort but also testifies to the holistic view of visual culture the editors possessed. The editors stated:

Looking back not further than 1936 it is now perhaps plain why a swan, several times life-size, is to be found floating on its little circular pond in the High Street of Mistley on the River Stour (vol. 79, 1936, p. 264), or why a menacing looking seaside seat was illustrated with violent contrasts between round and angular, black and white (vol. 79, 1936, p. 151) Paul Nash called the article in which this appeared Swanage or Seaside Surrealism. Architects, surely, should sympathize with surrealism so far as the bracing effect of this movement is out to make people see functionally incoherent objects in convincing visual relations. Hence the REVIEW’S attachment to the Folly, whether the eighteenth-century squire's, or the nineteenth-century merchant's (Marginalia, December, 1942), or that super-folly of M. Cheval, the French postman's, at Hauterives the Dauphine (vol. 80, 1936, re p. 147). Hence its attachment to Alton Towers (R. P. Ross Williamson, vol. 87, 1940) and Hafod (John Piper, vol. 87, 1940), or to the pattern books of the bourgeois architects of the early nineteenth century which created those townships of follies known to us as the suburbs (Peter F. R. Donner on Richard Brown, vol. 93, 1943).

Hence also a certain alacrity to record the crudely carved tombstones in a country cemetery in which the rare sightseers would only look at genteeler work (Innes Hart, vol. 86, 1939, and M. Whiffen, vol. 89, 1941) and the sumptuous absurdities of the Pere Lachaise (Joan Rayner, vol. 86, 1939), and in Kensal Green (R. P. Ross Williamson and Joan Rayner, vol. 92, 1942).

Hence, to add a few more instances, the REVIEW’S attitude to the pattern value of some of the new wartime shapes and colours in road and countryside, as Peter Ray discovered them with his camera (vol. 90, 1941) and many of the age-old shapes and colours of the English vernacular, the bollards (Poor Man's Sculpture by J. M. Richards,' vol. 87, 1940), and the black and white of the seaside (John Piper's The Nautical Style, vol. 83, 1938) and the roadside (J. M. Richards, vol. 82, 1937). Sometimes these vernacular forms are just shown for their own sake, for instance the elaborate cast iron garden seats of the nineteenth century (vol. 86, 1939); sometimes attempts have been made to group examples morphologically and deduct a topical moral from such grouping (Repetition in Decoration, vol. 83, 1938; Sermon in Seats, vol. 93, 1943 ; Stages of Engineering, vol. 94, 1943; Time, Trees and Architecture, vol. 94, 1943).
A number of the more ambitious serials which have been published by the REVIEW during the last seven or eight years were part of this campaign too. Professor Reilly’s Surveys of London Streets (vol. 79, 1936) Peter F. R. Donner's Treasure Hunts (vols. 91 and 92, 1942) an above all John Piper’s articles whose seemingly unconnected titles and manifold themes all contain the same message. The old Bath Road (vol. 85, 1939) revealed scores of unsteretyped visual pleasures, as did the Victorian pub (vol. 87, 1940) and the Nonconformist chapels. The case is to some extent summed up in John Betjeman's The Seeing Eye or How to Like Everything (vol. 86, 1939), a genial overstatement of an approach which, let it be emphasized again accepts the modern idiom as integral to it, or rather sees Picturesque theory as an integral part of the modern idiom, the fantastical being no more than a part, one that in this article perhaps has been made too much of, though if so for an obvious reason.23

As the editors stated in the final paragraph of this quote, they saw the Picturesque, as Christopher Hussey had argued in “The Picturesque” (1927) integral to the development of modernist aesthetics, from the folly to the objet trouvé, be it found in the city or in the countryside. Although their interest in the picturesque did not mean a formalistic revival and a return to historicism, AR’s position would come under attack by orthodox modernists when Townscape’s popularity increased in the 1950s.24

23 This is only a short comment on the nature of articles that could be included in the scope of this study. The period until Pevsner joined the editorial board is extremely interesting in regard to British modern art and architecture and merits more detailed study. This long quote attempts to give an idea of how some of the ideas that AR pursued after 1947 had an earlier, albeit scattered, foundation. ibid. p. 7.

The January 1944 cover by Kenneth Rowntree—in which “Exterior Furnishing” was published—superimposed the painting of a war ruin with a photograph of Alvar Aalto’s Paimio Sanitarium. Paimio was viewed through the gothic window of a church ruin devastated by the blitz: the promise of modernity coexisting with its own past (Figure 1.2). The same issue also featured a plea entitled “Save Us Our Ruins” for the preservation of certain war damaged churches after evaluation by authorities, to serve as memorial sites and to factor into urban design projects in future reconstruction. While the nineteenth century ruin could be contrived in order to call for contemplative but fictional associations, AR’s campaign aimed to eternalize the memory of war as an

---

25 The most important example of the realization of a similar idea would, of course, be the competition for the new Coventry Cathedral and the winning scheme’s integration of the bombed cathedral into the overall site plan as a pilgrimage site. Geoffrey Jellicoe, the famous landscape architect offered an article on the possible uses of these ruins and drawings were prepared by Neville Conder for certain sites such as Wood St. and Alderbury. At the same period AR continued collecting reports of war damage from several countries through the editors’ acquaintances. The Pevsner collection at the Getty Institute has several letters written to Pevsner from around Europe with respect to war damage.
inseparable aspect of the cities’ history. The call for a contemporary urban landscape carried over the idea of the ruin and the folly in the picturesque landscape by preserving the ruins of war. The ruin would facilitate a reinterpretation of the eighteenth century symbolism of ruins and the folly in the contemporary urban landscape. It would reactivate mechanisms of psychological association in the beholder through memories of war and enrich the urban drama by the associations of war. The twentieth century urban experience would be given its “natural” memorials as remnants of the blitzkrieg. The citizens surrounded with the new built around the ruin would reengage with the realities of both the past and the present.

One month after “Exterior Furnishing,” the Review started a subsequent series of articles in order to acquaint the readership with the theory and the products of the picturesque. The February issue reintroduced a florilegium of Sir Uvedale Price’s “Essay on the Picturesque” compiled by Pevsner. In November 1944 another compilation from the theoretical writings of picturesque theorists which exactly follows the organization of Pevsner’s studies for the manuscript, was published in the pages of AR.

AR wanted to demonstrate the validity of its theses in regard to modern architecture with a special issue on Brazilian modern architecture. The photographs, mostly of the works of Niemeyer, presented buildings accompanied with lush planting in the urban landscape and as integral to the historical fabric of the city. The May 1944 cover went so far as to superimpose the plan of the Ilha Restaurante in Pampulha by Oscar Niemeyer in red on the plan of Lord Burlington’s Chiswick gardens in black. (Figure 1.3) The captions stated:

The cover illustrates what might be called the theme of this issue: the integration of contemporary architectural practice with eighteenth century landscape theory. The Dance Club plan (in red)—in which the building as well as its environment has been “landscaped” to the extent that one is indissociable, indeed indistinguishable, from the other—can be regarded as the culmination of a Movement whose first approach shots are to be seen vividly expressed in the great 1736 Plan of Chiswick.

29 “The Genesis of The Picturesque” AR November 1944, v. 96, pp. 139-146.
30 See text explaining the cover in AR, May 1944, vol. 95, p. iii.
In a simple act of superimposition AR connected the history of Lord Burlington’s Chiswick gardens to Niemeyer’s Ilha, a flight of two hundred years depicting an evolution coming to its inevitable conclusion. It continued by arguing that the liberation from symmetry in the landscape garden was not followed by architecture until the twentieth century. The integration between landscape and architecture was not consciously pursued until the Modern Movement established its importance. If this teleological development—from the emergence of Picturesque theory for landscape, to the realization of its principles by the Modern Movement in architecture via functionalism and the development of the free plan—continued, the editors suggested that the logical result of “all that picturesque theory implies” would be applied to town
planning. This critical argument aimed to extend modernist teleology beyond the late nineteenth century and tried to redeem modernism by pointing to its hidden theoretical and historical roots.

---

31 See “Cavalcanti House” and the accompanying text by the editors. Ibid, p.130.
A2. "Genius Londinensis": Constructing the tradition

Having established their expectations from picturesque theory, claimed its affinity to the Modern Movement’s principles, and conveyed these expectations to modern architects, AR set out on the problem of urban reconstruction. In June 1945, AR continued its campaign with the aim of isolating and constructing the English planning tradition in the city. After the fall of Germany in the spring of 1945 the war in Europe was over and the plans for reconstruction, which had already been underway, were ready to go ahead.

Figure 1.4 Caption on the top left reads “Concerning the Modern Spirit and Its Affinity to Picturesque Theory” from “English Planning Tradition in the City” AR June 1945; caption on the top right reads “City Peep Show.”

In June 1945, AR published an article under the name “English Planning Tradition in the City” (Figure 1.4) in the introduction of which the editors warned the readers about the visual implications of current planning policies. This issue was intended “as a

contribution to visual planning.” AR’s approach rejected slum clearance or the simple reconstruction of the old street plans with “facial” improvement:

A timid preservationist attitude aiming at mere street improvement falls as short of what is required as the fantasies of the brave-new-worlders. Constructive compromise is what the genius loci calls for, not tabula rasa.  

This statement implied that AR would separate its own position both from those who believed in a total renewal of cities by extensive demolition and restructuring, as well as from those who wanted to reconstruct the war damaged cities as if they had never been bombed.

“The English Planning Tradition in the City” aimed to redefine the picturesque in the eyes of the public by introducing AR’s definition in order to contest its popular connotations. There existed a popular and an academic fallacy with regards to planning, according to the article. The popular fallacy argued that planning destroyed the “quaint and the beautiful” by replacing it with the “orderly” and the “efficient,” while the academic fallacy insisted on the formal and the monumental, instead of the “organic.”

The article also argued that, in order to be effective, planning policy had to take into account the cultural history of the city it aimed to transform. For example, a comparison of London and Paris would reveal that the respective city planning traditions of the two cities were “diametrically” opposed. The Hausmannization of Paris had taken place under a “totalitarian” state, but “the British... were determined not to be... welded into a whole” and hence the appearance of London in its current state.  

The history of London would reveal the tendency of the “British character” towards diversity and resistance to grand planning schemes, and would teach the planner to determine possible policies vis-à-vis this character:

And yet with all the regret in the world we can do nothing about it without setting out to alter the British character, and any planner who thinks he can impose an overall pattern on London just hasn’t learnt the history.”

---

33 Ibid. p. 164.
34 Ibid. p. 167.
35 Ibid.
The construction of an “English” planning tradition by the AR, directly involved the construction of a “British” character. The unconscious switch from “British” to “English” or from “English” to “British” was a common aspect in AR discourse. However this switch always prioritized the “English” over the “British” as the makers and determinants of the tradition. The city, growing under the impact of this character over the ages, as if this character was an unchanging timeless formation, had acquired its specific urban form in the making:

London has grown functionally, is an organism evoked largely without conscious control, a product of competing interests, from building speculators to pressure groups. The nature of an organism so evolved, though informal in the sense that it doesn’t fill out any preconceived intellectual pattern, is what we call functional, has, if it is lucky, what we mean by functional form.

The article later shifted its tone to recall the forgotten virtues of the picturesque in terms of urban planning and to establish the discursive similarity between modern functionalism and the picturesque by quoting several sources, including the Earl of Shaftesbury, Alexander Pope, William Hogarth, Sir Uvedale Price and Archibald Alison. If a formal, ahistorical and acontextual comparison in plan could reveal the familial connection between Niemeyer’s work and the gardens of Chiswick, a discursive comparison would be even more convincing as regards the link between functionalism and the picturesque. It also aimed to remind modern architects that “functionalism” was actually part of the agenda of picturesque theorists, but had a different utterance: “fitness for purpose.” If AR could persuade modern architects that the Picturesque was a close relative of “functionalism” in all likelihood they would no longer insist on condemning the Picturesque as a historicist and formalist theory. The article went even as far to say, albeit for the Georgians, “the Picturesque was the aesthetic of functionalism.”

38 “Fitness or the proper adaptation of means to an end, is the great source of the relative beauty of forms... instances which show that even objects which are disgusting in themselves, become beautiful when regarded only in the light of their fitness.” The article quoted Sir Thomas Dick Lauder in the introduction of Price’s “Essay on the Picturesque” published in 1842, ibid.
therefore aimed to “remedy” this lack of understanding by correcting the reception of what the picturesque was about:

...instead of identifying the picturesque or irregular with the functional approach, and both with the greatest of English traditions, [we] have been beguiled into treating the picturesque as the enemy of functionalism, as well as the enemy of the monumental. Well, the picturesque, even in its quaint old cosy corner connotation, is the enemy of the monumental; of the functional it is not merely a friend but a very close relation.  

The article also referred to Le Corbusier’s sketches of towers in parks for his Ville Radieuse and the Amsterdam extension plan of Cornelius van Eesteren as “a happy augury and more than a coincidence,” and as continuing the cult of informality carried over from the eighteenth century. Both examples were city parks and actually did not explicitly embrace the ideals of the urban picturesque that AR later added. The simple display of the picturesque in these park designs was to show that the theory was unconsciously incorporated into the designs, although its absence in the overall urban layout was not mentioned. 

The names of van Eesteren and Le Corbusier were not chosen randomly. By appealing to the practices of these two masters and the popularity of their work among modern architects, AR rhetoric was aiming at several goals. It was trying to create the necessary sympathy among younger architects for the picturesque by displaying it as part of the aesthetic vocabulary of the modern masters and to present the possibility of an effective strategy with regards to planning and urban design.

By arguing for functionalism and the picturesque being “of the same essence,” the picturesque would be absolved of its backward-looking appearance for the younger generation of architects. Also by creating a genealogical link from the picturesque to functionalism would expand functionalism as a doctrine that did not only belong to the theoretical apparatus of modern architecture, but also to the heritage of English architectural theory. Furthermore, by claiming the picturesque as a precursor to modernist

---

39 ibid. p.169.
40 “Le Corbusier was one of the first to introduce English landscape principles into the urban scene. Both modern and eighteenth century landscapists emphasize the functional requirements of their time and practice the aesthetic of the Picturesque.” Ibid. p.170.
functionalism, an English brand of modernist planning could be derived in order to rival CIAM planning. Any conflict with the avant-garde spirit and the backward-looking appearance of a call for the picturesque would be resolved through this familial bond.

Therefore AR emphasized the picturesque’s disdain for the academic and the classical, its call for variety within simplicity but undermined connotations of eclecticism. The picturesque could come to life again only by means of the “anti-stylistic” approach of modern architecture. To achieve the rejection of the formulaic solution and to approach every problem according to its own merits, a vital principle of the picturesque theory, was recalled to accompany its “progeny”: the program and problem-based reasoning of functionalism.

The picturesque was the mediating agent in the approach to the city. It would act in reconciling modern architecture to the “conglomerate” city in history by reminding architects that planning is an act of compromise.

...when the recommendation is put forward that London should be rebuilt in the modern spirit, the real meaning of the modern spirit should not be misunderstood. The modern spirit is but a natural enlargement of the eighteenth century spirit which in its turn was a rationalization of the traditional vernacular way of looking at the world the characteristic common to all three being that tendency to take the functional approach to build up the human background in those visual terms which the layman calls the picturesque.41

The human background that the city creates for the “laymen,” then, had to be researched, displayed; its visual data to be stored and its future planned and safeguarded. Consequently, AR continued the article by a visual survey of London, a tour that guided the reader through the blitzed streets of London. By resisting to the Beaux-Arts planning tradition and remaining picturesque, London had preserved its English character.42 The survey was not simply concerned with the monuments of London but also their backdrop, an urban fabric in its adhoc continuity. The article insisted that it was the incongruities of London that separated it from Paris, the unexpected twists and turns of its streets, the

41 ibid.
42 AR’s analysis in terms of London’s resistance to “absolutist” planning and as a “key to England” might be influenced by S. E. Rasmussen’s book “London: The Unique City” which was first published in 1934 and remained very popular. Rasmussen’s book was reprinted in 1937, 1948, 1960, 1967 and 1982.
surprising changes in scale, the parade of styles namely the “happy accidents” of the picturesque.\textsuperscript{43}

In accordance with the above and as part of the same article, \textit{AR} went on to explore “Genius Londinensis,” the spirit of London, namely its reigning planning principles. “The old city pattern” of London, according to the survey of \textit{the Review}, was mostly planned around urban quarters linked both in terms of visual connections and traffic requirements. London had kept on growing in terms of precincts characterized by their landmarks and largely pedestrian enclaves. Therefore, \textit{the Review} argued that the aim of the planners should be to keep to the precinctual grouping of buildings and roads, to enhance and emphasize visual connections in order to secure “character,” and to reconcile vehicle and pedestrian traffic in order to satisfy functional requirements. The similarity of the modern precinctual approach to that of the old college precincts in England could create for London the necessary planning precedents. In fact the pedestrianized precinct with peripheral vehicular access was argued as the contemporary embodiment of this approach.

The article noted modern architecture’s enhanced technological ability to establish visual connections between buildings by spanning larger distances and using isolated point supports. Monuments were vital to such an approach since they acted as “elements of romantic drama in the City setting” and they created necessary orientation in both the pedestrians and the vehicles by a sense of distinction from the rest of the urban fabric. \textit{AR} added that in circulation priority had to be given to pedestrians. Having stated the apparent principles, \textit{AR} ended the article by a case study for the area of St. Paul’s taking all the above into consideration. Axial vistas toward the cathedral were to be avoided; pedestrian and vehicular traffic separated. The plan and the brief was followed by perspective sketches (with indicated vantage points) drawn by Hugh Casson.

\textsuperscript{43} “Authentic London. When you want academic, classical, Royal academy stuff, this surely is the London to go about it, the cosy way; relying not on monumentally uniform elevations or the carrying on of cornice lines or on text-book overpoliteness (\textit{how unenglish, how ill-bred}) but on a contrast of academic opinions, a polite discord, like a dinner table of cultivated dons, each obstinately odd, beneath a suave contention of good manners.

That is one kind of urban visual set-up, classical in detail though in essentials picturesque, which modern planners want to see preserved and even extended:—good buildings, classical or otherwise combined with casual good sense rather than formal barrack square orthodoxy.” Ibid. pp. 171-172 (italics mine).
to allow the readers a walk-through.44 The suggested development was made up mostly
of modern buildings and intended to show how it was possible for modern architecture to
complement a historic context.

44 Although AR does not list the author of the drawings, one from the same the set of drawings was
published in Hugh Casson’s biography by Jose Manser. Casson joined the editorial board in 1951.
A3. Enter the painters

As I have already mentioned, AR’s early interest in the picturesque prior to 1946 was intended to win its readers’ sympathy for picturesque theory and to convince them of its potential in the domain of city planning and urban design. A parallel feature of the Review was its recognition of painters as experts on visual relationships. Both in Price and Payne Knight’s writings, paintings are recommended as the source of inspiration for the “improvers” of landscapes and painters are recognized as those who are “most sensitive to Nature’s order.” While pictorial composition became a source for architectural composition mostly in the form of eclecticism, the buildings’ specific position in the landscape and its layout with reference to the terrain, the experience of the observer in the garden in terms of movement in space became the key factors that influenced architectural design in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century. The irregular plans of Richard Payne Knight’s House, Downton Castle and Uvedale Price’s summer house oriented toward several views, as well as Humphrey Repton’s praise of irregularity for utilitarian purposes were evidences for AR, of the move away from academic neo-classicism. Both Payne Knight and Uvedale Price praised the sensitivity of painters like Nicolas Poussin, Claude Lorrain, Salvator Rosa or Thomas Gainsborough in creating visual relations in terms of color and formal composition. Compositional irregularity, the mimicking of nature’s supposed order, was believed to enrich the experience of the beholder in the garden. Apprehending Nature from multiple angles by the repositioning of the body and the consequent change of sensory data was likened to viewing an endless series of paintings.

As Hastings had confessed in the last page of “Exterior Furnishing,” painters had been regular contributors to AR between 1936 and 1942. The most regular of these, however, was the famous English painter John Piper (1903-1992), who was a good friend of Richards.45 Piper’s pre-war contribution incorporated a vast range of subjects. He

wrote articles on art history, did visual surveys on the countryside and the seaside which explored the landscape, the villages and their vernacular architecture, the spatial qualities of pubs, and values of folk-art that he thought had an affinity to those of the modern. In 1936 John Betjeman (1906-1984) the poet, commissioned Piper a travel guide to English counties to be published within the series produced for Shell, the oil company, whom he met via Richards’s and Betjeman’s friendship in the AR.

In this period, Piper was getting interested in portraying places, people and architecture. Richards accompanied Piper in some of the travels that he did for the Shell guides. The two were also interested in recording industrial vernaculars as well as vernacular dwellings that “historians for the most part ignored.”46 Piper also took part in the “Recording Britain” scheme which was launched in October 1939 by the Pilgrim Trust of the United States and was directed by Kenneth Clark.47 The works of artists, mostly watercolor painting, including Piper among many others, who traveled all around the country for “Recording Britain” was later exhibited under the same name in 1943. The exhibition was almost a natural continuation to Piper’s themes, given its concentration on the countryside and the vernacular that would soon face the threat of postwar reconstruction. In “New Art, New World: British Art in Postwar Society” (1998) Margaret Garlake regards the exhibition as “an attempt to fix traditional culture in a

---


47 For more information on “Recording Britain” see Patrick Wright, et. al., Recording Britain: a Pictorial Domesday of Pre-war Britain, (Newton Abbot : David & Charles in association with the Victoria and Albert Museum, 1990).
freeze-frame at a time of maximum vulnerability... [with] its medium and style...located in a strong sense of a national visual tradition.\textsuperscript{48}

An early draft, which sounds like Hastings's preparation for "Townscape: A Plea for an English Visual Philosophy Founded on the True Rock of Sir Uvedale Price" of 1949 entitled "Thoughts on Landscape and Democracy," clarifies the role of painters in building a visual culture and in asserting the importance of landscape for the reconstruction of the built environment.\textsuperscript{49} According to Hastings, a certain literary effort was needed for landscape design to be acknowledged as a major art. Under one of his subtitles "Wanted, An Expertise" Hastings argued that in a civilization where specialists run the order of the day, the art of landscape must be given its specialists. However, in Hastings's view, landscape was not simply the art complementary to architecture but it was the "art of OUT THERE which orientates and makes sense of all the other arts..."\textsuperscript{50}

Hastings's plea for specialization was probably a rhetorical attempt to attract attention as his ideas in relation to specialization would change in the late 40s, given his reconsideration of the overall impact of specialization on a country's culture. In the collaborative task of creating the environment of tomorrow painters had to be recruited to oversee visual control and the work of planners and architects:

Our painters are our visual experts; no time should be wasted in roping the Pipers, the Bawdens, the Pasmores on the modern visual offensive. Without such men, the architects can only regard themselves as visual infants... The painters, like the men of letters must be cajoled into taking their share in the planning game and overcoming their prejudices against modern architecture.\textsuperscript{51}

The articles that Piper prepared for \textit{AR} in the mid-1940s were commissioned with this agenda by the editors. For instance, Piper talked about "Colour in Building" in November 1943, "Colour and Display" in December 1943, and "Colour and Texture" in February 1944, to give architects hints about the effective use of color and texture from

\textsuperscript{48} Margaret Garlake, \textit{New Art, New World : British Art in Postwar Society}, (New Haven: Published for Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 1998). p.95
\textsuperscript{49} H. de C. Hastings "Thoughts on Landscape and Democracy." I could not exactly date this document but the core of Hastings's article is in the text. This document is in the possession of Ms. Priscilla Hastings, the daughter of Hubert de Cronin Hastings.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid, p.10. All of the painters mentioned in Hastings's statement were well-known younger painters of the day and are considered Neo-Romanticists by art historians. Bawden and Piper (which I have mentioned) were friends of Richards as well as Eric Ravillious who died during the war.
the educated eye of a painter. With “Flint” in November 1944, Piper wrote about the “visual pleasures” of the use of flint in buildings as a local material. Piper’s general task was to explain and promote the aesthetic pedagogy of the picturesque on architects and to supply collective “visual education” via AR.

Of course, AR did not simply commission John Piper because he was a famous artist and a friend of Richards, but the personal interests of Piper and the editorial program of AR overlapped to a great extent within the wartime historical context. It was also in the second half of the 1930s that the vision of Romanticism in the works of the nineteenth century romantics, which Hastings admired, became a fruitful resource for artists. Stuart Sillars argues that the work of neo-romantic artists reflect the need for a more direct psychological engagement with the reality of destruction that was part of their daily lives, and not an escape from it. Symbolic representation married to devices of abstraction and intensification of color, allowed artists like John Piper either to elevate the reality of war or to create a solid detachment from it. This marriage of abstraction to representation in the Romantic artists as a progressive step must have especially appealed to Hastings.

After the publication of “The Second Half Century” in January 1947, a program to organize the editorial policies of the Review for the coming fifty years, painters were given an additional and more deliberate role. “The Second Half Century” issued “a call for a visual reeducation,” and painters were be asked to write architectural criticism from a visual perspective in the expense of functional or constructional issues. While this did not mean that the Review handed over the whole responsibility of architectural criticism to painters, it marked their importance in AR’s attitude.

In “Pleasing Decay,” of September 1947, Piper spoke like a modern-day Ruskin, when he talked about the effects of the elements on a building through the years and how the “visual charms and appealing associations could be incorporated in the aesthetic repertoire of the modern planners.” He reminded architects and planners the changing visual qualities of materials as they aged and the possible associational effects of such
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53 See the introductory note to John Piper “Pleasing decay,” in AR September 1947, v. 102, pp. 85-94; and “Stonehenge,” in AR September 1949, v. 106, pp. 177-182.
aging on people. Piper made a plea for reestablishing the appreciation of ruins and the visual interest in decay where nature takes over the building and imprints a history on the building by its transforming powers. Nature, in Piper’s eyes as it was in Ruskin’s, completes the work of the architect by “bestowing” on the work its own color and form. He also referred to Ruskin’s definition of the contrived picturesque as “parasitical sublimity,” that is a quality added by the painters’ lines, and the traces of sublimity as a work of nature on the building which “surely” led to genuine picturesque character. In conservation, the preservation of character is the proper path to follow in order to establish the link between the past and present. Piper ended his article with the words of Ruskin from the “Modern Painters” (1873): When one looks at an ancient building; “No one wonders at it, or thinks of it as separate and of another time; we feel the ancient world to be a real thing, and one with the new... All is continuous...”54 It was part of AR’s agenda to perpetuate this continuity, a continuity of coexistence.

54 Ibid, p.182.
Chapter B: As declared policy, Sharawaggi meets Townscape

The picturesque came back in “The Second Half Century” not simply as a potent theme to enliven architecture and planning, but as the key ingredient for “visual salvation,” that is, a revolutionary means of delivering for the visual environment a desired role that would restructure the modern subject’s life and to enrich modern visual culture. Architecture was regarded as the base on which the visual environment was built and as a form of communication through the eyes. AR argued that, in 1947, the communicative function of art was lost to the public except for a limited number of painters that were visual professionals. The existing “visual culture” of the 1940s, according to the editors, demanded attention to the objects of art in isolation. The need to shift its focus to a broader grasp of the environment was needed. The editors stated that:

And to those for whom visual relations matter, the capacity to see represents itself as a way of salvation, just as for those whom social relations matter, forms of political arrangement represent themselves as a way of salvation...

Seeing in it the obliteration of environmental visual consciousness, AR reacted to the gradual division of the sphere of art in modern society and the development of connoisseurship. People used their eyes; the editors noted, only when they faced a work of art, be it a painting, a photograph, a cathedral, or a designed garden, but neglected the environment taken as a whole, especially cities. Architects, coming into collaboration with painters, could establish the necessary link between the environment and the rest of the arts by overseeing a coordinated effort that would help re-include all that was left outside this limited sphere to bring about a “visual salvation.”

55 Ibid.
56 “…in these latter days events have conspired to deny inexorably the break-in through visual art to all but a small number of elite of professional painters under special license to see. Only when we look at paintings, photographs (the films) and objets d’art—which includes anything from a cathedral to a piece of established scenery—are the rest of us expected to use our eyes. The rest of the seen world is considered to be visually outside the pale, which accounts for the astonishing visual conditions for instance of all our cities. Ibid.
aesthetics and the pedagogy of the picturesque were to perform a function both for AR and the architects that AR called to action:

Nor can architects be expected from this generalization, blinded as they are by training to all but a few routine effects. And yet although painting, as Uvedale Price realized, will always remain the great visual educator, and painters the top visual professionals, nevertheless it is to architects that mankind will have to look to realize in visible terms a favourable environment for itself. It is thus the architect’s role to become master coordinator, through whom the technicians of the statistical sciences, and the mechanical facts, as well as the painters and poets, must look to translate their raw material into the stuff of which visible civilization is made. To this end it is not merely desirable, it is of incalculable importance, that the architect, trained in many arts and sciences, should learn from the painter to see.57

AR’s critique involved a hierarchy of disciplines and professionals where painting and architecture assumed the top two ranks. In this hierarchy, technicians and scientists were given the role to supply the above two with the “raw material” to be processed, that is the findings of science and the inventions of technology. The painters were allowed the autonomy to pursue their art and asked to educate the architects. The “visually educated” architects would be capable of transforming the environment into visible civilization.

In the early 1940s, Pevsner had already done studies on London with an aim to reveal the visual intentions of London’s nineteenth century developers. In order to explain his theses visually, he had commissioned a photographer to take pictures of Ladbroke Grove according to a certain pattern of movement. The photographer was given a map, vantage points and angles to stop and shoot a frame and proceed along a visual promenade.58 This exercise aimed to convey the visual experience of the pedestrian in the city. However it was still not clear how the creation of a plan that would provide such an experience could be taught. A methodology, a set of skills or certain know-how to be acquired by architects, to transform this imagined sensitivity into actual environments in the shape of urban contexts or in the interaction between the town and the country was to arrive later.

The dispersal of AR’s campaign for the picturesque did not stay within the bounds of the Review. Pevsner gave a talk on November 27, 1945 at the Architectural

58 This study is in Box 25 of the Pevsner Collection at the Getty Institute.
Association of London. This talk was very much a précis of his manuscript. In it he dropped all references to “sharawaggi” and limited himself to his travels and his theoretical work on the picturesque. He continued the discussion of what he, along with Hastings, defined as the English planning tradition in the January 1945 AR. He noted that the idea of the garden suburb and the garden city allowed architects and planners to develop model villages, suburbs or cities which could be developed from scratch but did not enable architects to deal with the problems of an existing city. He directed the students to the exhibition of drawings by Hugh Casson that proposed how the future of London may look like according to the principles that he advocated.59

The discussion that ensued after Pevsner’s lecture as noted in the minutes recorded in the Architectural Association’s journal is telling. H.S. Goodhart-Rendel, regarded the theoretical attempt in Pevsner’s talk as “the doctrine of the future.” Hugh Casson, who was in the audience, protested the reaction to the “sharawaggi” movement as a misunderstanding. According to Casson, “sharawaggi” was wrongly condemned as the “eccentric hobby of a few people in a suburban hide-out,” (a probable reference to Hastings running the Review from his farm in Fittleworth, Sussex) although “it was a strong historical tradition.” It was also wrong to deny its necessity by reverting to fact that there was not enough people who possessed the necessary visual sensitivity and ability “to visualize the whole scene.” For Casson it was a matter of training and finding those architects of skill to implement the policy. No strong reaction against Pevsner’s ideas was recorded by the AA Journal to the lecture, other than Ralph Tubbs, who questioned the possibility whether Pevsner’s ideas could actually be incorporated into the building of a town from scratch.60

In late 1946, AR hired an extremely skillful and prolific architect and artist in Gordon Cullen (1914-1994) to translate Hastings’s and Pevsner’s theoretical effort into urban design schemes that would help convince AR’s audience. Cullen had started his education in the London School of Arts and Crafts and then transferred to Regent Street

59 “Whether that scheme will be bold in the Royal Academy sense or in the sense which I have tried to outline I do not know; but I would say “Give me Hugh Casson every time” and I would not say that the vision shown in his drawings is Utopian.” See Nikolaus Pevsner “Visual Planning and the City of London” AA Journal Dec. 1945-Jan. 1946, pp. 31-34.
60 Tubbs later designed the Dome of Discovery in the South Bank Exhibition of 1951, recorded as the largest spanning dome of the time.
Polytechnic to become an architect. He had worked for several modernist practices in England including the office of Raymond McGrath, Godfrey Samuel, Berthold Lubetkin and Tecton and also the British government's "Development and Welfare in the West Indies," an executive branch of the Colonial Office. Cullen had served AR previously by drawings and illustrations intermittently but in 1946 he took a fulltime responsibility.  

Cullen’s early work in AR, before the “sharawaggi” campaign was converted into the campaign of “Townscape” under expanded premises in 1949, developed and refined the ideas advanced in the earlier AR proposals, such as the plan for St. Paul’s area in London. His illustrations however were far superior, in terms of graphic communication, to any of the studies published in the AR after the “sharawaggi” campaign started. In October 1947, Cullen prepared “A Square for Every Taste” for AR in which he illustrated several types of squares categorized according to the city atmosphere they were supposed to create. Each square was differently treated according to the function it was planned around such as the municipal square, the collegiate square, enclosed and open private squares or the popular public square.

Cullen’s illustrations intended to create the feeling of differences in urbanity with respect to seclusion or openness and the landscape treatment that accompanied. In “Westminster Regained,” of November 1947, Cullen produced a series of drawings that depicted the visual experience of a pedestrian’s tour around Westminster Abbey and the Houses of Parliament what he would later call “serial vision.” These drawings achieved what Pevsner tried to do with his photographic study on Ladbroke Grove; the major difference was that the proposal itself was designed by Cullen, too. The plan of the area as a precinct followed the Abercrombie-Foreshaw County of London Plan (1943) and the perspectives illustrated a possible visual outcome of the plan. The editorial that introduced the scheme, probably written by Hastings, suggested that the scheme proposed a development “suggested by [Westminster] itself” and would bring about the visual coherence by attending to the diversities of the place. Cullen’s contribution illustrated the
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61 A good monographic study of Gordon Cullen was published by David Gosling in 1996, who was a sympathizer and follower of Cullen, in collaboration with his partner and son-in-law David Price who holds the Cullen archives. See David Gosling, Gordon Cullen: Visions of Urban Design, (Academy Editions: London, 1996.) Cullen was first listed as “assistant art editor” of the Review in February 1947. Gosling’s work, however, does not deal with either Hastings’s, or Pevsner’s possible contribution, and leaves the two at the background.

idea of a precinct and the history of Westminster in diagrams, two aerial photographs of the area that illustrated the traffic layout before and after AR’s intervention, and an elaborate walk-through done by the use of exquisite sketches according to certain vantage points indicated on the plan.

AR insisted on differentiating between what a precinct meant in town planning terminology and its own definition. The precinct for AR “has come to define an area of either single or varied function, from which through-traffic is purposefully debarred” and has several pedestrian zones that are accessed by minor service roads that allow “each street, yard and green [express] its purpose or personality” that traffic can easily destroy.63 With this definition AR was trying to separate its own use of “precinct” from the connotations of the “neighborhood unit” that was usually defined according to statistical data, such as the number of schools, density and the population it catered for.

Cullen’s sketches featured modern buildings, inserted into the precious historical fabric of the area, lined up along the public spaces and squares that were created for pedestrians. What was most important about Cullen’s “city pictures” was that simple details that made up the visual environment were carefully expressed. The differentiations in paving, the scale of buildings that accompanied major monuments, the relation of the people to the environment depicted within the illustrations were extremely seductive and convincing. They were also carefully crafted and balanced compositions in terms of proportion and color owing to Cullen’s skill and art education. In Cullen, therefore, AR found the painter doing urban design—that is the visually educated architect who knew how to see.

At the time Cullen was possibly working on his Westminster scheme, the sixth CIAM meeting was being held in Bridgwater, England September 7-14. The host of the meeting was the British Modern Architectural Research Group, known as MARS, and was led by J. M. Richards. Richards was one of the founding members of the group along with H. de C. Hastings. Hastings, however never seriously took part in the activities of the group although he supported them.64 In the meeting Richards carried part of AR’s agenda into CIAM via the leadership of the MARS group. In his talk on behalf of the

64 This was explained by Hastings to Susan Lasdun in an interview shortly before his death in 1986. Susan Lasdun generously gave a copy of this interview to me.
MARS group on September 13th, he complained about the lack of communication between modern architecture and the man on the street, and asserted modern architecture’s need to communicate with the “common man.” In the same talk, Richards also mentioned the integration of old buildings into urban design projects by modern architects and the importance of establishing visual relationships between the older city fabric and the modern additions to emphasize the historical continuity in a city to bring about a sense of familiarity, security and enclosure that the common man “yearned for” in his environment. By a careful rewording of Townscape ideas, alongside the need to reach the common man, Richards avoided transporting the tensions that the “sharawaggi” campaign had created among English architects into CIAM. In the end of his talk Richards stated:

And perhaps the landscaping of the town that he lives in is the medium through which the ordinary man can be given an acceptably human environment that yet utilizes the technique of modern architecture. In England this seems to present an opportunity of a rather special kind, because town-planning is but rarely concerned with building towns from the beginning. It is concerned with the rebuilding of war damaged towns, improving living conditions and communications and opening up the congested centres of towns in the nineteenth century. Existing towns have personalities and traditions of their own, by which their inhabitants naturally set great store. As well as being a way of earning the allegiance of the man-in-the-street, it is clearly the duty of the town planner to make a point of preserving and even intensifying local character rather than destroying it. Can he not do this by a technique of urban landscaping which incorporates modern buildings—themselves designed in a modern spirit—with existing buildings and existing topographical features in a consciously designed picture? Operating on the larger scale of the landscape designer, can the architect not utilize old buildings whatever their style or material—in his scenic compositions, exactly as he might incorporate traditional familiar materials in his design for an individual building? Is it possible by some such technique to

---

65 Richards’s interest in the “common man” or the man-in the-street is part of a longer discussion in the second part of my study, focusing on AR’s contribution to the debate on vernaculars and of anonymity, in the effort to “humanize” modern architecture.  
66 Eric Mumford discusses Richards’s role in CIAM and MARS in the Bridgewater congress in the framework of the New Monumenality debate. His discussion elaborates Richards’s interest in the “common man” with reference to Clement Greenberg’s essay “Avant-garde and Kitsch.” His reading disregards the overt references to the AR pedagogy on the picturesque that Richards integrated into the talk, albeit without mentioning the words “picturesque,” “townscape” or “sharawaggi.” Richards, in my opinion, was carefully rewording the AR program in order to appeal to the leftist and avant-garde majority in the audience, including a rephrasing of Townscape ideas. He needed this rewording since the “sharawaggi” campaign had divided the British community of architects into two, identified by Banham as Establishment and anti-Establishment. See Eric Mumford, The CIAM Discourse, 1928-1960, (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2000), pp. 168-179.
reintroduce into the urban landscape as a whole the human qualities—the *contrasts, variety and individuality*—that are in danger of being lost, on the scale of the single building, because of the dehumanized techniques that are nowadays employed?67

Preserving and intensifying local character and integrating existing buildings and existing topographical features into consciously designed pictures by paying attention to contrasts, variety and individuality was a succinct reiteration of “sharawaggi” principles or “townscape” ideals. Richards’s cautiously avoided any reference to a past idiom that would “alarm” the avant-garde, while expressing the concerns of cultural preservation and heritage which partially dominated the post-war agenda.

In the sensitive context of postwar reconstruction, when, for instance, Helena and Szymon Syrkus of Poland were rebuilding much of Warsaw as it was before bombardment, Richards’s rhetoric would have naturally appealed to the architects coming from the war torn cities of Europe. In the Bridgewater meeting, therefore, *AR*’s message was delivered to the international community of architects under the aegis of CIAM.

Richards gave an updated version of the same lecture four months later at the Architectural Association, on January 7, 1948 this time delivering his message to an audience of practicing architects and students.68 In this period, *AR* started shifting its rhetoric towards one that Richards used in addressing CIAM, gradually absolved of its references to the picturesque, and repackaged under the term “Townscape.” It would also be restructured in response to the postwar developments in town and country planning in Britain after the passing of postwar planning acts.

---


The Labour party came to power in Britain in July 1945 when the war in Europe was over. Until its relegation to the opposition in 1951 "the machinery of government, inherited from the [wartime] Coalition, proved effective in the discharge of a socialist programme of state intervention in economic, social and related affairs, including that of town and country planning."69 According to Gordon Cherry, the post-war social and intellectual consensus on the regulating role of the welfare state started with the Attlee government of 1945, and its model of mixed economy and nationalization programs continued until the late 1970s.70 The same period saw a major transformation in British planning effort during which the reconstruction program, initiated during the last years of the war, would be put into implementation. The period also witnessed the robust development of managerial and bureaucratic elite in government bodies and local authorities.

Patrick Abercrombie and J. H. Forshaw’s London County Plan, a major part of the reconstruction effort, was exhibited in 1943 and published in 1944. It was later expanded to the Greater London Plan of 1944 and published in 1945. The plan was conceived with the aim of reconciling the demands of decentralization and the reconstruction and restructuring of the center in order to relieve congestion and transportation difficulties. The Greater London Plan envisaged the building of new towns to locate industry and its relevant populations to new towns separated from London by green belts. In April 1946, the New Towns Act was passed amid protests in the parliament that regarded it a totalitarian experiment which could bring "grave social damage."71 Architects’ and planners’ role in the reconstruction acquired added significance when the scale of the task at hand and the new bureaucratic and institutional structure created for it was considered. By the passing of the Agriculture Act and Town and Country Planning Act in 1947, planning objectives for decades to come were
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70 Ibid.
71 Ibid. p. 122
established. The acts, in principle, suggested a clear distinction between town and country to keep sprawl under control. The priority in the countryside was to be given to agriculture and then to recreation. Townscape was AR’s first response to affect the outcomes of this mainly bureaucratic effort.

1a. The Cultural Assumptions of Townscape:

At the end of a year busy with the international debate on monumentality, the reintegration of historical precedents into architectural design, architectural criticism on world monuments from the eyes of painters in an effort of “reassessment,” a special issue on Britain’s canals and an enquiry into contemporary trends in British architecture, “Townscape” came back to AR in full force. In December 1949, almost three years after the formulation of the “Second Half Century” as a program for the AR to pursue, and five years after the start of the “Sharawaggi” campaign, Hubert de Cronin Hastings made his first attempt of translating AR’s attitude into urban design theory in his article “Townscape: A Plea for an English Visual Philosophy founded on the true rock of Sir Uvedale Price,” under the pseudonym of Ivor de Wolfe.

Hastings’s article followed a black and white photo that zoomed on a stormwater grate on a road paved with cobble stones and brick next to a curb of granite. On top of the frame was the hazy shadow of a cyclist. The rectangular grate acted as the regulating figure of the photographic composition. Aligning its edges were lines of brick bordered by a single row of cobblestone that separated the rest of the cobblestones arranged in arcs. The sheer materiality and the tactile emphasis of the photograph was followed by a caption emphasizing the need to relate town planning to visual perception and associational values inherent in urban experience.

---


73 TOWNSCAPE: The granite sets break-in waves against the cliff of the curb, the bicyclist throws a cloak of shadow as of a cloud upon the sea, the drain cover awaits the shower that will suck the heedless march-ends through fifteen avid little mouths into the sinister underground organization that underlies the city. Of such elements does human vision consist. To such is the conventional town planner almost completely blind…. In this sense the Picturesque philosophy… exhorts the visual planner—particularly the English visual planner—to reoccupy himself with the vast field of anonymous design and unacknowledged path which still lies entirely outside the terms of reference of official town-planning routine.” Ibid. p. 354.
The editorial introduction summarized “Mr. de Wolfe’s case” as a reminder of “a way of looking at the world that might be called perennially English.” By propagating this sensibility, the author hoped to “revolutionize [England’s] contribution to architecture and town-planning by making possible our regional development of the International style, [Sic] as a result of our self-knowledge—technics given in marriage to psychology.” This summary meant that Hastings aimed to do several things with his article and hence with the “Townscape” series: To develop an approach to planning through picturesque theory and psychology and to claim it in the name of the nation in order to mobilize the idea of a planning tradition to convince modern architects.

Hastings’s article issued a warning against the failure of mankind in inhabiting the environment that created patches of No-Man’s-Land: “We foul our own nest.” Instead of simply reiterating the verses of picturesque theory and trying to convince the reader of its virtues, like he did in “Exterior Furnishing,” the article aimed instead to ground an urban design theory within a larger cultural framework. This cultural framework would supply an analogical basis for architects to operate from and the necessary rules to establish the practice of townscape. He argued that it was not the architect or artist that should struggle in order to create a new methodology but the historians and the men of letters that should supply a path, a direction for the artist to follow. AR had taken on this task, that is gathering the army of men that would help formulate the path.

Hastings stated that he aimed to investigate the political sources of “Picturesque Theory” in order to be able to generate “a functional vocabulary for the art of landscape” in the postwar twentieth century. If he could establish the political and cultural basis to the success of the “landscape” movement and the English landscape garden’s proliferation around the world, he thought the principles derived from his investigation could apply to the modern city. In Hastings’s opinion, the birth of “Picturesque Theory”
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74 Ibid, p.355.
75 Hastings was highly interested the relation between psychology and perception, given the popularity of psychology in the 1930s. Although he does not cite any specific sources, the article suggests his interest in Gestalt theory. In his 1958 manuscript “The Unnatural History of Man” Hastings sees a potential of liberation in the developing science of psychology as part of an overall social program and has several references to Freud.
76 “Men of letters have to be invited, have to be politely pressed to do for landscape what Baudelaire did for art criticism.” Ibid.
corresponded to the “rebirth of the democratic idea” in Europe.\textsuperscript{77} He contrasted two
different versions of the democratic ideal, the French vs. the English, to illustrate that the
two ideals ended up creating two different kinds of environments. Treating each
individual as equal but nonetheless indifferent from the unanimous mass, he argued, that
the French ideal was based on a leveled social structure, in contrast to the English seeking
a “higher organization” by allowing the expression of difference.\textsuperscript{78} This would reflect on
the effort to develop universal principles, models or types by the French, and the rejection
of such principles to cultivate particular responses by the British. Out of these two
different understandings of liberty two styles of landscaping were born: the “Grand
Manner” or the “French tradition” vs. the “Landscape Movement, [which he defined as]
the English revolt from the Latin tradition.”\textsuperscript{79} According to Hastings, echoing
Shaftesbury, English liberty and its desire for individual independence, expressed itself in
the free-forms of the landscape garden whereas the French desire for universality and the
absolutist state created the axially ordered garden where geometrical form dominated
over “nature’s own order.”

By means of this article, Hastings aimed to add a layer of political legitimacy to
“Picturesque theory” in addition to the underlying morality of the Romantic Movement.
However, he still had to legitimize this concept against the planning ideas of the Modern
Movement, codified by the Athens Charter of CIAM to attract modernist architects. He
thus separated the teachings of Uvedale Price and Richard Payne Knight from the work
of Capability Brown and of Humphrey Repton in order to distinguish what he called the
“radical” Picturesque theory from “debased” versions that reduced it to simple visual
formulae. He named the Picturesque as the “first Western radical aesthetic” that

\textsuperscript{77} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{78} “To distinguish between them let us confine the term \textit{rational liberal} to the French side of the Channel,
where it was born, and call the other the Rousseausque or English form, by the specific English label
\textit{radical liberal}. The one looks to found the social structure upon the basis of the unanimity ultimately
predictable of all individual minds in virtue of the ultimate identity of reason; the other seeks the higher
social organization in the differentiation of the individual from the mass. One cultivates the universal, the
other the particular. The pattern and the atom philosophy.

Out of rational liberalim springs all that we mean by French classicism; out of the temperamental
radicalism of the English springs, to choose at random, laissez-faire, protestantism, nonconformity,
empirical philosophers, singular Englishmen, parliamentary government, the Common Law founded upon a
multitude of single cases, the absence of a Constitution, the Balance of Power and the Whigs.” See Ivor de
\textsuperscript{79} Ibid.
recognized the values of the “genius loci in a non-archetypal sense” to appeal to the avant-garde sensibilities of modern architects. As Stuart Sillars argues, and probably Hastings adopted, what was being rediscovered in “the Picturesque” through Christopher Hussey’s work was a perceptual revolution. Hussey saw in the picturesque the beginning of a movement towards the aesthetics of abstraction and stylized depiction, later to be manifested in the Romantic sensitivities of British painters such as J. M. W. Turner.

The picturesque, for Hastings, was a reaction in the form of a deviation from the idealizing norms of classical beauty aiming to empower the particular and to uphold character. The discourse of the picturesque resisted stylization and uniformity that had taken over as a result of the Brownian formula and Hastings thought something similar was happening in his own time in opposition to the International Style. He evoked the radicalism of the picturesque to rival the radicalism of the 1920s which had, according to him, ossified into a style and lost its radical edge.

Thus Hastings directed his attack towards modern city planning. He stated that modern town planning theory was in its “Lancelot Brown phase, with Corbusier, The Professor, busy about his clumps--clumps in the twentieth century of buildings rather than trees.” This fascinating analogy compared and equated Capability Brown's tendency of leveling the existing topography to create smooth lawns to Le Corbusier's 'will to demolition' as exemplified by the “Plan Voisin,” and Brown’s arbitrary grouping of trees on these lawns called “clumps” to the towers in the center of Ville Radieuse laid out on park land. He argued that in Britain, a resistance existed against modern planning practices. According to him, these practices tried to overcome a cultural and social problem by technical procedures left to the operation of specialists detached from society. In order to overcome this resistance one had to apply to the community for which the plan was intended. When the task was to create a new philosophy of planning, this community could be none other than the “nation”:
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80 Ibid, p. 360.
82 “Picturesque theory had turned into, a revolt against stylization—a situation which we ourselves are not unfamiliar with to-day in the action for and reaction against the International Style.” De Wolfe, “Townscape” p. 360.
83 Ibid. p. 361.
Each age has its own priorities, and ours are social and technical, living as we do in an era of advanced scientific industrialization. But each age also has its constants; and of these by far the most potent is that temperamental bias of a whole community which under the name of national character continually demonstrates its enormous power of survival.\footnote{ibid.}

An appropriate policy had “to unite national character with the Spirit of the Age” and to reconcile the values of the former to those of the latter. An English way of planning derived from picturesque theory with an inherent sense of cultural preservation, that reflects “national character,” would be married to the architecture of the Age, that is, to modern architecture. Hastings also implied that “national character” would mandate the aesthetics of architecture in the urban context, by way of establishing visual relationships between the existing and the new.

To clarify a mode of operation for this “radical visual philosophy,” Hastings defined “resistance to theory” as an attribute of Englishness. This philosophy operated on the one hand with “a dislike which amounts to an inability to see wholes or principles and an incapacity for handling theory; but on the other hand a passionate preoccupation with independent details, parts or persons, an urge to help them fulfill themselves achieve their own freedom; and thus by mutual differentiation, achieve a higher organization.”\footnote{ibid. p.362} He therefore theorized the “anti-theoretical” by suppressing abstraction as a principle and replacing it with analogy and judgment. Hastings also set up a dichotomy between the reaches of a visual philosophy and the limitations of “technics”—the former had to conceive the latter. An English visual philosophy would necessitate the rejection of a global model that would end up being imitated, such as a “Ville Radieuse.” Hence “Townscape” predicated an additive, piecemeal and regulatory urban process in its very inception.

For a true radical, Hastings argued, “theory and rule of thumb, reason and revelation [were] taboo.”\footnote{ibid. p.363} The picturesque would supply to the designer of townscoes the principle of “Be-Thyself.” He meant that the designer had to respect the individuality of parts and had to treat each object in the environment as having a personality. The
designer’s hand was an almost invisible regulating hand to put all the parts together, as the “artful artlessness” of the picturesque improver.

But then, in the absence of a model, how would the “townscaper” approach an existing design problem? Hastings concluded that the townscaper’s method had to integrate the technique of the circumstantial. The quintessential model that the urban designer had to follow could easily be found in the history of British Law. The Common Law, was based on the recorded accumulation of specific cases and judgments, and displayed particular processes of approach. It also required the future storage of precedents which would allow, according to Hastings, the creation of a kind of open database via which urban design examples would be accessed. This open database would be called the “casebook” by AR. The townscaper would advance his education by way of precedents that helped first “to train the creative faculty” and “then to provide exemplars from which to depart.”

The first task of the designer, then, was to select and accumulate existing precedents of urban design and categorize them within the casebook. The explicit prescription of precedents for new urban form challenged the avant-garde claim for originality. Townscape set aside the avant-garde rejection of history and its creative process that mandated originality emerging from a response to constant change and to the Zeitgeist. The avant-garde shunned the acknowledgement of historical precedents in the design process by exalting ex-nihilo creation.

1b. The Urban Gestalt Married to Association Psychology:

Gordon Cullen compiled the “Townscape Casebook” that followed Hastings’s article. It opened with an ambivalent three dimensional drawing, which could have been interpreted either as a “crystalline object” or as a cube nested along the intersection of three open planes (Figure 1.5). Two smaller drawings with added detail presented the same form as a box on the corner of a room on which a child sat, or the cut-away axonometric of a room when one is looking up, which was later called the “worm’s eye view.” The accompanying text stated that the activity of looking at the environment was either associational or objective. In the city, according to the author, the objective look

87 Ibid.
was almost never employed while the associational was always in charge of the activity of looking.

The text implied that the objective look was analytical. It incorporated a process of dissection that penetrated into the formal qualities of the object. The associational however concentrated mostly on the impressions created by the whole not necessarily focusing on parts. At this time, Gestalt psychology was in widespread use after the publication of “A Sourcebook of Gestalt Psychology” by Routledge & Keegan in London.

Figure 1.5 Cover of AR, December 1949, drawing by Gordon Cullen depicting perspectival illusion to note the change in perception
in 1938. The developing field had been instrumental in the use of camouflage during the war and had not escaped *AR's* attention.\(^{88}\) Gestalt theory looked for the effect of the whole on the subject and the relations of the parts to the whole conceived as an ensemble.\(^{89}\) The ability to perceive comprehensible patterns through the assembly of forms and relating the experience of certain moods to the perception of urban form was a key point of departure for the selected “townscape” cases. The author categorized the cases in the casebook according to the “particular exercise of the eye” in the activity to comprehend them.\(^{90}\) The cases were the “whole-conditions” for the townscape designer to investigate their influences on the observer and to decide whether or not to include in a future design problem. They were organized under peculiar titles such as “eye as fandancer,” “eye as netter,” “eye as agoraphobe,” “eye as articulator,” “eye as exterior decorator,” “eye as matchmaker,” “eye as sculptor,” “eye as painter,” “eye as traffic cop” and “eye as poet.”

The editors of *AR* also observed a scientific justification for association psychology in Gestalt theory and the multivalence of images that was constructed by the subject in the act of perception. *AR* explored how certain urban gestalts affected the pedestrian to enhance his experience in the urban environment. The captions following the images gave short analytical comments on the parts that contributed to the whole and referred to the mood that an urban space might create in the subject, coupled with value judgments. The Beaux-Arts vista was found despotic in comparison to screened vistas, which “reveal[ed] a more intimate contact with the environment” via the sense of enclosure.\(^{91}\) The richness of a street façade or the variety that multiple-use might create in urban space was studied to explain how the sympathy in the beholder might have been
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\(^{88}\) See “The aesthetics of camouflage” by Hugh Casson and “The technique of camouflage” by Julian Trevelyan under “Art by accident” in *AR* September 1944, v. 96, p. 67-70.

\(^{89}\) “The fundamental formula of Gestalt Theory might be expressed in this way: There are wholes, the behaviour of which is not determined by that of their individual elements, but where the part processes are themselves determined by the intrinsic nature of the whole. It is the hope of Gestalt theory to determine such wholes...

...when I see two colours the sensations I have are determined by the whole-conditions of the entire stimulus situation. Thus also the same local physical stimulus pattern can give rise to either a unitary and homogenous figure, or to an articulated figure with different parts, all depending upon the whole-conditions which may favour either unity or articulation. Obviously the task, then is to investigate these "whole-conditions" and discover what influences they exert upon experience." See Willis D. Ellis eds., A Source Book of Gestalt Psychology, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1938) pp. 2-5.


\(^{91}\) Ibid.
generated under the title “eye as matchmaker.” The images were selected from cases in which different architectural styles stood side by side creating formal and material contrasts, intricacy and shifts in scale. The qualities favored in the images were part of the discourse of the picturesque and the logical consequence of their application to the urban environment, such as multiple use, sudden shifts in scale, the limitation in the perception of the boundaries of an open space and the emergence of surprise. One of the major skills of the landscape “improver” of the eighteenth and the nineteenth century was to evoke certain moods by means of the use of water, vistas, expansive prospects, ruins, enclosure created by means of trees and landforms etc.

The introduction to the casebook stated that, what followed was only a small part of a possible casebook that the visual planner could put together for himself. The casebook suggested incompleteness, but required a selective authority that reigned over this incompleteness. The images were meant to act on the twentieth century “townscaper” like a Salvator Rosa, or a Gainsborough painting could have acted on the landscape improver heeding Uvedale Price’s advice. The casebook was none other than a reinterpretation of eighteenth and early nineteenth century pattern-books, which allowed architects to publicize their work to clients and to demonstrate their skills and taste. Nikolaus Pevsner had written on the cultural effect of the pattern-books under the pseudonym Peter F.R. Donner in 1943 when AR’s campaign was evolving towards sharawaggi. The pattern-book, by closely following the reigning taste of the period, was assumed to generate a unity of taste. For Pevsner, the pattern-book was a source of commonsensical information that disseminated and unified architectural culture in the middle of the eighteenth century. Its popularity brought about the acculturation of the developing middle classes to aristocratic taste. By the end of the 1840s, the pattern-books were replaced by architectural magazines and text-books that chiefly concerned architects. AR’s casebooks would take on a similar role in order to not simply educate the architect but also to inform those readers not professionally educated in architecture. Hence the audience, as well as the makers of the environment, would be drawn towards a

---

consensus. The pattern-book would be given a new life through the pages of AR's casebooks in order to fill the cultural void that was created after its demise.

At the end of 1949, after the launch of the campaign, the editors established "Townscape" as an unchanging section of the magazine, which would go on for decades. In the years between 1949 and 1958, when Cullen left AR, Townscape assumed the role of a laboratory of urban design. After Cullen left the magazine, the pedagogy of Townscape was easily taken up by others who worked for AR and even by outsiders who had embraced Townscape. In the meantime Townscape did not only analyze existing British cities and incorporate their urban design attributes into the casebook, but also refined its methodology or counter-methodology, if you will. A majority of the cases handled in the magazine were actual urban design problems under the process of decision-making by local authorities and their planning departments.

**1c. New Towns, Old Towns, National Parks:**

AR’s content was dominated by historical and visual research into cities and how Townscape could be brought into touch with the "Functional Tradition." Most of AR’s examples were chosen from within England that gave the Townscape campaign an appearance that resulted in it being perceived as narrow and nationalist. However AR’s emphasis was not necessarily limited to England. The editors published townscape studies of cities that were beyond the boundaries of England, which makes such perceptions disputable. AR also rivaled the New Towns program by its own proposals and expanded the scope of Townscape to incorporate the rural landscape and the National Parks program.

---

93 The Functional Tradition was always regarded as the proper architectural idiom of inspiration for Townscape studies. The dialogue between the “functional tradition” and “Townscape” will be handled in detail in Chapter B of Part 2.
c-i. “The Third Sack of Rome”:

In February 1950, AR published a long historical article on Rome, entitled “Rome: The Third Sack,” by Henry Hope Reed. Reed’s article argued that the final century of Rome’s history had to be understood in three phases, in all of which planning ambitions of rulers or ruling classes gradually aimed to “destroy” the city between 1870 and 1950. The editors’ introduction summarized these phases as the onslaught of traffic planning, building speculations of wealthy landowners and the imperial ambitions of Benito Mussolini. Thanks to Mussolini’s projects’ not advancing much beyond the drawing board, the editors noted, Rome had managed to keep its historical continuity. Therefore it created the most important example for capital cities all around the world to emulate:

Rome remains, despite the foregoing the most perfect example in Europe of the capital that carries out its capital functions without loss of historic continuity. Reconciliation of the modern and ancient Rome is thus the model from which morals for all capital cities can be drawn, both good and bad. It is THE place in which to show (a) how the historic centre of a capital city can serve modern needs without loss of character; (b) what little things nevertheless can entirely alter or destroy that character and (c) how dangerous good intentions are when harnessed to conventional ideas.

In response AR offered its own solution to Rome’s condition as well as to all of capital cities:

If the old city itself is to be saved, immediate measures are needed to (1) revive Piacentini’s proposal, first put forward in 1926 and later incorporated in the 1931 (2) deflect traffic from the traffic centre; (3) establish a traffic ordnance on the precinctual principle of pedestrian-vehicular precedence... and (4) form a corps of townscape practitioners to put the visual details to rights and keep them that way.

The items on the list, were universal principles of Townscape. For instance, number one could translate as “Piacentini’s proposal is the already existing proposal that suits Rome’s
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94 Henry Hope Reed is the founder and president of Classical America and an historian who wrote mainly on classical architecture. In the year 2002, Classical America and The Institute of Classical Architecture have been united under the name The Institute of Classical Architecture and Classical America. He still serves in its publication committee.


96 Ibid.
character," and that planning should follow the character of a city established by a visual survey. In the accompanying casebook, Rome was explored in terms of approaches, public spaces, its streets and the effect of demolitions. Eight sets of photographic comparisons illustrated how planning interventions destroyed the pedestrian qualities and the scale of Rome. The pairs were arranged in terms of chronology and the shots were taken from almost identical viewpoints to illustrate the public spaces being taken up by cars, street-widening destroying the scales of streets, traffic restricting pedestrian experience, nineteenth century Beaux-Arts planning removing and enlarging its smaller squares, and Mussolini’s demolitions erasing whole quarters of the city to make way for his imaginary reconstruction of ancient Rome. Rome was but one example that demonstrated AR’s skepticism of holistic interventions, and its equating of demolitions with dictatorial policies.

c-ii. New Marlow and The Thames Linear National Park

At the same time the Labor Government’s planning acts that would determine the future environment of Britain and their results were watched closely by AR. The newly acquired transformative power of the state and local planning machinery was perceived by AR as something that, if properly used, could have very beneficial consequences for the natural and the built environment. The New Towns Act (1946), The Town and Country Planning Act (1947), and the National Parks and Access to Countryside Act (1949), were regarded by AR not only in terms of the consequent building activity, but also as a fertile ground of opportunity for the magazine to put forward proposals.

97 S. Maria Maggiore in 1860 vs. in 1950, ibid, p. 104.
98 Piazza di Spagna in the 18th and the 19th centuries, ibid.
99 The effect of car traffic and tramlines on Via del Corso and Via del Tritone, ibid, p. 106
100 The transformation of Piazza Venezia, p. 107
101 Via dei Fori Imperiali demolitions of 1935 at Mussolini’s will: “The only comment worth making on this carefully and expansively laid out waste is that, with its concrete paths leading nowhere and its municipal lamp standards lighting up nothing, it is the most fitting memorial to a dictatorship in existence.
102 AR later published another essay on Rome, this time on the planning of Baroque Rome by Sixtus V, written by Siegfried Giedion. AR’s emphasis this time was how Sixtus V, by connecting the seven main churches and shrines on a pilgrim’s path, created a new unity in which the social and aesthetic factors were duly considered. See Sigfried Giedion, “Sixtus V and the Planning of Baroque Rome” AR, April 1962, vol. 111, pp. 217-226.
After the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act was passed in December 1949 *AR* took the opportunity to plead for the creation of a linear national park around the River Thames (Figure 1.6). The July 1950 issue was designated as a special number to display the potentials of the area surrounding the River Thames as a national park. The issue was prepared by Eric de Maré (1910-2002), who had already prepared an issue on England’s canals. De Maré was trained at the AA and had worked for the Architectural Press as a successful photographer. The canals issue aimed to direct attention to the fact that the canals of England, which were a major form of transport and tourism after the Industrial Revolution, were directly threatened by commercial obsolescence and physical dereliction. *AR* had also published a less detailed proposal similar to de Maré’s in principle in August 1949 by John Arrow, entitled “The [Norfolk]
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104 Eric De Mare, “Canals” (special issue) *AR* July 1949, v. 106. De Mare explored the canals for a year before he prepared the issue.
Broads as a National Park.” De Maré analyzed the river via the categories of Patrick Geddes’s “valley section”: place, work, folk.\textsuperscript{105} He argued that the areas which surrounded the river had created a River Culture and could be defined as a region (Figure 1.7).\textsuperscript{106}

The national park would be created out of a regional survey of the landscape and the man-made components that made up this culture. Furthermore de Maré argued that the river was once a major force of the economic life and the source of culture that surrounded it, which made this area “the most English of English regions”:

Except for the modern developments near London, at Reading and Oxford, there exists no other thickly populated landscape in the country which has changed so little in its natural features as the Thames Valley. The whole is arbitrary, informal, restrained, variegated, romantic, and as shy of rigid trammels as the English character. It is the most English of English rivers and the most English of English regions. Yet as an entity it is unique.\textsuperscript{107}

Thus De Maré’s article repeated an oft expressed consensus on Englishness in the pages of the \textit{AR}, understood in terms of the landscape and the vernacular and translated into planning. De Maré emphasized that the “thickly populated landscape” had changed very little against the impact of modern developments. English landscape was arbitrary, informal, restrained, variegated and most of all, romantic. The response of planning had to incorporate these attributes to enhance and continue “character” and ensure its permanence. The linear park was based on the idea of transforming the towpath into a continuous nature walk. The towpath was used by horses to pull boats along certain parts of the river and was mostly preserved. De Maré proposed to reestablish the towpath’s continuity by the help of the planning powers and to give walkers a 135-mile uninterrupted walk in order to provide an unmatched experience of the land and its culture (Figure 1.8).

\textsuperscript{105} “[If the region] is to become a National Park this character, composed of Folk-Work-Place, to use Sir Patrick Geddes’s well-known trinity, must be preserved and enhanced.” Eric De Maré “The Thames…” p. 7.
\textsuperscript{106} “Between Teddington and Cricklade the tideless Thames winds for 135 miles between the boundaries of eight counties. All the way with towpath and enclosing belt its width is only a few hundred yards. Nevertheless it has the right to be called a Region for it has its own special character and pattern and its own distinct culture and traditions.” Eric De Maré “The Thames as a…” p. 5.
\textsuperscript{107} Ibid.
c-iii. (Mis)appropriating Geddes

The seemingly conservative tone of De Maré’s article was broken unexpectedly at the end by the proposal of a New Town around the area of Marlow. After analyzing the visual qualities of the settlements and the natural beauty of the river in a casebook, AR proposed New Marlow as a social center for the National Park (Figure 1.9). New Marlow would check sprawl by establishing “riverside urbanity” in the shape of a water town. The river’s water would be diverted to create a lagoon and canals on which new housing would be built (Figure 1.10).
Figures 1.9, 1.10  New Marlow, town center, (above) and scene from the canals, drawing bys Gordon Cullen, River Thames as a National Park, AR July 1950
New Marlow did not include any industry, but was proposed as a resort that would be inhabited mainly by those who came to enjoy the “river culture.” The town looked like a modern-day Venice in the drawings of Gordon Cullen. The city center was designated a mixed-use, pedestrianized entertainment center served by canals and limited motor traffic. Surrounding the center were residences were developed around “basins,” that were housing complexes on the water in short walking distances from the town center. The city was compact, and no provisions for growth or a phased development were made.

New Marlow, however, did not take into consideration any of the governmental objectives that filtered into the planning of the new towns. The need to redistribute and reorganize industrial populations away from London to relieve congestion and to curb London’s growth was not at all addressed by New Marlow, in order for it to rival any of the new town schemes on the drafting table. Whether tourism could supply the necessary economic incentive for the development of a new city and the flow of capital into the area was highly dubious. It was motivated mostly by the need to preserve the area around the Thames by trying to divert development from the “line” of the park and by concentrating it on a new town. Instead of prohibiting ribbon development by restricting legislative measures, AR hoped that it would be given direction by providing centers of attraction. By enhancing the status of the river as an object of recreation, AR ignored the fact that the stimulus for ribbon development and economic speculation could actually be encouraged.

Although AR mentioned that its proposal was in its initial stage, the park and the new town proposal scarcely had any reference to Geddes’s idea of a comprehensive regional survey. A major part of the issue was itself a visual survey translated to the reader via Eric De Maré’s powerful camera. This survey tried to capture the minute details of the built environment as well as the natural landscape of the river. Geddes’s idea of the survey, however, had a greater focus that involved a pedagogic program of civic education alongside scientific analysis that dealt largely with quantification of the environmental.

As Michiel Dehaene argues, the idea of the survey was largely assimilated into the developing profession of planning to introduce “a new ethic into the realm of urban reform, which intended to remove the planning of the city from the realm of opinion,
custom or taste into the realm of authoritative science, with the production of thorough surveys as the number one hallmark of good scientific practice."\textsuperscript{108} In doing this, the profession largely denied/neglected the pedagogic program that involved empowering the citizenry to make a self-conscious decision towards the environment. According to Dehaene, while some groups embraced the survey simply as the quantitative infrastructure of the planning process, others limited its role to mobilize historical and landscape preservation.

Geddes also emphasized the transmission of the cultural heritage for a successful societal evolution through the “constant re-appropriation, selection, reinterpretation and reenactment of a fading past.”\textsuperscript{109} While $AR$ persistently condemned the planning profession for its obsession with the quantitative, it aimed to counter the quantitative by prioritizing the visual, and consequently reinforcing an environmentally preservationist agenda. $AR$’s preservationism was far from intervening into the urban environment by an eclectic, revival-based architecture that would generate a superficial continuity and that would resist all intervention. In Cullen’s images, all the buildings were consciously modernist, mostly alluding to the architectural vocabulary of Le Corbusier. New Marlow was not much different from the rest of the new town schemes in terms of total planning. It was built on a blank slate that did not incorporate any of the old town of Marlow, almost mimicking Harlow New Town under construction at the time. $AR$ would start to change its mind about the new towns after the first built products.

In the August 1950 issue, due to the re-edition of Geddes’s “Cities in Evolution,” in 1949 (edited by Arthur Geddes and Jacqueline Tyrwhitt), $AR$ published an article by Lewis Mumford on Geddes, with an editorial introduction that presented $AR$ as a follower of Geddes. Paraphrasing Lewis Mumford, the editorial introduction stated that:

\begin{quote}
...the permanent value of Geddes’s work and particularly his work as an ecologist “the patient investigator of historic filiations and dynamic biological and social relationships” is established beyond all doubt, while today it has a special value in that the things which his outlook and method contribute to planning are just the things that the administrator and bureaucrat, in the interest of economy or efficiency are tempted to leave out.\textsuperscript{110}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{109} Ibid. p. 41

\textsuperscript{110} See the editorial introduction on the table of contents page of $AR$ August 1950, v. 108.
Mumford emphasized, but also questioned the adequacy of Geddes’s City Exhibitions to give the mass of citizens a comprehensive idea of their urban environment. According to Mumford, the pictorial presentation of a general survey would not be capable of what Geddes hoped to achieve. He noted that Geddes was “right in holding that a certain richness of visual background is a minimum requirement for making creative decisions in town planning.”111 Geddes’s idea of “conservative surgery,” for Mumford, aimed to recapture the lifestyle of a place and enhance it. The bureaucrat and the administrator according to Mumford are inclined to disregard “time, patience, loving care of detail, a watchful interrelation of past and future, an insistence upon the human scale and the human purpose, above all merely mechanical requirements…”112 Local and regional personality or, in AR’s favorite term “character,” had to be made an essential part of planning. Mumford also maintained that although Geddes respected major planning ideas of the twentieth century such as the garden city and the neighborhood unit; he kept a conscious distance from the constraints of a certain urban model, such as the Garden City.

Mumford’s article on Geddes certainly matched AR’s ambitions. However, in AR’s proposals the citizen was absent from the decision-making process in relation to urban form, just as he or she was from the decision-making process of the local authorities and the central planning institutions. On the contrary, AR aimed to affect the visual choice of the citizens and the local authorities who had access to its proposals.

In the same issue Gordon Cullen presented a study of four seaside towns to demonstrate how the economics of the seaside and the natural geography affected the making of four seaside towns and how insensitive planning and development decisions could destroy “character.” Cullen analyzed Brixham, Fowey, Looe and West Bay with reference to the “the line[s] of life,” by which he meant the forces of development coming into contact with economic forces, social makeup and geography expressed in the urban form. The lines of life were major formal features of a town’s plan that had come into being after centuries of development. The planner’s job for Cullen was to identify

112 Ibid. p. 87
the lines of life in a city, analyze and categorize them in terms of importance, disentangle and reorder them if necessary, and organize future development accordingly. If a town lacked the coherence of development the lines of life could be injected by future development in order to provide character (Figure 1.11).

Figure 1.11 The Lines of Life, analysis by Cullen in AR August 1950, on the right

Cullen exemplified this by proposing a harbor walk and modern development around this walk in West Bay, where he linked the sprawling development along West Bay’s main road and the denser development along its marina. All of the four examples that Cullen provided were hypothetical interventions to enrich the open casebook of Townscape growing within the pages of the Review but also intended to affect the planning authorities of the four towns. The planners were asked to compare these examples to the work in their own hands and draw out necessary lessons on how to enhance and provide character.

However “Townscape” had still not proven itself as an urban design methodology that would be able to create a neighborhood, or as AR liked to call it, a precinct, in an actual built project. The editors would advance to demonstrate the validity and feasibility
of townscape in reconstruction via the example of the South Bank exhibition, which was organized as part of the Festival of Britain in 1951.

Id. the South Bank Exhibition:

On 4 May 1951, King George VI, accompanied by the Queen, Princess Elizabeth, Princess Margaret and a crowd of thousands, declared the South Bank Exhibition open. The exhibition, built on a 27-acre site on the south bank of the river Thames, was the leading show of the Festival of Britain, which was officially declared to commemorate and celebrate the centenary of the Great Exhibition of 1851. After almost four years of planning, South Bank opened its doors to a nation healing its wounds from World War II, comprehending the dissolution of its empire and recently fighting the overseas Korean War. During the years of its planning (1947-1949), the Festival had gone through stages of “downsizing,” depending on the economic resources that Great Britain could pour into it. Initially expected to be an international event, The Festival ended up national, costing only one sixth of the preliminary sum. Consequently it assumed a different emphasis. On 7 May 1947, almost a month before Secretary of State George Marshall outlined his plan at Harvard University for the economical recovery of European nations, Lord Morrison, the president of the Festival Council had stated in the House of Commons that:

Nevertheless the Government feel that it would not be right on this account to abandon the celebration of the centenary, and we therefore propose to mark it by a national display illustrating the British contribution to civilization, past, present and future, in arts, in science and technology and in industrial design.\footnote{Quoted in Adrian Forty, "Festival Politics" in Mary Banham et. al., A Tonic to the Nation (London: Thames and Hudson, 1976) p. 27.}

The proposal created a controversy over whether England was in the mood to celebrate anything. The national economy was not stable and the country was busy with the post-war reconstruction of its war-torn cities and settlements with the old empire going through the last throws of de-colonization and its status as a world power was under heavy dispute. Thus, it was not a surprise that the government had reduced the scale of the festival.
South Bank set the scene for several clashes between generations and ideologies. The exhibition was presented as "a tonic to the nation" by those who believed that it carried the hints of a new world and a utopian impulse for the British nation: a new architectural language, a manifestation of national power, how Britain could contribute to world civilization after shaking off the rubble from its wounded body. However there were also those who perceived it as a "narcotic." For them, South Bank provided an illusion to the people of Britain by means of a nationalist narrative that aimed to boost patriotic pride in order to cover up the fall from empire.\footnote{According to Adrian Forty, "The festival, in its nationalist aspect, seems to have been a symptom of the British isolationism of the late 1940s; and in a more direct way, the enormous coverage that it was given in the British media may have helped distract attention from the developments that were taking place across the Channel." See "A Tonic to the Nation," p. 35.}

\textbf{d-i. The First Modern Townscape:}

For \textit{AR} South Bank was a source of hope and achievement, both for the future of modern architecture and the modern city. In the foreword to its special issue for the exhibition, \textit{AR} declared that South Bank demonstrated "the vitality of contemporary British architecture" (Figure 1.12). In the planning process, \textit{AR}'s editor J. M. Richards took part in the advisory council called "The Council of Architecture, Town Planning and Building Research" to provide general guidance for the architects.\footnote{The members according to \textit{AR} were H. V. Lobb (chairman), H. V. A. Briscoe, F. J. Forty, W. G. Holford, Robert Matthew, Rowland Nicholas, Sir George Pepler, Howard Robertson and J. M. Richards. See "Foreword" to the special issue on the exhibition, \textit{AR} August 1951 vol. 110, p. 79.} He saluted the exhibition as the realization of the Prince Consort's far-reaching vision from 1851. For Richards, South Bank exhibited the genuine collaboration between science, industry and art, and he expected that its effect on the "public's taste" would be immense.\footnote{J. M. Richards, "1951: The Prince's Vision Realized" \textit{AR} May 1951, vol. 109, p. 278. \textit{AR} had already published an article on the exhibition prepared by Hugh Casson and illustrated by Gordon Cullen in April 1950. See Preview: 1951 South Bank Exhibition" in \textit{AR}, April 1950, vol. 107, pp. 261-268.}
The exhibition was made up of two groups of buildings, one based on themes of the British peoples’ contribution to civilization and the other to the resources of their land (Figure 1.13). Only one building was intended to remain on the site after the exhibition, which was the Royal Festival Hall, mainly housing concert auditoria and related social functions. Almost all of the buildings from the Skylon, that seemed to stand up without visible means of support using tension cables, to the Dome of Discovery, had an architectural language that displayed a bold and courageous use of technology. To many of the British who had not seen a major public project for years with such unfamiliar architectural imagery, the exhibition was mesmerizing under the floodlights.
However, the Review was not only interested in the architectural imagery. For the Review the planning of the South Bank exhibition was the first opportunity to prove Townscape as a viable urban design idiom. AR found South Bank “revolutionary” because, for the first time principles of the Picturesque theory of landscaping were applied to urban planning with “triumphant results”:

The South Bank exhibition thus fills the traditional exhibition role of nursery of new ideas in a particularly timely fashion, since the problems presented to its designers, especially the small size of the site, reflected many of the problems that constantly confront architects and planners in this overcrowded island: how to give a feeling of space while economizing the use of space; how to achieve a compact urban character while avoiding congestion--visual and actual; how to weld ideas of many architects into a whole without stifling originality or imposing uniformity; how to marry the new with the old so that one does not harm the other but, on the contrary, so that the qualities enhance each other.\footnote{Foreword to the "Special Issue on the South Bank Exhibition" AR, August 1951, vol. 110, p. 74.}
The editors marked that in its incorporation of a scenario that prioritized visual drama, South Bank set new precedent in comparison to the rest of the world exhibitions. In comparison to the plans of Paris 1867 and 1887, and those of Glasgow 1938 and New York 1939, South Bank was not axial, not dominated by a single boulevard or not housed within an engineering marvel. It was planned like a new neighborhood, in an existing part of the city. South Bank managed to create an example for future urban design by an unorthodox approach that set itself apart from the Beaux-Arts tradition of exhibition designs, and for cities that would develop by means of a “slow and organic growth.”

Figure 1.14. South Bank “walking scenario” for “The Exhibition as Landscape,” AR August 1951.

The exhibition had a walking scenario which was included in the guide given to visitors (Figure 1.14). The visitor was directed to experience the exhibition along a path where he/she would be given different angles to view buildings and the exhibition. The designers expected to create a certain visual drama by orientating the buildings according to this path and by connecting it to the city that lay outside the boundaries of the site. The visitors were intended to experience the feeling of being both in the old London across

---

118 Ibid.
the river framed by vistas and outlooks, and in the exhibition site by producing "scenes and progressions of emotional value." The movements of the visitors were guided by the intelligent use of landscaping elements without creating disturbance such as the calculated use of pools, change in surfaces and levels. The public spaces, the surfaces of the buildings as well as the small gardens, were decorated with works of art designed by England’s leading artists such as Barbara Hepworth, Ben Nicholson, Henry Moore, John Piper and many others. All the buildings made careful use of the same approach by linking their interiors to the outside public spaces with a generous use of glass surfaces. The lettering that would be applied to the surface of the buildings and to the signs was also controlled by a graphic code. AR added that the exhibition had to be regarded as a town planner’s pattern-book for future designs, since it was full of lessons. This pattern-book did not only incorporate cases of urban design but the creative use of the “functional tradition” and “the nautical style” that AR had been promoting since 1946. What fascinated AR was the contemporariness of South Bank. The criticism written for the exhibition buildings by Richards emphasized that “for the first time the public can move in a landscape that could belong to no age other than the present.”

**d-ii. Presenting an alternative: AR at CIAM**

For Misha Black, who was the coordinating architect for the upstream section of the exhibition, South Bank had achieved two objectives: “The first was to demonstrate the quality of modern architecture and town planning; the second to show that painters and sculptors could work with architects, landscape architects and exhibition designers to produce an aesthetic unity.” At the time Black was a member of the Modern

---

120 “in town planning much of the art lies in concealing conscious intention—in contriving the happy accident—and it is as a highly successful exercise in the art of the town-planner that the exhibition should first of all be regarded. It makes a real contribution to town-planning technique, and as the visitor walks round it, with its thematic story unfolding before him, he might well be exploring a subtly designed town. He is led from point to point by the skilful use of the devices the town designer, as well as the exhibition architect, exploits or should exploit—in order to heighten vitality and underline the personality derived from the nature of his site: expectation and suspense, the relaxation provided by the quiet enclosure, the shock of the surprising view, the contrast of the familiar with the unexpected, changes of level tempo and scale. See “The Exhibition as Landscape” ibid, p. 80.
121 J. M. Richards, “The Exhibition Buildings” ibid. p. 132
122 Misha Black, “Architecture, Art and Design in Unison” in “A Tonic to the…” op. cit., p.82.
Architecture Research Group (MARS), the English branch of CIAM, and he was simultaneously stating that the South Bank Exhibition aimed to fulfill the aims of CIAM’s postwar agenda, established in the 1947 Bridgwater meeting. The reintegration of urban design, architecture and art to realize a completely modern urban experience was one of the major decisions that came out of Bridgwater. A section of the city was conceived as a modern “Gesamtkunstwerk” to which each and every branch of art contributed. Indeed, the design of South Bank was produced by the close collaboration of several architects, artists, landscape designers and exhibition designers that worked under two architecture coordinators, Hugh Casson and Misha Black. Casson, as I have previously mentioned, was long affiliated with AR and a staunch advocate of “sharawaggi” later re-entitled Townscape.

AR’s special issue on the South Bank exhibition was published right after the eighth congress of CIAM, which took place July 7-14, 1951 in Hoddesdon, England. The MARS group that hosted the congress had planned a tour of the South Bank site as part of the activities, as well as to Harlow New Town and the prefabricated Hertfordshire schools program. The congress, the proceedings of which were published under the title “CIAM 8: The Heart of the City,” was based on the theme of “the core.” The size of AR’s presence in CIAM was doubled in the Hoddesdon congress by the addition of Ian McCallum who was made a member of the editorial board in March 1950. Both Richards and McCallum gave talks in the congress that carried AR’s message to the membership one more time. Richards’s talk was mainly based on the role of the core in the cultural life of the city and the symbolic values that the citizens attached to it. He argued that the development of old city centers had taken centuries, and that modern architecture had to consider the role of historical development in order to be able to intervene into the core. The edited version of Richards’s talk, published in CIAM 8: The Heart of the City” states:

The town centres we build are an expression of our own culture... Our interest in what has gone before thus takes two forms: appreciation of the atmosphere the past has created and visual awareness of the physical objects—in the shape of spaces and buildings—that it has left behind it. The first is not so much an aesthetic as a psychological form of apprehension, for it must not be forgotten that only the architect himself has the habit of applying strictly aesthetic standards to what he sees. To the inhabitants of the town—for whose benefit the Core exists—
it is not primarily a work of art, to be apprehended as an aesthetic experience, but
a collection of symbols and a familiar assembly of objects having certain
associations and reviving certain memories—since the Core is the repository of
the community’s collective memory.”123

Richards presented the example of the Westminster district as an urban core, the unity of
which was destroyed due to the “misapplication of science.” In the case of Westminster,
he stated that the architect’s duty was to recreate the destroyed unity in a modern spirit.
Since the 1890s, planners had given priority to traffic over the pedestrian in the name of
efficiency and speed, and had disregarded the cultural symbolism of the area. The book
“CIAM 8: The Heart of the City” provided Gordon Cullen’s drawing from AR’s proposal

As Eric Mumford notes in his study of CIAM, Richards’s ideas on the
preservation of historic cores was shared by Enrico Peressutti, the partner of Ernesto
Rogers from BBPR in Italy. BBPR was developing similar ideas in Italy at the time
which would be disseminated through Rogers’s editorial presence in Casabella, under the
rubric of “continuità.” Richards further pointed to the possibility that new cores could
also be created by establishing relations to the old and a very successful example would
be the South Bank exhibition. The exhibition, as I have previously mentioned, had made
scenic use of Westminster across the river as well as some buildings existing on the site
such as the Shot Tower and a nineteenth-century block of flats, “without compromising
the modernity of the exhibition”:

To look at Westminster again for an example: at the South Bank exhibition—
which was in a sense the starting point of a new core for London—older London
was used as a back-cloth to the new buildings. The towers of Westminster across
the river were consciously employed as a scenic background to certain groupings
of modern buildings. Without compromising the modernity of the exhibition they
were incorporated in the same picture and given fresh significance by the part
they had in it…. For in this scenic use of existing buildings, the intrinsic merit of
the buildings themselves is largely irrelevant. The colour, outline, scale and
texture they posses can be used by the planner with a discriminating eye to
provide a foil to the architecture he himself has the opportunity to contribute, to
bring out the latent character of every place, and intensify its functional

123 J.M. Richards “Old and New Elements at the Core” in CIAM 8: The Heart of the City, (London: Lund
Humphries & Co., 1952), p. 61, Italics in the original.
significance. He can help each generation, instead of being inhibited by the past, to see it with its own eyes and endow it with fresh significance. 

Ian McCallum’s talk, entitled “Spontaneity at the Core” focused on the aspects of the city left outside the jurisdiction of architects and planners. McCallum’s talk argued about the importance of people’s participation in the urban environment and cautioned against the desire of modern architects to regulate it down to every detail. From street vendors to pub lettering, from open street markets to tobacco kiosks and shops that have exterior displays, McCallum argued that the variety of street life had to enter the designer’s vocabulary to vitalize the modern city. He gave the example of Copenhagen’s modern center where colored awnings, flags and the use of signs were actually not the architect’s contribution. The city had to allow its citizens to transform it for their own pleasure and the designer had to be the enabler for such activity in order to avoid “deadness.”

In addition to the intention of connecting the old to the new without compromising the modernity of architecture, The South Bank exhibition aimed to incorporate the spontaneous in the small gardens, colored flags, balls, parasols, metal chairs, flower pots, the bold and bright lettering on building facades and directional signs. South Bank, was presented as an alternative strategy to CIAM, in opposition to the planning of civic centers such as Le Corbusier’s plan for the reconstruction of St. Dié (Figure 1.15). Instead of slab buildings floating on green and paved open spaces, South Bank offered a tight-knit assembly of buildings that were placed in close relation to one another according to a scenario. Against the apparent purity of Corbusier’s all-encompassing design, South Bank required a crowded team of architects building different buildings under the coordination of two architects that laid out the master plan and oversaw the implementation of the design.

---

124 Ibid. p. 63.
125 “...most of the designs for old or new town centres now being produced exhibit a peculiar kind of deadness, an absence of the thousand and one effects possessed by the town centres one has always known and enjoyed, effects take make them more bearable in spite of their often appealing general squalor.” Ian McCallum “Spontaneity at the Core” in “CIAM 8...” p.65.
126 These elements were later to be found puny, trivial, flimsy and effeminate by Reyner Banham in opposition to the “bloody-minded” architecture of New Brutalism and this view seems to have influenced the view of his students Charles Jencks, Adrian Forty and Nigel Whiteley. See Banham “Flimsy, Effeminate” in “A Tonic to the Nation... ”
According to Eric Mumford, the Hoddesdon congress created a disturbance within CIAM about whether CIAM would still remain as a generator of ideas to sustain avant-garde modernism via an elite organization of architects and planners or whether CIAM should allow its elite to be involved in the machinery of planning which could compromise the implementation of such ideas. At the same time, as Mumford adds, while CIAM’s “prewar ideas about the “Functional City” became commonplace, its position as a vanguard organization became doubtful.”

It was no surprise, then, that Richards felt uneasy about his relationship to the congress and slowly drifted away from CIAM, since AR combated the ubiquitous application of the functional city’s principles and had questioned the relevance of the avant-garde in the postwar context. Although Richards
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127 The Functional City was the theme of analytical presentations that Van Eesteren required CIAM groups to present the cities they worked on and the name of the fourth congress that took place on board the SS Patris II in the Mediterranean. Its results were later publicized under the Athens Charter published in 1943. The use of historical buildings in the re-planning of the city was not handled much differently from the slum clearance of Hausmannian Paris. The Athens charter sanctioned to isolate historically imported buildings from their neighborhoods by demolitions and use the space for the function of leisure, which as one of the four major functions. Mumford, “The CIAM Discourse…” p. 207.
and McCallum found a partially sympathetic audience to their views in Hoddesdon, the contextualist views of AR and its implicit pedagogy based on the picturesque was not welcome in CIAM congresses. AR's response to the need for humanization within modern architecture did not match the dominating avant-garde approach to architectural problems which constantly updated its aesthetic expression. What AR advocated was a tuning up of modern architecture and planning in response to the culture and the needs of the communities it aimed to serve, and not to impose its ready-made solutions deemed internationally valid through its self-appointed institutions. AR's decision to pull out of CIAM, was largely due to the emergence of a younger generation interested in a new architectural language and urban form, and their desire for promotion into the ranks of the international avant-garde, later to be known under Team X, as well as their preference for an architecture inspired by continental models.

The split between the younger and the older generation on how South Bank was perceived is all the more apparent if one compares Reyner Banham's reaction and his remembrance of Ernesto Rogers's comments on South Bank to John Summerson's comments on the South Bank exhibition written in 1956. Rejecting the idea that the festival brought forward a utopian impulse, Reyner Banham thought that the architecture of the South Bank exhibition only lagged behind what was happening around the world. In his article "The Style: 'Flimsy... Effeminate?'" in "A Tonic to the Nation" (1976) written for the exhibition twenty-five years after South Bank, Banham stated that the so-called "Festival Style" was a myth created by those who were part of the "festival establishment." Banham argued that the architecture of South Bank had no innovation at all. South Bank had not given architecture a push, but had taken its push from Italian architecture and of course modern architecture's great master, Le Corbusier. South Bank and British architecture had followed precedent and the British had "deserved a bit of a pat on the back for having finally caught up" with the pace of modern architecture. In a history of constant progress achieved through technological advancement and the pull of the avant-garde, for which Banham was a well-known advocate, South Bank could only be regarded a failure, a "blatant plagiarism."128 South Bank had nothing revolutionary,
merely an English version of the planning ideals of modern architecture's "ancestral voices":

What, for some English pundits, had been an overwhelming demonstration of the superiority of the English picturesque tradition over all other planning dogmas, was for these 'ancestral voices' simply an English version of their own corporate vision of the future city, perhaps even a welcome return of the British to the true path of modernism—at least to judge from some rather enigmatic remarks of Ernesto Rogers comparing the layout of the South Bank with Le Corbusier's plan for St. Dié of 1946. 12

The English pundits, of course, were Nikolaus Pevsner and J. M. Richards; and AR was the institutional mouthpiece of the "Establishment" to the advocacy of the Picturesque. Earlier in 1968 before the book on South Bank, Banham had accused the two of having "thrown principle to the wind and espoused the most debased habits of compromise and sentimentality." 130 According to Banham, the AR campaign on the picturesque and the reaction in the younger generation of students could be defined as "combat... between a barely middle-aged 'Establishment' armed with a major magazine, and a generation of battle-hardened and unusually mature students." 131 The Festival had worked for the good of British architecture in only one way for Banham; by giving the "unusually mature students" of the 1960s generation "something solid to react against, and with enough character to tell them which way to react... It was a turn on, man!" 132

The "ancestral voices" is a condescending reference to Ernesto Rogers, in reaction to his appreciation of the South Bank plan. We must also remember that Banham's reaction to Rogers's comparison was made after Banham's accusations of the latter with the betrayal of Modern Architecture in AR in 1959, which brought up the "Neo-Liberty Debate." Richards and Pevsner tried hard to absolve the magazine of his position, referring to it as Banham's personal views. Any explicit reference to history that could derail modern architecture from the path of progress manifest in its formal vocabulary, and any compromise from the self-annihilating ideology of the avant-garde, was, for

120 Ibid. p. 193.
131 Ibid.
132 Ibid. p.197.
Banham, anathema. Even the highly conscious use of technology in an overwhelming scale in comparison to any pre-war achievement in the exhibition was not taken into optimistic account in Banham’s evaluation. Rogers’s and BBPR’s attitude towards the historical city and the approach towards the core followed similar lines to that of AR’s, albeit in a terminology dissociated from a nationalist rhetoric infused with the phenomenology of Enzo Paci, the Italian philosopher.\textsuperscript{133}

Another witness of the period, deemed as part of the “Establishment” by Banham, actually thought that the planning of the exhibition was one of the main genuine directions which postwar British architecture could have followed. Beside the prefabricated schools program of Hertfordshire County Council, and the large scale governmental housing programs, South Bank’s urban design scheme set an example left unnoticed. John Summerson agreed with Banham that South Bank’s architectural language was not in the least avant-garde or epoch-making, but still argued that its planning was a big success. In evaluating the “Ten Years of [postwar] British Architecture” (1956) Summerson evaluated South Bank:

... under the leadership of Hugh Casson...was a grouping of English architects—a grouping which showed a school of designers whose aims were so close that it was possible for them to work in harmony on a plan of the most informal character, improvising a whole which in its sense of space and general relationships of scale and character was an undoubted success.... Few individual buildings of South Bank will be remembered as of much importance; the totality was certainly a milestone in the art of irregular planning and it is sad that no echo of this achievement has yet penetrated into more permanent building schemes.\textsuperscript{134}

South Bank, according to Summerson, was the first major urban design scheme in which a team of modernist architects collaborated under a certain theme that succeeded in creating the sense of scale and character he looked for in the modernist urban design proposals of the day. The exhibition buildings were hastily torn down by the


Conservative government that defeated Labor in order to open the site for redevelopment, leaving only the Royal Festival Hall in place. The Festival and the Exhibition is still a source of controversy among British historians, but continue to be popular among the public.\textsuperscript{135}

\textsuperscript{135} For more information, see “The Festival of Britain” issue of The Journal of the Twentieth Century no. 5, 2001.
B2. Proliferation of Townscape Pedagogy

2a. Townscape Ideals

Having demonstrated its viability to many in the example of South Bank, “Townscape” started to flourish in England and was disseminated throughout the world. Until 1958, when Gordon Cullen left for work in the planning of New Delhi, he continued in AR to produce “Townscape” as series of articles by himself, as well as with the help of Kenneth Browne who took over the series after Cullen’s leave.

Townscape pedagogy relied on the merits of a case-based methodology and the series in the Review were never intended to provide the level of order that might be expected from a theoretical inquiry. This approach is evident in the organization of the two canonical townscape books—Gordon Cullen’s “Townscape” of 1961 and Hastings’s “The Italian Townscape” of 1962 which was published after the June 1962 special issue of AR under the same name.

Townscape’s visual dissections created formal directions for urban design problems in trying to create the desired urban renewal which embodied a sense of historical continuity in terms of urban form. While townscape studies were proposed for several cities ranging from larger metropolises such as London and Manchester to smaller cities of different character such as Cambridge and Oxford (“the collegiate pattern” as AR would like to call it), or fishing towns such as Brixham or Looe, Townscape applied precinctual reunification and diversification by mixed use.

Townscape also called for reclamation of public space in order to encourage pedestrian use and to rival and curb the penetration of the car into the city. In May 1958, J. M. Richards argued that the policy of road enlargement led to more cars. He claimed that it was time for the society to decide how it wants to make positive use of the car and
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See the proposals for Trafalgar and Leicester squares in the October 1951 issue of AR as well as “The Lost Axis” proposal for South Kensington by Gordon Cullen in July 1955.
deemed driving a wasteful and anti-social activity. He complained that cars had become status symbols and that public transportation had to be “reglamorized” with the ultimate aim of social betterment. In reviewing Jane Jacobs’s “The Death and Life of Great American Cities” in February 1963, and celebrating the fact that AR found a strong American ally in Jacobs, Hastings went further to argue that if the speed limits were dropped in the city to 15 mph than there would not be any loss of life and the primacy of the car over the pedestrian would be reversed. 

In February and March 1952 Gordon Cullen published two townscape studies respectively entitled “Cross as Focal Point” and “Common Ground” both of which lamented the loss of public space in several scales—like the square, the village green and the market—as a result of insensitive traffic planning. The editors were also concerned that the loss of public space eventually brought the dissolution of the informal social functions of assembly.

Townscape also stressed the importance of aesthetic control over the urban totality through detailing of hard and soft landscaping. The editors argued that the respective pedagogical boundaries of architecture and planning simply overlooked their importance. Hence, Townscape aimed to provide a sense of context mostly via use of material and color as well as articulations of urban space. Contextual diversity was understood both in terms of mixed-use development as well as in terms of building style. In all townscape proposals the new interventions were proposed in the modern architectural vocabulary. This vocabulary was to be in dialogue with local vernaculars in order to establish the desired urban continuity. Aesthetic control included the supervision over advertisements, street furniture, paving, lighting, lettering, planting, texture and the use of color.

Throughout the duration of the campaign, “Townscape” institutionalized in education as a pragmatic approach to urban design by the joint studies of Gordon Cullen
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and Hugh Casson with the students of Birmingham and Bristol universities. As early as February 1951, Cullen produced “A scheme for the centre of Birmingham” with the students of The School of Architecture at Birmingham University. The scheme was not simply the preparation of an urban design proposal, but to do a pedagogical exercise with students on how to think as a “townscaper.” In September 1953 AR published another study entitled “Midland Experiment.” The editors stated:

... it is the time for the Editors to announce (with a good deal of pleasure) that the Extra-Mural department of the University of Birmingham has invited the REVIEW to collaborate in a public campaign to spread the townscape gospel throughout some of the Midland Towns that come under its--Birmingham University’s--sphere of influence, the first example, as we believe, of an English university taking up town design, as a public cause.

The example is significant because the task was handled by the Extra-Mural department that aimed to educate the larger public for the cause of townscape. AR’s aim therefore was not simply to create a new discipline, but to disseminate its ideals throughout the public. Later Cullen produced two studies of Dursley and Trowbridge in collaboration with Bristol University in 1956 and 1958.

In 1954, Townscape’s echoes had reached the United States in the call for urban renewal against massive suburbanization and slum clearance. Kevin Lynch supervised the master’s thesis of David Gosling which was a direct adaptation of Townscape

142 The question and answer introduction of the same piece is funny as well as revealing about the reaction of the editors to the understanding of Townscape merely as “cobbles and Victorian lettering”:

Q: What have we here?
Q: What is wrong with the present Centre?
A: There isn’t one; schemes have been prepared in the past but until now little has been done.
Q: And what have the students done to interest me?
A: Not only have they solved the problem of building accommodation and traffic reorganization but they have made the area exciting by the practice of townscape.
Q: Townscape? You mean cobbles and Victorian lettering?
A: Tut-tut, let us go through the scheme together.

The whole piece goes in the form of a dialogue which the answerer “convinces” the questioner that “Townscape” is not a planning idea based on personal whim but the exploitation of local conditions and principles into maximum visual effect as well as functional solutions.

principles to the center of Boston.\footnote{See the master's thesis of David Gosling, later a follower and business partner of Gordon Cullen at the MIT libraries. David Gosling, \textit{The Boylston Street Redevelopment Project}, (Massachusetts Institute of Technology: MArch Thesis, 1954).} The dominance of Cullen’s studies in Goslings’s thesis testifies to the interest of Lynch in Townscape, as evidenced by his later works, although Lynch’s “The Image of the City” (1960) does not directly acknowledge the influence. An overseas alliance also formed between Jane Jacobs and “Ivor de Wolfe” after the publication of her book. Hastings saluted Jacobs in his review of “The Death and Life of Great American Cities” in another one of his wittily entitled articles—”Death and Life of Great American Citizens” in February 1963:

“Now comes a warm but high wind across the Atlantic and (one hopes and believes) a hot handshake for the Ian Nairns, Gordon Cullens and Kenneth Brownes of this continent in the shape of a book which is a must for all who believe the urban consequences of those odd bedfellows, Ebenezer Howard and Le Corbusier, to be the spawn of the devil working through his chosen vessels.\footnote{Ivor de Wolfe, “The Death And Life Of Great American Citizens (review of The Death And Life Of Great American Cities, by Jane Jacobs) ;” in \textit{AR}, February 1963, v. 133, pp. 91-93.}"

Endorsing Jacobs’s claims about positive surveillance as a result of urban community, Hastings pointed to urban density as a positive factor that contributed to safety in the cities. He added that there was added threat to safety in the dispersed modern urban agglomerations due to car traffic. Unaware of the pseudonym, Jane Jacobs sent a letter to Ivor de Wolfe via the Architectural Press after the publication of the book “Italian Townscape” in England (1963, published in the US in 1966) to invite him to lecture in the US.\footnote{Letter from Jane Jacobs March 16, 1964, in the possession of Priscilla Hastings.} She stated that she was an avid follower of Townscape ideas and that she enthusiastically referred her students to the “Italian Townscape” and Gordon Cullen’s book which was published two years earlier.
2b. Makers of the Canon: "Townscape" and "The Italian Townscape"

After the publications of Cullen’s and Hastings’s books, the two became important pedagogical references, especially for urban design professionals and students. Although the affinity and the similarity between the two books are obvious, there was one major difference between the two. Cullen’s "Townscape" was absolved of any ideological reference to the neo-romanticism which had contributed to the initial phase of the Townscape campaign, while Hastings’s "The Italian Townscape" had an introduction conceived after the writing of "The Unnatural History of Man," which I will discuss in more detail in the next section. The article "Townscape: A Plea for an English Visual Philosophy Based on the True Rock of Sir Uvedale Price" Hastings had written in 1949 for *AR* in the beginning of the Townscape campaign is now well known through its inclusion in Joan Ockman’s anthology "Architecture Culture 1943-1968" (1993). This article, crucial to establishing Townscape’s link to the political, social and cultural history of Britain, was surprisingly excluded from Cullen’s book. It is not clear whether Cullen wanted to appear as the autonomous creator or Hastings simply found the article dated, but it is surprising not to see Hastings’s name in anything other than two photographic credits, since Cullen humbly credited Hastings fully after his death as the real “author.”

Of course without Cullen’s work, Townscape would never have achieved the same success, but its endurance was dependent on the pedagogy that Hastings established and the methodological framework he conceived.

Townscape’s apparent autonomy of thought along with the appeal to psychology and perception seems to have contributed to the success of the book. By the exclusion of Hastings’s text the ideological divide that “Townscape” exposed in the architectural community during the 1940s and early 1950s was prevented from being transmitted. Cullen introduced the book with a summary of its contents and motivations. He argued that like a “collective surplus enjoyment” can be created from the togetherness of people, “a collective visual pleasure” can result by a proper arrangement of buildings. Implicitly

---

148 "H. de C. was an editor who wanted material on the desk for publication: on the one hand he did the work himself, for example, *he more or less wrote Townscape*, although I must say, I may have clarified one or two points." See “H de C Hastings 1902-1986” *The Architects’ Journal* December 17-24, 1986, v.184, p. 5.
criticizing CIAM orthodoxy, he added that a scientific attitude which looks for a unique solution to an urban design problem was not entirely sufficient in the case of planning problems:

Firstly we have to rid ourselves of the thought that the excitement and drama that we seek can be born automatically out of the scientific research and solutions arrived at by the technical man (or the technical half of the brain)... the scientific solution is based on the best that can be made of the average: of averages of human behaviour, averages of weather, factors of safety and so on... these averages do not give an inevitable result for any particular problem... a town could take one of several patterns and still operate with success, equal success... the aim is not to dictate the shape of the town or the environment, but is a modest one: simply to manipulate within the tolerances...

Cullen rejected the idea that one allegedly scientific solution could bring an end to all problems in cities since the definition of urban problems shifted from one to the other. Scientific abstraction supplied the planner only with quantifiable data about averages, while the city itself was also a compendium of visual experiences reshaped by the positioning of the body in the environment. To explore this aspect of urban experience Townscape investigated man’s emotional reactions to urban environment with reference to “optics,” “place” and “content.” He introduced the term “serial vision” as a conceptual tool for recording the visual experience of the body in the city by the designer in a series of consequential sketches to understand the impact of urban space in movement (Figure 1.16).

Cullen added that his understanding of place was concerned with psychological responses to the positioning of the body in the environment. He produced a series of referential terms to explain the feeling of the body such as enclosure, exposure, constraint and relief, and added that the designer himself could generate such terminology in further exploration. “Content” was concerned with visual surveying that is with recording the material, visual or compositional aspects of the city in terms of color, texture and scale, which resulted in a specific urban fabric, in order to define character and to come up with a suitable response. All of the material in the book was compiled from Cullen’s studies published in AR.

---

"The Italian Townscape," (1961) published two years after "Townscape," featured a visual documentary of tens of Italian cities and a limited number of analytical studies by Kenneth Browne. Its introduction critiqued the state of city planning, via eulogy to congestion. Hastings understood congestion, human crowding that is, as a social force that encouraged the creation of the numerous relationships within society that were crucial to its culture. Congestion could be explained as a result of mankind’s tendency for social life which Hastings regarded as “a gravitational pull towards nucleated development,” that is, a movement towards the center or what Ebenezer Howard referred to as “a magnet.” Thus Hastings redefined Townscape as “the art of..."
humanizing high densities after the engineers have made them hygienically possible.”153 For him, the twentieth century city was characterized by a retreat from the city, a wrong-headed development encouraged by the automobile and by the profession of town planning. He found the obsession with decentralization that reigned in the first phase of the New Towns program dogmatic and fetishistic. The “collaterals of the modernist junior branch,” that is the disciples of Corbusier, as Hastings called them, were still fascinated by the model of the Ville Radieuse: “Enormous point blocks separated from the world and each other by tracts of landscaped park.” He called those who found the visual emphasis of townscape “superficial” as “fundamentalists.”154 The Italian examples presented in the book were to provide positive precedents of the past to serve in the interest of the present by listening “to the past in a new way.” Italy according to Hastings “merely encourage[d] the developers to see the world of the past a living inheritance [rather] than a hang-over.” Hastings’s rhetoric, as stinging as it was twenty years ago, was aimed to thwart the modernist claim for originality. The obsession of the avant-garde with the new had led to the unselective devaluation of everything related to the past, and the popularity of suburbia and the garden-city was built on this hatred. As he explained in “The Unnatural History of Man” Hastings took once again the opportunity to challenge the specialists’ claim to a somewhat esoteric disciplinary knowledge by declaring Townscape an art to be practiced by everyone:

“Townscape is an art which demands no expertise, no training, no professionalism, no effort, no discipline, no mental feats. Not even strength of character. Here, for once, is a mystery to which one can dedicate oneself at a moment’s notice—and become by the same token an expert, partly because there are no other experts, and partly because no greater skill is required of the adept than an ability to let events OUT THERE bounce off the retina of the eye, which they do anyway.”155

While this is a chilling comment, which probably was not taken seriously by planning experts of the time, Hastings’s sentences also carried a call for a democratization of the planning process in which the individual also had a say. In “The Italian Townscape”

154 This is probably a reference to Joseph Rykwert’s article “Review of a Review” published in Zodiac 4, 1959.
Hastings reversed his 1940s rhetoric when he referred to Townscape as a radical art to appeal to avant-garde architects. This time he attributed historical authority to Townscape by claiming the existence of a “townscaping sensibility” that had “been practiced for upwards of five thousand years.” He allied himself with Camillo Sitte who had seen a similar wisdom in the work of medieval planners and had deemed “Grand Manner” planners naively practicing “banal and obvious tricks to the disgust of more artful performers.” Hastings concluded that Townscape’s emphasis on visual ideas stemmed from the bankruptcy of other vital ideas that could have changed the fate of humankind in the twentieth century, ranging from the distribution of wealth to the hollow victory of the atom bomb:

There is something frightening about a world that combines honest worth, technical know-how, good intentions, a bottomless bank balance and an utter bankruptcy of ideas. Visual ones we speak of here but their absence is a symptom of other vital bankruptcies, emotional and intellectual, which have led the New World (for example), once the redresser of the Old, to redress herself in terms of the mining camp and used-car lot. The gap between potential and performance in this generation is far more sinister than any bomb or budgetary deficiency.

After Cullen left the Review in 1959, Kenneth Browne continued the Townscape series. The series also saw an increase in the number of authors and even received participation from readers who were not architects. AR’s goal to create an anonymous urban design discourse seemed to have born fruit. Almost every editor, even including

---

156 Ibid, p. 22.
157 Ibid, p. 41.
the young Reyner Banham, did participate in the Townscape series in terms of reporting problems of townscape if not urban design proposals themselves. Hastings made sure that “Townscape” continued, even though it repeated the same message time and again.

Chapter C: Towards an environmentalist AR profile

C1. AR and the New Towns:

AR’s postwar effort was partially directed against the idea of decentralization of large cities that was implemented by the Labor Government after the war. By 1951, construction of New Towns, such as Stevenage and Harlow, was advancing and the first results of the New Towns Programme were becoming visible. Although AR had supported the construction of New Towns, the ensuing reaction of the periodical showed that AR’s expectations were much different than what had been built. By Townscape AR promoted nuclear and piecemeal growth on the contrary to the New Towns’ being built on clean slate for industrial production that moved out of London. The next section discusses how Townscape and the official planning policies clashed in terms of decentralization and the ex nihilo creation of towns; while the following section analyzes how AR took an activist role in trying to mobilize environmental consciousness with reference to postwar industrialization.

1a. A city does not land with a parachute:

One year after the South Bank exhibition in 1951, AR questioned the feasibility of the County of London Development Plan in an article written by J. M. Richards. Richards argued that the success of the Abercrombie & Foreshaw’s planning intentions depended on the implementation of the New Towns program, which aimed to redirect and re-house the excess population of London in order to reduce congestion. He noted that confusion with regard to authority and a miscalculation of the course of events, threatened the success of London’s future. For instance, since the London County Council did not take construct the housing units for the citizen it aimed to re-house in the developing new towns, the towns did not grow with the speed intended in the plan. The

160 The development plan was based on Abercrombie and Foreshaw’s 1943 County of London Plan, but was revised by the London County Council. See J.M. Richards “London Plan” in AR April 1952, vol. 111, pp. 257-260.
relocation of industries to create economical incentives for the new towns was hindered
by the conflicting actions of the Board of Trade and the Government. In concluding
his article, Richards added that although the acceptance of the plan was still a major
achievement, its visual results were yet to be seen:

We have had enough experience since the war of developments—whether in the
shape of over-bulky and unwisely sited office blocks, of barrack-like housing
schemes too concentrated for their locality, of encroachments on open spaces that
can ill be spared or of threats to fine buildings surviving from the past—which are
clearly undesirable, but which planning as practiced at present does not seem to
prevent... such things are bound to happen if planning largely remains restrictive.
They are the results of an all-embracing positive idea of how London should
grow, of a failure to visualize its future development and pursue this vision of a
new city actively...
The present role of planning in London—that of a framework within which rival
interests may clash without injury to the basic needs of the citizen—is a necessary
one, but it is only the first stage. The next stage must be to use the framework, not
negatively but positively; as a discipline within which a genuine art of town
development (or as the REVIEW would say, of townscape) can grow to
maturity.161

According to Richards, no matter how massive the legislation and how powerful the
planning machinery could be, the plan simply supplied the necessary restrictions to
regulate building activity. It did not supply a vision to the citizenry about how their city
would look or the styles of life that would be generated by it. The transition from the
blueprint to built form was yet to be envisioned. At that stage, he recommended that
Townscape enter the picture and be established as an essential component of the planning
process. AR understood visual planning as inseparable from the idea of plan as an
economical and statistical exercise.

AR's scrutiny of the New Towns was proceeded by a Reyner Banham's 1952
essay on Hemel Hempstead entitled "The Voysey Inheritance."162 Banham evaluated
Adeyfield, the only completed neighborhood in Hemel Hempstead, from the perspective
of AR's Townscape principles. The neighborhoods of Hemel Hampstead "gave official

161 Ibid.
162 Banham started writing for AR in 1952 as a result of his connection to Nikolaus Pevsner as his student
and this essay was his second essay published in the AR. See Reyner Banham "The Voysey Inheritance"
sanction to low-density sprawl conurbation” due to the density codes. He added that the layout of the neighborhood discouraged pedestrian activity, likely to engender “a car-owning aristocracy and a cycle-mounted proletariat.”

English nostalgia for the garden suburb, provided for by the local authority with the popular “architectural dress” and inspired by the work of C.F.A. Voysey, with its white pitched roofs and small gardens, had no room for modern architecture. In Banham’s words, Adeyfield reflected a prewar order in postwar times. A limited number of modern buildings reflected faint hopes of an “advanced form of architecture and implied a more developed social order.”

Banham’s article established some of the themes of AR’s protest against the new towns regarding density, the discouragement of pedestrian movement vs. the encouragement of car ownership, and the segregation of social classes. In less than one year after Banham’s article, AR launched a major attack on the still limited built results of the New Towns Programme.

In July 1953 AR published two articles: “The Failure of the New Towns” by J. M. Richards and a visual commentary by Gordon Cullen entitled “Prairie Planning in the New Towns” to illustrate it. Richards’s article opened with a striking photomontage by Gordon Cullen. An old British gentleman was drawing on the sidewalk of an “imaginary new town,” which in Richards’s words was, the “traditional English design for urbane living” (Figure 1.17). The illustration depicted a dense urban environment where several different buildings leaned on one another with the pub and the fish monger visible in the foreground and the church spire in the background. The “imaginary new town” on the contrary looked dreary and isolated with the dark patches of empty land and a road passing through it. The landscape was populated with houses set at a considerable distance from each other; there were no leaves on the trees, no people on the sidewalks or in the seemingly dead gardens, other than the lonely gentleman. In comparison to the traditional urbanity of English towns, the new towns were utter failures. Richards argued that the high hopes of the 1946 New Towns Act had been betrayed by the results that had

---

163 Ibid. p. 367
164 At this time only parts of the so-called Mark One New Towns were designated. In addition to Stevenage in 1946, Crawley, Hemel Hempstead, Harlow, Newton Aycliffe, and East Kilbride were designated in 1947. In 1950 the designation of Hatfield, Glenrothes, Basildon, Bracknell and Corby followed.
recently become visible. He added that due to the insufficient commitment of capital and the lack of public buildings, the new towns could not generate the revenues that supported the cultural infrastructure of “a full life” and were deprived of the urban cores that were so highly valued by the late CIAM congresses as well as the AR. The new towns, in his opinion, still depended on London for the fulfillment of such cultural needs and ended up being dormitory towns instead of self-sufficient entities. Due to their appearance as large housing estates not cohering into neighborhoods, they nurtured suburban sprawl and whetted the appetites of the so-called “spec-builders,” in the editors’ words. Richards suggested that instead of spreading the available capital thinly over several new towns, the economic resources could be accumulated and deployed to create a single new town. This new town, then, could be developed under strict architectural control by the powers of the planning machinery into a worthy experiment, as seen in the South Bank exhibition.

Figure 1.17 The opening illustration of “Failure of the New Towns” AR July 1953
The main responsibility of the new towns' failure, according to Richards, rested on the Reith committee's insistence on low densities and its preference for garden city layouts. In addition, Richards believed that modern architecture was to blame for not being able to make a convincing argument against the Garden City. There were several reasons that the Garden City should survive as the dominant model of urbanism. Modern city life was understood by the public as limited to life in flats, and modern architects had not provided any alternative to counter this popular sentiment. Also, the Town and Country Planning Association which had grown out of the Garden Cities Association, worked in favor of the Garden City idea instead of the traditional urbanism of English towns. Due to a lack of resistance from modern architects, this mentality had infiltrated government policy and resulted in the codification of low densities. The arguments in favor of the city, such as the waste of agrarian land by decentralization and sprawl, the waste of capital due to expanding infrastructural investment, and transportation difficulties, were not advanced convincingly by modern architects. On top of all, although given the opportunity to control the architectural whole and to supervise its development, architects had not produced a better result than the disappointing imagery of dormitory suburbs. The inhabitants still congregated and socialized in the old centers or in big cities, and returned to their homes for the night. The historical lesson of the old market towns or the cathedral towns went unheeded. Richards's criticism, although impatiently timed, was on target as it was understood that the extremely ambitious New Town program had almost ground to a halt. Meryl Aldridge's study "The British New Towns: A Programme without a Policy" (1979) confirms Richards's observations. She states that creating balanced and self-contained communities in the new towns demanded the coordinated work of several bodies and especially a "reliable flow of cash," which simply was not in place.168

As striking as Richards's attack was Gordon Cullen's accompanying visual commentary. The source for the image in Richards's article was made clear by the

168 Aldridge states: "Whatever the intrinsic merits and feasibility of this aim, development corporations were from the start concerned to attract employment, to build houses for all income groups and to provide, or encourage the provision of publicly and privately funded facilities for education, health and recreation. It quickly became clear that all these goals were interlinked that their achievement required the commitment and cooperation of a large number of statutory, voluntary and private bodies, and a reliable flow of cash." See Meryl Aldridge, The British New Towns: A Programme without a Policy, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979) p. 43.
photographic illustrations of new town surroundings. Cullen argued that Townscape was bound to emerge as soon as two buildings were juxtaposed, since only this juxtaposition created the relationships between the buildings and the surroundings. The multiplication of the numbers of buildings, according to Cullen, created a necessary increase in the number of relationships. It was the job of the townscape to exploit these possibilities. The numerous building of the new towns did not come together in any successful visual or social relationship, which for him led to a physical as well as a psychological isolationism. Since they were set far apart from each other as a result of the building codes, people were automatically separated from each other, too. “Towniness,” for Cullen, required the exact opposite. In order to give an example of “towniness,” Cullen compared the center of Crawley New Town to that of Blanchland from North Umberland, a picturesque medieval village center and now a tourist attraction. The buildings at the center of Blanchland surrounded the square to create an enclosure and established a sense of continuity. This continuity also supported difference since the buildings were built at different times by different people. The enclosure at the center created a focus for the people to come together, and housed the different functions for their collective needs. On the contrary, the new towns’ planning facilitated “foot-sore housewives, cycle weary workers, never-ending characterless streets, the depressing feeling of being a provincial or suburbanite in an environment that doesn’t belong to town or country.”\(^\text{169}\)

\textit{AR}'s critique of the new towns received a fierce response from Frederic Osborn, who was the Executive of the Town and Country Planning Association and the editor of its journal, and at the forefront of the campaign for new towns. Osborn dismissed \textit{AR}'s criticism as “pseudo-sociology prompted by muddled aesthetic longings” and as a blatant manipulation of the public by means of visual distortion.\(^\text{170}\) \textit{AR}'s critique remained at the forefront of the architectural lobby against the new towns although the periodical was earlier committed to the planning intentions that led to the new towns program. For \textit{AR} the intention of building self-sufficient towns was reduced to relieving congestion and to increasing the housing stock. The planning profession had once again failed \textit{AR}'s hopes for the English urban ideal by promoting quantity over quality and by preferring simple

\(^{169}\) Ibid.

problem-solving to creating a way of life that incorporated the culture of English urbaniy. Bad blood between Osborn and AR would resurface almost two decades later in AR’s promotion of “Civilia,” a hypothetical new town that answered to all past new town experiments.

1b. Mobilizing Environmental Consciousness:
After the Conservative victory in the elections of 1951, the priority given to planning by the previous Labor government gradually faded and British society started transforming into a consumer society, from “austerity to affluence.” The new government’s reluctance to continue with regional planning schemes, and the policy of dispersal was resisted by the Town and Country Planning Association under the leadership of Frederick J. Osborn, who went on to promote town and country planning and regional development in the 1950s. In J. M. Richards’s article on the London Plan, AR had already taken notice of the government’s retreat from centralized national planning by the change in the name of the ministry—from “Ministry of Town and Country Planning” to “Ministry of Housing and Local Government.” According to Dennis Hardy, the 1950s as a decade was “dismal,” a time when the profession was trying to hold the ground it had gained during the bipartisan consensus on the welfare state’s nationalization policies.

At this time, AR was fighting a battle on two fronts, one against the Town and Country Planning Association’s insistence on low density policies and their implementations for the new towns, and second, the government’s move away from national planning.

In “Outrage,” the June 1955 special issue, under the editorship of Ian Nairn, AR warned its readers against the blight of British landscape. Ian Nairn (1930-1983) was not an architect or a historian like his fellow AR editors or contributors. He was educated in

173 Lewis Mumford, who had embraced the idea of the New Towns and was corresponding with Frederick Osborn at this time, also thought that the struggle for the lower densities discredited the larger cause for the new towns. See Hardy, “From New Towns to...” p. 42.
mathematics and was a National Service Royal Air Force pilot. Nairn’s knowledge of Britain and environmental problems mostly stemmed from his awareness of the country surveyed from the air. His being an outsider and sensitivity to environment must have especially appealed to Hastings, since he believed that AR had a duty to develop such sensitivities in its readers.  

This environmental mess encroaching upon the new towns and their surroundings was called “Subtopia.” The journal predicted a bleak future for the British landscape under misguided forces of planning machinery and development: Abandoned air fields as remnants of war, miles of concrete, wire and asphalt with repetitive homes of ribbon development, precious agricultural land greedily subsumed by pollutant industrial sprawl. The whole issue was devoted to a visual survey of “outrages” that scarred the face of the land from Southampton to Carlisle, from the very south of Britain to the north inculcating a “prophecy of doom” (Figure 1.18). According to the editors, “Subtopia” was the result of a deviation from the ideal separation between town and country. This separation, AR argued, was the historical outcome of the “distinction between the self-conscious world of men and the un-self-conscious universe of nature.” Subtopia was an anomaly then; a deviation from this “ideal” cultural development that lasted for centuries.

---


175 “Subtopia: Making an ideal of Suburbia. Visually speaking, the universalization and idealization of our town fringes. Philosophically, the idealization of the little man who lives there (from suburb=utopia).” See “Outrage” AR June 1955, Special Issue, vol. 117, p. 365.
The issue was composed of five consecutive sections entitled “Subtopia,” “Agents,” “Route Book,” “The Highland” and “Summing Up.” The visual survey of subtopia was followed by “Agents,” public decision-making bodies such as the defense ministry or municipal organizations that AR found responsible for the defacement of the environment. While the Ministry of Defense kept on spreading new bases to support the cold war arms race, it was also abandoning the obsolete structures and settlements of its World War II establishments, without worrying about their removal. Municipalities, under the influence of the Town and Country Planning Association, prioritized traffic and low density dispersal over compact, high density, pedestrian-oriented settlements.
Everywhere borough engineers “crack[ed] towns wide open with road-widening and local
council[s] obliterate[ed] the market place with a flower garden...[while another
department dumped] sewage disposal into the indifferent wild.”\textsuperscript{176} AR added that
seemingly minor but careless interventions into the landscape accumulated into disasters
such as the careless entry of traffic and roads as well as the power-lines, fences etc. into
the rural landscape in the name of contemporary “comfort.”

Following “Agents,” was the “Route Book,” a pattern-book of “don’t”s, or a
“black guide” of malpractices as AR called it, to illustrate the spread of suburbia along the
line followed from Carlisle to Southampton. Before “Summing Up,” AR added a section
on “The Highlands,” as Britain’s “last great reservoir of non-Subtopia,” that is, a
respectively virgin landscape which managed somehow to escape the assault of
settlements and industrialization. However, the needs of its inhabitants mandated the
arrival of power lines and sanitary services, and AR warned that every cautionary step
had to be taken to preserve the area as a “reservoir of wilderness.” The Highlands could
not be compromised since their presence created the necessary “psychological balance to
the Subtopian south.”\textsuperscript{177} Untamed nature, for AR, was mankind’s outlet to protect himself
from the psychological deprivations of untamed urbanity—a corrupted “Brave New
World” where the tail wagged the dog, where suburbia robbed the city and eradicated the
countryside. AR also predicted that this new environment would soon bring about its own
culture; a culture that had no environmental concerns.

In “Summing Up,” AR called citizens to action by means of a “Manifesto, a
programme, precepts and a checklist of malpractices.” The salvation of the environment
meant the salvation of mankind. In AR’s discourse, the citizen had become one with his
environment:

What must we do to be saved? These pages offer a Manifesto and a call to action,
a programme and a checklist of malpractices for which the opponents of Subtopia
must be ever on the alert. The programme calls for the development and
enhancement of the differences between places, it is oriented towards
topographical responsibilities, rather than administrative ones, what can be seen
rather than what it says on a piece of paper... The action is needed now... from

\textsuperscript{176} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{177} See the editorial summaries in the Table of Contents pages. Ibid.
all of us. The defence [Sic] of the individuality of places is the defence [Sic] of the individuality of ourselves.178

Hence, AR targeted the citizens and the local authorities to condemn “Subtopia” and aimed to mobilize them to rehabilitate the damages. The campaign's ultimate intention was to make a “sufficient [number of] people sufficiently angry”179 and to bring down the fall of “Subtopia.” In the concluding manifesto for the “layman” AR stated:

Don’t be afraid that you will be just one individual registering dissent. It is your country that is being defaced; it belongs to you, and as an individual amongst fifty million individuals, not a ‘set of income groups’ or an electorate.180

Through this patriotic call, Outrage aimed to mobilize the whole population to claim and to democratize its right to the environment independent of ownership, class or status. It did not matter whether one owned the land or simply enjoyed it as a visitor; as a patriot the responsibility fell on everyone’s shoulders. The issue ended with a “checklist of malpractices” addressing the “layman.” The checklist was a set of questions to be asked about the towns, the country, the suburbs and the wild. It would provide the necessary public surveillance to keep development and “wrong” planning practices from “defacing” the land. Every reader that heeded the message would become the agent of the anti-Subtopian campaign. AR also demanded from local authorities to commission architects to oversee visual control in the environment and to police Subtopia.

One year later, another special issue called “Counter-Attack,” again under Nairn’s editorship, was published to cure “public helplessness” against subtopia.181 (Figure 1.19) While Outrage claimed to diagnose environmental illness, Counter-Attack hoped to provide the antidote for the cure. Counter-Attack construed the public as a body of people uneducated in environmental visual qualities, speechless victims of the planning machinery detached from the decision-making institutions. AR also deemed the local authorities as ill-advised mechanisms empowered beyond their capacities to deal with environmental problems.

178 Ibid.
179 Ibid, p.393
180 Ibid, p. 451, italics from the original.
181 “Counter-Attack,” special issue of The Architectural Review, December 1956, vol. 120.
Figure 1.19 “Counter-Attack” was superimposed on the cover of the “Outrage” special issue to make the cover of “Counter-Attack,” AR December 1956.

Following Townscape pedagogy, Counter-Attack collected precedents into another case-book. These precedents, however, hoped to illustrate how certain solutions succeeded in “bringing modern life to terms with the landscape” and “to arm the public against the wrong way and [provide] examples of the right way of doing things.”

Counter-Attack opened with an illustration of Los Angeles, the polar opposite of the “good city.” Reflecting anti-American sentiment, which was common in both the circles of the early New Left and more conservative thought in the 1950s, and targeting the rise

---

182 See the introductory abstract of “Counter-Attack.” Ibid.
of pop culture in Britain, the editors deemed Los Angeles the epitome of “planned” sprawl and the inevitable future of Britain if things went on as they were.\textsuperscript{183}

Counter-Attack categorized the environment into five ideal types according to “character” and to levels of habitation: “Wild, Country, Arcadia (not Suburbia), Town and Metropolis.”\textsuperscript{84} As to street furniture, footpaths, railings, walls, hedges, lettering, coloring, bus shelters, street lighting, municipal planting, advertising on roads, building lines, monuments, wires, military installations and industrial plants that piled up on the landscape that either made or destroyed “character,” Counter-Attack recommended measures to bring them within a visual order. If they could not be brought to order, went the argument, that they should at least be camouflaged by means of landscaping elements. The case-book provided “desirable” precedents, which illustrated how to intervene in situations where a townscaper’s touch was needed (Figure 1.20).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure120.png}
\caption{“How the sequence works: two scenes rescued from subtopia and restored to town and country” in Counter-Attack, \textit{AR} December 1956, pp. 359-360}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{I} will briefly discuss the rise of cultural Marxism in England and its alignment with reference to a more conservative approach to culture in the next chapter.\textsuperscript{184} Ibid, p.353.
The expansion in *AR’s* policy from the problems of the city to the problems of the rural landscape and the surrounding environment was made further apparent in the content of expert articles. Three essays on afforestation and sprawl added expert reactions against the government’s and local authorities’ planning practices. The essay entitled “Afforestation” by Geoffrey S. Kelly, criticized the government forestry projects for obliterating pasture land for sheep and causing economic loss, and demanded a new landscape charter for Britain, to integrate economic goals with the planning of landscape. Reminiscent of eighteenth and nineteenth century gentry practices, Kelly demanded that foresters should be given aesthetic training, if forests were to generate both economic and aesthetic value.185

Expanding J. M. Richards’s earlier arguments in the “Failure of the New Towns,” Walter Manthorpe held the whole planning machinery of the new towns accountable for “subtopia” through convincing comparisons of densities between the new towns and popular neighborhoods of London. He recommended mixed-use development instead of functional zoning, urban redensification and adaptation instead of clearance and rebuilding, and flexibility in bylaws and building regulations to establish variety and diversity of character. Elizabeth Denby, the social reformer and housing expert, condemned the government’s decentralization policies for planning against people, using prewar data.186 *AR* summarized Denby’s article as:

Sixteen years after the publication of the Barlow Report, its out-of-date pre-war standards still form the basis of official housing policy, and have become one of the most potent administrative supports of otherwise unjustifiable sprays of housing. Much of the decentralization of redistribution of the population envisaged in the Barlow Report is now accomplished... the whole concept of density calculations, and the actions based on them, needs to be reformulated on a humane pattern of groupings.187

Hence Counter-Attack was answering the attack of the planning experts on the countryside with an attack on the experts by other experts. These experts spoke with a

---

187 Ibid. p.427.
sense of history that alluded to eighteenth and nineteenth century landscaping practices of
the gentry as well as that of urban development, which questioned the validity of
contemporary planning convictions such as the preference for low densities or the use of
a single kind of evergreen tree for forestation to maximize profit. Furthermore, they also
doubted the validity of the government policies that had been created during the wartime
studies for reconstruction. The experts themselves noted that the reign of expert opinion
had started to block access to the reevaluation of any of the traditional urban design and
landscaping practices as useful.

Counter-Attack ended with “A Plan for Planning,” which promoted a new attitude
named “positive planning” intended to “preserve and intensify the sense of place” and to
develop an interdependent relationship between town and country in order to limit sprawl
and to better allocate the resources of the countryside:

The ultimate object of positive planning is to preserve and intensify the sense of
place: the difference between integrating the result of a planning application into
the landscape and putting it down on the landscape.
We can’t be schizophrenic about living in towns and wanting to preserve the
countryside. In a country as small as Britain, town and country can’t be separate
concepts that you can develop independently. The only real guarantee of unspoilt
countryside is a set of tightly planned towns: and conversely, a green countryside
that can be made to stay green is a guarantee that our towns will be properly
redeveloped. But you can’t eat your countryside and have it.188

Counter-Attack, also asked for a restructuring of the planning machinery, and
specifically, for the creation of a national plan that coordinated development in different
regions, the towns and the countryside. AR also demanded that all existing plans be
supported with a visual development plan to inform citizens of the resulting
environments. The emphasis on statistics had to be replaced with the emphasis on visual
development.

Counter-Attack suggested that “a team of expert planners and architects inside the
Ministry of Housing free of administrative ties” teach how “to think visually and to
reword the planning legislation.”189 As a result, AR hoped “Townscape” pedagogy would
infiltrate into the very center of the planning machinery in order to curb sprawl and to

188 Ibid, p.431.
check the undesired impact of “subtopia.” AR also urged the establishment of a body of financial aid for countryside preservation, based on the example of the “Historic Buildings Council” for the townscapes and landscapes that could act as “live pattern-books” for the future.\textsuperscript{190}

In the conclusion, “A Vote of Thanks” addressed the authorities which responded to the call to rehabilitate “Subtopia,” listing and honoring certain county planning authorities, preservation societies and individuals.\textsuperscript{191} This note in Counter-Attack testified to the fact that within the year that passed, Outrage had managed to reach local authorities and organizations. The success of the campaign encouraged the continuity of AR’s propagandistic discourse.

Six months after the publication of Counter-Attack in June 1957, AR announced the opening of a “Counter-Attack Bureau” on the cover of the Review (Figure 1.21). Intended to serve as “a watch and ward service for the good character of visual England,” the bureau would help the so-called “victims of Outrage” by offering them consultation for their planning needs. It meant that via the consultancy Gordon Cullen and Ian Nairn, AR would be directly involved in the planning problems brought into attention by its readers.

\textsuperscript{190} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{191} Ibid, p.407.
The bureau's urban design attitude was named "The Improver's" in contrast to that of "Utilitarianism" and "Preservation." The editors exemplified how this attitude turned Barnsley, Gloucestershire into a model village. Although the feudal property structure had dissolved in 1930, the village was bought back by the remaining members of the family to be saved from estate speculators. The houses were modernized and adapted to contemporary needs by an "improvement grant system." 192

Two years later, Nairn published a progress report of the Bureau. 193 He lamented that their consultation was quite often rejected since they were not part of a "down-with-progress movement." Even the reconciliatory attitude of Townscape, which was found reactionary and anti-scientific by the likes of Joseph Rykwert and Reyner Banham at the time, was being perceived radical and progressive by the parties involved in planning processes. The Bureau, however, was frequently consulted. Only in 1958, according to

192 Ibid., p.380.
Nairn, two hundred cases were sent to AR. This number, I believe, testifies to the significant reach of AR, and to the popularity of “Townscape” discourse.

In the August 1956 issue, Gordon Cullen’s study of Bingham’s Melcombe—a case of wire routing through the rural landscape—argued for “improvement” was a vital strategy for the environment:

The curse of the English landscape is the absentee landlord. The old landlord, the man who created it, has been taxed out of existence and the new landlord, local and national authority, lives in town or suburb. Consequently that sense of personal responsibility arising from a knowledge and love of a particular piece of countryside is missing and is replaced by a beneficent but remote control: the difference between a parent and a foster parent.194

One of the aims of “Townscape” was, therefore, the transference of these traditional values of the gentry to the citizen and to the planning authorities, and to create a cultural continuity absolved from its class basis. The model citizen and the notion of the state, based on the historical personality of the gentry would take a formative role in H. de C. Hastings’s writings for a social project entitled “The Alternative Society” in 1980. Hastings named an early and much more comprehensive manuscript version of the book “The Unnatural History of Man” in 1958. The next section considers the manuscript as a programmatic palimpsest for which AR was partially an outlet that disseminated its message to influence environmental transformation.

194 Gordon Cullen “Bingham’s Melcombe” AR August 1956, v. 120, pp. 100-104.
C2. The Neo-Romantic Society: Hastings’s Britain

The Architectural Review’s concern with the environment aligned with the building of a modern city under the banner of “Townscape,” was the reflection of a larger social and cultural project, the precepts of which were alluded to but not explicitly stated. The major figure that laid out this project was the part-owner and the chief editor of the Review, Hubert de Cronin Hastings. Hastings is referred to as a “self-concealing genius,” by Nikolaus Pevsner and credited by J. M. Richards as the originator of the interest in the larger environment. It is not clear whether everyone involved in the editorial board of AR was aware of Hastings’s project completely, or of the ideological ramifications of his intentions. Albeit partially, the editorial board was convinced that this project’s environmental ideals ought to be followed, and its holistic cultural program be translated into the editorial policies of the Review. This social and cultural project lay at the basis of its environmental campaign, and its necessary architectural component was explained in a manuscript written by Hastings, entitled “The Unnatural History of Man.” Including some of his writings from the early 1940s, Hastings continuously revised, reedited and shortened this text to another version which was published under the name “The Alternative Society” in 1980. Following is a discussion that summarizes the manuscript. It illustrates how the beliefs and ideals of Hastings connect with AR’s contents.

196 The original manuscript is in the possession of Miss Priscilla Hastings, the daughter of Hubert de Cronin Hastings, who kindly allowed me to see it. The revised version was published as Hubert de Cronin Hastings, The Alternative Society: Software for the Nineteen-Eighties, (London: David & Charles Limited, 1980).
2a. A Programmatic Palimpsest: “The Unnatural History of Man”

There were, after all, many gods then; now there is only one—science.  

Ivor de Wolfe

There is no evidence as to when exactly Hastings wrote “The Unnatural History of Man” other than “October 1958” typed on one of the chapters by his secretary. The manuscript itself is more than 880 typed pages and the conclusion is missing; or maybe Hastings never finished the initial manuscript. The text, however, incorporates some of the similar themes and even paragraphs of Hastings’s article "Townscape: A Plea for an English Visual Philosophy Founded on the True Rock of Sir Uvedale Price," published in 1949. In my opinion, “The Unnatural History of Man” was a palimpsest, written over and over, that incorporated Hastings’s thoughts from the late 1940s to the second half of the 1950s. This manuscript also became the backbone of “The Alternative Society” of 1980.

Hubert de Cronin Hastings (1902-1986) was the second son of the Hastings family, “actually christened Robert Seymour, names which his father promptly exchanged for the more patrician Hubert de Cronin—de Cronin after a Huguenot grandmother.” Hastings graduated from Berkhamsted, one of the famous public schools, when the father of Graham Greene the novelist, was the headmaster. By 1918 he started working for the Architectural Press which was co-owned by his father. He was also sent to the Slade School of Art and the Bartlett School of Architecture by his father “to train his eye and teach him something of the architectural language.”

His education at the Slade introduced him to the dominant art criticism of the time, especially the idea of “significant form.” “Significant form” was a term coined by Clive Bell, to illustrate that it was only through “significant form” that emotional responses were created in the subject. Bell’s idea was largely based on the necessity of

---

197 Hastings “The Unnatural History of Man” p. 449
199 Ibid.
200 In his taped interview with Susan Lasdun, Hastings notes that he met Roger Fry personally.
educated taste, for "significant form" was capable of arousing a peculiar sense of emotion based on personal experience in those who had aesthetic sensibility. Although Bell promoted abstract modern art within the Bloomsbury circle, his writing carried distant echoes of the associationism of Archibald Allison and Richard Payne Knight's nineteenth century writings. It may not be surprising to see then, that Hastings, under his influence committed to the Modern Movement in architecture as well as modern art equally as much as he committed to Romanticism, especially the work of Blake and the 1940s Neo-Romantics. In the works of the Modern Movement Hastings saw the creation of significant form in architecture and a release from the grip of the historical styles. During his editorship in the 1930s AR and AJ were established as the platform for modern architecture when the movement was still in its infancy in Britain.

At the time Hastings's manuscript evolved, Britain's role as a world power as well as its social structure changed dramatically. Britain was no longer the great empire it once was, and had come instead to assume a lesser role in comparison to the two rising global powers of the Cold War. During the postwar period the Empire shrank gradually and became a "Commonwealth" of semi-independent nations. The postwar economy did not get a major relief before the 1960s—the age of pop and the rise of mass culture—sinking even worse in the late 1960s. At the same time, the consensus on the welfare state persisted together with the early Labor policies of nationalization. The increasing influence of the United States on British culture started to become a disturbance for some of the British intellectuals, although others were willing to embrace it.

The second half of the 1950s also witnessed the New Left's rise in Britain. Britain's imperial aspirations concluded as a result of the Suez Canal crisis. The invasion of Hungary and Khruschev's denigration of Stalinist policies created a sense of betrayal
by the USSR in the British left and evoked a need for change to come from outside the home of the October Revolution. According to Dennis Dworkin the New Left “came together in response to the Suez and Hungary crises in 1956 and then consolidated in a shared commitment to the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) of the late fifties and sixties. New Left activists attempted to create a new political space on the Left, and their project was critical to the development of radical historiography and cultural studies in Britain.”

Hastings’s manuscript, coming from the pen of a high-middle class, public-school-educated, late Victorian gentleman, echoed the then contemporary developments in the world as well as those in Britain. These he combined with a historical evaluation which stretched from England before the industrial revolution to his present day.

a-i. A Portrait of Doom:

In the introductory chapter entitled “New Elizabethan” Hastings set out by describing a state of hopelessness. He argued that there was a prevailing angst in the people of his day, although advocates of technological progress came out with the promise of a better future everyday. It was a social crisis à la Spengler, for Hastings, that had enveloped Western civilization, a paranoid state in which mankind faced its own demise via its own scientific creation: the atom bomb.

According to Hastings the prevailing belief that progress would come only through science and technology, and the reign of specialists and experts in the administration of the society were the real problems that Western civilization had to address to come out of this crisis:

A new kind of dilemma, not knowing why things have gone wrong. They went wrong in the seventeenth century because mammon stalked up and down the land, in the eighteenth because privilege, superstition and taboo prevented the free play of reason, in the nineteenth because vested interests obstructed the progress of science. In the twentieth however, all the great abuses have vanished, together with our sense of sin, and science sits enthroned and there’s next to nothing to put it right, yet here we stand... in front of a guided missile... There is the cult of the demonstrable, there is the need of a technological society to get quantitative

---

203 Dworkin “Cultural Marxism...” p. 45.
204 Hastings sees a deep crisis of civilization in the threat of technology against its own creator: “We are in far deeper than the Bomb can bury us. Western civilisation is facing in the words of The Times, a social crisis as deep as that of Hellenic Society in the 4th century BC” ibid, p.3.
results rather than qualitative results... Above all there is the modern fashion for specialization which sternly discourages public discussion except by experts... No one is to speculate about "life" any more, the experts because they do not deign, the amateurs because they do not dare.\(^{205}\)

Hastings's pessimism stemmed from the fact that a holistic vision of life was to be irrecoverably lost under the influence of the cult of expertise and the pursuit of progress via science and technology. A new comprehensive ideological stimulus was needed to initiate a "collective come-back." In reaction to the expert culture around him, he hoped that he, as a dilettante of philosophy, psychology and economy, could resist against this tyranny by trying to come up with an alternative and by giving it a voice. In the same chapter, Hastings further argued that what he saw in Britain in the 1950s was no more than a "New Elizabethan escape psychosis" instead of a world-transforming "New Elizabethanism." The major reason for Hastings's diagnosis was the lack of "ideological directive" in the South Bank Exhibition, which was to commemorate and surpass the Great Exhibition of 1851:

No such doubt existed in the mind of the authors of the Great Exhibition of 1851, who had a mission and knew it—to let the world see that the industrial revolution could mass-produce civilisation (it couldn't but that's beside the point). South Bank of 1951 had no such heady sense of mission, was doubtful even whether it ought to be there...\(^{206}\)

Hastings argued that the cold war world had reduced the alternatives of mankind to two opposing life-styles, where "the ideological directive came either from the White House or the Red Square." Both the American and the Soviets maintained a single model of progress through industrial growth by the help of science and technology, and their respective societies were administered by a managerial class, albeit elected differently under the guise of a capitalist democracy or the oligarchic communist bureaucracy. In both of the societies, he claimed that the individual was a cog in the machinery of production run by his managerial supervisors without a meaningful utopian ideal. This utopian ideal could be supplied by the British in the form of an alternative society. His manuscript was to propose a sketch of this society. In order to assume a pioneering role

\(^{205}\) Ibid, pp. 4-8.
\(^{206}\) Ibid, p.12.
in world civilization, he argued that the British ought to take up the moral idealism spurned by the Civil War of the 17th century under the leadership of Oliver Cromwell—the moral idealism which could recuperate a New Elizabethan age, which was lost to laissez-faire capitalism after the industrial revolution.

a-ii. The Balancing State:

In order to come up with an ideal to be embraced by the whole of Western societies, Hastings believed that a "simply economical" critique, such as that of Marx, would not suffice to point towards a new utopia. He believed that the most important "non-scientific" find of modern science was the concept of the unconscious developed by psychology. As apparent from his notes, Hastings's critique of Marx was directly influenced by the work of Isaiah Berlin as well as his own effort in trying to harmonize various objectives of men.207 He argued that if the psychologically satisfactory could be joined to the economically satisfactory in the creation of a societal model, the good life could be brought into being. It is not clear whether Hastings was aware of the revolutionary potential that Herbert Marcuse afforded to psychology, advocated in his famous Eros and Civilization of 1955, however Hastings was interested in Freudian psychology since the 1930s. Marcuse believed that Western society was unfree and repressive. Technology had made the masses complacent with the abundance of material goods, rendering them intellectually and spiritually captive.

Hastings went on to argue that the idea of the trinity was a long established Western tradition with regards to explaining the human being. While he was mainly

207 "The Austrian-born British philosopher Sir Karl Popper has demonstrated the pretensions of the 19th-century determinist philosophies such as those of Hegel and Marx, while an English historian and philosopher, Sir Isaiah Berlin, has ridiculed the idea of a supposedly objective march of history. Berlin also rejects the Marxist belief that all values are conditioned by the place men occupy on the "moving stair of time." Marx, he points out, was as romantic as Hegel in envisaging a "world which moves from explosion to explosion in order to fulfil the great cosmic design." Moral values, he insists, are not just a "subjective gloss unworthy of consideration on the great hard edifice of historical construction." No single formula can be found, Berlin argues, whereby the various objectives of men can be harmoniously realized. There are many human goals, which may well be in conflict with one another.

This empirical, pluralist, and liberal political philosophy has much in common with the approach of the Frenchman Émile Durkheim and the Englishman Graham Wallas, both founding fathers of modern sociology. Statesmen and political philosophers, they contend, should not play the part of prophets but rather confine themselves to investigating social patterns and the ideas that are part of them. Ways might thus be found of promoting the survival and vitality of a given society in its particular setting" [my italics].
influenced by Emmanuel Swedenborg’s idea of correspondences and his conception of the trinity residing in one person, he also cited Descartes’ “heart, head and hand,” Freud’s three agencies of the human personality—the id, the ego and the superego—as well as biologists’ soma (body), morphe (identity) and psyche (mind) to support his inclination to explain the human being as a trinity. He ventured to state that if the psychological biases of humans could be evaluated within the sphere of economy, a political system that catered to their emotional needs and a consequent balanced society could be established. He stated:

I maintain that man is in literal sense, three persons, a willer, a minder, a feeler… My ambition as a three-in-one-idea man is to harness it to affairs of person and of state, and having harnessed it, mount it and put spurs to it and then see where it leads me…

Hastings developed this argument by drawing on the occupational or social types as argued by Patrick Geddes with reference to the valley section and the increasing complexity of occupational types in the urban environment. He claimed that there were three economical biases in man that tend to either be suppressed or expressed in interaction with the economical developments in society while they remain inherent: a productive bias, a “consumptive” bias and a distributive bias. He criticized Marx’s idea of the correspondence between the relations of production and political superstructures and forms of social consciousness on the grounds that an economic critique resting on the idea of production simply disregarded the relations of consumption and distribution as well as the psychological realm of man in interaction with such relations. These three biases, according to Hastings, expressed themselves in the development of different social forms: “feudal tyrannies” of the medieval times where the productive bias was dominant, “the laissez-faire chaos” of post-industrial revolution capitalism, where distributive relations assumed more importance, and a “totalitarian dictatorship,” where a “consumptive” paradise was promised in the form of Soviet communism. However all these societies ended up creating a general repression of the two other biases by the

209 [When the state fails to produce equilibrium between these three powers] the political economy is thrust back on three single solutions each of which in its singleness had produced an overspecialization of one organ: a feudal tyranny (P); a totalitarian dictatorship (C), or a laissez-faire [Sic] chaos. The overspecializations have always succeeded in defeating the true ideal of government” ibid, p. 198.
demand they made on certain occupational types, resulting in a division of man’s psychological world that brought along an advancing alienation.

These biases in man acted on the material realm in terms of impulses. The productive man had creative and differentiative impulses, while the consumptive man was assimilative, and the distributive man coordinative. Hence for Hastings, this triad also manifested itself in the cultural products of man. For example the division between town and country was a natural result of this, where the productive forces of society was assembled in the countryside and the consumptive forces in the city, the two being linked by a distributing scheme. The city was mainly the habitation of the consumptive types of man. The country was inhabited by the productive type and the suburb, which was an anomaly in itself for Hastings, by the distributive type. The rise of the managerial class in the first half of the twentieth century, which Hastings believed was made up of the distributive types, was directly reflected on the development of the suburbs. Such a perception of the town and the country, as I have emphasized, would be operative and in the background of the campaigns for Townscape, Outrage and Counter-Attack, as well as the later campaigns of Manplan (1969) and the hypothetic new town of Civilia (1971), proposed on the brown fields of Nuneaton.

Hastings thought that an alternative society had to be balanced and had to stabilize the class rivalry emerging as a result of the relations of production, consumption and distribution. In other words, Hastings thought that a different role for the state had to be configured in order to avoid class struggle. Instead of perceiving the State as a necessary evil that has to gradually move out of the sphere of political economy, a new order had to give it a balancing role. The existing alternative in the form of a communist state advancing from Marxist doctrine had, Hastings argued, led to another dictatorship as the experience of Stalinist USSR had shown. Therefore the State should assume the status of an ideal negotiator that administered social equilibria:

---

There is no reason why the State shouldn’t handle producer and consumer interests with mutual satisfaction to both, but how can that happy state be realized so long as it remains the monolithic structure Marxist and Communist, even socialist theory demands. In the organisation or “Whole” we have to envisage the economic and thus the political set-up as consisting of a basic triad of antithetic “powers,” called by the wizards of economic science productive, consumptive, distributive, each having routines sovereign in its own field.\(^{211}\)

Having applied this theory to the idea of the State, Hastings thought that his theory could be tested in relation to culture as well. He accepted Marx’ idea that the economic structure determined people’s ways of life and their social consciousness, but he also argued that in the process of societal evolution culture became just as influential on the economic structure and could contribute to its transformation.

a-iii. T.S. Elliot: Cultures vs. Civilization, City vs. Region

“From one point of view we may identify; from another we must separate...”

T.S. Elliot “Notes Toward the Definition of Culture” p. 31

In order to develop a model for an alternative contemporary society where relations of production, consumption and distribution played their part, Hastings felt the need to support his argument with a cultural model.\(^{212}\) For Hastings such biases could be observed in the field of culture and the formation of artifacts. In fact, these biases were the generators of cultural diversity and uniformity of civilization. He believed that T.S. Eliot’s “Notes Towards a Definition of Culture”\(^{213}\) could provide him with an analysis of culture to support his speculations on the creation of diversity as a result of the productive impulse and the emergence of uniformity as a result of the consumptive impulse.

According to Hastings, while Eliot refused to differentiate between culture and civilization, his model promoted the concept of cultural unity as well as the necessity of

\(^{211}\) Hastings, “The Unnatural...” ibid, p.199.

\(^{212}\) “...this productive-consumptive-distributive intercom, accepted by the economic fraternity as the first commonplace of their craft is in fact, a piece of camouflage disguising a much more universal movement, distinguishable (in other fields as well) as the marriage within the social of the differentiative with the identifying impulse... is this pattern unique to economics? Or is it common to all acts of man?... In short, what the argument needs is an ally. As it happens it has one, unless I am mistaken no less one than T.S. Eliot, who, in his essay Towards the Definition of Culture does make so it seems to me exactly the controversial distinctions at this point.” Ibíd., p. 222, underlining in Hastings’s manuscript.

\(^{213}\) Hastings possessed a 1948 edition of Eliot’s famous book in his library that he very carefully read, underlined and even took notes on.
particularization into regional cultures. For Eliot culture, as people’s ways of life, was lived unconsciously almost like religion practiced all through the day and into the night. Hastings thought that Eliot’s understanding of sectarian variety in religion as the differentiation of a central doctrine into cults embodied a powerful model. This model could define the relationship between the meaning of culture vs. the meaning of civilization. Eliot stated three important conditions for culture: (1) culture is to have an organic structure to encourage the “hereditary transmission of culture within a culture” and this required the persistence of social classes; (2) it should be “analyzable, geographically into local cultures... [which brings up the problem of] regionalism; and (3) “the balance of unity and diversity of religion—that is the universality of cult and devotion.”

In articulating the similarity between culture and religion, Eliot also stated that “there is an aspect in which we can see a religion as the whole way of life of a people, from birth to the grave, from morning to night and even in sleep, and that way of life is also its culture.” Realizing that Eliot saw religion as a unifying force of European cultures Hastings asked:

> It is the capacity these things called culture, for being, that is both universal and particular. Cultural unity and cultural differentiation. How can the same activity separate and cement? My own impulse would be to use distinguishing words—culture for the differentiative process, civilization for the unifying.

According to Hastings, the dynamism of societies stemmed from the interaction between the resistances of cultures to the unifying impact of civilization. He followed with a criticism of his own perception of Lewis Mumford’s regionalism. Hastings claimed that the city and the region were antithetical formations in which the region produced culture while the city disseminated civilization:

> ... the truth that the region is not, as Mumford maintains, the extension of the city, but its antithesis, its “enemy,” its Great Adversary, in fact its complement.... Regarded as a way-of-life biases rather than as descriptions of population density these terms do however approximate to the true situation near enough to enable

---

215 Ibid., p.31.
216 Hastings “The Unnatural...” p. 225.
one to present them prime evidence and proof of the existence within the social body of the movements, one differentiative, the pursuit of way-of-life cults, and in that sense and that sense only, cultural; the other consolidating or consumptive, and to that degree a civilising process, uniting and bringing people together. Civilisation versus Cultures, the basis of the social dynamic.

Eliot’s thoughts on culture were very influential on Hastings in terms of giving a direction to the magazine’s treatment of architectural content, especially in the pursuit of anonymity and vernacular architectures.217 I will deal with this issue in the second part of my thesis.

a-iv: The Alternative Society and the Gentleman

There was one notion, however that Hastings did not totally agree with Eliot—there was the need to remove class difference and to establish equality. Hastings believed that the Marxist ideal had a potential to be realized in a World State where distinctions between classes would be removed. Even though Eliot asked for the preservation of classes, Hastings asked:

Are we then to renounce our efforts to break down the barriers of class and privilege? ...And how is the planner to reconcile world-statism with regional culture, internationalism with cultural differentiation, general education... with the ideal functional specialisation (ways of life)?

Or to put it the other way round, short of breaking up our grandiose ideal of world-wide political democracy, how are we to avoid creating a robot-like uniformity horribly similar to the ants?

This is democracy’s real dilemma.218

Hastings believed that the alternative society had to be raised on a political model that would safeguard cultural differences while promising material equality. “The ideal functional specialization” did not simply mean a technical division of labor, but the ability to create different ways of life to contribute to the cultural diversity of society, which was once provided by classes. The alternative society would incorporate what he

217 For instance in the September 1954, AR republished Elliot’s article “Play on Possum” on poetic creativity where every reference to poetry was replaced with its architectural counterpart to give architects an idea on creativity in the way Eliot understood it.
called the “temperamental radicalism” of the English understanding of liberty as opposed to the French idea of equality. In this part of the manuscript, Hastings came full circle to his early writings on the picturesque and townscape. The English idea of liberty was the sole guarantor of diversity in unity in cultural and social forms, which he thought were unique to the English. However liberty did not simply mean equality:

“Be Thyself.” It was this which determined Puritan politics and religion: independence—not equality at all... Out of the temperamental radicalism of the English on the other hand, springs, to choose at random, laisser faire,[Sic] protestantism, nonconformity, the spirit of dissent, empirical philosophers, singular Englishmen. Landscape and Picturesque theory, parliamentary government, the Common Law, founded upon a multitude of individual cases, the absence of a constitution, capitalism, the Balance of Power, the Whigs. Inequality is of the essence of this philosophy, or to put it another way, egalitarianism has no application [crossed over and written “meaning” on it—author’s note] here.\(^\text{219}\)

Hastings believed that the apparent self-contradiction in the above quote—that is the demand for a classless society but also recognizing class inequality as the basis of British cultural diversity—could be overcome in the process of establishing the principles of the alternative society. He demanded a historical intermission and a phase of transformation to build up the necessary infrastructures and to educate the new man that would create this society. The new man would be brought up by the “High Tory’s essential faith” freed from modern conservatism’s weaknesses—that is the exploitation of man’s emotional needs for political power without a program that caters to those needs—on the romantic ideals symbolized for Hastings by the teaching of William Blake:

...for Blake tyranny lies in the enslavings of the imagination... If [Francis] Bacon, the sinner against the Holy Ghost, is antichrist, Sir Joshua [Reynolds] is Satan. The first by putting commodity before principle commits the classic crime of all realpoliticians [Sic] since Pilate; the second by putting dexterity of the hand before the vision of the inner eye (what Rousseau calls the animal economy before emotional direction) gives the carnal, as Bacon gave the intelligent agent priority over the imagination.\(^\text{220}\)

This quote summarized Hastings’s reactionary worldview with reference to several issues such as the role of science, the task of the romantic artist and the problem of art, his

\(^{219}\) Ibid, pp. 251-252.
\(^{220}\) Ibid, pp. 261-262.
regard for the rise of reason during the Enlightenment as the “enslavement of imagination” and the repression of passion in the rationally administered society.

Hastings believed that modern education bred frustration in mankind via its emphasis on specialization. By giving an education that is reduced either to the humanities, science or technical skills, and trying to discipline his will, modern education taught the suppression of the passions and compromised man’s unity. The reference to Sir Joshua Reynolds expresses Hastings’s understanding of classicism as an idea that values skill, composition, perfection of execution in expense of individuality, imagination and character—all qualities that promote emotion over reason.

There was a unity that had to be restored to man in social life, in which reason, feeling and passions were given free expression. The ideology that could realize this task was conservatism, a conservatism that Hastings defined as the “romantic approach to the State.” Hastings consciously uses the word conservative in order to define the revolutionary sensibilities of the Romantic. At first glance his use might seem contradictory. However, almost all the conservatives that he cites are leaders that brought about important social transformations in their respective countries. Hence, for Hastings, revolution is an idiom that does not solely belong to the lexicon of the left. Romantic conservatives were men like “Jesus, [Benjamin] Disraeli, [Oliver] Cromwell, [George] Washington, Napoleon, Mussolino [Sic] and Hitler [who were] Tory reformers all of whose impulses were valid even when their actions were not.”

Conservatism, for Hastings, was a delicate ideology that needed extreme caution in application to society. It dealt with “the political manipulation of the will” which could either bring happiness to the community or bring about its end:

Conservatism is preoccupied basically with an eternal issue, so important to man and his polities that its frustration or misapplication or worse, neglect, can spell disaster to a whole community: the political manipulation of the will. And as we have seen to our cost in this country, the will of libido works either positively through love or invertedly through hate, a principle Hitler demonstrated for all to see with German thoroughness and indecency in recent history.

221“Here lies the true ground of the modern dilemma. However wise, liberal, humane, and otherwise enlightened, a system of education that introduces men and women to the humanities or the sciences or the technical skills and omits the training of the passions or seeks to “discipline” them in other ways than self-expression, is a monstrosity and breeds monstrosities.” p. 266.
222 Ibid, p. 269.
223 Ibid, p. 270.
Therefore, the powers of the libido had to be unleashed instead of being repressed through the mechanisms of society and directed to a positive cause. The project of psychology had to be channeled towards a conservative political system, based on brotherly love. This should be formulated in the form of a new utopian ideal against the two dominating ways of life, the American and the Soviet, in order to give the oppressed peoples an alternative story and to offer a trajectory for civilization. To establish that his proposal was an alternative, Hastings expanded his arguments through a criticism of the American and the Soviet “ways-of-life.”

For Hastings, the twentieth century was the “American century.” The United States was founded on the ideal of reform, and to establish a new world that was cleansed from the corruption of the old world. Instead of improving on the old world in a qualitative way, however, those that peopled and administered the new lands eventually dropped all their ideals and simply exploited the abundance of resources under their control. They created a “materialist engine” that made the best of technology and science and pushed the technological revolution to its extremes. With the added emphasis on liberal values, the United States created a charming example of prosperity which lured the rest of the world excluding those that subscribed to Communism.

What deeply disturbed Hastings was that an alternative model for prosperity was not available. The USSR, the only recognizable alternative, in promising material and social equality instead of only constitutional equality in the American case, subscribed to the same ideal—which is the mere removal of poverty by means of technological progress. Both systems worked with the assumption that quantitative changes would bring about the qualitative changes. Furthermore the American way of life depended on the need for abundant natural resources only the most efficient exploitation of which provided the material prosperity. It was natural then, he thought, those who lacked the

---

224 “... if I go still further and maintain that the psychological job of the second half of the twentieth century is to establish the will on a basis, not simply of equality, but of something more, priority, to the techniques of knowing and feeling, it is because it seems to me that this, the central article of Christian faith, is the very one that has been most neglected or when not neglected, travestied.” Ibid, p. 520.

225 “The Mayflower and its successors were to be little wooden wombs whence should springs Saints, the Saints who would found a society free from errors of the old corrupt world. Did they? Not a bit of it.... Improving on the Old World merely quantitatively. Here precisely lies the danger both for Europe and the US and, indeed the rest of mankind, not that Sam has broken with, but the fact that Sam has not broken with the Old World.” pp. 528-530.
necessary abundance of resources would rally towards the Soviet model due to the lack of an alternative bringing the world to the verge of self-destruction.

Around this time, the nuclear arms race and the space race was gaining full speed. In Britain the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament was being organized by the New Left under the premises that the British had to be the moral leaders of the world against the threat of nuclear warfare. In an essay published in the New Statesman on November 2nd, 1957, entitled “Russia, the Atom and the West” J. B. Priestley protested against the British government’s nuclear ambitions. Hastings thought that the nuclear arms race was the inevitable result of the two systems’ obsession with technological progress, only one step away from its logical conclusion—nuclear war:

So long as AWOL [American Way of Life]—or USSRWOL—goes on insisting that the technological liberation of man is preparing human society for an advance on the moral front which could be represented as a step forward in human progress, then we are being involved in a swindle which sooner or later, probably sooner, history will expose in an unattractive mushroom form. 227

What could be a viable precedent to establish a point of departure to set this development straight then? Apparently democracy was not the answer for Hastings, since he believed democracy provided false freedoms behind which lurked another form of dictatorship—that is the enslavement of the individual by the dictatorship of the masses. Democracy was an illusion in which constitutional freedoms masked “real freedom” and the individuals were disconnected from their emancipation as an effect of societal mechanisms. Hastings claimed that it was at the time of the Civil War in the 17th century that Britain had created a genuine opportunity to establish a model society of freedom—the realization of a New Jerusalem. The British Civil War, in Hastings’s

---

226 Priestley (1894-1977) was a leftist intellectual and one of the founders of the Common Wealth Party (founded 1941 and dissolved 1945) that argued for common ownership of land. Priestley’s involvement with the party was short-lived. Later he became one of the organizers of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament.
227 Ibid, p. 541.
228 “The understanding of democracy as giving every man every right without looking at his/her education] is dangerous because under a facade of freedom it can surrender to dictatorship and promote the re-enslavement of the individual to a mass tyranny more servile than feudal chains. After all, fascism and Hitlerism were by-products of democracy, a cridu coeur [Sic] against its insufficiencies.” p. 563.
229 “[The British] are beginning to see that the technological rat-race really is one and will have consequences indecorous for mankind unless and until some society can tip the emotional balance of nations towards a goal that is worthy both of man and of the technological achievement, and so create a dynamic fit to feed into the democratic machinery.” Ibid, p 583.
eyes was the real birth of the modern world, since it resulted in the Industrial Revolution as well as British romanticism. This bifurcation in history pointed to the fact that the British embraced the two ideals of scientific progress and the priority of man’s emotions, but could not achieve the proceeding balanced development due to yielding to the powers of laissez-faire capitalism.

Hastings referred to the Civil War as the Cromwellian Revolution. Although he regarded himself a conservative, Hastings was not alone in his interpretation of the British Civil War as a revolution. Since the 1930s historians connected to the Communist Party in Britain had started to develop a new historiography. They “viewed the Civil War as a pivotal movement in the creation of the English tradition, as a decisive phase in socialist theoretical development, and as a revolution, not an interregnum.” The Civil War brought up the vision of a “co-operative social commonwealth” in which “iniquity of class” would be removed. Marxist historians such as Edward Palmer Thompson, Christopher Hill and later Richard Hoggart and Raymond Williams were interested in the Romantic tradition in terms of Romanticism’s opposition towards liberalism, utilitarianism and laissez faire capitalism in the early 1950s. Early cultural studies were interested in “two traditions of dissent that had failed to converge: English popular resistance and the alternative vision of Romanticism” and were unified in opposition towards the Americanization of British working class by the impact of popular culture.

Thus, Hastings argued that the British had always been passionate revolutionaries after the Cromwellian revolution and chased the ideal of the New Jerusalem. According to Hastings, a revolution in his day had to aim at human nature instead of the economic system, or the ideals of technological progress. As I have previously mentioned, he proposed a period of intermission from the “technological rat race” and a policy of

---

230 See Dworkin “Cultural Marxism...” p. 32
231 Dworkin’s study establishes the active role of Marxist the historians group in this interpretation and their influence on the development of cultural studies: “The historians believed that Marxism alone occupied the position in historiography once held by the 19th century Whig interpretation, but they closely allied themselves with the radical democratic and labor traditions--Sidney and Beatrice Webb, J.L. and Barbara Hammond, G.D. H. Cole, and R.H. Tawney...” The group’s defense of the progressive tradition was apparent in the involvement in the two major English historiographic controversies of the 1950s: the gentry’s role in the English Revolution and the social consequences of the early Industrial Revolution. In the “storm over the gentry” Christopher Hill was the lone defender of Tawney, “the giant upon whose shoulders all historians of the 17th century stand.” Ibid. p. 19.
233“The British have always been incurably Messianic.” Hastings “The Unnatural...” p. 583.
"respite." He proposed that first mankind had to take respites: respite from the cliché of Marxist revolution, respite from the idea of wealth and respite from the class struggle. He believed that people have to be given new priorities, a new understanding of what revolution is, and a reevaluation of the meaning of wealth—all with reference to the good life instead of status.

Hastings believed that the class structure of British society was responsible for "grave abuses." He added that Marx's idea of a classless society and a proletarian revolution rightly stemmed from his hatred of the class society. He argued that the inevitable evolution of society was moving everybody towards bourgeois status. If every member agreed to being bourgeois by a sudden and drastic redistribution of wealth Britain could have achieved a bloodless revolution. The managers were the administrative leaders and the workers were the energy of the economy machinery. They had to think of each other as allies and not as adversaries.

To this extremely optimistic scenario, Hastings added the need for an educational reform in which the system trained gentlemen with a built-in sense of service to the commonwealth. The true class distinction for Hastings was the one that emerged out of one's habits of consumption which also provided the individual with a sense of personal identity. The gentlemen of the 17th century, Hastings believed, obeyed a universal moral code and a devotion to service. The gentleman served the public selflessly and thought of himself as paid when he added to the general wealth of the society while consuming "boldly, unblushingly, elegantly." He claimed that the closest thing to a consumer culture existed at the time when the dominant British class was the gentry and they were the real consumers. Eliot's idea, where high culture and low culture are not mutually exclusive but complementary, and the role of high culture being to drive the cultural transformation would be realized by what Hastings called "horizontal distinctions"—that is an identification based on consumption. The role of the public school system had to be reconsidered and its educational ideals had to be made widely available. These schools

---

234 "The "People" are on the move, the move to bourgeois status. Society has only to adopt the bourgeois ideal as the mean to which all men can step either triumphantly up or benevolently down, to achieve a capitalist society as free from the privilege and abuse as the Marxist one, without the bloodshed either.” Ibid. p. 696.

would define a holistic educational model largely based on a humanities curriculum and the teaching of crafts. Hastings hoped an education given to the students via the humanities would assure the emergence of a general culture, a way of life that could assure the creation of social unity against the "atomization" that the technological society had created. Education's objective was not to direct fresh minds towards the biggest wage packet but to "disseminate a pattern of purpose." Culture had to guard itself against the effects of civilization, which created uniformity by education.

Hastings also believed that trade unions should be allowed to evolve beyond being a bartering organization against holders of capital. Trade unions should advance towards a cultural role like that of the guilds which would, he hope, deliver labor "of an inferiority complex" imposed by capitalists. This way Britain would also be able to get rid of the "working class":

The plain truth is we have got to get rid of the working class. We can't afford a class of persons confessing to low consumer values. I say this is in no spirit of socialist chest-thumping...In twenty years we must have a value-educated England, bursting with the vitality that will spring from the disciplined release of the energy of the "workers" who after all have not exactly deserved ill of their fellow countrymen. Sane, humorous, wise and patient through two centuries of unpleasantness they have earned the admiration of all men of good will... Just the opposite of conflict between class and class: the hand of friendship. Why? Because that is the way of progress, the real meaning of the dialectic... The first requisite of all is an act of will and act of goodwill on the part of the Have’s for the Have-nots.

By educating everyone including the working classes into gentility, Hastings hoped that British culture would be saved from being replaced by a mass culture that upheld the

---

236 "When we realise that the threat is not of the bomb merely but of technology as a way of life, we shall appreciate another self-evident fact, that it is technological evolution that has led us to the point of atomisation, or, to use another word for the same thing, our genius for specialisation." Ibid, p. 759.

237 "The principle acts two ways; while gents go down the mine the workers can come up out of it—morally anyway. Labour has to be delivered of its inferiority complex. We must not make the mistake of the past in aiming this kind of snob education only at the black-coated worker."

"Trade Unionism is a peculiarly British invention and one of enormous potential social worth, but, having invented the thing, we leave it in the stale water it was born in, determined not to give it a chance to develop except as a tool of capitalism...They could of course fill the gap left by the disintegration of the gilds. [Sic] By what further mystery is he as cultist, to be nourished if not by the organisation that maintains the dignity and well-being of his craft... Every member of our society should be a trade unionist." Ibid. pp. 773-775.

238 Ibid, p. 782.
“wrong values.” Britain would bring up a balanced society that would make peace with its working classes and bring up a society of high-culture citizens.


“The Unnatural History of Man” would lurk behind the major campaigns of AR in the next 15 years that Hastings was in control until he retired. During this period, Hastings seems to have worked on the manuscript and was aiming to publish it. There is no archival resource that could enable me to track the development. However, in 1980 Hastings published his book under the title “The Alternative Society.” The book was a much shortened version of the “The Unnatural History of Man” that to a great extent kept a similar program for the British society and a call for reform all around the world. Hastings’s speculations with reference to psychology concerning the libido and the will were dropped completely while his proposal for the state, his ideas on the Cromwellian revolution and his reaction towards the role of technology and science and the Cold War environment was left almost intact. “The Alternative Society: Software for the Eighties” (1980) was to be Hastings’s last project, the only book published under his name and not his pseudonym, Ivor de Wolfe—the abbreviation of I, the World, the Devil and the Flesh, according to Priscilla Hastings.

“The Alternative Society” was based on the abstraction of a moral ideal from the past and the conversion of its economical structure into a working principle in the 1980s, that is, the British revolution under Oliver Cromwell. Hastings restated his belief that Britain could reinvigorate her cultural traditions and animate them with a reformist spirit to give a utopian message to the world against the two prevailing political models: the savage capitalism represented by the US and the managerial and authoritarian socialism as represented by the USSR. Idealizing the protectorate, Hastings argued that the Cromwellian vision ought to be creatively reinterpreted in order to formulate a pluralistic democracy to safeguard the welfare of every individual as well as that of the natural environment. In such a society scientific rationality and technological determinism would only play a secondary role on the human condition. The picturesque, “a radical, anarchist
and disorderly ideal... [and] a tremendous event in the long apprenticeship of democracy,” was to be the aesthetic metaphor of libertarian democracy.  

Hastings also dropped his call for the revolutionary transference to bourgeois status and aimed to define an economic model to reorganize the relationships between the individual, the State and the private sector. The roles of the individual and of the State took on the analogy of the eighteenth century gentry, like he described in “The Unnatural History of Man.” This more detailed model conceived the State as a balancing mechanism against the greed of capitalism by being the guardian of the individual. Like the gentry guarding those who cultivate and live on their land, the State would guard the collective Estate owned jointly by the citizenry and the State. The individual, by having a stake in the collective Estate, would rise to the level of the gentleman as well. He proposed the institution of a National Service that would create employment for the development of this “Estate” separate from the private market. The State would provide the individual with his or her consumptive needs for designated amounts of work given to this service. If the individual was not content with the offers of the State, he or she could switch to the opportunities of the private sector. Hastings imagined a market in which the consumer would be able to trade his demands to the State. He conceived the market as a closed system that relied on export controls to keep the local economy stable, and one that controlled production and consumption.

Hastings hoped that this economy would render wealth redundant by the image of the “good life” it provided. However, this model rested on the idealization of the gentry, and hence the State, by attributing to both a moral perfection. A state with such powers and such a National Service could easily become the tyrant that Hastings warned against. The State could easily subsume the private sector because it held so much power against it. Almost all the powers that led to the balance other than the State, were actually not as powerful. There was nothing more than the moral ideals of the gentry to protect the tenant farmer, or the individual against the State, except perhaps the moral responsibilities that framed the system in its very inception.

239 Ibid, p.103.
240 Unfortunately I did not come across any reviews of the book other than a newspaper article that Hastings kept among his documents. The review was titled “Just Like That?” and had a very sarcastic tone. The author Brian O’Neill stated that “as an economist, Mr. Hastings ranks with the Uri Geller of science.
2b. Environmentalism and the Camouflaging of Technology

The expansion of AR’s content to embrace the larger environment and the rural landscape was not only limited to the two campaigns—Counter-Attack and Outrage—in the second half of the 1950s, that I mentioned earlier. This expansion included several feature articles that disseminated different contents of the same pedagogic program, which aimed to reconcile architecture and planning interventions to the rural landscape. AR’s emphasis on landscape can be seen both as part of a gradual development that extended from the 1940s throughout Britain and a contribution to the developing profession of landscape design as an independent branch. In his essay entitled “Landscape in Britain,” Alan Powers traces this development from the foundation of the Institute of Landscape Architects in 1929, the emergence of its journal “Landscape and Garden” in 1934, and the joint work of Lord Reith in the Ministry of Works and Buildings with William Holford as his adviser for policy planning in relation to land use and national parks. Reith was later made the chairman of the New Towns Committee between 1945-46 and he established that a landscape architect be part of the design teams of each new town. Landscape architects such as Sylvia Crowe (1901-1997), H. F. Clark (1902-1971), Brenda Colvin (1897-1981), or Geoffrey Jellicoe (1900-1996), who was the wartime president of the institute, took part respectively in the planning of Harlow, Stevenage, East Kilbride and Hemel Hampstead. 241

The above mentioned names were frequently featured in the pages of AR during the second half of the 1950s. Between 1954 and 1955, AR published several articles and proposals prepared by Sylvia Crowe and Kenneth Browne—who worked alongside Gordon Cullen for the Townscape series. These articles focused on how industrial buildings, reservoirs, mining plants could be integrated into the landscape by exploring topographical potentials and landscaping techniques. The articles also raised questions on the government’s siting choices for industrial plants and on the issue of industrial

---

waste. In a series of three articles between November 1955 and 1956, Kenneth Browne speculated on how lands of earlier industrial “dereliction” could be reclaimed by landscaping processes and planning initiatives. In 1956, *The Architectural Press*, which was under the directorship of Hastings, published Crowe’s “Tomorrow’s Landscape” followed by “The Landscape of Power” in 1958 and “The Landscape of Roads” in 1960. Some of the material from the books were already published in the *AR* before the books were released.

In May 1959, further support for *AR*’s approach to the environment came from Lionel Brett, later 4th Viscount Escher, with an article entitled “The Environmentalists.” Brett announced the founding of the Society for the Promotion of Urban Renewal and the cause of its foundation as such:

[SPUR] has been inspired by, among other things impatience that the official policy of decentralization to new towns, necessary though it has been, should now take place to the rebuilding of old ones; disappointment with the results in terms of townscape of the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act; determination to fight the social and visual disintegration of the television age; anger at the spread of officially-sponsored subtopia and piazza romanticism picked up abroad.

He noted that the old towns could have been given an impetus of growth and development by the direction of resources that the new towns had absorbed in the 12 years of the campaign. Brett’s article signaled the shift in the understanding of planning from the scale of the city to the environmental, which was founded on the assumption

---

242 The articles I am referring to are “Industry Exploited” by Crowe and K. Browne in *AR* October 1954, v. 116, pp. 227-234, on how industry can be concealed or made use of as sculpture in the landscape, “Farm Boundaries” by Sylvia Crowe in February 1955, on how farm boundaries can be drawn by means of landscaping elements, “Mineral Workings” in March 1955, on the problem of landscaping old mines or those that are still in use, “Forestry” in April 1955, on the economic and aesthetic development of forests by Crowe and Browne, “Reservoirs” in May 1955, by Crowe and Browne on the possible uses of reservoirs for recreational functions. Also see “Wires overhead,” in July 1956 (no specific author stated) a plea to put wiring underground and to increase research on underground cabling, “Milford Haven” by Ian Nairn, and “Milford Haven” by R. Spurrier both in April 1960, questioning the planning decisions in the industrialization of Milford Haven; Green Mantle” by Ian Nairn on provincial green belts in November 1957.


that a healthy future environment would result from the development of compact and densely settled cities. On the other hand, AR started publishing articles that aimed to reframe the role of science and technology and consequent industrial development in the making of the environment.\(^\text{246}\) In January 1961, Max Nicholson (1904-2003), one of the aides to Herbert Morrison in the planning of the Festival of Britain, who was director-general of the Nature Conservancy 1952-1966 and later a founder of the World Wildlife Foundation, urged for scientific methods to take active part in sustaining the natural landscape and in its development via a continuous contact with ecologists.\(^\text{247}\) In 1967, R. G. Hopkinson called for an education that formulated an “environmental aesthetic” for architecture students and added a warning against too much scientism.\(^\text{248}\) The emphasis on scientific research had to be directed to the benefit of the environment. For instance, AR regarded the transformation of the rural scenery by the laying out of high voltage wires with an eye on economic efficiency as an unacceptable intrusion. While the editors noted that they understood the economic restrictions which directed the government to place overhead wiring, they urged the government to fund research that could eventually cheapen and enable underground wiring.\(^\text{249}\)

By publishing these essays, AR meticulously portrayed the mission of technology as the enabling infrastructure of a better environment, which should reconcile the “cultural and economic needs” of the British people, albeit in a preservative and invisible manner. Major evidence to AR’s plea for a conception of technology as harmless to the environment as possible, was the gradually increasing emphasis on public transportation in the Review. For Hastings, the railway closures of the early 1960s were symbolic of the car taking over as the primary means of transportation. In April 1962 AR’s cover page featured an abandoned locomotive on old railroad tracks and a photographic section entitled “Elegy to Dead Technology” by Ivy de Wolfe—which was the pseudonym that Hastings gave to his wife who took the photographs. The photographic article portrayed the train as a form of technology abandoned for the conveniences of the car, although the

\(^{246}\) At the same time Reyner Banham would write a series of articles on the impact of technology in architecture and its professional consequences, which will be dealt in the second part of the thesis.


car carried less people in number and destroyed more of nature as a result of highways and roads. The train symbolized the first major technological invention of the industrial revolution that made the countryside accessible to the majority. 

AR closely followed the opportunities that the railway closures created in terms of access to the landscape. In December 1963, AR published an article by Michael Dower entitled “Green ways: a positive future for Britain’s cast-off railways?” proposing to create green bike paths and walkways into the countryside from the unused railway lines.250 The journal’s emphasis on public transport found major support after the publication of the [Colin D.] Buchanan (1907-2001) traffic report prepared for the Ministry of Transport in 1963. Buchanan argued that traffic planning in the traditional cities had to curb car traffic and to provide public transportation alternatives since these cities had a limited capacity to allow traffic. Instead Buchanan offered environmentally protected precincts in which limited motor traffic and uninhibited pedestrian traffic dominated. Perceiving the affinity to Townscape ideals, AR applauded the report in an essay entitled “The Environmental Street” in a victorious tone:

[The report’s] dismissal of the flow capacity to a secondary level of town-planning consequence underlines a change from the quantitative to the qualitative that was long overdue in ministerial thinking about the traffic and streets—”crude capacity” implies that traffic flow is not the end-product of town planning but merely one of its raw materials, something that town planners are to work on, not work towards.251

For the editors, the Buchanan report would help in the creation of the environmental street. It would put the pedestrian’s priorities in front of the privileged driver’s. By discouraging motor traffic apart from public transportation, it would help create an urban environment shaped according to pedestrian values. In June 1964, the editors followed

---

250 See Michael Dower “Green ways: a positive future for Britain’s cast-off railways?” AR, December 1963, v. 134, p. 387-393. Michael Dower is listed as visiting professor in the University of Gloucestershire. According to his webpage “Professor Michael Dower was previously Director of the Peak National Park, and then Director General of the Countryside Commission. Before that, he was for 18 years Director of the Dartington Amenity Research Trust, which had a brief similar to that of CCRU. In CCRU, he shares responsibility with Malcolm Moseley for the European portfolio. He has completed two multi-country projects funded by the European Commission, relating to the creation of Heritage Trails in Slovenia and Bulgaria, and to creating added value from wine and wine-related culture in local economies. He is currently working on a further such project, related to creating added value from woodland products. He is also working in Vietnam, training public-sector staff in integrated rural development for the Ministry of Agriculture.” http://www.glos.ac.uk/research2/content.asp?pid=6 accessed May 12, 2003. The issue was taken up again in another articles in April 1966 titled “Railway closures and after.”

with a plea for a comprehensive regional if not national transport policy to complement the enthusiastic start of the Buchanan report, meaning all sort of transport to be reevaluated such as canals and air, instead of only car and rail. They repeated their demand in terms of three-dimensional planning in the form of a three-dimensional town-map for every town. The editors urged once again for a more comprehensive land-use policy to stop the exploitation of agricultural and recreational land. They also added that such a comprehensive development scheme should entail a national coastal authority as well as an environmental research council to oversee the development process.2

2c. Manplan: A Visual Manifesto of Frustration

In the second half of the 1960s in Britain, the affluent consumer society and pop culture prevailed. Themes such as expendability and obsolescence as well as an optimistic technological determinism dominated avant-garde architectural discourse such as the works of Reyner Banham and the work of Archigram. AR’s partial content, besides the continuing Townscape and Outrage series, were formulated to continue its project for a cultural continuity against this domination and its possible consequences in the environment. One campaign aimed to unify all these concerns. In September 1969, AR launched “Manplan,” and drastically revamped its structure and contents. Reacting against the frustrating results of modern planning, like the New Towns and mass housing, Manplan demanded a change in objectives one more time:

What is wanted now is a new image for the twentieth century in its third phase, which will unearth from beneath the lumber of war, napalm, famine, genocide, concentration camps, conveyor belts, population explosions, sonic booms and silent springs, a mission—and a determination—to swing the new potential of technology as revealed in the moon probes, behind the real objectives of human society. The British are bad technocrats, good humanisers. Or were once. It could be a role.[my italics] 253


253 Manplan was published as four consecutive issues starting from September 1969, after which it became bi-monthly until the last issue appeared in September 1970 totaling eight. Peter Davey, in his contribution to the special AR centennial number in 1996, notes that Hastings insisted on the change from the earlier layout of the Review into the form of visual essays. Richards opposed the idea and opted for the publication of special issues as before and to keep the contents of the Review tailored to the existing readership. As Richards had anticipated the Review went into an economical crisis in 1970 as a result of the Manplan series. This opposition seems to have led to the whole renewal of the editorial board between 1971 and 1974 starting with the sack of Richards from the position of executive editor and the departure of Pevsner.
According to Richards, Manplan was coined by Hastings as another catchy neologism to attract AR readership, but what Richards overlooked was that it directly opposed another phrase, Non-plan. “Non-Plan: An Experiment in Freedom” was published six months earlier in the New Society” by Reyner Banham, Peter Hall, Paul Barker and Cedric Price.\(^{254}\) In the form of a counter-cultural critique Banham and Hall demanded an experiment in planning democracy by lifting planning restrictions and allowing people more freedom of choice, arguing for decentralization and dispersal. Manplan was directly opposed to the idea in order to prevent its popularity as a nationwide policy. Instead of “letting planning loose,” the editors once more stipulated a comprehensive planning mechanism. Instead of “Non-Plan” they wanted “man to plan.”

The real aim of technology should be to humanize the environment by gradually becoming invisible, instead of recreating cities based on technology-derived imagery like in the cities of Archigram. Although they occupied antithetical poles, both Manplan and “Non-Plan” were reactions against the planning practices that had been employed until the late 1960s. What separated them was their respective ideological support for the uses of technology and for “pop culture.” While Non-Plan applauded the freedom of choice that consumer culture brought forward, Manplan was highly skeptical of it. When “Non-Plan” was enthusiastic about decentralization and dispersal, Manplan argued that the whole twentieth century planning experience was a proof of its failure. If Non-plan’s favorite cities were Los Angeles and Las Vegas, Manplan’s were London, traditional British market towns and Italian hill towns.

Written in a rhetoric of “revolutionary humanism,” the first issue aimed to voice “the sense of frustration” the editors believed that British society suffered. Photographs portrayed British people in a frenzy of production in industrial plants, waiting in boredom in overcrowded public transportation, students revolting, cars overcrowding eighteenth century parks and invading the countryside, high-rise office towers invading London. In

the form of visual essays accompanied in captions, Manplan made a call of reform. The editorial introductions, presumably written by Hastings, sounded the critique that Hastings had evolved in "The Unnatural History of Man" and that he was probably revising at this time for "The Alternative Society." (Figures, 1.22, 1.23, 1.24, 1.25)

In the editors' words, Manplan meant "a plan for human beings with a destiny rather than figures in a table of statistics."[255] The issues starting from the second were thematically organized around communication (referring to transportation networks), industry, education, religion, healthcare and welfare, local government and finally housing. With each issue, Manplan deployed an attack on the bureaucratic mechanisms that organized the above-mentioned fields and the inefficiencies of the democratic consumer society. The editors maintained that the logic of the industrial revolution was no longer applicable and the communications revolution had started. Manplan demanded

---

that politicians exert control on the disruptive effects of transportation and industry on the environment by drawing out a holistic, integrative structure.

Transportation, it argued, had to rely extensively on fast rail and canals to dominate over the car and air with airports pushed to coastal areas and linked by fast trains. Arguing that industry had become less pollutant, Manplan reverted to the earlier arguments of Townscape to reintegrate the separated functions of the city. The editors opposed the continuity of the New Towns experience by arguing that industrial concentration proved to be wrong and expensive. In the fourth issue on education Manplan attacked the British public schools system as elitist and creating “a self-perpetuating oligarchy” instead of creating a unified society. In order to produce a society divested of class segregation, schools had to be integrated into the community and designed by user participation. AR’s romantic bias within this reformist rhetoric took a new turn with Manplan’s fifth issue on religion. AR advocated that religion was inseparable from human consciousness even if it was not one of the historical religions. In the early seventies’ world, which was becoming more and more suspicious of the objective truth of science, religion would assume a new unifying role and increase “man’s chance of unfolding the ill effects of industrialization.”

256 See Manplan 5, AR March 1970.
2d. Civilia: The Alternative City?

The transference of Hastings’s ideals, expressed in “The Unnatural History of Man,” into architecture and city planning continued into the last campaign of his editorial rein. After withdrawing Manplan due to the decline in sales, Hastings thought that he could affect planning authorities and the people of Britain by promoting an alternative new town that would integrate the environmental ideals that AR had been preoccupied with in the last twenty-five years. If a convincing precedent could be created, it could be followed by others. This alternative town would be called “Civilia.”

With the help of his daughter, Priscilla, and of AR’s Townscape editors Ian Nairn and Kenneth Browne, Hastings wanted to create in Civilia a new town that people would want to “belong to” before it was built. Under the pseudonym “Ivor de Wofle,” changed from Ivor de Wolfe by a typo that he ended up liking, he wrote an introductory essay
entitled “Towards a Philosophy of the Environment” that recalled the title of his 1949 essay for Townscape. However this time he enlarged the scope of his political attention from Britain to the world. The basic task of the planner was to acknowledge cultural differences with reference to those of the regional and urban, as Hastings had inferred from Eliot in the “Unnatural History of Man”:

...the planner's first priority is... accepting the culture of cities and the culture of regions as opposing goals--urbanism as international, unifying, centralising, consolidating, its apotheosis MARShall McLuhan's global village; regionalism as insular, microcosmic, separatist, differentiative, the culture of place. Only by accepting this opposition and acting in accordance with the difference between the two can a balanced society develop.257

Although Townscape, Outrage and Counter-Attack had expressed an explicit anti-expertise attitude and attempted to remedy the fallacies of planning by visual and psychological responses, Civilia included a planner's report.258 The two planners approved Hastings’s agendas by stating that the twentieth century planning policies had been threatening city centers. They recommended a “reversal of present, largely unplanned decentralisation trends by injecting new centres strategically placed” to attract sprawl and to rehabilitate existing centers.259 The “utopian” schemes of early twentieth century had to be abandoned, since it was impossible to create “a definable and controllable “balanced community” that can be accommodated within an architectural unity expressed in the form of a new town.”

The choice of location for Civilia followed environmental concerns and the city was proposed for a site near North Nuneaton on old quarries260 (Figure 1.26). The site was found remarkable for the “picturesque visual drama,” due to abrupt level changes and the exposed rock surfaces of the quarry, as well as its central location in terms of sprawl. It offered a fantastic opportunity for Hastings to realize his dream: The city would direct technology for the benefit of the environment by healing a scar of brownfields and try to

258 The planners are listed as Rodney Carran (DipTP, AMTP) and Michael Rowley (AADip, ARIBA).
259 Ibid, p. 27.
260 In addition to Sylvia Crowe’s studies see “Landscape” by Betsy Spence to see the origins of Civilia in Johannesburg’s mine dumps in a similar proposal that aims to create sublime artificial landscapes as a background for new settlements from the abandoned mines.
create a better city by solving the problems of earlier urban developments. The romantic
dream to be at peace with nature entailed its healing as well. Instead of Gordon Cullen's
sketches Civilia was represented via photomontage images that brought together
photographs from Hastings’s 1963 book “The Italian Townscape” and of well-known
projects from the pages of AR such as Moshe Safdie's Habitat, the viewing platforms of
the South Bank exhibition and Paul Rudolph's Yale School of Architecture. The quality
of the environment in these images, Hastings hoped, would stimulate a desire in people to
move to Civilia. The imagery was aimed to recreate the promised urban experience for
the future inhabitants (Figures 1.27, 1.28, 1.29, 1.30)

While Civilia, like AR's other campaigns, owed its power to the visual content that
accompanied its provocative texts, this visual language also proved to be its ultimate
weakness. Although the texts hypothesized that it was well beyond possible, it still did
not have a plan, an analysis of its material necessities, the types of industries it could
support or the urban problems it would create a solution for, other than the existing
sprawl. Its final image implied a total control of form contradicting its first principle, user
participation. It was a romantic utopia with an anti-utopian aim, but it ended up being not
less “authoritarian” than the Ville Radieuse of Le Corbusier, which Hastings attacked
since the inception of Townscape in 1949.
Figure 1.26 “Before and after” in Ivor de Wolfe, Civilia (London: Architectural Press, 1971), p. 51
Civilia was announced by a press release and got mixed reviews from the newspapers exciting as much curiosity as well as disbelief.\textsuperscript{261} The Architects' Journal.

\textsuperscript{261} Hastings kept several newspaper cuts such as Building Exhibition of the Daily News of Monday, 22 November 1971, that was an approving article of the attempt or The Shropshire Star of Thursday June 10, 1971. The review published in Building Design June 11, 1971 was not very favorable. The Evening Tribune featured it two days in a row in articles titled “A New Nuneaton—or just a planners dream?” June 7, 1971 which questioned the possibility while in “Merely a Dream” June 8, 1971 added that Civilia did not have a chance to be funded. The Daily Mail article “A Monte Carlo on pit slag heap” by Rodney Tyler June 7, 1971 was enthusiastic and said “it is a pity that it does not exist.” The Birmingham Post on May 26, 1971 added that actually West European Building Corporation was planning a town in the area (Catthorpe Manor, Rugby) and Civilia was totally unaware of the development. Coventry Evening Telegraph, of June 7, 1971 called it an “Exotic city dream for slagheaps,” the Leicester Mercury June 7, 1971 “A citadel upon a spoil-tip,” The Guardian June 7, 1971 “Civilia-city built on a coalfield,” Evening Post “The Space-age city... where pleasure is the key and pedestrians walk in peace” June 7, 1971, and the Guardian Journal June 7, 1971 “His two-tier dream city would be built on rubbish tips.” BBC-4 did a feature article on Civilia, which, according to her daughter, Hastings did not bother to watch. Nuneaton Observer, June 10, 1971 asked “Is this Nuneaton of the future?” and added that “it wil be a city to be proud of.” Coventry Evening Telegraph, June 7, 1971 called it “Castles in the air...” It accused the authors of “ignorance for the area they are catering...They obviously have not studied the very type of people for which they claim to have provided Civilia... never a mention of who is going to pay...” It was also published in the East Anglian Daily Times June 7, 1971 “Rubbish tip city proposal.” On June 20, 1971 the Bucks Standard editorial stated: “give us concrete attempts like Milton Keynes and Northampton New City.”
AR's sister journal, published a commentary entitled “Civilia: The Professionals Comment” on June 30, 1971. Most of the critics pointed out that in order for Civilia to become a convincing proposal at all, it had to establish its full social and financial implications and an acceptance from the public. Architect and planner Tom Hancock, the author of Peterborough's master plan, stated that if the authors of Civilia wanted social reform they should “describe a new city, an alternative city and by describing, imply a new society, an alternative society.” Perhaps in response to Hastings entitled his book “The Alternative Society: Software for the Eighties” (1980). As I have already mentioned the book was his last project, where he aimed to publicize the social and cultural project that underlined his lifelong effort via the campaigns in the AR.

![Figure 1.27 “Cliffhanging,” p. 113 from Civilia](image1)

![Figure 1.29 “Pop End” (p. 77) from Civilia](image2)

262 Peter Cook called it a “paste job” while Frederic Osborn referred to it as “an odious damned lie.”
PART 2

“HUMANIZING” MODERN ARCHITECTURE:

CULTURE AND THE CALL FOR ANONYMITY
Introduction to Part 2:  
The Post War Trajectory of Modern Architecture

What can the architectural historian give the architect? My answer is above all a sense of continuity. He can show how worthwhile people handled the problems they were faced with. He can also show how within one civilization ideas seize people and propel them. This applies to all history.263

Nikolaus Pevsner, RIBA Gold Medal Address, 20 June 1967

The first part of this study might give the impression that “The Architectural Review” was a fierce campaigner for the city and the environment only. It was more than that. The thematic division of the text is consciously and inevitably artificial since the discussions that concerned the role of architecture took place simultaneously with the environmental campaigns. My division hence stems from the intention to show how these thematic agendas persisted in the quarter century that the editorial board remained more or less unchanged, as well as from disciplinary divisions that shape those polemics. Hastings’s neo-romantic interests and control over the editorial board, and the visibility of AR’s campaigns for the environment overshadows the journal’s significant formative role in architectural polemics.

The desire that AR expressed for cultural continuity necessitated parallel policies pertaining to the role of architecture within the environmental framework. For the board, the built environment was the main bearer of cultural continuity, within which architecture and city planning played a mutually sustaining and complementary role. If “Townscape” provided the principles for urban design intended to preserve and redevelop cities in tandem with a concern for the rural landscape, architecture’s duty was to provide the elements that would fit in this configuration. While the city would be altered in the course of a piecemeal change, its architecture was supposed to prevent the alienation of its inhabitants.

Hence, the editors defined “a field of expansion” for modern architecture in 1947. With this expansion they meant to overcome the limited presence of modern architecture in the built environment as well as to enlarge its respective audience. Such an expansion was based on an evaluation of modern architecture’s achievements in the previous two decades, during which it had become “established,” as well as a revision of its theoretical background. The Review attempted to redefine modern architecture’s priorities; and anonymity was given a central role for the future of architecture. Modern architecture’s insistence on novelty via the use of new technology and materials would be partially suppressed for the sake of promoting anonymity in this program.

Figure 2.1 “The Architectural Review outlines a further act for the main plot “The Second Half Century”

AR January 1947

In “The Second Half Century,” much to the surprise of the younger generation returning from the war, AR declared an end to the revolutionary phase of modern architecture. (Figure 2.1) The aesthetic vocabulary that came to characterize the 1920s’ and 1930s’ modern architecture—white surfaces, flat roofs, and the strip window etc. which was characterized as part of the vocabulary of “The International Style” by Hitchcock and Johnson in 1932—was not to continue unchanged. The elements of this

---

264 A summary of these objectives were given under the title “The Architectural Review Outlines A Further Act For The Main Plot” in “The Second Half Century” AR January 1947, vol. 101, p. 36.
“limited” vocabulary were deemed transitional symbols of “the revolt against the fancy
dress styles” of the past. The editors demanded that functionalism should advance
unrestrained by this aesthetic, but not compromise modern architecture’s alignment with
contemporary technical developments. What had started as a “revolt” was now to develop
into, and continue as a “regime,” uninhibited by the codification of the International
Style. This intention was manifested in the form of short term and long term objectives
for the future of architecture. The long term objective was to reform planning and to
establish townscape as a discipline, as discussed in Part 1, whereas the short term
objective was to “humanize” modern architecture, the main discussion that will occupy
Part 2:

After the Act of Revolution, therefore—which is largely iconoclastic in
caracter—comes the process of building anew... The obvious short term
objective must consist in getting back some of the scope and richness that the Act
of Revolution discarded. Architecture has had for the time being deliberately to
dehumanize itself, but the success of the Revolution and the subsequent
consolidating period of functionalism means [Sic] that it can now seek more
direct contact with human aspirations without compromising any of its
principles.... A short term objective must involve new richness and differentiation
of character, the pursuit of difference rather than sameness, the re-emergence of
monumentality, the cultivation of idiosyncrasy, and the development of these
regional dissimilarities that people have always taken a pride in.266

The editors argued that the “first accent on the aesthetic” had to be side-stepped for
modern architecture to develop a comprehensive vocabulary, and that modern
architecture had to come into contact with “non-eclectic” architectures wherever an
alliance of principles could be established. Another AR slogan came to life in a clever
unification of concepts. “The Second Half Century” asserted that such architecture
existed in the form of a “functional tradition.”267 Tradition and functionalism would be
put into dialogue to define an emerging vernacular, as part of AR’s attempt to argue for

265 The editors pointed out that this aesthetic represented only one vision out of many that modern
architecture developed: “The flat roof, the long window-bands, the glass-cage staircases and all the motifs
of architectural cubism in terms of walls and openings were developed before functionalism became the
slogan. The first accent, therefore, was on the aesthetic rather than the utilitarian, but the seed was there,
and functionalism was soon to come into its own and to make a regime out of a revolt...” See “The Second
266 “The Architectural Review outlines a further act for the main plot” Ibid, p. 36.
the existence of a continuing architectural tradition and its enduring principles. The "functional tradition" would also enable an approach to popular art and architecture, "popular" comprising both anonymous vernaculars as well as the so-called "spec-build"—the architecture of the speculative builder. It would expand the "casebook" of precedents that modern architecture could turn to, in order to enrich its aesthetic dimension. For AR popular art and vernacular architecture, over which the community of architects had no control, was an indispensable portion of the total environment. The inquiry into visual culture as a whole obliged the embrace of high art as well as the popular, and the periodical took it as its mission to put them into communication.

The editors also maintained that AR's support for modern architecture did not mean a total rejection of history in art and architecture, as the politics of the avant-garde would suggest. History could be admired in an "instructive" instead of an "evocative" mode. By the "evocative" appreciation of history the editors meant the historicist and formally eclectic use of history that prevailed in the nineteenth century, whereas by the "instructive" they pointed to an analytical appreciation of history in terms of principles. Modern architects had to develop a new consciousness towards the history of architecture in order to embrace the past and to enhance the present and the future of modern architecture.

Thus, the campaign for "visual education" would proceed from a reappraisal of the "functional tradition" and a selective attitude towards forms of popular art, design and architecture. This reappraisal would reflect on the agenda to "humanize" modern architecture. The idea of humanization had already been in architectural discourse till the early 1940s, especially after Alvar Aalto's article, entitled "The Humanizing of Architecture" was published in Architectural Forum.268

AR aimed to instill a new discipline in the citizen via visual education in order to build anew, but also to sustain an existing "visual culture."269 The second part of the

---

269 "Let it therefore be boldly stated that the REVIEW has a "call," a call of quite a low-class, evangelical kind. It does not set out to lead a political or moral or even a social revolution... The REVIEW has another job to do... which may be described by the words, visual re-education... But the particular purpose a magazine can serve is to isolate specific targets for attack, and it is the REVIEW's function to emphasize the problems s and potentialities of visual design, to re-create a visual culture, which will help to re-create civilization." ibid. p. 23.
thesis examines how this “call of quite a low-class, evangelical kind,” as AR stated it, was transformed into architectural polemics. It analyzes the pedagogy of this visual education in terms of political ideologies, formations of intellectual identity and art historical methodology. The discussion is organized in two parts. The first part investigates how Pevsner’s historiography comes into contact with the British cultural context and how Pevsner explores the possibility of modern architecture as a universal paradigm that alters when it encounters local cultures. The second part explores AR’s impact on architectural polemics through this project of humanization by focusing on the role of anonymity and disciplinary continuity in order to support cultural continuity, especially against the politics of the avant-garde and the rising consumer culture.
Chapter A: Paternalism, Historiography and Visual Education

A1. Liberal Paternalism Meets Kunstgeographie:

From the second half of the nineteenth century cultural identity was a serious matter of debate in the course of Britain’s modernization. The effects of the Industrial Revolution on British society stimulated several authors to struggle with the forces of modernity and to fashion cultural identity in the service of that struggle. It is impossible to bracket the discourse of “Englishness” to a certain form of resistance or to an attempt to reconcile assumed cultural values to those that were in emergence as a result of modernity. However, the debate can be enriched by a critical contextualization of actors that took part in the mobilization of Englishness. AR’s campaign for cultural continuity is situated within a historical context in which several groups laid claims to the definition of cultural identity in Britain. The periodical became one focus among many that attempted to affect the development of British visual culture. During the war and after, the editorial board of AR believed that channeling the forces of cultural identity under the rubric of Englishness could help overcome the destructive forces of modernity.

After the war the perception of AR’s identity was altered. Although AR was regarded as the “mouthpiece of the Modern Movement” in the 1930s, it gradually came to be seen as an impediment to the progress of modern architecture by the Smithsons in the 1950s, Archigram in the 1960s and “their” number one historian, Reyner Banham especially at the time when New Brutalism achieved its power. This perception


271 In the course of this struggle “Englishness” emerged in the contradictory forms of progressivism, resistance, reconciliation or outright rejection both in the work of conservative writers as well as the work of modernists. As Corbett, Holt and Russell state “For the most radical thinkers of the period, the question was how to be both modern and English, local and international, informed by the past and open to the future.” Ibid.

272 Banham would later change his views partially as one can see from “The Revenge of the Picturesque” and the book version of “The New Brutalism.”
stemmed more from the neo-avantgarde’s own desire for self-identification more than a fundamental shift in AR’s position. From the very beginning of AR’s advocacy for the Modern Movement in the 1930s, AR’s editors were concerned by the need to preserve cultural particularities of both “common culture” and “high culture.”

In my view, this commitment can be seen as part of a liberal paternalism in British culture that reached back to 1850s, and changed attitude after the second half of the 1950s. Examining the relationship between cultural identity and the study of politics, Julia Stapleton maintains that from the first half of the nineteenth century until the late 1950s, a tradition of “positive engagement with nationhood” existed among intellectuals. This engagement assumed that scholarship could provide a nationally and culturally uplifting influence. As we have seen in Hastings’s attempt in the first part of this study, and as we will see in the case of Nikolaus Pevsner, many intellectuals believed that scholarship had to be disseminated down the ladder of social class instead of being monopolized by the elite. Such engagement with the public aimed to ensure national unity and integrity against the divisive influence of class conflict during the transformation from empire to the British Commonwealth when the ideals of empire were regarded as ecumenical and its heritage as shared. Political thought and public values were increasingly shaped by a growing concern about “English character” by “establishmentarian” intellectuals.

From the early forties to the late fifties Ernest Barker rose to becoming the main spokesman of English character, with the support of historians A. L. Rowse and G. M. Trevelyan, who promoted Whig history and paternal liberalism. These thinkers opposed a slide towards social engineering especially against the growing power of the State and its centralized power apparatuses during the reign of the Labor party. Their opposition to the emerging trend of specialization, regarding it insensitive “to existing political and cultural traditions and political insights afforded by classical learning,” resulted in a certain brand of anti-intellectualism. This interest in “serving the nation” was not limited to so-called “conservative liberals” such as the names mentioned above. After the war, intellectuals from the emerging New Left engaged in a debate that addressed

274 Ibid, p. 119.
questions of cultural particularity in order to define a specific socialist, or social
democratic, program of cultural development. The works of Edward Palmer Thompson,
Raymond Williams or the more preservationist Richard Hoggart can be remembered here
as part of the early New Left’s intellectual efforts. By the surging wave of the younger
New Left in the 1960s and a turn towards continental models of Marxist theory, the early
New Left’s attempt to situate cultural dynamics of British history with respect to the rest
of Europe was deemed “British exceptionalism.”

From the 1930s onward, the BBC became the major instrument in the
dissemination of the ideals of Englishness by a young middle class administration that
mimicked nineteenth century liberal thinkers and opinion formers in a similarly paternal
attitude. Single-handedly supplying an alternative to the cinema and the popular press,
the BBC became a collective focus that “sought to enlighten and improve the visual
literacy of the public.” The middle class elite who ran the BBC assumed that their
aesthetic preferences would appeal universally. Reinforced with its periodical “The
Listener,” the BBC followed a policy that emphasized “access to culture rather than free
choice” to influence its listeners’ aesthetic preferences without resorting to “popular
taste” under John Reith’s directorship. A major turning point in British culture was
reached with the disillusionment of the Suez crisis and the Soviet invasion of Hungary
both on the left and the right. The 1930s pedagogy which was continued well into the late
1950s started to change and popular culture gradually acquired more weight in BBC’s
broadcasts. The disengagement of the intellectual from the Victorian idea of public
service and from the service of the nationhood was completed by the late 1950s when
Britain’s larger global role ended. After 1956 intellectuals started to take an “iconoclastic
and oppositional role rather than the establishment mode” they had been in previously.

Both of AR’s editors, J. M. Richards and Nikolaus Pevsner, were recruited by the
BBC along with state bodies such as the Arts Council or the Council for Visual
Education. In close contact with policy makers, the editors stayed close to institutions

275 See D. L. LeMahieu, A Culture for Democracy: Mass Communication and the Cultivated Mind in
276 Andrew Causey’s “English Art and The National Character, ’1933-34,” (in Geographies of Englishness :
Landscape and the National Past 1880-1940, ed. David Peters Corbett, Ysanne Holt and Fiona Russell,
(New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2002)) has a comprehensive list of talks and publication in
the 1930s that dealt with English character, and cultural identity.
which aimed to influence the run of culture in Great Britain and to a certain degree the Commonwealth. Pevsner appeared on numerous radio talks including those of the “Third Programme,” which aimed to “uplift the taste of the British public.” Richards also took part in BBC’s effort in a program called “The Critics.” Beginning in 1948 and continuing for twenty years as art critic, he introduced architectural debates to the public. A year earlier he had started writing for “The Times.” Richards remained the paper’s architectural correspondent until 1971 “to teach the public what architects could do,” as he put it in his memoirs.

In the early postwar period when the Review was attempting to define a field of expansion for modern architecture along with the environmental campaign, the three editors took different but complementary roles. On the humanization of modern architecture, Jim Richards brought most of the theoretical debates into the Review, while Pevsner was highly instrumental to ground it with a convincing historiography. The campaign for the “functional tradition” was intimately linked to the ideals of early postwar social realism and to the campaign for Townscape. Although he did not directly contribute to its specific polemics as author, Hastings gave his support. Due to his belief in an emerging anonymity as the principal ideal of the Modern Movement, Pevsner joined Richards’s attempt to forge a “collective unconscious” for architecture. This chapter will mainly examine Nikolaus Pevsner’s contribution to AR’s program in conceptualizing the role of anonymity and local particularities for cultural continuity.

277 The radio talks given by Pevsner, including the Reith lectures were recently edited by Stephen Games. The whole list of talks given by Pevsner at the BBC can be found in Nikolaus Pevsner, Pevsner on Art and Architecture: Radio Talks, ed. Stephen Games, (London: Methuen Publishing Limited, 2002).
279 Thanks to Karen White, BBC Archivist, I was provided an index of Richards’s talks by the BBC Written Archives.
From the beginning of the 1940s and to the late 1950s, AR’s own cultural program partially employed the histories drawn by the paternal liberal vein of thought. What has been overlooked by many scholars is that the liberal paternalism in British intellectual culture is as tightly interwoven into Pevsner’s work as the well-researched formative influences, such as the role of Kunstgeographie and the influence of Wilhelm Pinder as a popularizer of local cultures, and his emphasis on the political commitment of the art historian.  

When he joined the AR in 1941, Pevsner had worked on the idea of Englishness for eight years. In his first visit as a scholar in 1933 Pevsner was asked to give a lecture at University College for the Royal Academy Exhibition entitled “English Art from a Foreigner’s Point of View.” His interest did not diminish, nor did his methodology alter drastically in a time of over four decades—although it went out of favor—the last of his printed lectures being “Ruskin and Viollet-le Duc: Englishness and Frenchness in the appreciation of Gothic Architecture” published as part of the Walter Neurath memorial lectures in 1969. Pevsner developed this theme into a series of lectures given in 1941 and 1942 in Birkbeck College, London. He continued working on these lectures and transformed them into radio talks aired on the BBC in the fall of 1955, which were entitled “The Reith Lectures.” These were published as “The Englishness of English Art” by the Architectural Press in 1956. Pevsner dedicated the book to “H. de C.”—that is Hubert de Cronin Hastings—to mark his appreciation to the “self-effacing genius” of Hastings. Hastings’s interest in the book, as well as Pevsner’s dedication is further

---

281 Both in Marlite Halbertsma’s as well as William Vaughan’s work, which I will refer to, this immediate contextual referent is overlooked. The formative influence is thought of as coming directly and only from Pevsner’s educational background and methodology.

282 Causey, “English Art and...” op. cit. The year Pevsner gave his talk Arthur Bryant’s talks titled “The National Character” was being aired on the BBC.


284 The Reith lectures were aired every Sunday starting on October 30th and ending on November 27, 1955. The radio talks given by Pevsner, including the Reith lectures were recently edited by Stephen Games. See Nikolaus Pevsner, Pevsner on Art and Architecture: Radio Talks, ed. Stephen Games, (London: Methuen Publishing Limited, 2002).
evidence of how important the arguments in "The Englishness of English Art" put forward had been for AR.

Pevsner's early interest in "national characteristics" largely stemmed from his art history education in Leipzig under the tutelage of Wilhelm Pinder (1878-1947). Pinder was a doctoral student of August Schmarsow having studied under him in Leipzig. His career reached its peak when became professor at Munich in 1927. Later he was transferred to Berlin by the Nazis in 1935. He was loyal to the Nazis, giving a speech in favor of Hitler at a rally in Leipzig and writing a eulogy on occasion of Hitler's fiftieth birthday in 1939. Pinder was dismissed from his post by the Russians in 1945, was imprisoned by the British in 1946 and died in prison. 285

In her article "Nikolaus Pevsner and the end of a tradition: The legacy of Wilhelm Pinder" Marlite Halbertsma identifies Pevsner as "a transitional figure from the heavily theoretical art history practised in antebellum Germany to the animosity towards theory that dominated the immediate post-war period in art history." 286 Pevsner not only adopted Pinder's methodology, but was also highly influenced by his mentor's personality as a "tireless popularizer driven by a cultural and political commitment." 287 He sympathized with the paternalist socialism of Labor—mostly due to his belief in William Morris's ideals—and the idea of the Victorian elite dedicated to public service. Halbertsma emphasizes that Pinder was motivated by a desire to give "German art the place it deserved alongside French and Italian art." 288 In the 1930s when the Nazis spurned modern art, Pinder aimed to convince the Germans that a new German style was emerging from the Bauhaus. Due to his commitment to the ideals of the Third Reich, Pinder would later go on to argue the supremacy of German art over other countries. However, the dose of Kunstgeographie in Pinder's methodology would transform into a belief in cultural relativism in Pevsner's work. What is important for this study is that Kunstgeographie was not only the foundation of his effort to argue for the significance of

286 See Halbertsma, p. 109. Pevsner acknowledged his debt to his teacher in his dedication of the "Outline of European Architecture" (1942)—to W. P.—as well as in the RIBA Gold medal award ceremony speech on June 20, 1967 and finally in the bibliography of his work published by the American Association of Architectural Bibliographers (1970).
“English” art against prevailing continental developments such as Cubism. Kunstgeographie also grounded his warning against the proliferation of a formulaic International Style and consequently AR’s later campaign to open separate channels for modern architecture to follow.

Pinder conceived of art history as having autonomous cyclical developments of thirty years in which a new generation would challenge the previous generation. Change would take shape with reference to “harmony with the existing and its rejection” while “national, tribal, regional, family and individual characters” would remain constant factors in the formation of art.289 According to Halbertsma, Pevsner adopted from Pinder “an ideal-type method, in which the formal analysis of individual works of art leads to the extraction of general stylistic characteristics for a period and/or a geographical unit. These stylistic characteristics serve as instruments for determining the physical attitude of the country.”290 However this explanation is still not convincing when it comes to defining “national character,” and that is one reason why Pevsner must have felt the need to apply to other histories for deriving such characteristics.

Research on Pevsner’s art historical methodology focuses on Pevsner’s alleged reading of opposition to modernity as an attribute of Englishness.291 However, when it comes to the history of modern architecture, his interest in “national characteristics” is overlooked to establish his role in the writing of the canonical histories of modern architecture.292 There is a contradiction in this attempt to detach nationalism from modernity and the characterization of modern architecture as an international phenomenon. Due to Kunstgeographie, Pevsner had built Englishness and national identity into his early work on the Modern Movement—i.e. “Pioneers.” Hence the three

289 Halbertsma insists that for Pinder “Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte” analyzed the “history of the psyche of the age” instead of the “zeitgeist” in all its Hegelian connotations. Halbertsma, p. 108 Stephen Games also notes that “art history combined a classical training in the idealization of form with an interest in art as a reflection of Volksgeist or national character.” See Games’s introduction to the radio talks, p. xvii.
290 Halbertsma, p. 108.
292 For instance see Panayotis Tournikiotis, The Historiography of Modern Architecture (The MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, 1999.)
major figures of the editorial board were united on AR’s cultural program: Pevsner’s concerns for regional variations of an international “style” overlapped with Jim Richards’s concerns for culture and anonymity and with Hastings’s concern for giving England the lead in the debates on urban design by making cultural particularity the point of departure. The postwar development of modern architecture was expected to take shape in the way Pevsner’s historiography foresaw cultural progress and the development of art. In the long course of his acculturation Pevsner was more and more convinced that continuity and a gradual assimilation of change was healthier than radical breaks with the past.293

These points can be demonstrated by further reference to Pevsner’s work. In the “Pioneers” one of Pevsner’s main concerns was to define the artists’ role with reference to cannon, the proliferation of which established cultural unity. Pevsner regarded Morris as the first pioneer, since he was the first to advocate a social idealism with the claim that “all was craft” in order to secure art from the grip of the romantic artist. He rebuked the romantic artist disconnected from the society and consequently its twentieth century progeny, the avant-garde, that arrogated to himself the leadership of society. In talking about the conflict between van de Velde and Muthesius on “Typisierung” Pevsner asked:

...the buildings in the same Cologne Exhibition... proved impressively that the future belonged to Muthesius’s and not to van de Velde’s ideas. Besides which would a Gothic builder or a Greek sculptor have chosen, individual freedom or the cannon? ...Today the new style—international though as clearly divided into national modes as was Romanesque or Gothic art—flourishes in all artistically creative countries of European civilization.294

Pevsner called the artist to humility with reference to a canon or style and to obedience to standards in order to partake in the sustaining of cultural continuity. The “new style” demonstrated a unity of principles for artists to follow; it would start to diversify by coming into contact with regional characteristics. For instance, in evaluating Joseff

293 In his RIBA medal address Pevsner noted what the historian can give the architect is a sense of continuity and a sense of the unique. “What can the architectural historian give the architect? My answer is above all a sense of continuity. He can show how worthwhile people handled the problems they were faced with. He can also show how within one civilization ideas seize people and propel them. This applies to all history.”

Hoffmann’s “Convalescent Home in Purkersdorf (1903-1904) Pevsner directed attention to the combination of international and local characteristics:

International as these motives are, local peculiarities are clearly visible in the brisk rhythm of the small window panes... The art historian has to watch national as well as personal qualities. Only the interaction of these with the spirit of an age produces the complete picture of the art of any epoch, as we see it.295

According to Pevsner, on account of the same reason England let go of the leadership of the Modern Movement: the interaction of the spirit of the age and national and individual peculiarities. In my view, Pevsner did not see Englishness in direct opposition to modernity. For Pevsner the artistic products of English modernity would emerge out of a negotiation with tradition since Englishness usually opted for reconciliation instead of a drastic break with tradition.296 For instance, Pevsner found C. F. A. Voysey “unconsciously progressive,” that is, Voysey worked within a canon; he expanded it but did not step totally out of its limits.297 In obeying the rules of tradition Voysey did not deliberately seek novelty as the avant-garde modernist would do, but developed variations in certain elements; such as preserving the overall appearance of the cottage while improving it in plan, reducing ornament and increasing planar surfaces, enhancing the qualities of light in the inner space as well as simplifying details.

In another instance, Pevsner asserted that schemes of town planning as part of public reform emerged earlier in England and “remained confined to England well over a decade” before other countries took the lead in Europe. He believed that due to the structure of liberal democracy and the Victorian idea of public service, it was independent benevolent institutions and private enterprise that led such schemes instead of local or public authorities. In countries where centralized administrative powers reigned over the production of architecture and urban design the impact of modernity was more visible than it was in England. During the 1950s Pevsner would reflect similarly on

295 Ibid. p.188
296 “It seems very understandable that England led the growing Modern Movement as long as it implied a revival of wholesome traditions.” Ibid. p. 63, also see p. 141, where Pevsner talked about painting and the lack of desire in England of a “deliberate break with tradition.”
297 “...indeed we have only to look at one of Voysey’s wallpapers printed in the nineties to see the great difference between him and Morris. Not that he aimed at novelty; his modifications and progressiveness, it would seem, were almost unconscious.” Ibid. p. 141.
the Welfare State’s housing policies and planning debates via his articles published in *AR*.

1.6 The State and Service, The Genius vs. The Avant-garde:

b.i Endorsing the Welfare State:

In 1946, the first year of Labor Party’s postwar government, Pevsner elaborated on the role of the state, art and the artist for the common good of the society with a talk on the BBC.\(^{298}\) The duties that he imparted to art, the artist and the State were very much in agreement with the social ideals of the Welfare State.\(^{299}\) The principles that Pevsner stated in this talk also paralleled *AR*’s campaign to define a new regime for modern architecture in which the project of the avant-garde was understood as consolidated.

Pevsner started his talk with an anecdote, which mentioned the architect’s problem of professional identity with respect to that of the artist. The architect in Pevsner’s story complained that in contrast to the artist he had to compromise the integrity of his design ideals by bowing to the demands of local committees. He envied the artist due to his “ideal existence,” meaning his detachment from clients. Pevsner questioned the architect’s assumption whether the “[artist’s] freedom or the architect’s service [was] really the healthier state of affairs.”\(^{300}\) He added that, in his day, it was not clear whether every artist’s work would actually reach a larger audience. The art work might even be condemned to a basement, whereas the building would be there for years till demolition.

The difficulty of art in reaching the public for Pevsner was “a most unhealthy state of affairs.” He compared this state to the Middle Ages when the Church, as the main

\(^{298}\) Nikolaus Pevsner “Art for Everyone: Art and the State” 16-18-19 June 1946. The producer was Noni Wright. The talk was aired on Pacific Service, African Service and North American service respectively. This talk, curiously enough, was not included in the volume compiled and edited by Stephen Games. A copy of the script was provided to me by the BBC Written Archives. In the introduction to his book, Games argues that Pevsner remained a clandestine Nazi, repressing his sympathies in England. I will not go into this debate since it falls outside the scope of my thesis. I believe Pevsner’s position is a lot more complicated then how Games portrays it due to the changes in history and their direct impact on his life.

\(^{299}\) For more details of the art support system in the early postwar period see Chapter 2 titled “The Art Support System” by Margaret Garlake, *New Art, New World: British Art In Postwar Society* (New Haven: Published for Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 1998).

\(^{300}\) Pevsner “Art for Everyone...” Ibid. p. 1.
patron of arts, guaranteed the reach of art to the public. The Church, in his view, stimulated the appreciation of art as a cultural medium with the churches functioning as public meeting places and “even places of entertainment and business.” Pevsner argued that, in the twentieth century, “the State, town councils and semi-public bodies” had to assume a similar role in order to provide patronage and institutional settings, and to facilitate a similar form of communication between the artist and the public. The emerging social centers in Britain were supposed to assume some of these functions.

There were signs of State patronage that Pevsner found promising to fill this gap in a balanced way. Clearly Pevsner saw the State’s benevolent intentions instead of its hegemonic face. The State could wed the Morrisian principle of “art for everyone by everyone” with concerns for visual education. The former wartime Council of Encouragement for Music and the Arts, now named The Arts Council, was providing visual education via exhibitions that took modern art to smaller towns, and had lately announced plans of building art centers. At the same time the Ministry of Food’s British Restaurants—the inexpensive restaurants that the Ministry and local councils had established around the country—provided artwork on display not necessarily acquired from first-rate artists but from local artists or art students. For Pevsner, this stimulated interest in the local people for whom the artwork was intended to serve, and supplied patronage for young and local artists; hence establishing a social role for art in these communities. At the same time that this talk was broadcasted, the Council for Visual education published Pevsner’s pamphlet “Visual Pleasures on Everyday Things” with an introduction by Herbert Read, who, at this time, was the vice president of the council.

---

302 “[In the British restaurants] an art adviser arranged for wall paintings—not everywhere, but in a number of them. They were not necessarily by first rate artists, but rather by students of local art schools, or a team happening to be working on, say, camouflage, in the neighborhood. The terms of reference were work of a light-hearted, not too permanent character, pleasant to look at perhaps connected with the history or the lore of the town. The quality of at least the best work was excellent, and has been thoroughly enjoyed by those for whom it was done...” ibid., p. 4
303 Herbert Read was (1893-1968) one the foremost critics of his time that supported an idiosyncratic agenda for the promotion of modern art. His writing covered society, art, and literature from his own anarchist point of view. Read wrote articles for AR probably via the solicitation of Richards and Pevsner. Richards and Read took part in the founding of the Institute for Contemporary Art. For more on Read, see James King, The Last Modern: A Life of Herbert Read, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1990) and, David Goodway, ed., Herbert Read Reassessed, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1998).
The pamphlet was aimed as part of a series of pamphlets to educate the public in issues of
design as well as in issues of taste by the Labor government. 304

Pevsner also recalled the earlier wartime projects for encouraging the arts—such
as the “Recording Britain scheme” by the Pilgrim Trust in the United States or the War
Artists’ Committee—and praised these schemes for the amount of freedom granted to the
artists, allowing them to pursue their individual preferences, although conceived within
an overarching theme. It is not my intention here to criticize the idea of State patronage,
but to expose how Pevsner understood its value with reference to the role of art in society
and how his views mirror AR’s cultural program in the early postwar period. The main
role of the State and local government was to facilitate the artist’s contact with the
community and to enhance the daily visual experience of the citizens. Pevsner closed his
talk by going back to the doubts of the architect and by linking the question of the
“genius” to that of the connection of art to the society:

Can the public en masse ever understand the genius, the daring explorer? ...Cast
your net as wide as you possibly can, and make it as firm as you can, the genius
will always slip through the meshes. He must live and work as his daemon tells
him... But let me add this: it would be untrue to pretend only the highest genius is
worth having, and all other art of no importance. What we need is an infinitely
closer relationship of art with life, of artist with society, and of the individual man-
in-the-street with the individual work of art-in-the-street. My plea for that is in no
way invalidated by whatever reaction it may find with the true Michaelangelos of
today, if there are any. 305

For Pevsner the genius was exceptional, able to overcome obstacles of patronage
or the conditions of the market by the power of his art work. An earlier article published
in 1934 reveals that Pevsner’s ideas on the romantic artist and the role of the artist in
society had remained very much unchanged between his early work and his radio talk in
1946. Pevsner published an article in 1934 in “Der Türmer,” known to be sympathetic to
the national socialists, with the same title of his 1946 BBC talk, “Kunst und Staat.” 306
His rhetoric in the 1934 article fluctuated between a tone sympathetic to the Third Reich

304 Nikolaus Pevsner “Visual Pleasures From Everyday Things: An Attempt To Establish Criteria By
Which The Aesthetic Qualities Of Design Can Be Judged” (London: B. T. Batsford, ltd., (Published for
305 Pevsner “Art and the State” p. 6.
306 I am thankful to Susie Harries, who was working on the biography of Nikolaus Pevsner at the time this
text was written, for providing a translation of this article to me made by Rose Knowles.
and that of a negotiator for the artists excommunicated by the Third Reich. The ideological underpinnings of “Kunst und Staat” were abandoned in the 1946 BBC talk, but the historical analysis and the social ideals that determined Pevsner’s position is basically similar.

The article aimed to establish the relationship of art to the “liberal” state—Pevsner probably expected of the Third Reich to be a liberal state. In a historical preamble, Pevsner contrasted the absolutist French state to that of the “bourgeois Dutch republic” to clarify how the nineteenth century German Romantic artist emerged and became an epitome of the future “western” artist. Art was produced and consumed under two opposing conditions since the medieval times. In the courtly art and design of Louis XIV there was strict control over style and over the education of the artist in order to propagate stately ideals and in order to provide economical protection. In the 17th century art of Holland, however, the market of buyers from different classes and tastes were catered by an “artist proletariat.” Pevsner argued that this market-oriented art scene prevailed after the dissolution of the absolutist states via bourgeois liberalism, leading to the destruction of “all roots” and the alleged organic link between medieval society and art. As a result art assumed an autonomy that discontinued any commitment to the state or the society as well as its own traditional forms in the nineteenth century. Here is how, according to Pevsner, the persona of the romantic artist was constructed:

Now, especially through Schiller, art becomes the highest ideal; the artist is graced by God; the dignity of man has been placed in his hands. The equal of the King, he walks on the summits of mankind; no one knows as well as he does how to educate and how to ennoble. Art is to bring about the ethical state of the future, but not to submit to any existing state or any state possible in the present. For the state as it is can bar art from its proper province, but cannot rule in it. In this way the holy autonomy of art is founded, and its supremacy over state and society proclaimed. The consequence is that it is no longer natural, as it once was, for the artist to acknowledge the demands of the state or of the public...

The autonomy of artists and the authority conferred upon them promoted “extreme individualism,” while crafts lost importance and art became marginalized into the domain of the “creative arts.” For Pevsner such individualism was an unfortunate turn of history that would later bring about its own cycle of “healthy” reaction, especially in the Arts and

---

Crafts movement, and in the development of functionalism. Pevsner understood and explained functionalism to have two distinct purposes: "material" vs. "ideal." There was a utilitarian aspect to functionalism—which determined for example, the form of a kitchen utensil or the plan of a house—and a communicative aspect that conveyed meaning, both being responses to different demands:

Art is once again to be functional, as it was throughout the Middle Ages and the Baroque era.... For the ‘functional’ is not only the fork, the cushion and the house but also the historical and social novel, the altar picture, the didactic painting. It is simply that in the former case we are dealing with material purpose; in the latter we deal with ideal purpose. No one can deny the fitness for purpose of the carved altarpieces of the later Middle Ages... Today without question political ideas, giving political ideas, giving ‘political’ its widest meaning, are prominent. The consequences for the arts are irrefutable.  

Therefore, it was not only the utilitarian function of art or design that would lead to the social recovery of art, but also the reevaluation of its communicative function. The political ideals which surpassed the religious would demand expression from art and replace its public presence. Such reevaluation put emerging genres, which Pevsner qualified as “militant,” at the disposal of the State. These were “tendentious paintings, [a militant form of] poetry, novels as reportage, poster art, etc.” Pevsner added that in order to start such recovery and to instigate the return of art to the public realm, “a phase of kitsch” was unavoidable. Hence one can read in the 1946 essay that Pevsner’s sanctioning of a “lesser art” tolerated kitsch, as long as it contributed to the visual culture of the society. Pevsner also warned against kitsch, but did not see any way out of it. Apart from the utilization of these militant genres, history painting would once more come to the forefront to transmit national ideals. The artist would become the most effective shaper of opinion for the State, as well as the creator of a new total “style” via his devotion to its political ideals.

---

308 Ibid.
309 “Anyhow, a social recovery of art in the twentieth century is impossible without first going through a phase of kitsch. For hasn’t the ethically positive painter of topical kitsch the one vital advantage over the most artistically gifted of the esoteric Cubists of at least meeting a demand with his work?” Ibid.
310 “One should think instead of a development in which, after the sole reign of purpose-free painting in Impressionism, the emphasis is placed firmly one more on the purposeful painting—that is on history painting. The statesmen can all the more be confident of achieving their ends in that they must have been aware of a yearning among our most esteemed artists to submit. And if the state advances the interests of
Pevsner did not see any evil intent in the submission of the artist's powers to the State since this submission was not a total surrender in his eyes. He believed that the artist's willing contribution would enable him or her to guide the people to a "common ideal, [a] common faith and a common morality." At the end of the article, Pevsner drastically changed his tone. He noted that such contribution by the arts could not come without a cost to the State. To establish mutual respect, the State had to draw a program of support for the arts and the artists. He stated that the arts and the artist had two demands. First, the State had to encourage and continue the existing reforms of educational institutions on the basis of uniting arts education and crafts training under a single roof. Pevsner did not specifically mention its name, but from the significance he attributes to the school in "Pioneers" one can easily speculate that he was referring to the Bauhaus, which was closed in 1933. The second was to allow unrestricted freedom for "the creative genius" to develop. Pevsner complained that a strict program drawn by the State could stifle artistic production since it "smother[ed] the creative spirit," and many of the creative artists were excommunicated by the Third Reich at the moment he was writing his article. The state had to extend its generosity and its understanding for it needed help from the artist to sustain its programs as well as the quality of the art:

For the new state should recognize clearly that the change of direction away from Art for Art’s Sake towards an acceptance of functional art is a turning towards service and therefore in the final analysis a turning towards the state... Too many of the best have remained outside. It is worth some effort by the statesman to try and win them back. He can tell himself confidently as he struggles that which matters is the common ideal, the common faith and a common morality.\textsuperscript{312}

Functionalism's central aim was to serve the whole society by providing for not only the material but also the social needs of the citizens. Pevsner's identification of functionalism with social service and as "a turning toward the state" might be evidence of his expectations from the state. In coordinating such service and by determining its ideals

\textsuperscript{311} ibid.
\textsuperscript{312} ibid.
Pevsner called the state to rehabilitate the German art scene. In my opinion, the idea of service was one of the main factors that made Pevsner feel at home in Britain. This notion also drove Hastings to conceive the Architectural Review not as a specialized periodical for architects, but a medium of visual culture.

b. ii Pevsner Contra Giedion:

In August 1949 Pevsner wrote a harshly critical review of Sigfried Giedion’s “Mechanization Takes Command” for AR.\(^{313}\) In this article he differentiated himself from Sigfried Giedion in terms of the historian’s role as well as in terms of historiography. The article reflected the clash of two operative projects promoted by the two historians. Pevsner started the article with “Judges VI, 34,” the biblical verse, quoted as an epigraph: “But the spirit of the Lord came upon Giedion and he blew a trumpet.”\(^{314}\) He implied that Giedion arrogated to himself to cast a verdict on the path of civilization instead of confining himself to the “proper” limits of the art historian. Referring to Giedion’s doctoral work, he argued that Giedion employed Wölfflinian historiography at the expense of “Kulturgeschichte, Geistesgeschichte or Sozialgeschichte.”\(^{315}\) Pevsner added that it was around the time when Giedion became the secretary of CIAM, starting with “Building in France—Building in Iron—Building in Concrete,” (1928) that his history turned “militant” and neglected the aesthetic side of architecture. The lack of distance between the historian and the cause that he promoted was unacceptable to Pevsner. Coincidentally, Pevsner’s article was published days after CIAM 7 was completed in Bergamo, on July 22-31, 1949. He argued that Giedion willfully overlooked a vital part

\(^{313}\) Nikolaus Pevsner, “Judges VI, 34” AR August 1949, v. 106, pp. 77-79.

\(^{314}\) The whole verse is “But the Spirit of the LORD came upon Gideon, and he blew a trumpet; and Abiezer was gathered after him.” in the King James version of the Bible. See http://www.biblegateway.com/cgi-bin/bible?passage=judges+6%2C+34&KJV_version=yes&language=english&x=12&y=12. Gideon was one of the Greater Judges of Israel. He belonged to the tribe of Manasses, and to the family of Abiezer.

\(^{315}\) “But the combination of historiography and propaganda has its dangers, and Dr. Giedion has not always escaped them. What has established him in his precarious and fascinating position is matter of peculiar personal experiences. He took his degree with Wölfflin, of all art historians of the twentieth century the most convinced that art history is history of visual matters exclusively and should not be disturbed by any Kulturgeschichte, Geistesgeschichte or Sozialgeschichte—history of culture representing the trend of the nineteenth century which culminated in Wölfflin’s own master Burckhardt, history of thought representing what came to the fore with the most inspiring art historians slightly his younger, with Dvorak and Pinder, and social history representing what began to haunt those who only started when he was sixty.” p. 77.
of architectural history and suppressed the aesthetic component of modern architecture by portraying it as a simple extension of architecture’s technological development:

There is however one caveat, which I think, should be put against Space, Time and Architecture; he sometimes tends to forget that architecture has its aesthetic as well as its technical and functional sides. In fact his account of the nineteenth century architecture... is the history of one tendency made to appear as the whole... Dr. Giedion enthrones one set of values—and very important values they are—at the expense of all other values, because they happen to be of the greatest interest to the present and future of architecture. This changeover from telling historical truth—the whole truth—to the blasting of a trumpet... is a sin in a historian.316

Drawing parallels between John Summerson’s 1942 review of Space Time and Architecture, again published in AR, Pevsner found the diachronic formal comparisons in Giedion’s Space Time and Architecture arbitrary.317 In “The Philosopher Historian” Summerson had argued that Giedion was after a philosophical imperative via a “didactical elaboration of history.” Summerson and Pevsner were united in their critique that by imposing on the reader a “secret synthesis” that existed in the present civilization, Giedion attempted pseudo-philosophy. By tailoring it to the advance of the Modern Movement in Space, Time and Architecture via the ascendancy of mechanization Giedion had reduced the complexity of architectural history.

For Giedion, the Modern Movement served as an agent to accelerate the ubiquitous emergence of a universal civilization, by giving its technological dynamics architectural and artistic form. It was the duty of the architect and the artist to use or interpret the most advanced technologies and to reflect the most advanced scientific developments. As Panayotis Tournikiotis pointed out, the nature of the social change that such development had to bring about was left unclear in Giedion’s historiography.318 The advance of mechanization is assumed to inevitably bring about a change for the better for

316 Pevsner “Judges...” ibid.
318 “However the ideal of reintegration of the split personalities and split civilizations contains no plan for social change. The “new tradition” does not promise a radically new society, but only a universal approach “to a new balanced life for enormous numbers of men.” Giedion adopted a largely neutral attitude toward the social problems of his age—starting with world war itself—and his interest focused chiefly on the problem of equilibrium between permanence and change between the individual’s inner life and his external relations.” See Panayotis Tournikiotis, The Historiography of Modern Architecture, (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1999)
“the masses of mankind,” via the achievement of avant-garde artists and architects that Giedion celebrated.

A major problem that divided Pevsner and Giedion, then, was the role of the avant-garde for cultural progress. According to Giedion, the avant-garde enabled progress regardless of the community of individuals it provided for, due to the privileged position it occupied. In other words, the avant-garde rode the wave of mechanization in touch with the spirit of the age. For Pevsner, however, the architect had to cater to the needs of the community in order to hold the community together. He had to channel the use of all his resources for the development of an anonymous culture which grew out of national culture(s). Having a moral responsibility to check their consequences for the betterment of all humanity, the architect had to be aware of the resources mechanization granted him. The twentieth century avant-garde, then, had become for Pevsner, the reincarnation of the culturally and politically detached nineteenth century romantic artist.

In the second half of the article, Pevsner expanded his critique to “Mechanization Takes Command.” If mechanization was the element that fueled the development of modern architecture in the narrative of Space, Time and Architecture, it had become the sole engine of civilization in Mechanization Takes Command. The book had been recently published in English and Pevsner’s review must have had an important impact on its reception. He was appalled by Giedion’s fascination with mechanization and found his concluding message that recommended striking a balance between “cosmic forces and the individual” unpersuasively weak in contrast to the glory the book portrayed for mechanization.319 He argued that Giedion himself was not in the least against wholesale mechanization, albeit aware of its destructive consequences. In other words, Giedion became a prophet of doom:

Having seen the ‘median section of the cow showing the reproductive organs with nozzle of syringe inserted into the cervix’ and a ‘machine dragging a pig through a series of little knives, attached to adjustable springs... we feel so close to the gas chambers of the Nazis that we are almost waiting for the prophet’s voice to shake us into the final submission: ‘Woe to the sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a wicked seed, ungracious children,’ but the prophet’s voice is not heard until the very end of the book is reached... And it may well be that after tracing the earliest

319 “The pages on the mechanization of death... are the climax of the book. Every sentence here, pronounced completely dispassionately, is as crushing as Brave New World and The Loved One.” Ibid. p. 78.
thought on propaganda and management of a business to the complete subjugation of the individual by means of ingeniously played psychology, one feels so completely enwrapped in a relentless tragedy that any suggestion of a possible happy end would come as an anti-climax. But perhaps there is yet a deeper reason for Dr. Giedion's greater power in describing than in fighting mechanization. He is not wholeheartedly against it, as the prophet must rouse the masses.320

The reference to the Nazis is all the more interesting since Pevsner's mother had committed suicide to avoid being sent to Nazi concentration camps seven years before, in 1942. By portraying the inevitable success of mechanization, Giedion connected progress and hence the future of civilization to mechanization. Pevsner and the AR were promoting an ideal in which the ramifications of mechanization were to be checked against the advance towards humanistic values, whereas Giedion seemed to believe that universal prosperity would arrive via this advance. In agreement with Hastings, Pevsner believed that mechanization, increasing specialization and the reign of technocracy caused the "subjugation of the individual." While this did not mean an outright rejection of technological advance, Pevsner did not accept that mechanization should be given priority over other aspects of civilization for the cause of progress. He concluded his article by expressing dissatisfaction with the continental and American bias in Giedion's book. The leader of the Industrial Revolution, he believed, should have deserved more consideration.

Pevsner came to grips with the opposition between mechanization and humanization by interpreting it in a larger framework, namely the opposition between civilization and culture. A culture of reconciliation had to follow.

320 Ibid.
2a. Diversifying the International and the Genius Loci

As Pevsner himself admitted in the radio talks of 1955, "visual arts cannot reflect everything." He did not simply derive all English characteristics he included in his writings from his analyses of art and by trying to locate what is common to all of them. He would support his writings by several sources, such as other literary works or his daily observations. In the first part of this study, I explained Pevsner’s interest in the picturesque as a result of the book that Hastings commissioned him. The values AR advocated in the campaign for the picturesque as English values were mostly adopted from Whig historians, the most influential figure in that respect being Ernest Barker (1874-1960). Hastings’s book “The Unnatural History of Man” was highly influenced by Ernest Barker’s ideas. There is no archival evidence that I have located to see whether Hastings had a direct influence on “The Englishness of English Art.” However, Pevsner indicated his debt by dedicating the book to H. de C. Also, the first printing press that published the book was the Architectural Press under the directorship of Hastings.

Barker was a political scientist who had studied at Oxford. He served as principal of King’s College at Oxford and as professor of political science and fellow at Peterhouse, Cambridge from 1928 to 1939. According to Julia Stapleton “the England which [Barker] framed was securely anchored in Establishment institutions and practices that aimed to challenge the “technocratic” middle class of socialist and Labourite England....[Also Barker defended] a “gentlemanly” ideal of government—which was based upon liberal learning rather than trained expertise. Through bracketing the former within Englishness he sought to extend the wider set of values upon which it was based, to all “Englishmen” representing it as a vital embodiment of both their personal and national character.”

Barker—like Hastings and Richards—was himself formed in the liberal institutions of Victorian education. He conceived the state as a moral community, the duty of which was to emphasize and encourage social solidarity. He believed that the state had to protect citizens against the “pressures of modern life.” Barker’s thought rejected the ability of a single political system to create an overarching solution to the problems of society. He argued for moderation and “the need to refrain from pushing either political principles or demands to extremes; thus shorn of their excesses, they might be accommodated with their rivals.”

What Barker intended to forge out of British history was a sense of Englishness that would transcend the ideals of a certain class. He believed that the ideals he elected should be disseminated to the different strata of society. Such dissemination would be achieved via adult education and the role of intellectuals in educating and transforming mass culture. Although he advocated mostly higher middle class and aristocratic values, Barker also believed that it was not only these classes but also “the simple tastes of the mass of people” that contributed to his sense of Englishness. He saw a certain wisdom in the daily rituals and traditions of the lower classes and believed that English culture had to be understood as an amalgam of their values as well as of the higher ranks of society. Englishness, nevertheless, had three cultural “constants: The centrality of the gentleman, with its intimate connection to the cult of the amateur, and to the voluntary habit of association in British society.

The gentleman’s education, in Barker’s view, was to be focused on the acquisition of moral values through the teaching of humanities. The gentleman would be given a versatile but nonetheless amateur character so that he could take part in civil administrative duties. Since Barker was himself from a working class background, he believed that the road to higher ranks in the society was by no means blocked to those who were from lower strata. He was brought up by a dedication to service, and was himself a product of the ideals of service. In focusing on amateurism as a general feature of English life, Barker intended to give broad cultural sanction to a political ideal which was antithetical to large-scale social planning through the application of expertise. Hence
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he believed in a limited state which supervised society instead of managing and
manipulating it against the initiatives of its citizens and their independent associations,
when the "managerial revolution" was on the rise after the 1930s. Barker advocated a
limited scale of social experimentalism instead of "scientific" social projects, later termed
"piecemeal engineering" in Karl Popper's "Open Society and Its Enemies" (1945).

In writing "The Unnatural History of Man" Hastings not only advocated similar
ideals, such as the centrality of the gentleman for the new society and the role of
humanities in education, he fashioned himself after the amateur gentleman who had no
professional training with reference to the several disciplines his manuscript dealt with—
such as sociology, psychology, philosophy, urban planning and history. The threat of
expertise in shutting off citizens from public life had already been a major issue that AR
argued against during the war. Hastings even believed that the success of his project
would set an example and renew faith in the spirit of the amateur. Paralleling these
concerns, AR's postwar program for "visual reeducation" would encompass a broad
cultural range, from popular and local arts to the reappraisal of the vernacular to high art
including the latest developments in modern architecture.

Barker's idea of voluntary association as an English characteristic reached from
the small scale of clubs, associations and trade unions to the idea of the Commonwealth.
He saw empire as a liberating force for universal improvement and the Commonwealth a
logical conclusion to empire. For him the adoption of the English principle of voluntary
association in the colonies bore fruit in the transition from the Empire to the
Commonwealth as a series of nations held together in alliance. While nationalism was
inevitable for the colonies producing the dissolution of Empire, the habit of voluntary
association provided the antidote, keeping them together as one Commonwealth.

Attributes of English character defined by paternal liberalism that Barker's
thought represents and their relationship to artistic production became a persistent thread
throughout Pevsner's work. The earliest is his "English qualities in English ceramics:

326 "It is bold for the ordinary person to use nearly any words or to have any opinions on any subject
whatever. As things go on, they become more complex and can only be dealt with by specialization, so that
no place is left for the average men of goodwill." quoted Richards W. R. Lethaby in "A Theoretical Basis
evolution rather than revolution” written for Country Life in 1941. This article is an attempt to differentiate the conceptualization of national character in art from that of the Nazis.

At the very opening of his article, Pevsner stated that Nazis essentialized national character and limited its dynamism by linking it simply to blood and soil, and hence taking history out of the equation. Correlating political continuity and continuity in artistic form, Pevsner explained the development of English ceramics with reference to the “English tendency” to avoid revolution for the sake of a piecemeal evolution which determined the life of society as well as its arts.

In 1942, Pevsner introduced the theme of “compromise” and “reconciliation” as a formative component of British institutions such as the Church of England but also in the work of Joshua Reynolds in his article “Heritage of compromise: a note on Sir Joshua Reynolds who died one hundred and fifty years ago.” Pevsner established parallels between The Church of England and the artistic personality of Sir Joshua Reynolds:

The Church of England and Sir Joshua Reynolds are about the most English phenomena in the history of England. In what other part of the world could one conceive a church keeping peace and goodwill among its members with a dogma essentially protestant and a cult essentially catholic, and with bishops whose uninterrupted sequence back to St. Peter as one of its fundamental tenets, while the King as its Summus Episcopus appoints them at the suggestion of the Prime Minister. It is all disarmingly illogical and only understandable as a compromise accepted because of its adaptability and practicability, by the most compromising, the most adaptable, and the most practical of all nations.

In order to elevate portraiture to the level of the grand style of the Renaissance master such as Michelangelo, for Pevsner, Reynolds attempted a compromise, retaining characteristics from the latter to increase the recognition of the former.

Two years later, when AR’s campaign for the picturesque in urban design took a new turn with Hastings’s essay “Exterior Furnishing,” Pevsner compiled a genealogy of

---

328 “So, as no break has destroyed the political continuity in this country between the days of Wedgwood and our own age, it is possible here more easily than anywhere still to create shapes and patterns which, in spite of their modern qualities, seem effortlessly to follow the traditions of the great eighteenth century.” Ibid.
the picturesque from seventeenth and eighteenth century written sources. For Pevsner, "The genesis of the picturesque" was an inquiry into the roots that made the picturesque a "uniquely English" development and landscape "the greatest English contribution to European architecture." 330 In the concluding summary, Pevsner emphasized that the amateur gentlemen architects who conceived the landscape garden were not trained as architects but they were "philosophers, writers and virtuosi." 331 He pointed out that the English landscape garden was essentially the "garden of Liberalism," that is Whig liberalism, and its forms symbolized liberal ideals:

The free growth of the tree is obviously taken to symbolize the free growth of the individual, the serpentine path and rivulet the Englishman’s freedom of thought, creed and action, and the adherence to nature in the grounds, the adherence to nature in ethics and politics. Whig is the first source of the landscape garden, the philosophy of rationalism is the second. 332

The "unique" English feature that determined the form of the landscape garden, and would have future repercussions for modern architecture, was the belief in the "genius loci" for Pevsner. In 1954 the concept of the genius loci and the picturesque became the centre of controversy. Basil Taylor, who was an art critic and Pevsner’s producer at the Third Programme, reacted to the AR campaign on the picturesque and accused the journal for leading a campaign that restricted English art within the confines of the picturesque in three separate talks in this year.

Pevsner responded to Taylor’s claims in another talk entitled “The Picturesque and the Twentieth Century” on January 31, 1954. 333 He insisted that AR’s campaign for the picturesque was aimed at architecture and town planning and not at painting. By differentiating AR’s pedagogy from Basil Taylor’s misreading of the picturesque movement—as “a beau geste on the part of talented but whimsical amateurs, entertaining but from the point of view of art not serious”—he contested it by the double meaning AR attributed to genius loci and its formative role for the picturesque.

331 Ibid., p. 146.
332 Ibid.
333 This talk was later published as an essay in the Architectural Review under the title “C20 picturesque” AR April 1954, v. 115, pp. 227-229.
According to Pevsner, the real value of the picturesque stemmed from its core concept, the genius loci and the topographical capabilities and sensitivities it imparted on the architect. Pevsner mentioned how he perceived a contemporary reinterpretation of the theory of the picturesque in the Bauhaus buildings at Dessau, designed by Walter Gropius. By citing a pioneering work of modern architecture, Pevsner hoped to show how skillfully the modern architect can marry picturesque composition to functional layout, yet stay away from the qualities that Taylor identified as “defective” in the eclectic and arbitrarily cluttered specimens of what was called picturesque architecture in the nineteenth century. The Bauhaus buildings were “uncompromisingly severe in their details... yet saved from uniformity and inhumanity by a free and imaginative grouping which at the same time honestly represented the function of each part.”

Pevsner added that he saw the similar sensitivity existing in Cambridge, Oxford and Bath in the layout of the towns which distinguished them from the axial layouts of continental cities such as Paris, Potsdam and Karlsruhe.

Although AR had continuously tried to disentangle picturesque theory from the historicist development of architecture in the nineteenth century, restrict it to a conceptual basis that drastically enriched the experience of nature and architecture in the landscape, and argued for a transference of principles, the view of the picturesque as the source of eclecticism came up several times to haunt its campaign. Taylor’s perception of the picturesque as “amusing, chic and accidental;” purely reactionary to the modern and threatening the “right formal qualities” of modern art was shared by the younger generation of modernist architects.

When Pevsner’s talk was published in AR in the April 1954 issue, Alan Colquhoun sent a response to the journal that accused Pevsner of implicitly infiltrating into the modern movement with the “historicist” component of the Picturesque. Colquhoun interpreted Pevsner’s article as a betrayal of the modern movement’s ideals by sanctioning “a purely eclectic attitude towards style,” and by licensing ad-hoc visuality independent of functional concerns:

... in a Picturesque building the massing is not necessarily an expression of the plan... but in a building by Le Corbusier the visual hierarchy always reflects a
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334 The original script is in the BBC archives. The quote is from the third page.
335 See Alan Colquhoun’s letter in the “Correspondence” section of AR July 1954. Joan Ockman refers to this letter as “a succinct critique.” I will simply call it a reaction that stems from a misperception.
Like Colquhoun's later work would elucidate, his views in the letter exemplify the younger generation's unsuspecting belief in the myth of functionalism. He did not limit his accusation to modern architecture's betrayal but also held the Review responsible for the "effete and superficial" stock of postwar British architecture. Pevsner, unable to understand if there was any contradiction in what he argued for, had to get on the defensive stand once again and redclare his commitment to the ideals of the modern movement to assure the younger generation.337

While the arguments on the relationship of the picturesque to town planning are familiar to the reader of Part 1, there was one new argument with specific reference to architecture that Pevsner made in the published version of the talk. The argument maintained a role for the "genius loci" as a crucial mediator between nationalism and internationalism, a universal style and its particularized versions; hence modern architecture and its possible local derivatives:

Paul Nash, in 1933, must have been the first to restore to [genious loci] that meaning which the eighteenth century planners had endowed it with. It is a twofold meaning, when applied to the architectural tasks of the twentieth century. One refers to the fact that each country (on the rich soil of its traditions) will find its most suitable variations on the universal style of a period. The other refers to the fact that each individual task must be treated on its own merits, according to its own locus and usus... The real point... under genius loci, the issue between feeling and principle—both equally valid, indeed complementary, though contrary, stimuli to art... It happens that the first half of the twentieth century was a period of innovations, that the old principles of academy and Beaux Arts were no longer acceptable, or indeed applicable. The artist had to feel his way, explore, risk and often fail, but the architect doing the same succeeded—succeeded in reaching the safe ground of locus and usus. For him at the moment the Picturesque movement, the first feeling-your—way theory of art in European art history and the far greater contribution England has made to aesthetic theory is, as I maintain, supremely significant, it is the life line by which he can defeat chaos.338

336 Pevsner, "C20 Picturesque," Ibid.
338 Pevsner "C20 Picturesque" p. 229, italics mine.
Therefore, the idea of the genius loci, as Pevsner understood it, was a universal idea of
local origin, put to its best use within England in the eighteenth century. As a result
of the twentieth-century developments in architecture it found, and it would find, the most
fertile terrain to grow and spread as a natural result of modern functionalism. Just like
Barker’s idea of national English values becoming no longer English but international,
(for example, he believed that India adopted several values of the British liberal
traditions in the days after its independence) the genius loci was an universal idea to be
adopted by all countries that embraced the Modern Movement.

In opening the BBC Reith Lectures in 1955, Pevsner gave priority to explaining
his methodology to his listeners.339 Although he did not openly state names, he wanted to
distinguish his own effort from those who made art history serve as “nationalism in
action.” The geography of art, Pevsner stated, would help to bring an expanded
consciousness, “a juster understanding of the principles of the art of other peoples and a
widened instead of a narrowed sense of [England’s] national possibilities.” In the radio
talks, Pevsner asked whether it was “desirable to stress a national point of view in
appreciating art and architecture” and whether there was a thing as “a fixed or almost-
fixed national character.”340 Although he answered a problematic “yes” in the radio talk
to both of these questions, he removed his answer in the book, content with expressing
that both questions can get answers from outside the sphere of art.341 Emphasizing the
idiosyncratic nature of language and climate, Pevsner stated certain political qualities that
were “obvious in his day” but could be altered in the longer run of history as a result of
the interaction between “national character” and “the spirit of the age”:

Personal liberty, freedom of expression and wisdom in compromises, the two party
system not shaken by communism or fascism, the democratic system of negotiating
in Parliament as well as on boards and committees, the distrust of the sweeping
statement (such as mine are) and of the demagogue... the eminently civilised faith
in honesty and fair play, the patient queuing, the wisdom in letting go of Ireland of
India, of Egypt, a strictly upheld inefficiency in the little business-things of
everyday such as the workman’s job in the house, a certain comfortable

339 But these lectures are not going to deal with the development of style from period to period --that is
the history of art -- but with a different type of generalization, a type you might call the geography of art.”
Nikolaus Pevsner “The Geography of Art,” in Stephen Games ed., Pevsner on Art and Architecture:
340 Ibid.
341 Compare to p. 11 in The Englishness of English Art: An Expanded and Annotated Version of the
wastefulness and sense of good life and the demonstrative conservatism of the wig in the court, the gown in school and university. 342

In the conclusion Pevsner turned most operative in propagating an ideal to be followed by architects. Entitled “The Genius of the Place,” the last radio talk of the lecture series aimed to add major support to AR’s campaign on the picturesque, expanding the limits of its readership to listeners of nationwide radio. Almost repeating his defense for the genius loci against Taylor, Pevsner informed the urban pedestrian audience about the promising developments in architecture and modern urban design that accepted these principles in the work of Hugh Casson, Frederick Gibberd, Holford and Holdon, the London County Council and the campaigns of AR. He added that “if English planners... design functionally—that is englishly—they will succeed.” 343

What was also taken out from the printed version of the talks was Pevsner’s argument for Englishness as a contributing factor to the “humanization” of modern architecture. 344 Pevsner stated that the modern architects’ difficulty had been the “conflict between the sense of adventure in the individual and the sturdy resistance to adventure in the multitude represented by councils and committees.” 345 The English principles of reconciliation, compromise and toleration would help get over this conflict. Pevsner called this attitude “constructive conservatism,” an attitude that would help the resisting modern architects and the rejecting committees tolerated each other’s concerns by mutual compromise. He cited certain precedents such as the Crystal Palace, and the suspension bridges of the eighteenth century from which he thought a humanist, but not a “watered down” style could be derived. Although this point is not elaborate in his talk, while Pevsner invited local councils and committees to be more open to negotiation, he expected architects to establish a more legible relationship to the historical precedents that he cited for the councils and committees to associate with.
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343 In the printed version the title was changed to “Picturesque England.” Pevsner “Radio Talks...” p. 236.
344 “I have shown you how Englishness might benefit the whole urban scene. Now I want to suggest that Englishness could also contribute to humanising a rational, very intellectual style of designing buildings. I say “humanizing” not prettifying and watering down. However, that can only be so if the conservatism of inertia does not get the better of another more constructive conservatism which insists on carrying on from the Crystal Palace, from the suspension bridges, from Wedgwood’s eighteenth century dinner ware and from Hardwick Hall.” Ibid, p.237.
345 Ibid.
Pevsner had another opportunity to express what he meant by a "humanist style" when London's first major mixed development housing complex was almost completed and published in the pages of the *AR*. Although he was not essentially prescriptive, it was clear where his biases lay. In July 1959, he wrote an article on the Roehampton estate entitled "Roehampton: LCC Housing and the Picturesque Tradition." Roehampton estate was one of the largest public housing projects of its time designed by the London County Council’s large bureau of architects, conceived in two separate phases (Figure 2.2). Pevsner explained the apparent duality in the overall appearance of the project by tracing a compound genealogy for Roehampton, but skipped the apparent ideological conflict within the LCC architects’ office that determined the final form. He attributed this duality to the change in the directorship of design from Robert Matthew to Leslie Martin. The project’s ancestry included the picturesque tradition, the prewar projects of Le Corbusier’s *ville contemporaine* (1922) and the *plan voisin* (1925) in its planning and
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architecture as well as the Swedish co-op housing projects of Kvarnholm (1927), Frederick Gibberd’s postwar mixed development for “The Lawn” at Harlow New Town (1952) and Le Corbusier’s Unité d’Habitation. In citing these precedents, however, Pevsner added that Le Corbusier’s inspiration could have been “a stimulus as well as a danger” since his planning relied on an “absolutist pattern” in comparison to the free planning of the picturesque tradition and that of the Swedish precedents.

Such combination of precedents was justified, Pevsner thought, since both the “cubic building” in contrast to a free flowing landscape, as well as the informal grouping of buildings was part of the “English” tradition. However the individual design and detailing of the buildings that populated the western side of the project were in stark contrast to those of the east, which, for him, disrupted the overall unity. The eastern side of Roehampton was made up of buildings unassuming in design, blending into the landscape in terms of color and material, varying in scale from single family cottages with pitched roofs to point blocks. The western side was made up of several slab blocks that closely followed the architectural language of the Unité.

What Pevsner valued in the eastern side of the project was what he called the architecture of “ease.” While the individual designs of the buildings were not outstanding, they contributed to an overall harmony. The Corbusian side, however, was dominated by the repetition of high and massive blocks of béton brut, that Pevsner characterized as “intelligent, crisp, precise” but “completely flat” and “ruthless” in their rhythm. The “refusal to compromise with sentimentality” unlike the eastern side, amounted to an understated violence in the architecture that was being consciously pursued by the followers of the “New Brutalism” after Banham’s article promoted it in 1955.347 As one would remember from Pevsner’s talk, “Art and the State” Roehampton’s eastern half was aiming to establish a dialogue between the man-in-the-street by the quality of its architecture assuming a subordinate role within the overall harmony of the built environment. While the western side upheld architectural quality for each of its buildings, the units’ relentless repetition in the park reduced the appreciation of such quality.
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347 I will discuss the reception of New Brutalism by AR in opposition to the Functional Tradition.
2b. The international bond of the Commonwealth

In the year Roehampton was published, the editors employed the pedagogy of the genius loci as a mediator between the local and the international in a series of articles dedicated to the architecture of the Commonwealth (Figure 2.3). The same year AR published articles in two parts to inform its audience about architecture in the developing nations of the Commonwealth. One aim of the Review was to bring to light the work that was being produced by either British or local architects that worked in the dominions. Another was to gather the architecture of the Commonwealth under a unifying pedagogical umbrella which in turn would diversify the architecture produced by the separate nations. A third was to question why “England as a source of inspiration had been eclipsed by America.”

Pevsner realized that what he stated as a developmental course for modern architecture in the “Pioneers” as early as 1936 had not been embraced. Architects did not consciously search for particularized versions of the international idiom, but stuck to narrow formulas. For instance “little independent thought had gone into the problem of marrying modern form with conditions of climates” and air conditioning mostly remained the single unimaginative solution in most of the dominions. In 1961, AR’s study was expanded and compiled in a book entitled “New Buildings in the Commonwealth,” which presented research into the architecture of the commonwealth in more detail. In the introduction, J. M. Richards explained that all the dominions represented in the book were expected to evolve a “consistent architectural style of their own,” over time while they established the professional infrastructure of architecture. Pevsner and Richards enthusiastically argued that modern architecture could not be limited to the technologically developed nations in the form of a ubiquitous “style.”

---

The architects, who introduced Commonwealth nations that they worked in, were given a brief to respond to in the form of an essay. The brief asked them to give a short history and assessment of the country and its relation to architecture and planning. The corresponding architects evaluated the relation of the local people to architecture, the state of architectural education, the spread of modern architecture, the development of the profession, the availability of traditional and modern materials to architects, and the possibility of the emergence of a modern vernacular.

The Review hoped that the answers to the brief would reveal the impact of international developments as well as local ones on these countries’ architectural production. Maxwell Fry succinctly summarized AR’s pedagogy in stating that the task of the modern architect was “creating a regional character answerable to local needs, a dialect of internationalism.”\(^{350}\) It has to be noted, however, that this policy was not a colonial dictate. The Review did not prescribe that the dominions create an introverted

architecture which developed only from local craft and materials nor that they should continue their “traditions” intact. On the contrary, the larger dominions of Canada, Australia and New Zealand were seen as fertile ground for the proliferation of modern architecture. A traditionalist resistance to modern architecture did not exist in these countries due to the limited building stock and the relatively shorter histories. But even in these countries, in contrast to India or the Africas, the architects agreed with AR’s pedagogy that the international had to be diversified by applying it to the local. Reporting from Australia, Robin Boyd noted that Australian architecture “could quite easily be swamped by mass-produced ideas” if a locally sensitive attitude did not take hold. The Australian architects sensitive to this problem were looking towards colonial precedents of the nineteenth century to produce a “National Style.” Boyd added that such sensitivity, combined with locally produced materials and climatic features in “unselfconscious construction,” resulted in an “adopted” ingenuity.

Boyd’s words echoed the Review’s discussions on the role of local vernaculars initiated in “The Second Half Century” which I will deal with in a separate section later in detail. However, what I want to stress here is that AR’s pedagogy was for the creation of what Fry called local dialects, be it English, African or Australian that would display a familial bond to modern architecture. Modern architecture’s theoretical core, but not its aesthetic vocabulary, and its demand to utilize new technology established in the 1920s, would serve as the principal grammar that underlay these dialects. Fry also argued that the emerging “client groups” in Africa were embracing modern architecture to reflect hopes for a new Africa. He argued for a selective appropriation of modern technology in these countries in order to solve problems that had not been solved by locally available means.

Pevsner’s writings in the Architectural Review, with specific relevance to the question of national style, decreased in number after 1960, when such a rhetoric and historiography increasingly lost credibility. With Pevsner’s full support, most of his editorial responsibilities were turned over to Reyner Banham, who was made assistant executive editor in 1959 and had already become a critic of full-force via the outlet that the journal had provided for him since 1953. In the meantime, the Review itself started to embrace a more specialized distribution of editorial duties and Richards’s stronghold on
the executive editor position started to break down. Pevsner indeed felt quite frustrated with the turn that modern architecture took in the second half of the fifties in Britain. He also realized that AR’s formative influence on modern architecture, as well as his own, was diminishing. In a resignation letter to Hastings, which expressed his indebtedness to AR, Pevsner stated that he had lost faith in the modern architecture of his day:

One of my chief grounds is that I shall be sixty in a few weeks and that one should not at “sixty” be one of the editors of a modern paper, but I shall have to spend most of my ink to prove to you that this argument in my opinion does not apply to you... It is that, as I am getting older, I find myself more and more out of sympathy with what is going on in architecture and what we, as a “modern” paper, have to put in. A serious paper such as ours, can, I am sure of it, not keep up the faith (and subscriptions) of its readers unless the editors have a coherent, consistent faith themselves in what they put in. I have not--less than you. I am an inveterate puritan and thirties-man. You have never been that.

...And now thanks to you without whom I would not have become one of the Picturesques and thus have acquired the saving grace of just a little bit inconsistency. 351

Although his resignation was not accepted, Hastings agreed to reduce Pevsner’s role to advisor to the history section of the Review. This sincere letter notes the intimate relation between Hastings and Pevsner, and testifies to Hastings’s influence on him.

“New Buildings in the Commonwealth” illustrated the pedagogical role of Pevsner’s historiographic method rather than Richards’s attempt to ground modern architecture’s relation to local vernaculars. While the two agreed on its fundamental premises, AR’s research into the vernacular, mainly by Richards and including contributions from Hastings, had a more complex and diverse background.

Richards’s interest in the vernacular stayed constant while the subtext for this interest changed over the years. From the 1940s to the first half of the 1950s, his interest was mainly grounded in an ideological sympathy to social realism and the attempt to find a cultural expression to the changing lives of different classes. In the late 1950s he justified his interest by promoting the vernacular as the unifying thread of built environments and as a bearer of cultural continuity. In the late 1960s Richards embraced the rise of advocacy planning and the acceptance of client participation for the

continuation of vernacular traditions. The next chapter aims to explore this effort in more detail.
Chapter B. Humanizing Modern Architecture: “The Hollow Victory” and the Quest for the Vernacular

From Revolution to Regime:

In “The Second Half Century,” AR’s editors recognized the opportunities to emerge from the technological infrastructure that had supported the war effort, and the consequent industrial dynamics for reconstruction. It was clear to the editors that modern architecture, “predicated on functional determination and technological advancement” would dominate the reconstruction effort with an emphasis on speedy recovery. This would bring further legitimation for modern architecture, in their view, by easing the struggles of modernist architects against local committees and governmental bodies. In his “Memoirs,” Richards recalled that while the battle was won in this sense, it was far from over:

But if the battle for modern architecture had in this sense been won, it had only been won to be succeeded by other battles such as those concerned with quality instead of ideology and with the architect’s deeper involvement in social and environmental improvement... the new task of the Architectural Review was to discriminate between architects who used the new freedom from academic restrictions intelligently and responsibly and those who had merely jumped the stylistic bandwagon under the impression that modern architecture besides being fashionable was easier to do... So the Review, in addition to analysing and criticizing individual buildings began to concern itself with theoretical questions like the place of ornament in buildings that were no longer the work of craftsmen, the relevance of monumentality, the relation of buildings to the landscape and the increasingly dominant role played by technology.

Richards’s recollection was incomplete. The Review did not only question the role of ornament, evaluate and transmit the debate on monumentality that was started by Giedion, Sert and Leger in 1943, develop a new role for the picturesque in the twentieth century and question technology, albeit in a limited amount. Articles published in AR aimed, and gradually accomplished, more. They dismantled the functionalist

---

352 See Joan Ockman’s introduction to Architecture Culture 1943-1968 (Rizzoli: New York, 1994.)
justifications of modern architectural aesthetics and promoted the "functional tradition" instead. They also asserted universal principles in the name of this tradition.

Apart from the themes Richards included in his recollection, the Review called a halt to the avant-garde's rejection of the past and its emphasis on shock and novelty. What was now needed was a phase of consolidation, leading AR to publish articles on the role of history, the problem of symbolism and communication in modern architecture, the augmentation of materiality via texture and color, regional variety in opposition to a stagnant international style, and against the disciplinary split that divided engineering and architecture.

In addition to the emphasis on a more distant past, in the early 1950s Reyner Banham introduced an interest in the early twentieth century avant-garde. A promising doctoral student of Nikolaus Pevsner, Banham was hired in 1952 as assistant literary editor. In the beginning, he had a relatively minor role in comparison to the rest of the editorial board which, in 1952, was composed of Richards, Pevsner, Hastings and Ian McCallum. By means of articles produced for his doctoral research, Banham carried a critical and radical theoretical agenda into the pages of the Review. In due course, Banham's equation of modernity with the politics of the avant-garde counteracted Pevsner and Richards's attempt to establish a post-avant-garde phase for modern architecture. Via his involvement in the Independent Group within the Institute of Contemporary Arts and his active promotion of the New Brutalism, Banham aimed to restore a place for the avant-garde.

Banham became assistant executive editor in 1959 after McCallum left to direct the American Museum and stayed with the Review until 1964. While he was in the assistant executive editor post, Banham's focus shifted towards the role of new technologies in the shaping and consumption of architecture, especially for the provision of environmental services. In this period the editors had to try hard to distinguish Banham's personal position from the rest of the Review's editorial board.

354 The idea of an architectural avant-garde was sternly contested by Tafuri's alignment of modern architecture with capitalist production. AR's editors do not directly use the term but usually refer to the "revolution." See Esra Akcan on Tafuri's position vis-à-vis the avant-garde in "Manfredo Tafuri's Theory of the Architectural Avant-garde" in the Journal of Architecture, Summer 2002, vol. 7, pp. 135-170.
355 Banham was first listed as assistant literary editor in 1953. For the composition of the editorial board see Appendix 1.
356 Banham's Ph.D. thesis was later published as "Theory and Design in the First Machine Age" in 1960.
In the following section I will concentrate on the period roughly between 1947 and 1955, when *AR* declared the program for "The Second Half Century" and connect it to the later period in which Banham became the voice of the avant-garde. This early period served as a prelude to *AR*’s attempt to establish a lasting role for vernaculars. It was also in this period that the core of *AR*’s editorial policies was formulated. While cultural anthropology’s alliance with art history served to validate the need for the vernacular, the pedagogy of cultural continuity challenged the very existence of avant-gardism.

I will trace this development mainly in the continuity of J. M. Richards’s belief in modern architecture’s potential to create an emerging anonymity as well as his modeling of anonymity on the analysis of existing vernacular traditions or their invention, with the support of the remaining members of the editorial board, apart from Banham.
B1. An Emerging Anonymity: “Castles on the Ground”

According to his memoirs, Richards’s interest in the relationship of modern architecture to vernaculars was first stimulated by the work of Alvar Aalto which he saw during his trip to Finland in 1934. In Aalto’s furniture designs Richards saw the small town carpenter’s technique of handling wood and its translation into industrial possibilities. When he actually visited Aalto in Finland, he found Aalto very sensitive to vernacular traditions in order for Finland to have a distinct political and cultural identity in the impending climate of war and Russian threat.

The 1930s was also a time when Richards’s left-wing political sensitivities were honed in the struggle against the rise of fascism and totalitarianism around the world. In his “Memoirs” Richards recounts the political atmosphere of the 1930s and his disillusionment with the USSR:

“What I remember as characteristic of the 1930s is something very different, which did for a time play a part in my life. This was the development of passionate political feelings among people like myself to whom in other circumstances politics would have meant nothing. They were the days of the rise of Fascism, of the Spanish Civil War, of the Popular Front; to be more specific, of Adowa and the Reichstag trial, of Leon Blum and Potato Jones; in England of Mosley’s Blackshirts and the Left Book Club. I and my friends and acquaintances joined and subscribed and protested and marched in support of left-wing and anti-Fascist causes that seemed desperately to matter... At the same time the identification of freedom with the left became the common currency of my generation, and decades of disillusioning happenings in Hungary and Czechoslovakia were needed before we relinquished our deep-seated belief that in seeking the social ideal we should look always towards Russia.”

Richards recognized a potential in the concept of anonymity to translate his political sensitivity into architectural discourse. He expressed his views on anonymity in the avant-garde circles that he joined during the 1930s. In 1937 he was invited to submit

357 See Richards “Memoirs...” p. 119
an article to “Circle: International Survey of Constructive Art” edited by Ben Nicholson, Naum Gabo and J[ohn] L[eslie] Martin. “Circle” was designed to present the works and writings of those who aimed to unify the arts under a “common idiom” that would demonstrate a universal alliance. As stated in the introduction by Gabo, most of the submissions to the survey stressed the leading role of the avant-garde artist in expressing the spirit of the age, regardless of ruling tastes in society. Richards’s article adopted a contrary position to the avant-garde by ruling individuality irrelevant in architecture in differentiation from modern art.

Echoing Nikolaus Pevsner’s explanation of art-for-art’s-sake and the celebration of the individual artist in “Pioneers of Modern Design” (1936), Richards argued that nineteenth century architecture suffered a “cultural decay,” the cause of which was a lack of social unity:

The more immediate cause of decay was a cultural—a socio-psychological one, a phenomenon that may be summarized as a diffusion of purpose, manifested in a divorce of art as an individual achievement from art as a vernacular expression... Architecture cannot afford to be an affair of the individual. It is only when the individual innovation becomes assimilated into a regional tradition that it can be regarded as culturally valid... Richards argued that when the link between working and creating was broken by the rise of Victorian bourgeois capitalism, individual artistic personalities emerged as a form of distinction in bourgeois society. What this development also created was the rise of connoisseurship and a fascination with style for the sake of variation. For Richards, the aim of the modern movement was to return to society a unity of social and cultural

358 Circle was first intended as an art magazine to be published by Faber and Faber, but later it was published as a book. Contributors included British artists as well as émigré artists who were in Britain at the time. Circle brought the work of a whole range of painters, sculptors, architects and thinkers, to survey the “emerging cultural unity” in the words of Naum Gabo. Circle was not a manifesto and the contributors were from diverse backgrounds subscribing to varying positions such as historians/critics Lewis Mumford, Sigfried Giedion and J. M. Richards or painters and sculptors like Ben Nicholson, Barbara Hepworth, Henry Moore, architects like Walter Gropius, J. Leslie Martin, Alberto Sartoris. Le Corbusier also submitted an essay classified under painting. I had access to the American edition published in the same year. See J. L. Martin et. al. eds., Circle: International Survey of Constructive Art, (Prager Publishers: New York, 1937). An exhibition was held to commemorate the journal and constructive art in Kettle’s Yard Gallery curated by Jeremy Lewison in 1982. See J. Lewison eds. Circle: Constructive Art in Britain 1934-40, (Kettle’s Yard Gallery: Cambridge, 1982).

purpose that would pervade life as a whole. At the time when such cultural unity existed, it expressed itself as common cultural language that could be read in vernaculars, widespread in the architecture of certain communities and regions. An anonymous tradition of “cultural value” could therefore be recovered through the astylistic contribution of modern architecture.

In Richards’s view, anonymity emerged from the assimilation of architectural culture by its producers to the level of “instinct:”

[In the eighteenth century] The mass of small houses, of village cottages and of terraces in the market towns in which this universal vernacular manifested itself, grew almost spontaneously from the habit of mind of their builders whose creative capacity was exercised only in a subordinate sense, almost as instinct... this universal tradition of the eighteenth century may be regarded culturally as the continuation of the medieval tradition...if we ask whether today we can restore this tradition of anonymity, and regain a vernacular architecture, I suppose the answer is that we must reestablish first that unity of purpose—that settled continuity of social life and the formal expression of it. The answer, then, to the question of how we can regain a true folk architecture remains a social and political one.360

In Richards’s account, the culture of the builder superceded a personal will to expression. The builder observed a dominant canon, just as Pevsner wished the modern architect to do. As Richards would reiterate in his article “The Wrong Turning” in 1949, such an anonymous tradition developed in nineteenth-century engineering. The nineteenth-century engineer acted almost like a medieval builder by building different types of structures like roads, canals, ships, bridges without specializing on a single one. These engineers created, in Richards’s words an “unselfconscious engineering tradition of true cultural validity, pursued by the mass of designers anonymously.”361 Such anonymity, he claimed, could still be observed in speculative builders’ housing. A common aesthetic and the economy of construction determined the design process of such housing; however, Richards argued that such architecture lacked “a socio-cultural consciousness.” He concluded his article for “Circle” by paying tribute to the “common mind” and

---

361 Richards, “The condition…” ibid.
pledging for a “new tradition of natural anonymity” to divest architecture from the “irrelevances of self-expression.”

Richards’s “Introduction to Modern Architecture,” which was published in 1940 by Penguin Books, continued the same line of argument. The book was intended not only to give a historical introduction to the development of modern architecture, but also to dispel the propaganda of modern architecture’s detractors. He also hoped to lay the groundwork for an architecture that would appeal to the “common people.” Modern architecture was not to be understood separately from the “roots of the national culture” and had to accommodate cultural differentiation with reference to “temperaments, ideals, climates, habits and raw materials.” Acculturation and habit contributed to an “instinctive selection of materials, shapes and colours; our emotional reaction to climate and to social relations.”

Richards believed that “decent” modern architecture would be produced by “decent” but ordinary modern architects.

Although Richards employed the argument of continuity between Georgian and Regency architecture and modern architecture as pursued by articles published in the Review by John Betjeman and P. M. Shand he also turned to Herbert Read to attribute an “instinctive” aspect of all vernaculars. Comparing Greece of 5th BC and the Christian Art of the 12th to 13th centuries to the 1930s in “Art and Industry,” Read explained culture as passing from “early and primitive to latent and decadent phases, with the latter dominated by taste and decorativeness,” and placed them outside an academic tradition. Early Gothic, for Read, was produced with a balance of logic and intuition as “an immediate solution to a social need using techniques and materials appropriate to
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362 ibid.
363 “...there is much truth in the latter allegation if it means that Western architecture is too often an architects’, not a people’s, architecture. For connoisseurship of modern architecture is still largely confined to the professional man and the intelligentsia. This is a defect that time and modern architecture’s own ability to cultivate the graces on which popular appreciation rest should succeed in remedying. People generally, not only architects, can be taught to look forward.... The weakness of the Soviet attitude was that it opened no window on the future.” J.M. Richards, An Introduction to Modern Architecture, (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1940), p. 102.
364 Ibid. p.124.
365 Ibid.
366 Ibid. p. 129.
the desired solution. It was the correspondence between need and provision in the modern movement that helped Read to characterize it as free of style, rather than being a style itself.

During his years in the Ministry of Information Bureau in Cairo starting in late 1942, when Pevsner and Hastings were in charge of editing AR, Richards had the opportunity to travel around the Middle East. His fascination with the vernacular architectures of the Middle East found a place in the Review during the years after his return in 1946. In this roughly four-year period, Richards finished his book “The Castles on the Ground: Anatomy of Suburbia.” (Figure 2.4) The book was illustrated by John Piper and published in 1946. (Figure 2.5) Right after he came back to Britain, Richards was appointed chief editor of the Architectural Press’s book department.

Figure 2.4 J. M. Richards, The Castles on the Ground, (London: John Murray, 1973, 1st edition by the Architectural Press, London, 1946.)

Figure 2.5 One of John Piper’s illustrations from the book.

369 Ibid. p. 131.
"The Castles on the Ground," as Richards regretfully acknowledged in his "Memoirs," was perceived as a betrayal of the Modern Movement’s ideals and as a eulogy to suburbia. Since it was inspired by the older suburbs of London where Richards spent his childhood, "The Castles on the Ground" was also interpreted as a nostalgic account of the good old days of early twentieth century suburbia. The book’s illustrations, depicting pitched roofs of shoulder-to-shoulder houses in lush landscapes with ornate ironwork fences and greenhouses, embodied the sense of middle class life in the suburbs. At the heyday of planned development and postwar reconstruction campaigns when modern architects were slowly emerging in key positions, such negative perceptions might seem unsurprising at first. However, Richards’s position, as an active member of the MARS group and as organizer of two CIAM congresses at the time, requires casting the book in a different light.

In "The Castles on the Ground," Richards attempted to analyze suburbia by putting economy, class culture and psychology into a relationship that characterized its built environment. The image of the idyllic villa and its picturesque surroundings, according to Richards, gradually translated from the aristocracy to the middle classes, remained an unchanging feature of English culture, infiltrating the depths of the English psyche. In his words, the book was written to analyze a "puzzle": how to explain the popularity of suburbia and how to account for the "deficiency of taste" architectural critics deplored in suburbia. Richards argued that the "suburban environment is the choice of people who know what they like, and the architecture of the suburb may even be called a true contemporary vernacular...it has the one quality of all true vernaculars, that of being rooted in the people’s instincts, and even its shortcomings--its snobberies, its self-deceptions, its sentimentalities, the uncertainties of its objectives--are evidence of this closeness to everyday life."370 The principles of living in a democratic society meant that architects should renounce their elitism and listen to what people desired.

The proliferation of picturesque landscapes since the eighteenth century and the aspiration to the acquisition of taste had secured in the English a commercial appeal of the suburbs as well as internalized a passion for gardening and a sense of environmental

quality. What Richards valued, in essence, was an apparent lack of planning and an organic maturation that took place over a long time where the quality of individual buildings lost importance with reference to the whole ensemble. In Richards’s characterization a definition of the vernacular of suburban architecture underlay:

It is one of the attributes of a vernacular that *its characteristic effects are not produced selfconsciously* but through the operation of *an instinctive sense of style*, and suburban architecture at its best may therefore be said to represent the true vernacular development of the Picturesque landscape tradition in the same way that Georgian farm buildings and market squares represent the true vernacular development of the tradition of scholarship and taste established by Wren and the architects who followed him.\(^371\)

Thus, Richards saw the real source of the vernacular in the assimilation of traditional knowledge by the producers of buildings, which were not necessarily architects but builders and the people: “architecture of the people by the people.” Architecture should be judged socially, meaning from the point of view of the people who inhabit it. Richards believed that suburbia was populated by middle and “artisan” classes, where these classes felt themselves in control of the world around them and felt responsible for the environment in contrast to the town and city, what Richards regarded “the impersonal product of a collective effort.”\(^372\) He also acknowledged a sense of nostalgia in suburban architecture that echoed “the country squire’s own tradition-rooted architecture...when the world was a self-sufficient place.”\(^373\)

By taking control of their environment either through picturesque gardening or building around the suburban house, Richards believed that the suburban middle class realized its *will-to-art*, which Herbert Read has defined as a universal instinct, found psychological release through the realm of fantasy.\(^374\) If this were true, the aesthetics of modern architecture could not solve the problem of the suburban, representing only an amateur’s effort against that of the expert. For the inhabitants of suburbia, taste was a

\(^{371}\) Ibid. p. 31.
\(^{372}\) Ibid. p. 36
\(^{373}\) Ibid.
\(^{374}\) “If we accept fantasy—and the sense of release that fantasy offers—as an end in itself, is not the suburban landscape the world over, and is not its very variety the hallmark that proves its authenticity?” Ibid, p. 39.
matter of memory and familiarity inseparable from class-consciousness, where the past was always carried to the present by means of association. The vernacular emerged in a process of "like breeding like." The imagery that formed the symbolism of the suburb was transmitted over centuries as a result of assimilation and internalization by the amateur middle class suburban and had become his cultural property. Since modern architecture left out the very features of such symbolism by rejecting it as vulgar taste, it lost the chance of communicating due to the very alienation prompted by its unfamiliarity. Richards connected the problem of symbolism to the socialist realism debate in the USSR:

The lesson to be learnt from Russia of the twenties and thirties, therefore, is that it is no use trying to impose a strange new style on any public, since architecture will lose its meaning for the public if its changes faster than the popular demand for it.375

Richards argued that the eighteenth century understanding of taste permeating from the top to the bottom as a "criterion of culture and good breeding" was now "a fad." The taste of the middle class who ran the society were not "far removed from the taste of the suburbs."376 Hence it was left to the speculative builder, slow in reacting to change and responding to the taste of his mass clientele, to perpetuate the vernacular tradition.

In his concluding chapter entitled "The Origin of the Species," Richards hypothesized a basic abstract relationship between economy and a cultural pattern that triggered the historical emergence of the suburb. Until the industrial revolution, Richards asserted that two main economical processes shaped the two different types of cultures in the built environment.377 The town and country were shaped by forces of production and consumption leading to land economies in a flux of centralization vs. decentralization. These complementary processes, forming the opposing forces of a dialectical unity for Richards, created urban and rural cultures. The city localized the culture of consumption, whereas the region created a culture of production catering to the city. After the industrial revolution, developing technologies of transportation disrupted the well-defined

375 Ibid, p. 64.
377 During my research, I could not find out which textual influence Richards adopted this relationship from. The same idea was also employed, as will be remembered from Part 1, by Hastings in his "The Unnatural History of Man." It is not clear whether Hastings influenced Richards or vice versa.
relationship between the country and the city, and the middle class emerged into the social scene with the new dynamics of “distribution,” a third economical process for Richards. The suburb was an end-product of this economical process, becoming the superstructure which answered to the middle class substructure. The emergence of planning in the twentieth century responded to restrict the forces of this development, to keep “distribution” under control and to keep its dynamics from getting out of hand.

Richards viewed the domination of the middle class culture of consumption and the economics of laissez-faire as the grounding rationale of the unplanned suburb. His cultural determinism even led him to identify certain “types of man” with suburbia, the city and the country. The middle class that inhabited suburbia was a materialist at heart, leading the society towards a culture of consumption:

The instincts of the man belonging to the world of distribution are all towards anarchy. This applies equally to his political instincts, though these are often disguised as liberalism (or, when he is thwarted, as Fascism.) His system is laissez-faire, his ethic enlightened self-interest and his philosophy the survival of the fittest. The so-called Americanization of modern life is largely identifiable with his influence. His art is one of pastiche, and his architecture that of fancy dress. 378

“The Castles on the Ground,” revered the sense of anarchy that seemed to determine the suburban environment torn between the hands of the developer and the owners’ interventions on the path to establishing self-sustaining communities.

The suburbs in Richards’s account, gathered from childhood memories were the older and densely built suburbs of London. These had grown from small settlements to highly populated neighborhoods, acquiring social functions through time with the addition of pubs, schools and in certain cases civil administrative functions. Richards insisted that low density was against the spirit of suburbia. Hence, he argued that the planner or the architect, if he is to have any contribution to the suburb, was to simply “play the part of guide, rather than that of a didactic school teacher.” In order to improve the suburb, the architect had to respect “people’s existing modes of expression.” 379 If the purpose of the modern movement was to bridge the gap between the people and art, it had to adopt a pedagogy that would start from the existing level of taste. The vernacular
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378 Richards “The Castles...” p. 79.
379 Ibid. p. 89.
would provide the architectural measure in order to build incrementally from, instead of condemning the inhabitants’ vulgarity of taste.

Richards concluded the book by making a plea for assigning priority to social instead of technological progress, to accommodate the people. Cultural continuity could only be achieved by the participation of the majority and by the elite’s sensitivity towards this majority’s values. He granted the suburb autonomy from elitist judgment and asked modern architecture to aid the people in the making of their own environment:

The time has passed when the “modern movement” had to be justified as an experiment. Its principles are now accepted, and it is part of the world a new generation is growing up with... We are particularly concerned with preservation of human values and continuity, since the very virtues of a machine aesthetic contain the germ of its destruction...
...modern architecture has to avoid... the mistake of allowing itself to become a specialized art that can only be appreciated by the minority. For a minority art is a closed art, closed to the warming influence of popular enthusiasm and understanding. It also tends to be dogmatic and lack the common touch that should enable it to reflect those human vagaries which are the foundation of architectural richness...[a true vernacular character in architecture and design] can be developed... not... by the introduction of fancy-dress styles, but by fostering a modern aesthetic that allows romance and fantasy to flourish, as distinct from one dictated solely by rational scientific planning.

After his return to the Architectural Review Richards, pursued a resolution to the problem of anonymity in modern architecture with the concerns he mentioned in the quote above. His writings for AR would react against the dictates of rational scientific planning and bring about the need for this true vernacular, which in his view combined rationalism and fantasy. He carried this agenda into international debate via CIAM and through the editorial policy of AR, with a specific emphasis on social realism in an ambiguous relationship to politics in the USSR.
AR’s early postwar effort to “re-include” the aspects of architecture—that were “excluded” at the time of the “revolution”—within a modernist vocabulary took place simultaneously with a clash of ideologies that shaped the postwar world. In the earliest part of this debate AR promoted the Scandinavian “New Empiricism,”—a title the Review itself had invented—and the Bay Region style to offset the impact of “socialist realist” Soviet architecture as possible options by a “social realism,” defined by Richards in 1950.380 In his memoirs, Richards recalled that the Allied victory brought a sense of euphoria that grew hopes for a “truly democratic world.”381 In the attempt to redefine the aesthetics of modern architecture, the editors felt obliged to develop a position alternative to the Zhdanovist party line of socialist realism that ruled in the USSR.382

Eric Mumford argues in “CIAM Discourse” (2000) that the affinity between the Labor Government’s policies to those of Sweden’s, turned the attention of British architects to Swedish architecture as the “logical architectural expression” of social democracy. However, AR’s position was neither limited to promoting the “New Empiricism” in Britain nor to opposing socialist realism. AR campaigned for the proliferation of a modern attitude sensitive to local traditions and the needs of “the people” to uphold cultural continuity. This effort included the creation of Britain’s own modern vernacular which was to continue what AR had named the “functional tradition” in “The Second Half Century.”

The “Functional Tradition” was partially theorized in a special issue in January 1950, in the special issue on canals by Eric de Maré and another special issue on the “Pub.” While British architectural histories fully recognize the impact of AR’s promotion of “New Empiricism,” AR’s fundamental attempt to define the “functional tradition” as

380 Richards’s mentioned “social realism” for the first time in his article “The Next Step?” published in the March issue of 1950. I will discuss this essay in more detail in relation to the invention of the “functional tradition.”


382 Mumford “CIAM Discourse...” pp. 163-168.
the architectural component of Townscape is overlooked. A closer look at the continuity of themes in the Review provides a larger framework of reference for the debate around “New Empiricism” and its limited role within AR’s own agenda. It also establishes that the so-called Scandinavian influence was not unidirectional, and AR’s influence in Scandinavia was felt after the publication of the “Functional Tradition.”

2a. Architecture for the People: AR versus USSR

In May 1947, AR published a set of thematic articles entitled “Reconstruction in the USSR” written by the leading architects of Soviet reconstruction D. Arkin, A. Bunin, and N. Bylinkin, to inform its readers about the state of reconstruction and its principles in the USSR. The editorial introduction, placed before the Soviet authors’ articles, argued that the international architectural community was frustrated with Soviet architecture and art because of its ostensibly “bourgeois” and “retrogressive” aesthetics. The contemporary Soviet buildings and the city plans submitted to the Review by the Soviet architects were openly historicist and eclectic in their formal preferences. AR argued that such mediocrity could only be pardonable due to authoritarian State patronage.

A similar commentary on totalitarian regimes was already published in the AR by Lionel Brett entitled “The Architecture of Authority” in May 1946. In this article, Brett pointed to architecture in Amsterdam, Copenhagen, Stockholm, Zurich and eighteenth century towns of England as an alternative democratic response to the needs of the
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383 For instance see Royston Landau’s “New Directions in British Architecture” (1968) or Reyner Banham’s “The New Brutalism” (1966). Joan Ockman’s introduction to Hastings’s “Townscape” article also sees “Townscape” as an isolated urban design debate.
384 Stanford Anderson’s article “The “New Empiricism-Bay Region Axis”: Kay Fisker and Postwar Debates on Functionalism, Regionalism and Monumentality” helped me establish this link via his research on Kay Fisker. Fisker published an article titled “Den Funktionelle tradition” 6 months after AR’s January special issue on the “functional tradition.”
386 “…it is the artistic taste shown in contemporary Russian architecture—and for that matter, in the other arts as well—which other nations find most puzzling.” Other nations see Russia as the example of a country where no building takes place but by order of the State; and the designer—town-planner, architect or decorator—is wholly dependent on the State; and seeing that, according to sophisticated European Standards, Russian buildings appear bourgeois and retrogressive, they wonder whether this is the inevitable result of extensive State patronage—whether the rule of the official does not by its nature result in leveling down to an uninspired mediocrity.” Ibid.
people. For Brett, these cities had an architectural tradition "where a single and simple language is spoken by large house and small house, by church and school, by inn and town hall," which could serve as the alternative to the language of socialist realism and the defeated fascist regimes. In these examples, the vernacular building traditions were understood to secure the continuity and the unity of the built environment and stood for the built expression of local culture.

Nevertheless, while they disapproved the aesthetic, the editors did approve a certain rationale behind the Soviet policy, and shared most of the criticism these architects raised against modern architecture and modernist city proposals. For instance, Arkin seemed to echo AR rhetoric on the relation of deriving urban traditions from a city's character, as promoted in "Exterior Furnishing" of 1944. He argued that the architect's aim was not to "depersonalize a city to fit it to abstract "ideal" layout, transport and settlement schemes and so forth but to promote development of the finest individual features of the city in question." Resorting to sarcasm, Arkin added that modern architecture saw itself as a science to be performed in laboratories and test tubes, and fell short of giving "expression to the people's, the locality's, the city's individuality..." Reminiscent of the arguments put forwards by Richards in "The Castles," the editorial introduction argued that the Soviet attitude was understandably grounded in a "tacit psychological policy" that justified the aesthetics for the Soviet architects:

The uniformly eclectic style of contemporary Russian architecture... is the result of the tacit acceptance of a policy based on psychological need, perhaps more than anything else on a need not to outpace the slow growth of popular understanding. It may be that for a generation architecture employing a familiar symbolism will be needed in Russia before pure architectural form is able to evolve a response from a sophisticated public, as it is beginning to do in Western Europe and America now..."
By employing a historicist aesthetic, the editorial introduction argued, Soviet policy disregarded Marxist dialectics. Hence, Soviet people were regarded by the administrators of the regime as incapable of attuning themselves to the progress of architecture.

The architects who sent their views on Soviet reconstruction followed the Zhdanovist partly line of cultural policy. Formulated by Andrey Aleksandrovich Zhdanov, this policy insisted on the creation of exemplary myths in art. Starting from 1934, the Soviet regime rejected modernism as art-for-art’s sake, legislated censorship and a repressive patronage. Zhdanov believed Soviet people demanded the architecture produced by the classes that repressed them before the revolution. Under his control, art was reduced to therapeutic pedagogy and propaganda. Popular and realistic themes as well as folk elements prevailed in art in order to manipulate the masses. The work of modernist art critics like Clement Greenberg, condemned this approach as kitsch.

Almost a year later in March 1948, the Soviet architects replied with a fierce condemnation of AR’s editorial preface sent via the Soviet Embassy, when an exhibition on Soviet architecture took place in the RIBA. They argued that AR insulted the Soviet people by declaring them architecturally illiterate, and willfully ignored the Soviet “achievement towards an organic national culture.” AR’s response was to the Soviets’ detriment. In a lengthier article the editors decried the repressive policies of the Soviets for excommunicating artists and writers that did not want to participate in Zhdanov’s cultural policy. Artistic production could not expect to be in “religious conformity” with dictatorial measures.

Richards hoped that the victory of democracy over totalitarianism and fascism in the postwar world would make modern architectural programs more responsive to people’s utilitarian as well as emotional needs. He expected that the USSR to be the first place to yield results in this direction. The editorial introduction, although not clearly stated, was presumably written by him. Expecting Soviet architecture to become a major influence in the rapidly transforming postwar world, and dissatisfied with the official
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391 The Zhdanovist line was initiated in the Union Congress of Soviet Writers held in Moscow in 1934, drafted into a resolution in 1946 by Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by the party secretary and cultural boss Andrey Aleksandrovich Zhdanov. Although Zhdanov died in 1948, his principles ruled until Stalin’s death in 1953.
policy, he attacked even while acknowledging that the questions socialist realism posed against modern architecture were well-founded.392

J. M. Richards’s sympathy towards socialist realism evaporated when he was invited to the Congress of Intellectuals for Peace in Poland in 1948. His expectations, which he shared with many in Britain, that the USSR might create an “art for the people and by the people” were frustrated by communist authoritarianism. Furthermore, the intellectuals he held in high esteem such as T.S. Eliot, Jean-Paul Sartre, André Malraux and Eugene O’Neill were all condemned by an “uncompromising, anti-Western, anti-liberal tone.”393

Looking back to the 1950s in “The New Brutalism: Ethic or Aesthetic” (1966) Banham categorized AR’s support for New Empiricism as the “Anglo-Zhdanov line.” The split between modern architects in Britain in the postwar period had become most visible in the London County Council’s Department of Architecture after 1950. This split was later embodied in the stylistic duality between the eastern and the western halves of the period’s biggest housing project in Alton Estate, Roehampton. The first phase of the project was realized by the architects sympathetic to a socialist realist agenda. The second phase was produced by those who saw themselves as more liberal. The site planning of one half was dominated by the principles of the picturesque whereas the other by Corbusier’s site plan for the Marseilles Unités. The architects who produced the traditionally-inspired dwellings were later to be mocked by labels such as the “Softs” (vs. the Corbusian “Hards”) and as “William Morris revivalists.”395 At this time, Banham himself was preoccupied with defining a new avant-garde under the banner “New Brutalism,” and he claimed that the New Empiricism was a retreat from the ideals of
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392 In his memoirs Richards says little about his first wife, the artist Peggy Angus, who influence on his thinking about society, politics and art was probably considerable. Known as “the Red Angus,” she was a vocal defender of Soviet Russia, which she had visited before the couple got married in 1936. The couple were effectively separated by the war and divorced in 1948.
393 See Richards’s account of the congress in his memoirs, pp. 198-200.
395 When I first mentioned my project to the historian Royston Landau—who worked as an architect in the LCC at the time—as an effort to contextualize AR’s postwar campaigns, his first response was to express disapproval of the project as a reappraisal of these “William Morris revivalists.”
Although he criticized the invention of stylistic labels such as “New Empiricism” and its later rechristening as “New Humanism,” he was as anxious as Pevsner was to present the world of art Britain’s “first native art movement” with a rivaling label such as “New Brutalism” in 1955.  

One month after “Reconstruction in the USSR” AR presented its readers one possible solution among many to provide a “psychological solution” without undermining the “functionalist” basis of modern architecture. AR welcomed “The New Empiricism” as “Sweden’s latest style” and as a genuinely modern attitude which claimed to expand the range of architectural expression as a response to the threat of one style dominating the world. AR had published Sven Backström’s earlier article entitled “A Swede Looks Back at Sweden” in 1943, which called for a revision of modernist principles from the viewpoint of the inhabitant. In the 1943 article, which the editors quoted, Backström argued that modern architects’ preoccupation with the aesthetic took priority over functional concerns, and claims of objectivity backfired to prove the superiority of certain traditional solutions. The published examples of 1947 incorporated free planning, prefabrication, a sophisticated interest in structure, technological equipment and details but also allowed a traditional material palette. While some of the houses such as the one at Kevinge by Sven Markelius combined a traditional language with that of the modern by large glass surfaces in the living room and a pitched roof, one built by the Erskine couple combined cubist geometry and traditional materials in stark contrast to the landscape.

In the fall of 1947, at the time when the issue on Soviet reconstruction appeared, and the one on “New Empiricism” was in the works, Richards attended a preparatory

---

396 I will discuss this tension in another section that focuses on Pevsner and Richards’s anti-avant-garde effort to secure a continuous modernist tradition.

397 Although Banham argues that the label was invented to mock “New Empiricism” it is quite puzzling to see him claiming “Britishness” for New Brutalism since he criticized Pevsner’s preoccupation with “nationalist sentiment” in “The Englishness of English Art” and the campaign for the picturesque. Ironically, Banham’s first attempt to characterize the “New Brutalism” was published in AR and the satirical reference to “New Empiricism” does not exist in the earlier article. See Reyner Banham, “The New Brutalism,” in AR, December 1955, v. 118, pp. 9-11.

398 My emphasis.

399 Eric Mumford credits J. M. Richards as the author of “The New Empiricism: Sweden’s Latest Style” however the article was left unsigned. It is quite probable that it was Richards. Eric de Maré could have written this article, too. He was an English citizen of Swedish origin, and he wrote another article on “New Empiricism” half a year later titled “The New Empiricism: The Antecedents and Origins of Sweden’s Latest Style” AR January 1948, v. 103, pp. 9-22.
meeting in Zurich for the sixth CIAM congress that would take place in Bridgwater, England. Contrary to what Richards argued in his memoirs about "Architectural Expression" being the central theme of the Congress, several national committees that attended the meeting brought diverse themes to be discussed in the congress. As a result, according to Eric Mumford, Bridgwater was accepted as a preparatory congress for CIAM 7 in Bergamo 1949. In the preparatory meeting, Richards argued that most of the members of CIAM groups were in key public positions of planning and building, to implement CIAM principles. Therefore, for him, it was time for CIAM to turn to discussions of architectural expression. Giedion’s interest in a new monumentality in order to give a new expression to community spirit and Richards’s interest for redefining an aesthetic program partially overlapped.

The CIAM Congress took place at Bridgwater, on September 7-14, 1947 and Richards gave one of the concluding lectures. In this talk, Richards argued for healing the communication breach between the public and modern architecture via a modification of modern architectural aesthetics. His talk partially reintroduced the principles of AR’s postwar program in “The Second Half Century” to the audience. Richards also put forward a toned-down version of the issues he had previously explored in relation to culture, suburbia and the role of the vernacular in the “The Castles on the Ground,” only recently published by the Architectural Press. However Richards’s emphasis in the book on anonymity and class-consciousness was omitted from the talk.

After Bridgwater, Richards continued publicizing his ideas on “Architecture and the Common Man” by a talk in the Architectural Association in January 1948 which elaborated on the themes he had introduced in CIAM. There as well as in his AA talk, 403

---

400 “These were the MARS group’s “architecture in relation to the common man,” suggested by Richards; Giedion’s “architecture and its relation to painting and sculpture,” attributed to the Swiss group; and “units for planning of urban housing,” suggested by the Swedish group, which was similar to a theme suggested by the Polish group on “Neighborhood planning.” See E. Mumford “CIAM Discourse...” p. 170.
401 Richards’s talk was published alongside with those of Gropius’s and Le Corbusier’s in the Architects’ Journal on September 25, 1947, pp. 277-279.
Richards shifted the discussion from class-consciousness to a more universalized plane under the generic notion of the “common man” popularized by New Deal politics in the United States. 404

Richards defined the “common man” as someone who had no training in architecture and apart from his limited relationship to architecture as a user, one that had a predominantly visual relationship to his surroundings. He argued that architects had discarded the public’s views on their work and adopted a technocratic self-righteous attitude. While modern architecture answered utilitarian needs and satisfied emerging building programs by incorporating the developments in engineering, it lost its “emotional” appeal by obeying the moral demand for a novel language. 405 This disconnection was threatening modern architecture with the danger of becoming, “a private cult.” It was after realizing the danger of losing the people’s support that the Soviets had retreated from the avant-garde architecture that aimed to express the early revolutionary zeal of October 1917.

Thus, Richards’s narrative pointed to a threat to modern architecture, posed by the two dominating attitudes in the early postwar period which would largely determine AR’s postwar policies: One totally undermined the modern movement by arguing that a direct return to the earlier historicist phase of architecture was necessary to communicate to the people; the other simply disregarded such need for communication as part of modern architecture’s agenda. No matter how sound the justification for the Soviet retreat, Richards believed that both attitudes were wrong:

404 In this period Henry Agard Wallace was the 33rd vice president of the United States in the democratic administration of Franklin Roosevelt, who epitomized the philosophy of the “common man.” Wallace was a prolific writer whose works included America Must Choose (1934), The Century of the Common Man (1943), Sixty Million Jobs (1945)—in which he called for governmental action to supplement private enterprise—and The Long Look Ahead (1960). See "Wallace, Henry A.." Encyclopædia Britannica, 14 October, 2003 <http://www.search.eb.com/eb/article?eu=77957>.

405 “Modern architecture has suffered along with all the other arts from the necessity of having to create a new set of symbols which by definition, lack the sentimental appeal of the old familiar symbols... the penalty modern architecture paid for its bold resolve to face contemporary needs and meet them with contemporary means was that it had to accept for the first time all the implications of the industrial revolution—and all the technical innovations that naturally followed. These are familiar to us all: the factory production of building parts; the separation of craftsmanship from design; the abolition of hand-worked ornament through the use of the machine; the use of synthetic materials—like reinforced concrete... In these and similar ways architecture was compelled to become a scientific mystery at the moment when its social impulse was to become once again a social art.” Richards “Architecture and the Common Man,” p. 155.
So one way that modern architecture can get the common man on its side is simply by demonstrating to him its capability of improving his standard of living and enriching his environment... some architects are confident that the difficulty of common man’s failure to appreciate the contemporary idiom will be overcome naturally, as modern architecture enlarges and humanizes its vocabulary—which it has shown signs that it is beginning to do—by readmitting regional characteristics determined by conditions of climate and environment, by greater use of natural materials and materials that mellow with age...

Richards’s interpretation, then, implicitly saw modern architecture’s earlier development as the assimilation of technological and structural change and one that established utilitarian concerns central to its response to social change. Hence, the earlier aesthetics did not necessarily have a political symbolism. It was time for this “infrastructure” to take on a variety of “skins” to serve its new clientele, the “common men”—who for the first time in history became the “real patrons of architecture”—provided that they differ from the fancy-dress styles of the past. Modern architecture’s true “revolutionary” aspect was in its recently developed capability to provide fast and well, for the new demands of those in the lower ranks of society. By putting on natural materials and regional characteristics it could simulate familiar environments and assume a psychologically therapeutic function for the “common man.”

Richards’s CIAM talk did not simply suggest that modern architects should change their material choices and look up to local traditions but also that they should look for alternative technological means to satisfy the common man’s demand for identity. The vernacular helped the “common man” to identify with a larger framework of culture while his own interventions, like gardening, reinforced his individual identity. Reverting to Morrisian critique, Richards indicated how modern architecture proudly made use of certain technological advantages based on their economical efficiency but downplayed their social and practical ramifications. Standardization and prefabrication, mostly of larger scale construction members, for instance, created a bland uniformity due to monotonous repetition that overlooked clients’ demand for individuality. For Richards

---

407 “But the use of standardization presents a more difficult problem, and arouses a more positive resistance, because standardization suggests loss of individuality, and therefore conflicts with people’s natural instinct to struggle for the preservation of individual identity in a world dominated by the impersonality of the machine.”
machine production and its processes could be refined by modern architects to provide diverse solutions. He suggested that, for instance, prefabrication could be channeled to provide variety of architectural form instead of speed of production by researching smaller instead of larger building components.\footnote{Banham would come to a similar conclusion in his On Trial series published in AR throughout 1962, from the point of view of consumer culture and the freedom he imparted on the consumer.}
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\caption{De Mare's article “The New Empiricism” follows the IRB Building in Brazil, AR January 1948}
\end{figure}

On January 1948, AR published another article that further clarified the Review’s interest in “New Empiricism.” Eric de Maré’s “The New Empiricism: The antecedents and origins of Sweden’s latest style,” asserted that “New Empiricism” had a certain cultural affinity for architects in Britain.\footnote{De Maré went to the Architectural Association in the 1930s and worked full-time at the Architects’ Journal prior to becoming a free-lance author and photographer in 1947. He was a British citizen of Swedish origin and did architectural photography for the Review.} (Figure 2.6) It had its origin in the “Swedish temperament,” which aimed to balance “German mechanical perfectionism and love of abstractions... by British practicality...and common sense” and “an experimental,
undogmatic” character. Apart from this nationally sensitive emphasis De Maré evaluated the conscious questioning of attributes that came to characterize the modern movement in Sweden after this country’s successful experiments in the previous decades. Swedish architects had come to realize that the performance principle characterizing functionalism happened to be employed more as an alibi to justify puritan aesthetics. Flat roofs leaked, white surfaces stained and needed maintenance, while traditional materials still provided performance as well as richer texture and color. The emphasis on material function undermined what Pevsner had called “spiritual function,” or what one may call “symbolic” function today; and de Maré argued that modern man longed for “fantasy and ornament.”

![Figure 2.7 House in Brentwood, California by Richard Neutra, AR November 1947](image)

Between 1947 and 1948 the Review published several buildings from Brazil, the east and the west coast of the United States, Holland, Denmark and Sweden where the interest in a new language was transforming the face of modern architecture. The editors

---

also focused on some of the “white” masters of the 1930s who were now practicing in the US. Two Californian houses by Serge Chermayeff and two by Marcel Breuer in Long Island in addition to a desert house in Colorado and another in Brentwood California by Richard Neutra aimed to illustrate “the elusive relationship between style and materials” (Figures 2.7, 2.8).

Figure 2.8 Two houses in Piedmont, California by Serge Chermayeff, AR August 1947

Lewis Mumford’s advocacy for the “Bay Region style” came particularly close to the editors’ opinions. In September and October 1948 the editors introduced the Bay Region style, by insisting that “New Empiricism” and the Bay Region style were evidence of a shared tendency in modern architecture. For the editors, “New Empiricism” was a younger development in comparison to the Bay Region style which had gone through a longer period of evolution and continuous local growth before it transformed into a modern idiom:

411 Chermayeff’s houses were published in August 1947, Breuer in October 1947, Neutra in November 1947 and January 1948 issues of AR.
Here it is pointed out that whereas its recent spread in the U.S.A. is undoubtedly a symptom of the same tendency as gave rise to the New Empiricism, the Bay region style differs from its Swedish counterpart in having roots which go back fifty years into the past.  

*AR* did, however, adopt, Lewis Mumford’s definition of the style as a “humane” expression of the “way of life on the [Pacific Coast]” and his plea for it to spread around the United States. Mumford also attributed a sense of self-maturation to the modern movement by means of which it shed its “quixotic purities, its awkward self-consciousness, [and] its assertive dogmatism,” and made use of its developed ability to direct machine production and the processes of industrialization for humanization. The concern of the younger generation to experiment with color and texture in order to respond to the inhabitants’ feelings and sentiments, for Mumford, was the result of this maturation.

In citing the *MoMA* symposium entitled “What is Happening to Modern Architecture?” of 1947 as an occasion of passionate debate for the “Bay Region Style,” the editors consciously downplayed the style’s relegation to “heresy” by the “eastern architectural establishment” in the United States, as Stanford Anderson called it in his article “The “New Empiricism-Bay Region Axis”: Kay Fisker and Postwar Debates on Functionalism, Regionalism and Monumentality.” Anderson’s account of the transcontinental link between the “New Empiricism” and the “Bay Region Style” reveals an interesting polarity in terms of the formation of “establishment” lines vis-à-vis the younger generation. In the United States those who opposed the “Bay Region” style were part of a circle centered around the MoMa and the publicists of the “International Style”—like the director of the museum Alfred Barr, H. R. Hitchcock and Philip Johnson. In Britain however, the younger generation opposing the so-called “Establishment,” idolized the same figures, most importantly Mies and Corbusier, held in high esteem by the older generation around MoMA. The British youngsters, like the

---

412 See the table of contents page of *AR*’s October 1948 issue.
Smithsons, Colin St. John Wilson, Alan Colquhoun and James Stirling favored the favorites of the American “establishment.” The battle lines that Banham established with reference to a young generation vs. British architectural “Establishment” actually did not make much sense on the other side of Atlantic, at least with reference to generational conflict.

That *the Review* was after a modern architectural tradition defined in terms of continuity to serve for different everyday cultures was confirmed when *AR* allied with Mumford against Giedion on the debate on monumentality. In September 1948, *AR* published a symposium to survey how different leading architects and architectural writers understood the concept. Far from establishing a consensus, the authors, including Gregor Paulsson, Henry-Russell Hitchcock, William Holford, Sigfried Giedion, Lucio Costa, and Alfred Roth, expressed a spectrum of opinions that witnessed to the elusiveness of the term. The arguments varied from total opposition to monumentality (Gregor Paulsson), to a re-assimilation of the classical canon (William Holford). Some wanted to create anew a monumental modern vocabulary in order to create a backdrop for mass spectacle (like Sigfried Giedion).416

But it was to Mumford that *AR* devoted most of its attention, giving him the amount of space it had given to the whole symposium seven months later.417 Mumford pointed out that creating a new civic symbolism through the re-appropriation of hierarchic order, monumentality and abstract form was impossible, and monumentality could only result from the social intention of new building programs.418 The platform that *AR* provided for Mumford allowed him to transcend the limited discussion on “monumentality” and he ended up diagnosing the state of modern architecture and answering his critics on the “Bay Region” style.419 Mumford identified two schools in modern architecture; one that emphasized continuity and another that emphasized discontinuity. He identified the latter as a dated “narrow canon” affected by “the Cubist

---

417 It must be remembered that *AR*’s position on regional planning was never in agreement with Mumford. *AR*’s editors, especially Richards and Hastings found Mumford’s ideas on decentralization and the regional city against the nature of what they called the town and country dialectic.
419 On p. 174 Mumford directly responds to Alfred Barr’s condescending reference to the Bay Region style as “bay region cottage architecture.”
theories of painting and by the mechanocentric attitude that Le Corbusier sought to translate into aesthetic terms” practiced by the New Pioneers.420 For the work of the former, the New Traditionalists, he gave the example of “Fritz Schumacher, Auguste Perret and the elder Kolomon Moser,” who “on approaching maturity, promptly reached back for certain elements they had dropped in their first one-sided absorption in expressing technical processes.”421

The editorial introduction of AR presented Mumford as attempting the definition of “a truly inclusive kind of modernism... characterized not by uniformity but by unity.” In this modernism, “the regional [would] bear the universal stamp and the universal [would] incorporate and further the regional.”422 Mumford cited regional experiments from around the world which testified to the emergence of a modern architecture “indigenous” to world cultures opposed to the “covert imperialism of great world Megalopolises” lurking behind the “International Style.” AR would offer the “functional tradition” to offset both the universalizing tendencies of the International Style and the historicist Soviet attitude in order to develop a modern architecture indigenous to Britain and universally “appropriate.” The Functional Tradition would mend the break with the past that the revolution had created by recovering “architectural” aesthetics. It would attempt to return ornament, color and texture to architecture, oppose the split between architecture and engineering, and argue for a “relevance of the past.”

2b. Recovering “Architectural” Aesthetics:

For AR, to declare an end to the revolutionary phase of modern architecture meant that they also declared an end to avant-gardism. Apart from using traditional materials and alluding to regional varieties in the international debate, AR aimed to reestablish the links to history that modern architecture had severed in its formative period. AR responded in a series of sporadic articles that aimed to resituate modern architecture with reference to architectural history, the use of ornament, proportioning systems, color and texture and a critique of the split between architecture and engineering.

422 Ibid, p.177.
For those who saw modern architecture as an ever-advancing, ever-changing phenomenon, the most visible and most “heretic” of AR articles was Osbert Lancaster’s “The Relevance of the Past.”423 This article itself was an introduction to a series of articles entitled “Reassessment.” Written by different critics, these articles would evaluate buildings of historical importance with an emphasis on individual experience in order to rejuvenate sensitivity to earlier masterpieces of architecture. By these articles modern architecture’s relationship to history would be redefined. AR stated the intention of the “Reassessment series:

The condemnation by the protagonists of the Modern Movement of the excessive preoccupation of the nineteenth century with the architectural monuments of the past was wrongly interpreted by many people as a rejection of the past per se. What they were really condemning, and rightly, was the spirit in which the nineteenth century had approached those monuments—that spirit of revivalism which sees the past as a pattern book to be pillaged rather than a history book from which to learn.424

Lancaster’s article elaborated on this message to clarify the role of historical precedents as the most powerful force in the history of architecture. In the second quarter of the twentieth century when the Modern Movement gained popularity in Britain, Lancaster observed, three main historical interests stood in opposition to modern rationalism: (1) An antiquarian interest in follies and an architecture of fantasy, (2) an interest in obscure buildings of merit that remained anonymous and outside history books, and (3) an interest in British neo-classical architecture of the eighteenth century.425 By the ascent of modern architectural pedagogy in the 1930s, Lancaster argued that the power of history was denied the potential it could have for architecture. He furthered his argument by adding that this denial could lead to an “impoverishment of [British] cultural life.”426 The reassessment articles would serve to restore the historical value to monuments as part of

423 Having joined AR in 1934, Lancaster had been serving on the editorial board since 1947. Lancaster established himself as an architectural critic via his cartoons after joining The Daily Express and his books known for their “sardonic humor” in relation to architecture and architectural history. See Louis Hellman “From to Pillar to Post-Modernism” The Architects’ Journal, 6 August 1986, p. 10 and the biography by Richard Boston titled “Osbert : A Portrait of Osbert Lancaster” (London : Fontana, 1990)
424 From the table of contents page in AR April 1949, vol. 105, no. 628.
425 In the second category Lancaster refers to the interest created mostly by John Betjeman in the unknown buildings of small British towns such as nonconformist chapels, old railway stations and in the third the founding of the Georgian Group and the popularity of John Summerson’s book on John Nash.
the campaign for visual education. AR found it necessary to avoid the “expert approach” for these articles. The critics were expected to follow the code that Hastings so admired, namely that of the English gentleman. Laying their specialization aside they were to narrate their personal experiences.\(^{427}\) The buildings chosen for the reassessment series were Canterbury Cathedral reviewed by the painter William Townsend (April 1949), The Great Pyramid by J.M. Richards (May 1949), Charles Garnier’s Paris Opera House by H.S. Goodhart-Rendel (June 1949), three Oxford Colleges by Nikolaus Pevsner (August 1949), and Stonehenge by John Piper (September 1949).

Colin Rowe’s now famous essay “Mathematics of the Ideal Villa” was published for the first time in March 1947 in the Review. Inspired by Romanian theorist Matila Ghyka’s (1881-1965) “The Geometry of Art and Life” (1946) and Rudolf Wittkower’s teaching, Rowe’s analysis and comparison of Palladio and Corbusier’s villas in terms of proportioning and structural systems rooted Le Corbusier in the classical tradition. In February 1948, AR published an article by Ghyka that analyzed the relationship between the Golden Section and Corbusier’s proportioning system “Modulor” to provide guidance to modern architects for compositional harmony.\(^{428}\) In February 1951, AR asked Kenneth Clark, who was director of the National Gallery at the time, to review Rudolf Wittkower’s “Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism.”\(^{429}\)

In May 1950, Colin Rowe’s second article entitled “Mannerism and Modern Architecture” proposed to understand masterpieces of modern architecture through mannerism as a state of mind instead of a stylistic category. This time Colin Rowe’s emphasis expanded from the work of Corbusier to the whole corpus of modern architecture’s early phase including the works of masters such as Adolf Loos, Ferenc Molnar, Walter Gropius, Mies van der Rohe in terms of form-making strategies. For the editors, Rowe broke new ground and challenged the alleged self-referentiality of modern architectural composition by “turn[ing] a number of stones which have been hiding other

\(^{427}\) "Our authors have been urged to avoid writing on masterpieces in a style of which they have specialized knowledge and to apply their critical intelligence to some work lying outside their own particular sphere but with some familiarity which was formerly regarded as being part of every well-educated man’s intellectual equipment." Ibid. p.160, my emphasis.


\(^{429}\) Wittkower’s book received a very positive review by Kenneth Clark in Feb. 1951.
things than some people thought." The skeptic tenor in the editorial preface was complemented by Rowe's questioning the exclusion of Corbusier's villa at La Chaux de Fonds, an early work with the most overt historical references, from the construction of his own architect persona in the Oeuvre Complète. Rowe not only investigated compositional strategies and linked them to modern architects' conscious use of new technologies to create unprecedented aesthetic effects, but also compared them to sixteenth century precedents in which he detected similar design strategies.

Thus, AR challenged the avant-garde architect's claim for a disconnection from history but also answered the critics of modern architecture who used this "alleged disconnection" to condemn it. In order to block any possible historicist implication to the pedagogy that Hastings had argued for the use of precedents in "Townscape," the editors published Philip Johnson's Glass House at New Canaan, Connecticut, distinguished by its apparent Miesian purity and simplicity, with a plea to the architect to reveal his "inspirations." Johnson's citations explained how he directly reproduced Mies's detailing of steel construction and how Malevich's paintings influenced the geometrical composition of the plan among other precedents. (Figure 2.9)

The interest in history brought back a revaluation of ornament and color. *The Review* argued that the need for color and ornament stemmed from "a fundamental human necessity." In prefacing Kenneth Clark’s article published in 1943 entitled "Ornament and Modern Architecture," the editors had asked whether there were possibilities in which ornament could return to modern architecture. For the editors, color and ornament served the "layman" to overcome the "drabness" of life in the built environment and modern architecture's purity had not yet provided the "layman" with any substitute. Clark’s article argued that although modern architecture suppressed ornament as a response to economical necessity new forms of ornament kept infiltrating into different types of architecture as the result of this "instinctual" will-to-art.
This “instinctual response” was grounded in the theories of “primitive” art and the evolution of consciousness. In “Art and Society” (1937), Herbert Read had argued that man, including children and the so called “primitive” cultures—which were being largely investigated by cultural anthropologists at the time—had an innate tendency to produce “art.” Art was a fundamental elemental activity in man to make sense of the world around him. Primitive man’s cave paintings or a child’s scribbles were executed in “a mode...of envisaging the individual’s perception of some aspect of universal truth.”

While this instinct was fundamental to every human being, the consciousness of the will-to-art was understood in terms of an evolutionary ladder, the top of which was occupied by the modern artist and his intellectualized processes of abstraction. For Clark, intellectualized abstraction was coupled with an emphasis on economical efficiency in modern architecture, leaving no future prospect for ornament. Clark concluded his article by speculating that while modern architecture’s lack of ornament was legitimate on a materialist basis, this “instinct” for ornament remained unsatisfied. He speculated that if the instinct did not vanish, ornament would have to come back to modern architecture in the form of a new tradition in order to satisfy the need of human beings not necessarily sharing the same level of artistic consciousness.

Since modern architecture condemned the superfluities of the “classical and Gothic traditions of antiquarianism and connoisseurship,” the editors looked towards an alternative tradition in which ornament was handled differently. In the 1943 issue in which Clark’s article was published, AR presented Eric Ravillious’s designs for Wedgwood porcelains as a fruitful outcome of the designer’s research into the English vernacular for ornament.

In June 1948, the Review published another article, this time by Millicent Rose entitled “Dwelling and Ornament in the East End,” to present how nineteenth century working-class buildings of the East End adapted the Georgian vernacular of the eighteenth century into the way-of-life of the inhabitants, by means of a “collaboration between builder and inhabitant.” Rose contrasted the “function and hygiene-based

---

433 Ibid. p. xii.
434 Eric Ravilious was one of J.M. Richards’s closest friends since the early 1930s. Ravilious was a prolific painter and designer until he was killed during the Second World War when he was on a mission as part of his duty for the War Artists Program in 1942.
modern architecture" to the variety of the simple Georgian vernacular of the “East End,” much favored by their inhabitants. According to Rose, the inhabitants showed that they “loved and craved decoration” in the skillful arrangement of their gardens as well as their interior decoration. Apart from the inhabitants’ own decoration, such as the addition of flower pots and the addition of trellises for creepers, the dwellings photographed for the article had simple decorative motifs made of brick and stucco integrated into structural members or by alternating patterns of construction. The simplicity and geometric character of Ravilious’s designs as well as the Georgian vernacular of East End, “herald[ed] a new kind of ornament.”

The life in the East End became a source of inspiration for the Independent Group in the early 1950s through the group’s anthropological interest in working class life as part of a project by sociologist J. L. Petersen between 1948 and 1952. However the result of this interest followed modernist models of abstraction in the Smithson’s work, reducing the functional complexity of the street to the monotonous and disconnected “street deck,” as well as the complete detachment of pedestrian circulation from social functions in the later 1950s projects such as Golden Lane and Berlin competitions.

*AR* also aimed to articulate a role for color in modern architecture to “educate the eyes” of architects by the sensibilities of the painter. A series of articles that ran from November 1943 to September 1947 was aimed to recover the “associative” value of buildings derived from local vernaculars. Colors, like “the ochres, the browns, creams and apricots of cottage, pub and shop” were deemed “in imminent danger of dropping out of [England’s] aesthetic patrimony.” Due to photography circulated via architectural journalism the modern architects’ visual sensibility had become too eager to envision buildings in black and white images.

According to the editors, the painter’s task was not to merely depict urban scenes, but to intensify and dramatize “the real” by the lines and colors of the buildings that gave the scene its character. John Piper’s neo-romanticism, carefully poised between the naturalistic and the surreal and depicting the urban and the rural equally as skillful, was

437 See the editorial introduction to John Piper “Colour in the Picturesque Village” *AR* May 1945, v. 97, pp. 149-150.
expected to speak to the modern architect in the formulation of a richer color palette.438

British painter Michael Rothenstein (1908-1993), known for his paintings of the Essex countryside of the 1940s and his abstract expressionist paintings of the 1960s, argued that modern architects, having invented a new and exciting language, did not develop color in the midst of unlimited polychromatic possibilities and limited themselves to the "photographic eye." For Rothenstein, modern architecture gave priority to the expression of unadorned structure and of simple volumes. The engineer’s aesthetic assimilated under the rubric of “machine aesthetic” had superceded that of the architectural, suppressing material variety.

J. M. Richards criticized the domination of the engineer’s aesthetic by explaining it as the result of a “wrong turn” in history as well as in historiography. In March 1949, Richards published an article entitled “The Wrong Turning” largely inspired by Marxist émigré historian Francis D. Klingender’s book “Art and the Industrial Revolution” (1947).439 Richards argued that it was misleading to see nineteenth-century engineering structures as forerunners of modern architectural aesthetics since to their creators these structures “may have been necessary outcomes of economic expediency.”440 Although these structures were awe-inspiring and beautiful, the real value of these structures, for Richards, was the world view of the public that backed the engineers who designed them with a sense of conquest. The engineers not only solved mathematical problems of construction but also gave expression to the tension within the nineteenth century mind that contemplated the sublime forces of nature with awe, while simultaneously “pursuing


439 Francis Klingender was born in 1907 of a German father and English mother, and grew up in Germany. In the late 1920’s his father and him went to England where he became a student at the London School of Economics. His interest in economics and sociology led him to Marxism and he joined the Communist party. He was related to the Artists International Association, a strongly leftist organization, which was founded in 1933. Klingender taught at Hull University after World War II and was largely interested in social psychology. For more, see Donald D. Egbert “English Art Critics and Modern Social Radicalism” The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism Autumn 1967, v. 26, pp. 29-46 and Social Radicalism and the arts, Western Europe; a cultural history from the French Revolution to 1968 (New York: Knopf, 1970) of the same author which is an extended version of the mentioned article.

the means of taming it.” The works of engineering, such as Telford’s Cysylte Aqueduct over the river Dee, were raised to the level of a work of social art by being the result of nineteenth century society’s aspirations to conquer the sublime. Such monumental engineering works represented the “emotional fusion” between science and art, and therefore were truly creative works of architecture. This fusion was lost when the experimental phase of engineering ended, followed by “rules of thumb and primitive specialization.”

Richards derived the moral that a social sense of mission had to be reflected onto postwar reconstruction programs by architects in order to recapture such fusion. However the parameters that would affect such a program remained vague in his discussion, the ideal being to achieve this “emotional fusion” between science and art. In my opinion, one may look for the ideological background for such a program in the text that inspired Richards’s article, although Richards suppressed this background in his article. Francis Klingender’s Marxist art history had detected the cause of the split between architecture and engineering in the history of political economy:

When political economy abandoned the humanist standpoint for a sophisticated defense of property, the links between science and art was broken... arts, in themselves good, turned into fearful scourges of mankind, and science turned into sophistry through attempting to justify the evil.

Klingender’s attack was directed at Malthusian economical theory of the late eighteenth century and its ramifications. Malthus’s “Essay on the Principle of Population” (1798), argued Klingender helped justify for the capitalists the conditions of the “struggle of existence” and to hinder developing channels of humanism that could have helped the working classes. According to Klingender, romantic poets protested the abuse of the working classes and alerted the society. They pointed to the root of evil in the immoral use of science as well as art. Although science got a bad name for the romantics, poets like Shelley and Wordsworth still saw the hope of a “growth of true science beneath the
perversion forced upon it by a false morality and evil institutions.” \(^{445}\) Social recovery, for Klingender, could be realized by imparting art and science their lost moral mission and by making them serve common humanity instead of capitalist greed.

J. M. Richards followed Klingender by stating that when the links between science and art were broken as technical progress marched towards instrumental specialization. Architecture, slow in assimilating the progress in engineering, turned to revivals to build symbols to capitalism in the nineteenth century, and was victimized during this process. Modern architecture seemed to have started to repair the “divorce between architecture and engineering” during the developments of the thirties but in the postwar era a similar danger seemed imminent once again:

...modern architecture having been invigorated by the injection of a new technical knowledge, new materials and new methods of producing them industrially, has a second opportunity of keeping the style of its outward expression with the spark of technical vitality. Now that all talk is about rehumanization of architecture after the discipline of the thirties, there is clearly the possibility of architecture again being led, by its most devoted adherents to a wrong turning... The alternative is not a new puritanism, but the development of a humanized vernacular on the basis of the emotional fusion, which the nineteenth century failed to achieve, between the sciences and the arts. It is not impossible that the great social opportunities represented by such undertakings as the New Towns may serve the same function as the railway and canal building undertakings of a century ago, and inspire another generation of designers with the sense of mission that inspired the early nineteenth-century engineers... These engineers combined material achievement with a poetic vision of a kind to which the English have always been susceptible. \(^{446}\)

AR would follow seven months later in January 1950, with a special issue on “The Functional Tradition” to supply modern architects with the hints for a “humanized vernacular” by selectively collecting existing vernaculars for inspiration. This collection would put forward how architecture and engineering were harmonized in the modest but vigorous aesthetic of nineteenth-century industrial structures, albeit built without a subscription to the discourse of functionalism that came to dominate architecture after the 1930s.

---

\(^{445}\) Ibid; p. 102.

\(^{446}\) Richards “The Wrong…” p. 108 (my italics).
In March 1950, J.M. Richards published a polemical article entitled “The Next Step?” which defined what he called a “social realist approach” to architecture to provide a trajectory for modern architecture. Richards explained anonymity and cultural continuity through the lens of social realism and asserted that local vernaculars held the key to rejuvenate anonymity in architecture, and to preserve homogeneity in the built environment in combination with Townscape principles.

Echoing Lewis Mumford, Richards argued that a doctrinaire and routine functionalism was on the march to become a style. A new routine was needed for modern architecture “to take the place of the old classical orders and the pattern-book styles.” For Richards the ranks of “nineteenth century high priests” that the modern movement dethroned were replaced by new ranks of modern priests. The self-referentiality of modern architecture had become irritatingly evident, especially in Eastern European countries:

...since cultural unity disintegrated after the Industrial Revolution and architecture got out of touch with life, it has needed a conscious effort to recover content. The purpose of content, of course, is that architecture shall have meaning for others beside architects... That is the basis of the search for style that seems to dominate the architectural scene in this self-conscious age. It is especially evident, for obvious reasons in the Eastern European countries. For the problem is to retain, in a highly industrialized, scientifically conceived architecture, a content that will make it intelligible to everyone, and will therefore allow architecture to take its place naturally as one of the popular arts and one of the vehicles of patriotic sentiment....

In the search for this ideal, Richards noted that several catchwords such as “the new empiricism, the international style, the Bay Region Style, Sharawaggi, the new monumentality, art of the people, mechanization, the organic, the functional tradition,”

---

447 The editorial preface noted: “In this article J. M. Richards points out the dangers inherent in the situation—including the danger of functionalism itself becoming a style, as hide-bound as any of the older ones...” J. M. Richards, “The Next Step?,” in AR, March 1950, v. 107, pp. 165-181.
448 Ibid. p. 166.
have been produced in the forties to define the new orientation for modern architecture. Refusing the East European answer, he argued, modern architects were split between continuing modern architecture’s self-referentiality by rejecting any appeal to popular taste or by being eager to produce “something closely resembling a popular vernacular.” Richards brought back his thesis in “The Castles” but gave up his plea for the acceptance of people’s taste as it is. Since such architecture was not accepted by architects, an effort had to be made to utilize the spontaneity and vitality of the suburban vernacular by grafting its popular qualities onto contemporary functionalism.

The content of Richards’s article was closely linked to the January special issue of AR on the “Functional Tradition.” (Figure 2.10) Before “The Functional Tradition” was prepared as a special issue, the role of vernaculars in the built environment was explored in two more special issues by the Review in shorter section; one on Britain’s canals and the other on the “Pub tradition.” AR also organized a competition for a hypothetical pub designs for modern architects to analyze the local pub as a vernacular type, determine its material and spatial characteristics and to reinterpret it within the vocabulary of modern architecture.

The functional tradition was assumed to have a genealogical link to contemporary functionalism through the principles that defined its making. If modern functionalism meant designing with functional principles by employing “the most suitable materials, processes and performance standards to justify one or several specific functions,” then the examples that the editors included, built by “generations of blacksmiths, masons, wheelwrights, millwrights and shipwrights,” employed similar principles. The editors argued that although it was characterized and limited by utmost economic necessity, the functional tradition transcended bare materiality and brought “sensuous enjoyment” into the life of the people by means of its intelligent use of material and detailing. The vernaculars published in the issue covered a large spectrum including warehouses, sheds, piers, signs, fencing, railing, gates, steps, road paving, drains, beach huts, bridges, pubs,

450 Ibid. p. 168.
windmills etc., namely types of buildings or design objects that populated the environment but not necessarily taken as objects of design debate.

The most successful examples of the functional tradition were found in what the editors called “the nautical style” that characterized the “maritime way of life.” As a case study, the editors provided several photographs from the Cobb at Lyme Regis in the southwest of England, a historic breakwater built out of stone over the centuries following the contours of the underwater bed of rock (Figure 2.11). Not only the breakwater fulfilled its function against the winter sea but it also provided subtle effects of shade and shadow, textural qualities by the aging stone and place of public promenade and leisure for the inhabitants.

The functional tradition was also spotted in structures where “clearly some anonymous force was seen to have dictated the form assumed by a bridge, a windmill or a pub, a form that appeared so satisfactory.” Objects realized in the functional tradition in their allegiance to the principles of the modern idiom could help realize a “homogenous world” but also “by the startling nature of their contrasts provide the antidote to uniformity.” (Figure 2.12)

The reason why vernacular buildings started to look sympathetic to the eyes of modern architects was this intimate functionalist connection which successfully created “subtlety of form” out of an emphasis on economic construction. Richards argued that “functionalism” could be employed “instinctively as well as consciously.” While modern architecture practiced a scientific, “calculated” functionalism, the “instinctive” kind of functionalism that operated in the making of “the functional tradition” continued throughout history. Therefore the future of modern architecture would be shaped by a

455 Ibid, p. 65.
new definition of functionalism by bringing the instinctive into the realm of the calculated.

Richards evaluated three alternatives for the future of modern architecture, naming them "unlimited mechanization," "conscious humanization" and the "social realist approach." The advocates of "unlimited mechanization," like Buckminster Fuller, accepted that contemporary civilization was based on machine production to substitute handicrafts. Architecture, in order to be in tune with the zeitgeist, had to adapt itself to the procedures of machine production. This was not a viable option for Richards, since "true functionalism" and "unlimited mechanization" were incompatible. True functionalism had to enable a specific solution to each problem, "every case to be treated exactly on its merits," and had to necessarily create an architecture of the particular; whereas mechanization, based on the idea of repetitive production, demanded an architecture of the general. The only possible solution to this incompatibility was to concentrate on smaller building components.
Those who searched for “a conscious humanization” dealt mainly with the problem of reestablishing the popular appeal of architecture by concentrating on the “organic and visual” and by undermining its technical aspects. By referring to the examples of New Empiricism and the Bay Region style, Richards argued that for this “school of thought,” the only hope for modern architecture was to concentrate on local characteristics and to evolve a new regionalism from aspects of climate, materials and social needs to overcome the “internationalism” of the nineteen twenties. But this approach had the problem of turning into an escape from the dynamics of an “increasingly unified world, whose problems cannot be solved by a sentimental preoccupation with the charms and chances of local topography…” Richards believed that the disadvantages of these two approaches would not be overcome by an architectural solution. He positioned himself as a supporter of what he called the “social realist” approach against that of a “socialist realism” codified by Soviet state policy. He stated:

This approach... stresses always that architecture is simply a reflection of the times that produce it... It goes on to say that the way for architects to enter into the life of their own time is by making their own specialist contribution to improving the standard of life as it is lived in their time. Rather than appeal for a renewed popular interest in architecture by making buildings more sympathetic to look at, they should concentrate on demonstrating to the public in the most practical way the role architecture can play in harnessing the products of modern science to human use and in bringing purpose, order and system into a world that suffers at present both from confusion of purpose and from too many competing systems. When this demonstration has taken place, the argument runs, will be the time enough to see what style of architecture a new order of society is willing to welcome and is capable of participating in... The argument in fact ceases to be an architectural one, because architecture becomes an effect not a cause. And the proper answer is not to deny the contention that good architecture is a by-product of a good society but to insist on the validity of the axiom already propounded: that architecture as well as being made by circumstances, makes them.... Beyond the functionalism of the general, which is concerned with establishing principles, there is a logical next step, the functionalism of the particular... relating it ever more closely to the essential particulars of time and place and purpose. That is the level on which humanity and science meet.457

457 Ibid.
In conclusion, Richards’s analysis left the direction of architectural production to the run of history and to the operation of the dialectical principle. However, he also saw it as a prerequisite for architecture to be welcomed by the society and to participate in it.458

Richards’s definition of social realism was inspired by Francis Klingender’s pamphlet “Marxism and Art: An Approach to Social Realism” published in London for the first time in 1943 as part of Lawrence & Wishardt’s Marxism Today series, which was equally influential for John Berger, later a well-known Marxist art critic. In “Marxism and Art,” Klingender evolved a critique of Zhdanovist historicism and Roger Fry’s formalism, and an assessment of possibilities for modern art. He argued that, by limiting aesthetic experience to ‘pure’ form Fry impoverished the world of art, while his followers, who looked into art to see the emanation of the subconscious disregarded the larger realm of human consciousness, ignoring translatability of social relations into art.459 For Klingender, Fry attempted to construct an autonomous sphere for art where the artist lived in almost complete isolation of the “realworldly.” Artistic autonomy could be justifiable in Victorian society because the artist, by shutting himself off from its false morality, was enabled to preserve his integrity and to provide a critical attitude. However as a negative consequence, the unification of art with the people emerged as a problem and remained unsolved to Klingender’s day.

Klingender concluded that, in order to unite art with the people, art had to reproduce everything that interested man in life that is the “sum of man’s social relations” with a certain individualist take. However reproduction did not necessarily mean literal external representation: “to paint a face beautifully is not to paint a beautiful face.”460

458 "The Next Step?" must also be understood within the context of the rise of realism in Britain. In “The Battle for Realism: Figurative Art in Britain during the Cold War 1945-1960” (2001) James Hyman argued that two main channels of realism were developed in British art after the war as a reaction to abstraction which he termed “modernist realism” and “social realism.” Modernist realism resisted storytelling by emphasizing the metaphoric and the allusive via non-literary and non-illustrational depiction to distance itself from social and socialist realists. British social realism, however, had the ambition to “rejuvenate notions of a national tradition of illustrative reportage” that stretched back to the time of Hogarth. The critics that led the two currents, David Sylvester in the case of modernist realism and John Berger for social realism, were united in their criticism of the continental art establishment in Paris and their resistance to Soviet and American culture. As Hyman states “underscoring each was a dialectical relationship between a desire to present British culture as hegemonic and attempts to forge a decentralized, European culture free from the dominance of a single nation or superpower.”
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Hence Klingender opposed figurative representation as a requirement in socialist realist art. What was crucial for Richards’s article was that Klingender defined the purpose of art as the expression of “the unity of opposites.” This would lead Richards to make a similar correlation between the local vernaculars and international modernism. Klingender stated that, in portraying reality art had to express the particular for it to attain a universal significance:

Art is thus a striking and at the same time a particularly revealing illustration of the key conception of dialectics, the unity of opposites. For in art the particular becomes the general, the general reveals itself in the particular, and it is the unity of the particular and the general, expressed in the unity of content and form, which makes art an inexhaustible source of significant experience.\(^{461}\)

According to Klingender, Marx understood art as the reflection of man’s own practical activity in changing reality. Man’s consciousness altered as a result of social relations and the art he produced expressed these relations. Hence, although Klingender did not employ the term, the ideals of beauty of different classes are determined by class-consciousness. But since the artist’s work was a product of his total social relations, the artist could, and sometimes necessarily would, adopt a position opposed to the interest of his social class and thus develop a critical attitude. Therefore, a work of art, to be good, was accepted to challenge the creative faculties of man, and orient him towards the struggle of life instead of “drugging and deflecting” him.

Marxist theory, for Klingender, employed a dual standard to judge art. First it evaluated art with a relative standard based on the social conditions and the outlook of class it reflected, and second, it tested whether it contained a kernel of truth. Consequently Klingender argued that Marxist theory did not necessarily condemn all bourgeois art as bad. Finding the “modern movement” in art sterile, he pointed to a humanist and moral tradition that existed in British art which started by Hogarth’s work that expressed “the interests and aspirations of the people.”\(^{462}\) This agenda was later to be

\(^{461}\) Ibid, p. 23.

\(^{462}\) “With the appearance of Hogarth in the early eighteenth century British painting lost its provincial backwardness and assumed a leading role in Europe. Hogarth’s art is essentially ‘moral’ i.e. it is constantly and intimately concerned with social life. This social interest survived in the marvelous school of British caricature based on Hogarth which reflected the interests and the aspirations of our people from the time of the South Sea Bubble to the rise of Chartism... as soon as this vital substratum of popular, socially
embraced by other thinkers of the early New Left, such as E.F. Thompson in “William Morris: Romantic to Revolutionary” (1955) Richard Hoggart in “The Uses of Literacy” (1957), and Raymond Williams in “Culture and Society” (1958).

The vernacular for Richards, then, was the kind of architecture that expressed the “interests and the aspirations of the people” without mediation by the professional architect in the past. In a healthy cultural transformation, Richards believed that a new vernacular had to emerge from existing vernacular traditions to express people’s ways-of-life with the aid of modern architecture’s technological and programmatic infrastructure. The locally produced vernacular, evolving with the help of modern architecture’s dynamics, would fulfill this need by supplying the ahistorical and astylistic precedent for modern architecture without resorting to pastiche. It was time to suggest a modus operandi for the post-avant-garde regime.

conscious art had disappeared, British art as a whole relapsed into provincial eclecticism.” Klingender “Marxism and...” p. 11
B4. The Post-Avant-Garde Regime:

AR’s interest in the “Functional Tradition” and its role within Townscape continued in an uninterrupted fashion in 1950s and 1960s hardly affected by the rapidly transforming historical context. The Functional Tradition became a popular insert of the editors but not necessarily appearing in every issue throughout the 1950s and with less frequency in the 1960s. That the January 1950 special issue made an impact abroad was visible in Kay Fisker’s article under the same title in the Danish “Arkitekten” six months after the AR publication with specific reference to Richards’s article “The Next Step.” What had emerged as a stylistic debate early in the postwar was channeled into a traditional foundation, with an emphasis independent of stylistic change.

The editors aimed to prove the origins and the universality of the “Functional Tradition” in the early 1950s by turning to cultural anthropology. In February 1954, AR published an article entitled “Grass Roots: Huts, Igloos, Wigwams and Other Sources of the Functional Tradition” by Alain Houghton Brodrick who had been the “Joint Secretary General of the International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences” from 1934 to 1938. It was time for modern architects to learn from the “primitive.” AR’s editorial introduction stated:

The forms of these dwellings are as diverse as the cultures which use them, and Mr. Brodrick’s article surveys the circumstances and areas in which simple and autochthonous houses may be found... Through all varieties of dwelling will be found two constant themes; simplification of the shelter unit, and maximum exploitation of the materials and techniques, however primitive, of which the builder disposes. Primitive societies live at the upper limit of their technological resources, civilized societies live, on a statistical average, well below theirs, and can therefore learn much that is useful and necessary from their less well-equipped brothers of the tropics, the Arctic and the steppe lands.


Most probably authored by Hastings, with his usual skepticism towards science and technology, the editorial introduction acknowledged the "primitive builder" as a fiction just like "his brother the noble savage." However this "fiction" would be useful to battle another fiction in the so-called "civilized" society, since the structures of the so-called primitive man displayed a highly sophisticated use of limited available technology.

While the use of symbolism was very restricted in the dwelling, there always existed separate buildings in which ornamental symbolism represented the significance of a building for a community. Thus, architecture was divided into two primordial types, the monumental vs. the vernacular. The editorial introduction also added that modern man designed "well below his technological ceiling" and "well above [his] aesthetic one." Modern architects were invited to explore the efficiency of the use of materials by looking at the efficiency of their "primitive" brothers at the same time relearning the need for symbolism in architecture.

Brodrick's article argued that the dwellings in the cultures he investigated changed very slowly because the aesthetic of the dwelling became "part and parcel of man's private world" as a result of cultural memory. The superiority of newer technologies over that of the old was a modern day fallacy when propriety to the architectural problem was concerned.

By directing its readers to the proofs of anthropology and situating it firmly under the generous umbrella of culture, AR diverted the discussion of "the functional tradition" from the realm of taste and ideology. Another but more interesting instance in the attempt to prove the same argument reappeared, this time as the cover story of AR, like an intriguing allegory of modernity and an allusion to the alien quality of modern architecture. (Figure 2.13) The article was based on the colored architecture of the M'Pogga people, a branch of the Bantu tribe in Pretoria; written by Betty Spence and Barrie Biermann, the former an architect and research officer in the National Building Research Institute in Pretoria, the latter a lecturer in the Department of Architecture at Durban University.

---

The M’Pogga had moved to another settlement in which they were unable to find the main building material they were accustomed to in their ancestral land. Instead of using thatch, the M’pogga started to build by mudbrick and whitewash. They appropriated painted decoration, borrowed, according to the authors, from “white civilization” (Figure 2.14). However, the authors noted that the “eclectic mixture of Bantu and European culture [was] summed up and controlled in the same formal discipline as shapes the buildings themselves.”[^466] AR’s editorial introduction insisted that the Bantu, “a people with long-standing traditions of its own, living on the fringe of Western culture” had established a memorable built environment in a land that they only inhabited for a short time and that they would have to leave again when the farming work they did for the “white man” was finished. They borrowed “figurative and abstract elements from every level of the cultural experience of a people suspended, temporarily

between two ways of life." The modern subject and the primitive shared a suspended, transitional state of life. The value of the Bantu example, as stressed by the article’s authors and agreed by AR’s editorial introduction, was that the Bantu people articulated in their architecture “every level of [their] cultural experience” in a natural spontaneity. In order for modern architecture to satisfy the demands of people who participate in a certain culture, it had to adapt itself to their “cultural pattern.” When left to people themselves, as the M’pogga example proved, people recreated edifices that reflected their cultural memory no matter how mixed with so-called external influences.

AR’s editorial subscribed to a type of cultural particularism, that was developed by Franz Boas and his followers, Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead who studied culture as an integrated way of life. Benedict’s “Patterns of Culture” (1934) remained an influential work for about three decades. Ruth Benedict saw culture as a systematic body of learned behavior. By using comparative studies of the so-called “primitive” cultures, Benedict believed that modern man could better see his own socially transmitted behavior as well as understand the difference of standards between different cultures. “Primitive” cultures were accepted as a laboratory of social problems set in simpler terms by identifying “cradle traits” fundamental to all human thinking.

Benedict hoped to understand cultural forms and processes to differentiate between “local cultural types and those that are general to mankind.” She also bemoaned that modern civilization posed a threat to the diversity of cultures. Drawing from the life of a Native American tribe, she argued that the change in domestic rituals and public ceremonies by the integration into modernity changed the meaning of life. Therefore, the task of anthropology was “to study the living culture to know its habits of thought and the function of its institutions” because “such knowledge cannot come out of post-mortem dissections and reconstructions.” For Benedict, cultures had a tendency to wholeness and anthropology could study this tendency together with “simple association

467 Ibid, p. 36.
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mechanisms. The Bantu, represented the original mind of mankind, operating at the level of sub-consciousness.

Although Richards refrained from pointing to a formal direction in “The Next Step?” the social realist approach and the reincarnation of the functional tradition in modern architecture was joined under a single agenda. In 1953 Richards published another polemical article to challenge the impact of the emphasis on originality in the ideology of the avant-garde on architects. This article continued a debate that started in May 1953 between Richards and Frank Lloyd Wright, when Wright protested collectivism and team-work for being detrimental to the spirit of democracy in architecture. Richards argued that modern architecture needed to develop a canon and was in need of clichés at a time when the so-called “internationalist phase [was] passing.”

“In Defense of the Cliché” contrasted the agency of the architect to that of the community. AR’s editorial summarized Richards’s idea as “examining the benefits of not being original.” The pioneers of the Modern Movement had introduced modern architects with “new found freedoms” as result of developing technological possibilities. However “they left the ordinary rank and file of building designers without the support of rule of thumb procedures and pre-established solutions to every-day problems—that is without the support of clichés.” The vernacular and its repetitive unity subtly modified with creative detailing would provide the answer instead of a crude functionalism and mannerism that departed from the unique masterpieces of the pioneers. The modern architect, Richards argued, could easily use traditional materials and technologies with the hindsight of modern architecture’s principles without “aligning himself with traditionalists.”

As part of AR’s project to reunite modern architecture with its supposed origins “The Functional Tradition” came back in another special issue in 1957, this time drawing on the simple conventional architecture of the nineteenth century that responded to the emerging utilitarian programs of the industrial revolution. The July 1957 special issue of

---
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AR was later published as a book by the Architectural Press. The book was largely based on photographs and intended as a source of inspiration to architects without providing any historical research into the design of the buildings or their architects apart from simply listing them. Richards asserted that historians like Giedion, with the interest of “weaving history into a continuous fabric” had linked the development of modern architecture to the adaptation of engineering solutions, but in the process of selection had willfully overlooked those structures that did not fit into their own narratives:

We are now ready therefore, when we choose to look back a hundred years or more, to respond to the qualities we discern in a new category of functionally conceived buildings, whose prominent characteristics are not connected with new materials or experimental structures: the largely anonymous mills, warehouses and factories that rose up so boldly—and as it must have seemed at the time, brutally—in the last years of eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth; the years when England was being transformed by the industrial revolution of then they were of course the product.475

Richards defined the modern architect’s task as a switch from a radical, innovative attitude to that of an imitative, conscientious builder who assimilates a gradual evolution by incrementally perfecting the art of construction through the appropriation of precedents handed down by history. These structures were:

...personal creations whereas the process of refinement and attainment of subtlety in the handling and juxtaposition of materials, which we are now pursuing in our own architecture and in aid of which we can find inspiration in the functional architecture of the industrial revolution, are less matters of individual inspiration than of evolution. New and more sophisticated standards are achieved gradually and unselfconsciously as one anonymous mind after another applies itself to the modification of an established pattern.

That is how all styles of architecture perfect themselves, and our problem is to set this procedure satisfactorily in motion at a very difficult moment in history... The modern architect has reached a crucial point in the development of his art, which has been utterly changed by new technical resources, new planning responsibilities and new aesthetic ideals. Its impetus has, up till now, been a revolutionary one, but no art can ever remain for ever in a state of revolution. Innovation gives its vitality and its capacity to develop, but after the revolution comes consolidation depending on the creation of a vernacular language in the most worthwhile ideas of all the innovators gradually become merged.

Architecture's special need now is to perfect such a vernacular, even in the face of the difficulty that it means achieving the unselfconscious virtues in an age peculiar for its self-consciousness.476

Against the concrete grain elevators and silos of white, plain, unadorned surfaces that inspired an earlier generation of modern architects by Giedion, Richards pitched a new set of precedents such as robustly tactile warehouses or breweries, largely built of brick, wood, stone and iron and covered with pitched roofs. The functional tradition, he argued, had "a timelessness that allow[ed] the modern architect to learn from its without being guilty of archaism."477 The industrial structures also illustrated harmony with the landscape as was expected from modern industrial structures such as airports and atomic power stations.478

"The Functional Tradition" was also hoped to have a "taming" influence on the anti-aesthetic impact of "New Brutalism" that was also being developed at this time. Banham's defining essay published in AR in December 1955 set "memorability of image, clear exhibition of structure and valuation of materials as found" as the fundamental principles of "New Brutalism," qualities that Richards most appreciated in the industrial structures of the Functional Tradition. The essay's heavily avant-garde emphasis and Banham's stress on the movement's "bloody-mindedness and ruthlessness" was bypassed in the editorial introduction written for AR's table of contents page. Instead, New Brutalism was placed in the post-war continuum of the work of modern masters like the post-war work of Le Corbusier, just like Hunstanton School was interpreted as a successful derivation of Mies's work when it was published in 1954.479 "New Brutalism" was regarded as a return to modern architecture's first principles and its Englishness was emphasized.480

476 Ibid.
477 Ibid., p. 131.
479 The Hunstanton School was reviewed by Philip Johnson for the AR and the editors deemed Johnson as a true Miesian. See AR September 1954, v. 116, pp. 149-162. Letters from readers were published in the journal finding the building "utterly unenglish."
480 "These are found to be a strongly moralistic attitude to structure, in its widest sense, and materials in their crudest sense, coupled with a desire to render every building with a memorable visual image." See the
The hopeful link between the Functional Tradition and the work of the New Brutalists was repeatedly established for the work of the Smithsons after Hunstanton school and the early work of Stirling and Gowan. The discrepancy between AR’s representation of the Smithsons and their self-identification as the new English avant-garde and their perception by some of AR’s readers was expressed in protest letters sent to the Review. Two months after the Smithsons’ Sugden house at Watford was published in September 1957, one reader urged the editors to refrain from implying a relationship between the “conscious, educated casualness of the New Brutalists” and the “spontaneous quality” of anonymous architecture. He added that AR, as a “cultured publication,” had no space for Smithsons’ “vulgarity.”

---


481 See the reader correspondence in AR’s September 1957 issue.
Featuring Stirling and Gowan’s “Ham Common Flats,” (Figure 2.14) the editors were convinced that British architects were on the move to create a sophisticated vernacular. The editors stated:

What emerges...even more forcefully from the flats illustrated on the following pages, is an attempt to face the economic realities of dwelling construction in England today, and to extract from them an architecture that is workable in plan and grouping, and an aesthetic that is affective, rather than merely sufferable. The result seems to open the prospect of a sophisticated vernacular—and if that appears a contradiction in terms, then it may well be that our terms are in need of revision, for a vernacular without the affectations of primitive innocence is one of the possible lines of delivery from the depressed state of housing design in England.482

The call for the reinterpretation of local vernaculars by modern architects coincided with the neo-realist agenda in Italy. In 1957, AR published the “Urbs in Rure: Urban Nuclei in the Countryside” by Hilda Selem, that investigated the results of the INA-CASA competition projects in Italy (Figure 2.15).483 What was important for AR was the decentralized approach to these developments that is the involvement of local instead of central government authorities operating on a national scale. Selem emphasized that these development programs facilitated a greater sense of integration into local life and into social progress by involving the inhabitants and thus enabling participation, observed keenly by Richards. Following the Italian example was Suffolk village housing by R. L. Davies and John Weeks conducting a similar approach.

483 According to biographical note given in AR, Selem graduated from Rome University Architecture School and was an assistant at the school at the time of when the article was written. “As a result of winning the INA-CASA competition she has designed houses in many parts of Italy, from Catania to Lido di Venezia; among her other jobs have been a centre for delinquent children in the Abruzzi, the design and supervision of low-cost housing at Matera (Lucania) and a public park at Macerata. See Hilda Selem "Urbs in Rure," in AR, August 1957, v. 122, pp. 91-97. “Between the enactment of Legge 28 in 1949 and the adoption of the new Legge 167, in 1962, public housing in Italy was managed by l'Istituto Nazionale per le Assicurazione, the so-called INA Casa. This organization administered the post-WWII version of a series of earlier social housing programs in Italy: Istituto Case Populare (ICP, 1903); Istituto Autonomo per le Case Popolari (IACP, 1909); the Istituto Facista Autonomo per le Case Popolari (IFACP, the IACP under the fascist government); and for a while after INA Casa, Gestione Case per Lavoratori (GESCAL). ...INA Casa was a nation-wide program of housing construction that was concentrated in the principle metropolitan centers.” See http://www.housingprototypes.org/project?File_No=ITA016, 20/10/2003.
Figure 2.15 “Urbs in Rure,” Italian Neo-Realism and English Village Planning in _AR_, August 1957

The Italian as well as the English examples, according to the editorial introduction, allowed the local inhabitants to overcome their “suspicion of planning” by preserving “valuable cultural and social elements” from their traditional way of life. The projects provided “semi-enclosed public spaces with a strong sense of place and character, to act as natural fora for the life of the inhabitants.” Although the two examples highly differed in terms of production—no information given about whether local labor was involved in constructing the English example while the Italian buildings did—they were brought together in terms of small-scale rural planning experiments in which architecture played a subordinate role to create a sense of place. It must be emphasized here, that the language of the English example (Figure 2.16) was highly abstract as well as its detailing highly industrial in comparison to the Italian examples that quoted the regional directly, especially in contrast to San Basilio by Mario Fiorentino.

---

Manfredo Tafuri argues in the “History of Italian Architecture 1944-1985,” (1989) that Italian neo-realism was based on a sham intellectualism where architects shed their class consciousness to achieve:

a cathartic bath... the intellectuals’ exploration of these traditions hid a masochistic need to identify themselves with the losers, that their search for roots in the peasant hearth assuaged the anxiety of disorientation experienced through contact with mass society... The language of popular experience was invoked to annul a past founded on an intellectualized or expedient reliance on constructivist, internationalist, or neoclassical etymons.485

Tafuri’s argument, presupposes that by anchoring them in these rural developments, bourgeois architects pulled away the lower classes from the reality of metropolitan capitalism where alienation through the system reached its apogee. The projects succumbed to increased speculation and allowed the cooption of technological

backwardness into a means of development for advanced sectors by using “eloquence” to stabilize social forces.\textsuperscript{486}

Only via carrying the urban into the rural, and expressing the extinction of the rural within the urban, could architecture achieve the sense of alienation to expose the reality of the human condition: architecture must portray craft on the verge of extinction in the city and the rural incarcerated in the urban. Tafuri points to the sense of “community” portrayed both in the English as well as the Italian examples, as the projection of a regressive utopia, undermining the liberating anonymity of metropolitan shock.\textsuperscript{487} However, Tafuri’s evaluation begs the question whether a sense of “community” and urban anonymity are mutually exclusive realities when the urban is understood to harbor the coexistence of community and anonymity in the city’s semi-segregated alcoves and its foreign crowds.

The same year Sybil Moholy-Nagy’s book “Native Genius in Anonymous Architecture” was reviewed by Ian Nairn, who had edited the Counter-Attack (1955) and Outrage (1956) issues, under the title “US Functional Tradition.” Nairn was convinced that a worldwide consensus emerged on the value of anonymous architectures around the world, and was especially pleased that the book was based on buildings in the United States.

Nairn added that Moholy-Nagy succeeded to demonstrate that the Functional Tradition was a viable solution to the problems of architecture, equally applicable in either town or country.\textsuperscript{488} The persistence of anonymous tradition, for Nairn, was evidence of “total performance”: traditional solutions answered problems of economical and sturdy construction and the incalculable emotional impact on humans. New technology could guarantee better performance for machines, but although he was “given a lot of new gadgets to play with” it was the old Adam still inhabiting the earth. The vernacular was the return of the repressed childhood of modernity.

\textsuperscript{486} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{487} “A classic regressive utopia was being pursued, that of the “community,” as opposed to the anonymous metropolis “where one proceeds as though in a foreign land.” Ibid, p. 29.

\textsuperscript{488} “This book is a formidable swipe at runaway technology and its verbose prophets. Thank goodness; and thank goodness that it has come from America and about America, so that its message can come across without any sense of being a western European sermon to the New World.” See Ian Nairn, “US Functional tradition” dR December 1958, vol. 124, pp. 407-408.
In October 1958 Ian Nairn presented a review of housing in Norfolk villages, produced in collaboration with local authorities and the firm of Tayler & Green under the title “Rural Housing.” Nairn pointed to the humble role the architects preferred in order to reconcile industrial production, topography, settlement patterns and the demand for cultural identity.\(^\text{489}\)

The “functional tradition” was also embraced by certain leading representatives of the younger generation. In 1960 James Stirling published his article “The Functional Tradition and Expression” by contextualizing the qualities of anonymous architecture in the postwar work of Le Corbusier and his own partnership with Gowan. Acknowledging the influence of De Stijl and the Jaoul houses as precedents to the flats of Ham Common, Stirling admitted a particular fascination with the “vernacular brick buildings such as the Liverpool warehouses and the great virtuosity of English nineteenth century brick technology.”\(^\text{490}\) Stirling agreed with \textit{AR}’s genealogy that buildings of the functional tradition were “suggestive of the early ideas of Functionalism but less of the machine aesthetic, which was primarily a style concern.” Stirling’s insightful analysis went further than the \textit{AR}’s editors analysis in the special issue on the “Functional Tradition” by emphasizing the relationship of volumetric arrangement and possibilities of alternative expression to style and structure—“an unsophisticated but successful integration of large and small elements with a degree of inevitability.”\(^\text{491}\)

\textit{AR} did not assimilate the rise of mass culture and media into its own version of popular culture and found it unworthy of being included in its pages. Instead it stressed the art that was produced by the people themselves such as the “Pub Tradition,” “Fishermen Net-Shelters” (Figure 2.17) and “The Unsophisticated Arts” series of the 1950s by Barbara Jones. \textit{AR}’ editors were interested in people’s habits of producing the so-called minor arts instead of their habits of consumption.\(^\text{492}\) Consumer culture took center stage by the end of the 1950s in Britain partially influenced by the activities of the Independent Group.

\(^{489}\) For a good introduction to Tayler and Green, see Elain Harwood and Alan Powers [intro. by Norman Scarfe], \textit{Tayler and Green Architects 1938-1973: The Spirit of Place in Modern Housing}, (London: The Prince of Wales Institute, 1998).


\(^{491}\) Ibid. p.91

\(^{492}\) These series were later published in Barbara Jones, \textit{The Unsophisticated Arts}, (London: Architectural Press, 1951).
The duality that Pevsner had created in the beginning of "An Outline of European Architecture" (1942), Lincoln cathedral against the bicycle shed, in a way came back to characterize architecture in the communitarian vs. the vernacular supplied by cultural anthropology. This categorization hinted at how the editors understood culture: a coexistence of high culture and low culture in implicit dialogue, the dynamic boundaries of which were overseen by the elite. While Banham and the Independent Group perceived culture as a broad front via the diversity of consumption habits and media culture and understood regional traditions of craft as uniform "lore" destined to die, Richards's idea of the functional tradition as accepted by the rest of the editorial board, saw mass culture as a force that dragged cultural diversity into uniformity. Both models were selective and exclusionary with reference to the definition of mass culture. At the same time the technological anonymity that Banham advocated, within which the

493 "A bicycle shed is a building, Lincoln cathedral is a piece of architecture. Nearly everything that encloses space on a scale sufficient for a human being to move in, is a building; the term architecture applies to only buildings with a view to aesthetic appeal." See the introduction to Nikolaus Pevsner, An Outline of European Architecture, (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1942).
individuality of the architect dissolved in “scientific” provision of environmental services, was found utterly inhumane. AR would resist against the agency of people in the production of culture to be taken over by the mass media and processes of industrial manufacture.

Stirling’s analysis of the “Functional Tradition” also adopted two main themes from articles that had been published in the AR: the timeless quality of the “Functional Tradition” and Reyner Banham’s reference to “The Machine Aesthetic” as a stylistic gesture. This leads me to investigate how Banham’s production for AR fits in with the overall policy of the journal from the late 1950s and early 1960s.
B5. The Brief Reign of Reyner Banham:

AR’s response to the mass media and popular culture in the 1960s has been a general skepticism and inertia. Although AR had managed to be a trend-setting magazine since the 1930s, its active role in polemics was altered after Reyner Banham’s departure from the assistant executive editor post. Until the burst of Manplan into the architectural scene in 1969 as a last battle cry against the forces of mass culture and the equation of technological progress with modernity, AR remained more of a spectator of the transforming architectural discourse. In this period, Townscape and the environmental policy that had been developed in 1950s continued, albeit with dimming enthusiasm.

Banham’s role in the Independent Group and architectural discourse has been largely investigated by Anne Massey in “The Independent Group: Modernism and Mass Culture in Britain, 1945-59” and by Nigel Whiteley’s “Reyner Banham: Historian of the Immediate Future” (2000). Within the scope of this study, I would like to interpret Banham’s contribution to AR from the point of view of his revisionist history. Banham’s revisionism led the rest of the editorial board to accept his work while they undermined his avant-gardism and embrace of technology. The subversive individualist face of the avant-garde that Banham grafted onto modernism and his particular promotion of mass culture were not acceptable to the rest of the editors.

From 1954 to 1960, Banham wrote several articles for AR that investigated the omission of avant-gardes from the canonical histories of modern architecture, especially the Futurists and the German Expressionists, in order to stress, what he called, “the scandals covered up” by the canonical histories of modern architecture. By each article

published, ultimately forming a large part of his “Theory and Design in the First Machine Age,” Banham debunked the fundamental myths of modern architecture, such as the machine aesthetic or relationship between plan and elevation etc., and equated its consolidation to the emergence of “a universal style.”

A few examples can clarify my understanding of Banham’s dismantling of these myths and the conformity of such dismantling to AR’s editorial policies. For instance, in “Façade” of 1954, Banham rightly argued that elevational treatment did not emerge out of an effortless expression of interior space according to the functional resolution of programmatic requirements. Form did not follow function in this sense, but assumed a certain symbolic codification in a process that referred outside of the classical cannon. The Hallfield Estate at Paddington by Drake and Lasdun belied this principle by the careful articulation and the independence of the façade from the spatial arrangement of the flats behind it. The architects sought a legible expression to communicate the building to the beholder by their specific treatment of the façade.

In declaring the “Machine Aesthetic” defunct, Banham asserted that the specific machine aesthetic that modern architects committed themselves to, was of an obsolete diagrammatical quality that had informed early twentieth century machine production. Hence, for Banham, a new alignment between the machine and architecture had to be established in terms of mass production and product design aesthetics with a consumer-oriented symbolism. The primacy of symbolic aesthetics over the machine must have especially satisfied Hastings and Richards, when linking the dehumanization of modern architecture to the adoption of the machine aesthetic is remembered.

496 See Reyner Banham “Casa del Girasole,” in AR, February 1953, v. 113, pp. 73-77.
497 “...to set up an exclusionary standard, which is what any universal criterion of taste like the Machine Aesthetic, must eventually become, is simply to deny ourselves the enriched experience which a variety of product aesthetics can offer us. The Machine Aesthetic is dead, and we salute its grave because of the magnificent architecture it produced, but we cannot afford to be sentimental over its passing.” See Reyner Banham “Machine aesthetic” AR April 1955, v. 117, pp. 224-228.
genuine grandfathers of his own generation, Banham intended to direct modern architects towards the rejection of ancestral pedigree. While Banham’s inquiry was perceived by the editors as a continuation of the enrichment of modern architecture’s historical and theoretical background, his interest in “un architecture autre” was met with stiff resistance.498

Major conflict between Banham and the rest of the editorial board’s intentions regarding AR surfaced when Banham’s concluded his series entitled “1960.”499 In these series he evaluated the architectural context with reference to science, technology and the role of history.500 In a series of five articles, three of which were organized in the form of discussions by experts recruited from different fields of science and technology, Banham aimed to revamp the institutional organization of modern architecture and to conceptualize a new role for the architect in order to address the postwar developments in technology.

Pitching tradition against technology, tradition in Banham’s model was an obsolete force to be replaced by technology. It was a defunct form of knowledge based on local operational lore, and a closed economical system. On the contrary, science had the capacity to disrupt the run of history by overruling “all existing general knowledge,”501 a

498 As Anne Massey states: “In his introduction to the series Art-Anti-Art, on 2 November 1959, Basil Taylor identified a concurrent thread in twentieth century art to that of the modern movement. According to Taylor, this Anti-Art lineage began with Futurism, moved through “l’art Brut” and “art autre,” and concluded with This is Tomorrow.” The sixth talk in the series “Primitives of a Mechanised Art” of 21 November 1959 consisted of Banham eulogizing the Futurists.” See Massey, “The Independent...” p. 110

499 The editorial board also did not agree with Banham when he created an uproar in Italy and around the world with his article “Neo-Liberty” that blamed Italian advocates of “continuita” with “infantile regression from modern architecture.” The ensuing debate by letters sent to the review by Italian architects and others (Sibyl-Moholy-Nagy joined from the US, Federico Correa from Barcelona, Figini and Pollini, Ernesto Rogers (as editor of Casabella), Bruno Zevi (L’Architettura), Piccinato and Quillici, Cesare Brandi (from Corriera della Serra) and Giovanni Bernasconi (from Rivista Tecnica) from Italy) were printed together with Banham’s responses with an editorial note that aimed to absolve the Architectural Review from the debate.


501 “...tradition means, not monumental Queen Anne, but the stock of general knowledge (including general scientific knowledge) which specialists assume as the ground of present practice and future progress. Technology represents its converse, the method of exploring, by means of the instrument of science, a
force on its own that should stop being a servant to architectural tradition and get in command of it. Modernity in architecture could only be realized via the transgressive power of the avant-garde in full utilization of technological potentials. In this transformation technological procedure would erase the commanding role of the architect and would make him a specialist among many who shaped the design process according to quantifiable data.

Banham invested the “mathematician” with the power to analyze the “psycho-physiological,” and the computer with the power to plan. In consequence the reign of “the universal man” was doomed to perish in order to give way to the makers of the “well-tempered environment.”

The job of the historian, Banham believed, was to supply modern architecture with, what he called, the “compulsive progressivist reflex” that it lost after its canonization by the earlier histories of Giedion and Pevsner. One among the team of specialists, the 1960s historian was to ask “embarrassing questions” to the earlier histories to arrive at “objective truth.”

In the last article of the series, planned as a conclusion to evaluate the series by the directing editorial board, Hugh Casson, H. de C. Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner and J. M. Richards discussed the issues raised by Banham and the experts that participated. At the very beginning of the article, entitled “1960: 5, Propositions,” the directing editors put a significant distance between their positions and that of Banham. Instead of being perceived as making AR’s editorial policy explicit, the editors insisted that the series had to be understood as AR’s effort to fuel debate on technology, produced under the sole editorship of Banham.

For Banham, the series proved that it would be possible to develop an aesthetic, grounded in the quantifiable procedures of science. Aiming to expose architects’ reluctance to engage with high technology, Banham asserted that “technological habits of thought [were] hostile to architectural habits of thought.” The rest of the editorial board found Banham’s technological determinism reductive. Puzzled by Banham’s concluding potential which may at any moment make nonsense of all existing general knowledge.” See Reyner Banham "1960: 1: Stocktaking," in AR, February 1960, n. 756, v. 127, pp. 93-100.


remarks, Casson and Pevsner replied that architectural design required “conscious action based on knowledge” instead of operating with, what Banham termed, “conditioned reflexes of habit;” hence technology was one of the many factors that the architect incorporated into the design process. Pevsner had realized that the logical conclusion to the domination of engineering processes over conventions of architecture would be “non-architecture,” in which aesthetics would be sacrificed for performance. Locating the ideological conflict between Banham and the rest of the editorial board, Richards answered in a condemnation of positivism:

What has been happening is not a new habit of thought brought about by a different architectural technology, but a habit of assuming that technological values must supersede all other values, just because they are technological—a habit peculiar only to scientists, and not all scientists at that, but one that has been allowed to create a kind of mystique about science which has been accepted by ordinary people without question.... [people] are more easily deceived into believing that a world (or an architecture) dominated by technology is only one that is “modern.”... Because of science architecture will not be the same again. But because of science it need not be determined by science—or it is no longer architecture. Architectural habits of thought therefore embrace, but without being invalidated by, technological habits of ditto. The so-called design team is therefore not a substitute for the architectural mind, only a mechanism to make sure that the architectural mind is fully briefed about science and its obligations. The team is the answer to the complexity—not necessarily any altered value—in modern technology. The visual appearance of a building continues to depend on value decisions which by definition are not identical by scientific determinants.504

In expected continuity with his arguments in the early 1950s, Richards saw the seeming divergence between tradition and technology as the biggest challenge of the architect. Architects had to create a new tradition of values to regulate technology’s contribution to society in order to restore a balance instead of allowing science to drive history.

Supporting Richards, Hastings stated that science assumed a metaphysical importance in contemporary society which “own[ed] no other God.” 505 Instead of dominating man’s vision as the sole instrument to search for truth, Hastings believed that

504 Ibid, p. 387, my italics.
505 Hastings stated that “‘[if this means that] science should be permitted in this emergency to stimulate new ways of seeing to which tradition (i.e. habit) tends to blind us, then the arguments seems to be not merely sound but stimulating... what matters to architecture is not the rational content, but the emotional head of steam. Scientists have succeeded in working up an impressive head of steam for their chosen ark of the covenant and so have acquired the emotional initiative in this century.” Ibid, p. 387.
science had to allow new means of perception which would enrich man’s capability of apprehending and appreciating the universe.

It is clear from Richards’s remarks that the model of cultural progress which the directing board had taken for granted, was jeopardized by Banham’s uncritical appreciation of technology as the sole redemptive force of civilization. Commenting on the role of architectural history for the future Richards cautioned optimistically on the developing historical sophistication and self-consciousness given to modern architects by historians. Hinting to the effect of pop culture and the “rapid revolution of the cycle of taste” Richards warned:

Increasing sophistication about history is partly the result of continually more rapid revolution of the cycle of taste, resulting in a revival of interest more and more recent aesthetic ideals and partly the result of the historian himself having adopted more scientific methods and being less content with the romantic and evocative, so that instead of being ‘one of them’ (i.e. the people from whom the creative artist is trying to assert his independence) he has become ‘one of us.’ The consciousness of history that this sophisticated attitude induces in the artist is necessary because in the new circumstances, it is the means by which new ideas are assimilated into an accepted language or idiom; in the days before self-consciousness the equivalent means were the evolutionary ones residing in craft traditions and the social ones resulting in the leadership of taste by an elite. 506

It is the second half of this paragraph which clarifies what set Richards and the directing board largely apart from Banham. By allowing the architect to articulate new ideas into an “accepted language or idiom,” Richards believed, the consciousness of history helped a new vernacular to be born from the old with a distinguishing sense of continuity. Banham did not agree that such an articulation had to reside either within an accepted language or a conventional framework. In the board’s model, “low culture” or the popular and “high culture” interacted to create a memorable identity in the work of the historically conscious artist which linked the past to the present.

Collins vs. Banham: Establishing Disciplinary Continuity

In the same period, AR opened its pages to another young historian, Peter Collins (1920-1988), the work of whom specifically targeted Banham’s equation of modernity

506 Ibid, p. 386.
with a “compulsive progressivist reflex.” AR’s bias was turned towards restoring the connection to the classical vein of modernism by Collins’s understanding of modern architecture as a rational, evolutionary development from the time of the Enlightenment to the twentieth century, simultaneously with the inclusion of vernaculars as repositories of primordial architectural knowledge.

I do not intend to re-contextualize and analyze the oeuvre of Collins but point to AR’s editors’ intention to curb the increasing role of the avant-garde and the role of pop culture, by giving a heavier emphasis to the work of Peter Collins in the 1960s within AR in order to connect a disciplinary line to their own project of continuity. Hence I wish to illustrate the subtle shift that AR’s older editors, meaning Hastings, Pevsner, Casson and mostly Richards as executive editor, employed to sustain this project.

What Banham stressed as the lack of an understanding of engineering in the modern movement was perceived by the editors as the modern movement’s peculiar way of assimilating technology with an aesthetic bias. The early 1950s agenda of unifying an aesthetic idiom with that of functionalism was actually being confirmed for Richards and Pevsner. Banham’s intervention made the modern movement appear as another form of classicism with universal principles in communication with technology, perfectly consistent with the continuity advocated by the older editorial board.

Although AR was willing to let Banham explore the earlier avant-gardes of modern architecture, it met the 1960s post-Brutalist avant-garde in Archigram with suspicion, and mostly silence. The metaphoric and abstract use of biology and technology by the Brutalists could be willy-nilly swallowed by the editors of the Review under the rubric of the functional tradition. However, the “bowellism” of Archigram in looking for an expression of technology and mechanical services instead of assimilating it

---

507 Peter Collins was born in Leeds in 1920 and was educated at Leeds Grammar School and then the School of Architecture at Leeds College of Art. According to Tanis Hinchcliffe, the school emphasized client participation in design decisions and social effects of architectural design. See T. Hinchcliffe “Peter Collins: The Voice from the Periphery” in Louise Campbell eds., Twentieth-Century Architecture and Its Histories, (London: The Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain, 2000). pp. 177-194.

508 John Summerson’s talks on the BBC, titled the “Classical Language of Architecture,” were aired from July to May 1963. However Summerson did not feature in AR as many times as Collins did.

509 None of Archigram’s projects were published in any detail, but mentioned mainly as youthful fantasies in AR. See the “World” section in January 1965, to see how Archigram’s plug-in city was featured.
under a conventional and contextual architectural skin would be simply ignored.\textsuperscript{510} Hastings’s fear for the supremacy of technology over nature was realized in Archigram’s dystopic cities hovering over the landscape.

In the mid-sixties, due to the post-Stalinist transformation in leftist politics, the political basis to \textit{AR}’s interest in the vernacular dissolved into the publication of special issues that consisted mainly of Richards’s travels. In the late sixties, the vernacular came back to \textit{The Review} once again under the popularity of participation and advocacy planning in architecture and city planning. \textit{The Review}’s reluctance to engage with the polemics of the avant-garde and the visionary cost it to lose its unchallenged leadership of the architectural press.

In this context, Peter Collins’s frequent contribution to \textit{AR}, which started after he became a faculty member in McGill University in Montreal, is doubly significant.\textsuperscript{511} On the one hand, Collins formulated a new disciplinary continuity to modern architecture reaching far back to the eighteenth century with the early drafts of his book “Changing Ideals in Modern Architecture,” parts of which were published in \textit{AR}. On the other, Collins and Richards largely agreed on the significance of the user, the role of precedents, a specific consciousness of architectural history, the centrality of constructional principles for architectural form and their averseness to avant-gardism and fashion.

Tanis Hinchcliffe’s paper entitled “Peter Collins: The Voice from the Periphery” sheds important light on the dialogue between J. M. Richards and Peter Collins on Collins’s rise to importance for \textit{AR}.\textsuperscript{512} Collins’s revisionist history continued \textit{AR}’s post-war intention to “include the excluded” aspects of history left out by canonical histories which, for Collins, had been detrimental for modern architecture.

\textsuperscript{510} For the use of the term and Archigram’s birth as a post-brutalist idea see Simon Sadler “The Brutal Birth of Archigram” in “The Sixties” \textit{The Journal of the Twentieth Century Society}, no. 6, 2002, pp.121-128.


\textsuperscript{512} In a letter to Richards in 1961, Collins’ states his intentions to establish a different spatial model, parallax, as the creative basis of modern architecture in response to the space-time idea analyzed in the examples of Giedion, Corbusier, Moholy-Nagy, Rudolph, Spengler and Einstein. Hinchcliffe “Peter Collins…” p. 186
In “Historicism” (August 1960) Collins criticized not only the politics of the avant-garde but also the operative role of Giedion’s history that pushed avant-gardism as the single moral choice for modern architects. Collins used the term “historicism” in the sense that Karl Popper used it in his famous “Open Society and Its Enemies” to condemn Hegel and Marx and to criticize historians’ efforts to give a predetermined direction history. According to Collins, architectural historians “breathed on the necks of architects.”

By forcing them to come up with original ideas that could transform the face of architecture historians aimed to direct the evolution of modern architecture. Alluding to Giedion’s re-editions of Space, Time and Architecture by the inclusion of more and more recent work to project “contemporary history,” Collins protested the blurring of boundaries between history and theory and Giedion’s abuse of history’s authoritative voice.

A year later with “Aspects of Ornament” (June 1961) Collins supported Richards’s campaign for the vernacular by pointing to vernacular traditions as the living core of architecture and the role of tectonic elements as basic creators of form. Their belief in the irrelevance of avant-gardism to architecture and the separation of architectural theory from that of the plastic arts was the strongest connection between Richards and Collins. Drawing on French literary critic Henri Peyre’s book “Literature and Sincerity” of 1963, Collins argued that a cult of sincerity defined the acts and works of the modern artist as well as the modern architect since the time of Rousseau. The “sincere architect,” in Collins’s words, designed buildings without concern for the client’s and the public’s acceptance. By establishing parallels between Rousseau’s and Le Corbusier’s lives, Collins argued that many architects thought of themselves as “superintellectuals” that have a unique awareness of humanity and a creator of

---

513 “The term “contemporary history” was invented by Giedion... [as] a selection of structural and spatial developments of the past few centuries which seem to him relevant to the creative needs of the present age. But this is precisely what the late nineteenth century architects understood by “theory.” [Collins states that Giedion follows Julian Guadet’s methodology in writing but he is committed to certain architects of his own time, which to him is unacceptable.] It is becoming less and less easy to do this because Historicism, after having imposed itself on biology by means of the theory of evolution, has now begun to control our basic thought-processes as a result of the importance now attached to psycho-analysis. See Peter Collins, “Historicism,” in AR, August 1960, v. 127, pp. 101-103.


515 Henri Peyre was Sterling Professor of French, Yale University, 1938–69 and distinguished Professor of French, Graduate Center, City University of New York, 1969–81. See Peter Collins, "Sincerity," in AR, March 1964, v. 135, pp. 165-168.
environments which were ideal essentially for themselves. Such a self-identification
brought forward a disregard for contextual awareness and introverted architectural
design. Architects were obsessed with their personal image and the consistency of style in
their career paths. This led them to undermine the idea of anonymous collaboration which
was at the foundation of Bauhaus pedagogy. The condemnation of academicism and
tradition led young architects away from painstaking study and refinement of
composition. Instead of exposing material properties as a natural result of tectonic
assembly, brutalism led architects to look for deliberate and complicated techniques to
expose “the guts of a building.”\(^{516}\) “The will to annihilate style” led modern architects to
a misguided stylistism, to an indulgence in fashion, and an aversion to a sophisticated
consciousness of style:

[According to Henri Peyre] The will to annihilate style... implies an unflagging
awareness of style itself designed to eschew its flourishes and to sift the most
genuine in our experiences in our emotions of what might be borrowed, assumed,
feigned... It also leads to a writer’s straining of his own originality, in his anxiety
not to imitate technical devices of previous authors. In the past borrowing such
devices had seldom detracted from creativeness...\(^{517}\)

Collins concluded his article with an attack on Banham’s promotion of the avant-garde as
the glorification of the tabula rasa, which according him to him, rendered the critic
superfluous:

Thus sincerity in architecture has meant, in effect, starting from scratch, or as
Reyner Banham puts it, “the freedom to live in a house designed as if houses had
just been invented.” It has meant rejecting the acquired experience of our
ancestors... Sincerity is only a virtue when it is unselfconscious. When the artist
becomes so priggishly aware of his own sincerity that it dominates his own work,
other values of equal importance become pushed into the background...\(^{518}\)

When Changing Ideals in Modern Architecture was published in 1965, Collins’s
interpretation of Perret’s structural rationalism and his praise for the “banality” against
the “shock of the new” came remarkably close to Richards’s understanding of the
positive use of “clichés.”

\(^{516}\) Ibid, p. 167.
\(^{517}\) Ibid.
\(^{518}\) Ibid.
In "Oecodomics" Collins launched another attack against Banham’s historiography which took the artistic avant-garde as the only legitimate ancestry to modern architectural theory. By demanding to see the evolution of architectural theory in a history reaching back to Vitruvius, Collins defined theory as the “total sum of academic knowledge required to design a building.” Instead of versing architecture students in a limited theory of the avant-garde and the latest reaches of technology as its contemporary correlative, Collins argued that students had to be exposed to the broad range of the history of theory in order to develop a design philosophy for themselves. From the mouth of a younger revisionist historian, and with convincing historical substantiation, Richards’s earlier arguments against the cult of novelty and originality found more historical persuasion and depth.

Collins’s “Paradigmatics” contrasted the nineteenth century interest in the use of precedents in architecture to the twentieth century’s obsession with the unprecedented and linked this interest to the operative power of architectural historiography being founded on formal analysis and stylistic development. In preparing his book "Architectural Judgement" which investigated a possible analogy between architecture and law as professions, Collins published “Architect’s Architecture vs. Lawyers’ Law” in AR. It can not be substantiated whether there was such an influence, but it is highly likely that Collins was aware of the powerful analogy Hastings had drawn in his 1949 essay on Townscape between urban design precedents and the practice of common law for the making of urban spaces.

Questioning the domination of originality and "rule-scepticism" since the mid-eighteenth century as the essential trait of modern architecture, Collins brought forward the forgotten discipline of rules that had characterized architecture for centuries. He called the architectural community to establish standards and norms to endow the

---

520 ... in so far as Summerson is justified in describing architectural history as "games" it is because the latter has become a game of “hunt the precedent” whereas the former [meaning, architecture] has become a game of "hunt the unprecedented." ...If architects today occasionally display an extravagant concern with novelty for its own sake, it may well be because architectural historians are still unemancipated from a methodology devised when the principles of Revivalism constituted the basic architectural philosophy of the age. See Peter Collins "Paradigmatics," in AR, March 1968, v. 143, p. 180.
architectural profession with a social obligation and to question “the deference to the
standards of the public in the profession—mainly through the influence of Le
Corbusier—” that “tend[ed] increasingly to regard itself as a paradigm for the whole
human race.” The public, like Richards had argued in the 1950s, had the right to
question unconventional interventions into their living environment and to demand a
certain moral responsibility from the architect.

While Collins’s contribution strengthened the reclamation of a disciplinary
continuity to architecture and the interest in the history of theory, it indirectly contributed
to AR’s portrayal of vernacular traditions as the expressions of people’s ways of life and
supported the demand for cultural continuity to find its expression in the built
environment. After vernacular architecture was finally accepted into the sanctuaries of
high culture by Bernard Rudofsky’s MoMA exhibition “Architecture without Architects”
(November 9, 1964 to February 7, 1965) in the second half of the sixties, J. M.
Richards’s interest was increasingly directed to the variety of vernaculars built by the
people themselves and the demand for contextual and preservationist conformity from
modern architecture by means of an evolution from the traditional vernaculars to modern
vernaculars.

Richards continued AR’s emphasis on vernaculars from around the world by
articles specifically targeting vernacular environments where a stylistic unity was
observed. His earlier emphasis on people’s architecture was added the encouragement
of self-help and the economical propriety of local technologies—”reinforced but not
supplanted by modern technology”—to maximize the use of existing resources. Although

522 Ibid. p.120
523 Ibid.
524 Rudofsky’s exhibition was received as a pleasant contribution “to a cause that the readers of AR had
been familiar with” for about a decade. See the short mention of “Architecture without Architects” in the
“World” section of AR’s December 1966 issue.
526 The vernacular architecture of Malta as a synthesis of the vernacular and the modern was featured
several times between 1965 and 1970 via the work of architect Richard England. See “Building on Rock:
rocks” AR December 1966, v. 140, front cover, p. 391, and finally the special July 1969 issue on Malta.
his editorial introductions were imbued with a sense of nostalgia that harked back to a
communitarian cultural unity expressed through the vernacular, Richards believed that
the empowerment of local economy ensured the preservation of continuity and the
creation of familiar settings for people. 527

In a lecture given to the Royal Australian Institute of Architects in 1970, shortly
before Richards retired from AR, he outlined a new trajectory for modern architecture. He
reframed his views on user participation and the social obligations of architecture, the
impact of industrialization and his categorization of architecture into the anonymous vs.
the symbolic. Structured as a brief review of modern architecture’s history, a sense of
frustration permeated Richard’s evaluation of the development of modern architecture as
a progression of “fashion and style.” 528

Richards acknowledged that industrialization would shape two different kinds of
architects and two different categories of architecture. One, a repetitive, relatively
anonymous and regional, industrially based, and fast and cheaply produced architecture
of the background. To produce this kind of architecture, one needed sophisticated
knowledge of assembly and production in communication with designers of building
components. The other would be the architecture of significant monuments:

Instead of difference for its own sake we need difference used deliberately
for the symbolic value it can have; and if we accept the repetitive, relatively
anonymous, character of much future architecture we can then, I think, indulge
ourselves in a much more generous attitude to the special—the significant—
buildings designed because of their purpose, to stand out from the rest. The
confusion of the present-day urban scene arises from worthy and unworthy
buildings, significant and insignificant, competing with each other on the same
terms.

...to classify buildings into those that fit into an anonymous repetitive
pattern and are therefore logically constructed out of standardized components, and
those that stand out as individual and significant monuments, is quite a helpful way
of indicating how architecture may be able to exploit these circumstances so as to
rediscover the coherence and sense of discipline which architecture has not

527 Richards’s interest was increasingly directed to different cultures and vernacular architectures in the
second half of the sixties. See “Traditional architecture of Ceylon” February 1966, “The Painted Churches
528 “the course of recent architectural history, for the public that tries to follow it, is largely a history of
fashion and style....“the only thing that matters about modern architecture is its ability intelligibly to apply
available means to scientifically ascertained needs, and that style is only a by-product.” See J.M. Richards
possessed for two hundred years, yet remain able to deploy all its dramatic resources when these are appropriate to its role as one of the visual arts.

...two kinds of architectural office. One would assemble, in cooperation with the town planner and the sociologist, standard components of various kinds into housing schemes, commercial centres and the like. He would be the creator of the basic environment, guided by strict environmental standards. The other category would be responsible for the independent monument.

In this lecture Richards developed part of his annual discourse given to the Royal Institute of British Architects entitled “The Hollow Victory” which was received as Richards’s renunciation of modern architecture in 1972. The discourse is auto-critical as well as condemnatory of the years modern architecture enjoyed in Britain. Richards admitted responsibility in encouraging modern architecture to have an anti-historical stylistic foundation. Modern architecture’s main objective, that is to create a new relationship between architecture and society, was obscured by the emphasis on the aesthetic and the relentless search for novelty of expression: “The modern architect’s persistent search after novelty [had] helped to prevent the growth of an informed body of public opinion.” Richards blamed art history’s emphasis on “change and geniuses,” destroying the path to anonymity and added that “the celebrity architect” had to be avoided. The main culprit in this transformation was popular culture and mass media and it could hardly be hoped that a new vernacular could come out of this pluralistic, image-based consumption culture:

A vernacular language is in any case the product of particular social situation. The Georgian vernacular of 150 years ago was so widely spread because the masses accepted whatever the educated admired, and the question we must ask now is whether, in our self-conscious age, we can expect to look forward to a vernacular architectural language in a Georgian sense. We already have the popular vernaculars of the spec builder’s housing estate and the caravan park; does our contemporary culture, with its differences of internal tempo and its acceptance of continually changing fashion, with its enjoyment of allusive images such as those which form the basis of pop art, require a single visual language to be spoken in all places and at all times?

When the paternal organization of society was irretrievably lost during the 1960s mass affluence, and when identity became increasingly identified with habits of consumption,
preservation rose to become the sole protector of continuity in the environment. As long as the resources of technology were not assimilated into a social culture of preservation, cultural continuity would be impossible to sustain in the built environment.

The logical action to stem the tide against continuity would then be to redefine the role of the modern architect, recharge the battle for modern architecture and set it on a new course by declaring that “the battle for modern architecture” had actually been lost.531 The new architect would be defined by “humility,” the willingness to conform to an established pattern. Proposing the reintegration of the previous pupilage system into architectural education to develop this humility, Richards suggested the localization of architects and the supervision of building in these locales by a single architect to oversee anonymity and unity. The local architect would then be administered both by the professional organization and the public, and architecture would be redefined as a profession of civil service. The lack of unification in ideology about the social role of the architect in the profession would be imposed from the outside as the public’s will, involving the public in architecture and obliging the architect to be responsible towards a local constituency.

---

531 “We are no nearer than the Victorians were to achieving a vernacular language that the man in the street as well as the architect regards as right and inevitable. In this sense, it is nonsense to assert that the battle for modern architecture has now been won.” Ibid, p. 193.
Conclusion: The Story of a Shared Discontent

In “Revenge of the Picturesque: English Architectural Polemics, 1945-1965” (1968), written as part of a series of essays dedicated to Pevsner, Reyner Banham condemned AR’s editors, Richards and Pevsner, for having “thrown principle to the wind” when the younger generation returned from the Second World War. Banham asserted that their two “leading oracles of modern architecture” had started to “espouse the most debased English habits of compromise and sentimentality.” He cited the Smithsons’ collaboration with Gordon Cullen for The Economist Building in 1965 as complicity with the “Establishment.” Banham concluded added that the “picturesque” faction had then, in essence, defeated the New Brutalists by infiltrating into their design thinking. “So total [had] been the triumph of the unacknowledged Picturesqueness of the Picturesque’s avowed enemies.” This was an admission of Banham’s own defeat as the promoter of the New Brutalists.

Although Banham’s essay provides a respectively accurate portrayal of principal issues in architectural debates in the space of a nine-page essay, it is far from providing deeper insight into AR’s impact. It may be all the more surprising then, to see Richards in 1971 pronouncing that the victory of modern architecture was itself “hollow.” For Richards modern architecture had become remote from the ideals imagined during the movement’s inception. So how to explain this dissatisfaction both in the spokesman of the “younger generation” and in the spokesman of the “Establishment” that apparently guarded the values symbolized by the Picturesque? What does this shared discontent shed light on? A conspiracy perhaps, that Banham made it out to be, carried out by the betrayal of those who were the most ardent advocates of modern architecture in the 1930s? Or a

534 Banham, “Revenge...” Ibid.
betrayal by the postwar generation as implied by Richards, who abandoned the ideals of the 1930s in order to replace them with their own version of modern architecture?

Banham’s evaluation does not mention the diversity of content that AR’s readers enjoyed, and the possible rationale behind this diversity. It also obscures the multiple roles that AR assumed from the minutely architectural to the environmental and ecological. Posed as a struggle between an Establishment and the opposition to this Establishment, Banham’s unfruitful representation, has negatively effected the perception of British postwar architectural history.

It is impossible to explain the long term effort of a periodical such as AR, by trying to see in it the reign of a single ideology or politics of a certain class. In June 2002, when I interviewed Priscilla Hastings at Fittleworth Manor, she told me that before he died in 1986, his father had expressed disappointment with the reduction in The Architectural Review’s range after his retirement. According to his daughter, H. de C. had always intended AR to be a “cultural” review that reaches an audience larger than the architectural community.

And indeed, under Hastings’s editorial control, AR aimed to be a periodical documenting visual culture by putting architecture at the center of its focus. By situating architectural history within the cultural history of Britain, one can explore AR’s role in the postwar period and one can understand the two incompatible perceptions of modern architecture mainly responsible for the conflict that Banham hinted at. Framing the discussion within the global framework of a neo-romantic project and trying to see its ramifications for architectural discourse, I believe, has been more rewarding than reducing it to the politics of the avant-garde vs. the reactionary.

---

535 Raymond Williams states that a one to one correlation between class and cultural production is far from representing reality: “If the major part of our culture, in the sense of intellectual and imaginative work, is to be called, as the Marxists call it, bourgeois, it is natural to look for an alternative culture and call it proletarian. Yet it is very doubtful whether bourgeois culture is a useful term. The body of intellectual and imaginative work which each generation receives as its traditional culture is always and necessarily something more than the product of a single class.” See Raymond Williams, “Culture and Society” p.339.

536 Interestingly, the same complaint was made during the Pevsner centennial (12-13 July 2002) at Birkbeck College by the scholars attending the conference.
The ripples of AR’s impact is visible in the transformation of the remaining half of “the second half century” within a plethora of genres of contemporary architectural discourse. In that sense, AR succeeded far beyond what its editors could have imagined.

a. The Nature of the Incubator

In the introduction, I referred to the editorial board of AR as an incubator of ideas the leading figures of which were Hastings, Richards and Pevsner. Hastings saw himself as a genuine Tory, who subscribed to a paternal socialism which the conservatives defined in the 1930s and influenced by a liberalism defined by the thought of Ernest Barker. He constructed a neo-romantic social model, in which the material well-being of each member of the society and the environment would be overseen in a mutual relationship. Envisioning this model in continuity with British traditions, Hastings attempted a reconfiguration of the role of the State, the cultural elites and the nebulous category of citizens.537

In contrast, J. M. Richards’s political sensibilities were developed in the politics of the 1930s’ Popular Front. These sensibilities were affected by the consequent transformation of leftist politics within the period that stretched from the 1940s to the 1960s. Richards thought that the real priority of modern architecture was to provide a service to the “masses,” and increase their quality of life. As one remedy for social psychology, architecture could help reduce the sense of alienation by enabling people to participate in the making of the built environment. The anthropological vision of cultural particularism inspired him to oppose the ubiquitous and uniform development of modern architecture as part of an elite culture. Instead, Richards’s Marxism in dialogue with cultural particularism pointed to an exchange between the particular and the universal which implied a natural resistance on behalf of the particular.

537 According to Martin Wiener, Harold Macmillan—at the time a member of the House of Commons, and prime minister in 1957—had insisted back in 1936 that “Toryism has always been a form of paternal Socialism.” “The Right Road for Britain,” the official statement of the Conservative Party in 1949 for the next election, announced: “Conservatism proclaims the inability of purely materialist philosophies to read the riddle of life, and achieve the necessary subordination of scientific invention and economic progress to the needs of the human spirit... Man is a spiritual creature adventuring on an immortal destiny, and science, politics and economics are good or bad so far as they help or hinder the individual soul on its eternal journey.” See Martin Wiener, English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850-1980, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), p. 108.
Pevsner shared most of Hastings’s and Richards’s concerns. He aimed to remove himself from political controversy by trying to limit himself to art historical writing. A reinterpretation of Morrisian socialism in dialogue with national culture, developing technology and state apparatuses underlay his sympathy for modern architecture. His writings aimed to define the character of “Englishness” in the attempt to extend this definition towards the international practice of modern architecture. He supported Richards’s quest for the vernacular, equally influenced by the cultural politics of paternal liberalism.

However different these three ideological sympathies, they did not strictly divide the editors. All three were ardent reformers. Reconciling their differences within AR’s cultural program, the editors aimed to contribute to the transformation of British society. Like Raymond Williams would remark later, the editors had a quite clear understanding that it was the social mechanisms which pertained to the production of architecture (such as the professional organizations, decision-making bodies, the citizens) that had to be changed through cultural pedagogy. Architecture would soon follow this change. While the neo-romantic project gradually acquired a global emphasis and tried to assimilate technology and science into its dynamics of progress, the artistic component nested within it came to terms with the dichotomy between high and low culture in resistance to “mass culture.”

---

538 Williams noted that in order to understand the transformation of culture one should analyze and understand the process of transformation and ultimately culture as “process” instead of cultural products as its residue. He stated: “In most description and analysis, culture and society are expressed in a habitual past tense. The strongest barrier to the recognition of human cultural activity is this immediate and regular conversion of experience into finished products. What is defensible as a procedure in conscious history, where on certain assumptions many actions can be definitively taken as having ended, is habitually projected, not only into the always moving substance of the past but into contemporary life, in which relationships, institutions and formations in which we are still actively involved are converted, by this procedural mode, into formed wholes rather than forming and formative processes. Analysis is centered on relations between these produced institutions, formations, and experiences, so that now, as in that produced past, the only fixed explicit forms exist, and living presence is always, by definition, receding.” Raymond Williams, Marxism and Literature, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), pp. 128-129.
b. A Watchtower of Visual Culture: Calibrating “the High and the Low”

In “Cultural Marxism in Postwar Britain: History, The New Left, and The Origins of Cultural Studies,” (1997), Dennis Dworkin links the origins of the field of cultural studies to a crisis in postwar British culture that grew from a disillusionment with science and technology as well as the decolonization of the British Empire. Looking for a way out of the impasse, the developing field of cultural studies probed “two traditions of dissent that had failed to converge: English popular resistance and the alternative vision of Romanticism.”

What is important in Dworkin’s study is that these inspirational precedents were instrumentalized by both sides of the ideological spectrum. It was not only the left that recognized the potential of recovery by reinvesting these two traditions with contemporary meaning in order to reinvigorate British culture. In my opinion, AR partook in this effort by directing these traditions towards environmental intervention through its own filter of culture as “a whole way of life.”

Emerging from the postwar period, the seminal work that defined cultural studies in Britain was undoubtedly Raymond Williams’s (1921-1988) “Culture and Society 1780-1950” (1958). In the introduction “Culture and Society 1780-1950” Williams probed the different meanings that “culture” acquired from the industrial revolution to the early postwar period. Williams’s inquiry into culture as a process that reflects as well as transforms “a way of life,” is best summarized in this paragraph from his introduction:

I wish to show the emergence of culture as an abstraction and an absolute: an emergence which, in a very complex way, merges two general responses—first the recognition of the practical separation of certain moral and intellectual activities from the driven impetus of a new kind of society; second, the emphasis of these activities as a court of human appeal, to be set over the processes of practical social judgement and yet to offer itself as a mitigating and rallying alternative...

The idea of culture would be simpler if it had been a response to industrialism alone, but it was also, quite evidently, a response to the new political and social developments...


540 See Raymond Williams “Culture and Society,” (New York: Anchor Books, 1960), p. xvi, italics mine. “Culture and Society” is the culmination point of Raymond Williams’s work that started by his work as the editor of “Politics and Letters” in 1946. Williams also refers to the discussions he had with Francis
As the quote indicates, culture emerged as an instrument of resistance as well as an instrument of domination in the hands of different political multitudes. Williams emphasized that during this process art came to be separated as a distinct sphere of moral and intellectual production. The meaning of art transformed from “art” as any human skill to the “creative arts.” At the same time the meaning of industry changed from “skill, assiduity, perseverance, diligence” to the complex of manufacturing and production institutions. Consequently a change from craftsman to artist as well as craftsman to worker severed the link between “art as work” and “art as creative professional activity.” This crucial separation brought about a hierarchy of agency, which fed into the division between high culture and low culture, fundamental to the process of modernization.

What is important for architectural history and hence this study, is not Williams’s remarkable insight into culture as a process in the 1950s, but the synchronicity of AR’s effort and Williams’s analysis that allows us to understand the peculiar circumstances that the periodical faced. AR aimed to overcome this failure by the formulation of a neo-romantic project for the environment within which anonymity took a central role. In the earlier period of AR’s postwar effort an equally influential figure was T. S. Elliot. In concluding his analytical essay “The Idea of Culture” (2000) Terry Eagleton points to a conflict between T.S. Eliot’s and Raymond Williams’s theories of culture. Although both authors, that are Eliot and Williams, agreed on the necessity to create a common culture, they clearly disagreed on the process of achieving this common culture and the agencies that would create it. Williams agreed with Eliot on the anthropological definition of culture as “a whole way of life,” but he parted with him on common culture to be created by a privileged few and to be disseminated through the elite.

For Williams, common culture could only be produced by a collective that embraced all strata of society that did not neglect sub-cultural differences. It would be

Klingender when his work was in progress, whose work J. M. Richards incorporated into his writings for AR.

authenticated by making, and the agency of the people organized in solidarity to resist domination.\footnote{I do not use resistance necessarily to mean as resistance to progress as well as from the point of view of a certain class such as the lower classes against the higher etc. Resistance can come from any strata in society and I believe Williams acknowledges this.} In contrast, Eliot argued that the existence of the elite could only be sustained through class difference. In other words, if culture was to be preserved, the elite and the institutions that create the elite had to be guarded. Williams and Eliot agreed however, that there was the possibility for high culture and low culture to interbreed. Through the process of interbreeding both high culture and low culture transformed each other. From a conservative point of view, Eliot believed that the dichotomy between high culture and low culture had to be preserved. In contrast, Williams believed that such a difference could only be erased through the restructuring of society, not granting art or architecture the power to directly effect the transformation.\footnote{In the section titled “Marxism and Culture” Williams indicated that Marx refrained from designating a direct relationship of the art work to social progress: “Marxists, more than anyone else, need to repudiate [the argument that the artwork has to help the socialist movement], in practice as firmly as in theory.” See Williams, \textit{Culture and Society}, (New York: Anchor Books, 1960), p. 295.}

\textit{AR’s} cultural program incorporated the attitudes to culture theorized by both of these thinkers due to the editors’ sympathy to the two positions represented by them. Richards sympathized with Eliot as well as having strong left leanings which connected him to Francis Klingender and Raymond Williams ideologically if not directly personally. Hastings was an avid reader of Eliot and carefully watched the fast changing postwar geopolitical conditions especially with relation to Britain’s position in it. As I explained in Part I through his manuscript “The Unnatural History of Man,” Hastings believed in the eradication of class difference and the material well-being of each citizen by means of humanist education programs. Thus the editors liberally syncretized an editorial policy to orient \textit{AR} in the postwar cultural climate.

Another text that might shed light on \textit{AR’s} skepticism towards the developing mass culture is “A Theory of Mass Culture” (1953) by Dwight MacDonald (1906-1982), the American critic.\footnote{Dwight MacDonald “A Theory of Mass Culture” in \textit{Diogenes}, no. 3, 1953, pp. 1-17. MacDonald was the son of a lawyer who graduated from Yale in 1928. He wrote for \textit{Time}, \textit{Fortune}, and than joined the \textit{Partisan Review}. He left this journal in 1943 and started another journal called \textit{Politics}. Later he became a staff writer in \textit{New Yorker} and film critic for \textit{Esquire}. See John Elson “No Foolish Consistency,” \textit{TIME}, April 4, 1999 vol. 143, no. 14.} MacDonald had already noticed in 1953 that mass culture had
assimilated high culture in a diluted sense and threatened the “popular arts.” His definition of popular arts came very close to AR’s interpretation of the art of the people. “Popular arts” were the product of the culture of the people, a folk culture; whereas mass culture was produced for the people to consume, regulated from above by the culture industry. Surveying the cultural theory of his day, MacDonald evaluated the two possible cultural policies: Replace the old class boundaries to save high culture as Eliot demanded or educate the masses to increase the level of mass culture and revive the cultural elite. As Hastings himself asserted in “The Unnatural History of Man,” replacing the old class boundaries would be impossible at a time when the two dominating nations of the Cold War world were essentially “mass societies.” Seeing the future of high culture in doubt, rejecting any possibility for an avant-garde art and seeing the future of “popular culture” doomed to be co-opted into mass culture, MacDonald proposed to revive the cultural elite.

AR’s editors embraced two of the three options that MacDonald’s text foresaw. By means of the post-avant-garde regime the editors agreed with MacDonald, seeing no further benefit from avant-gardism while reserving the “genius” an exceptional status. By providing continuous and recurrent thematic agendas, the periodical struggled with the dichotomy between high culture and low culture, and aimed to preserve the “popular” by resisting against “mass culture.” The Review also aimed to speed up the “interbreeding” between high culture and low culture via its campaigns and supported the visual education efforts of the Labor government after the war.

The preservation of popular culture against mass culture took place through defining “anonymity” in the realm of architecture and urban design. According to Raymond Williams the processes of culture brings forward a continual selection and reselection of ancestors and a competition between the agents that make this selection. AR was such an agent. Williams adds that the practice of recording and the absorption of these records into a tradition inevitably ends up defining a culture different from the one that was actually lived. “Anonymity” allowed AR to conceptualize reconciliation between culture as anthropology, as “ways of life” or “structures of feeling,” and culture as aesthetic—that is culture as the arts. AR’s reevaluation of anonymity pointed to outside the narrow realm of architecture defined by high culture. The recognition of the creative
energies of folk culture including popular arts and vernacular architecture as well as "primitive" communities aimed to direct these energies to the society as a whole via architecture and urban design. Townscape’s emphasis on contextual continuity and The Functional Tradition’s emphasis on historical continuity aimed to sustain the anonymity in “the particular ways of life” manifested in the built environment. AR’s casebook approach provided an open-ended platform to accumulate precedents that would inspire the endurance of continuity but also allowed to accommodate change.

The editors believed that visual education had to be bidirectional. AR’s campaigns would present the elite with the popular as well as present the discourse of the elite to the makers of the popular. For instance, AR aimed to introduce architects to the resources of popular culture by means of its foray into the realm of the vernacular. By inventing “The Functional Tradition” AR created a new and universalized genealogy for modern functionalism. The creation of this new genealogy would allow modern architecture to migrate from the realm of high culture to that of the low. It would also allow resistance for popular culture by opposing the aesthetics of abstraction and subversion popularized by the New Brutalism.

From the late 1950s to the 1960s AR’s resistance to “pop” stemmed directly from its skepticism of “mass culture” being sold as the “popular” by the likes of Banham or the members of the Independent Group. By denying agency to the people, the culture of consumption provided no solution to alienation, which Richards thought was at the source of “cultural decay.” The rest of the editors were not convinced by Banham’s investing the consumer with a critical potential merely due to being able to choose. For the editors, the elevation of “pop” overlooked the passivity of the consumers. I should note, however that AR’s conceptualization of the “popular” as “collectively made” and Banham’s call for the “popular” as “popularly consumed” were mutually exclusive. Banham simply dismissed the collectively made as irrelevant due to “traditional lore.” He denied the technologies that produced the popular any use or a chance of survival. In contrast, AR’s skepticism of consumer culture undermined the culture industry’s power as well as the possibility of any critical resistance by the consumer.

Therefore, the drastic change in AR's format for the Manplan series must be understood in terms of AR's ultimate, if delayed, awareness of the domination of media and pop culture. Hastings organized Manplan in 1969 as shocking visual essays with little textual content in sharp contrast to the intellectually sophisticated and diversified pre-Manplan AR issues. By appropriating the appearance of popular mass media, Hastings aimed to respond to the changes in the habits of the reader. If AR could compete with the rest of the mass media, as Hastings hoped, and reached a larger audience by being easy to consume, its message of social reconstruction and the translation of social reconstruction into architectural reconstruction would be better heard. The sudden decline in AR revenue after the initiation of Manplan, testifies to the fact that its readers were still largely from the architectural profession, unwilling to sponsor the change from what they saw AR—a specialized architectural periodical. Hastings’s final compromise, however, backfired.

The erasure of the difference between high culture and low culture via anonymity, carries a certain paradox into the production of architecture, be it the contextual anonymity that Richards advocated or the technological anonymity that Banham picked up after announcing the death of New Brutalism. The logical conclusion of the anonymity that Richards advocated inevitably points to the dissolution of “Architecture” in context, by adopting technologies available to the locale and by sharing the architectural vocabulary of place. It also points to the dissolution of the “Architect” into the builder, if not a policy maker or enabler of building production by the community. In contrast, the technological anonymity that Banham advocated in terms of the “well-tempered environment” and “Non-Plan” leads to the dissolution of “Architecture” in infrastructure. It reduces the role of the architect to that of a technician struggling to preserve its status among the proliferating mass of technicians that take part in architectural production.

To prevent this dissolution and to preserve “Architecture” as a discipline and profession was the reason why Richards reverted to Pevsner’s categorization of building production into “architecture vs. building via Lincoln cathedral vs. the bicycle shed” in 1942. Shifting the debate towards disciplinary continuity by means of Peter Collins’s revisionist historiography, Richards reinforced this categorization, as well as the
opposition between the vernacular and "Architecture." “Low culture” was once more subordinated to high culture,” its role being to nurture high culture.

By the end of the 1960s, pop and the culture of consumption had an undoubted victory against AR. The periodical had to open its pages to authors that aimed to formulate how architecture could respond to “pop” and provide the needs of a consumer society. At the same time, Richards reformulated his ideas on the vernacular in the 1973 re-edition of his book “The Castles on the Ground” twenty-seven years after its first publication, presenting the book as a defense of participation, self-build and advocacy planning for the democratic consumer society. His early post-war agenda had been finally accepted into mainstream architectural discourse albeit shorn of its ideological core.

**c. Ecology versus Consumerism**

[An] insane over-confidence in the specialised powers of metropolitan industrialism has brought us to the point where...the risk to human survival is becoming evident, [and] ...there is the clear impossibility of continuing as we are.\(^{547}\)

*Raymond Williams “The Country and The City” 1973*

Behind AR’s skepticism towards the culture of consumption and its reaction against concepts such as expendability, transience and ephemerality that emerged in connection to consumer culture, are the ideals of the neo-romantic, social project that framed the periodical’s outlook. The editors also argued that scientific and technological progress enjoined to consumer culture and ever-expanding economic growth brought a ruthless exploitation of resources as well as the destruction of the rural landscape.

Townscape was not simply a visual idea of urban beautification. Townscape’s resistance to decentralization and its aim to keep the city compact and dense obeyed the ethical imperative to preserve the resources that feed the city. Preserving these resources

---


meant preserving the livelihood of those who cultivate these resources, as well as the landscape as a means of rehabilitation for the citizens.

Counter-Attack and Outrage thus aimed to increase the sensitivity towards the environment that the post-war military industrial complex had come close to ruining. It is ironic that these issues were edited by Ian Nairn, a Royal Air Force pilot before he joined AR. By the opening of the “Counter-Attack Bureau,” AR mobilized resistance against national and local planning initiatives and provided advocacy for alternative schemes of planning and urban design. The readers’ as well as the correspondents’ letters enabled AR to intervene into conflicts via its Townscape editors. “Counter-Attack Bureau” ended up being a short-lived experience of “culture in resistance” turned to action.

The economic downturn in Britain in the late 1960s as well as the student riots convinced Hastings that he should question British society via Manplan. Civilia, the swansong of Townscape, aimed to portray the possibility of an urban utopia that would cure the environmental defects created by the post-war planning experience, and to present AR’s answer to the New Towns. After Hastings disbanded the editorial board and became editorial administrator over a larger body of younger editors in 1971, he wanted to reformulate AR’s environmental emphasis. Among Hastings’s documents are memoranda to the board which shows that he aimed to start a series of articles to take the January 1972 issue of The Ecologist, entitled “A Blueprint for Survival” as a springboard (Figure C. 1).
A pioneering document of the environmental movement, the campaign that the Ecologist started with "A Blueprint for Survival" created the foundation of the Green Party in Britain.\footnote{On the history of *The Ecologist* See Fred Pearce "Age of Rage" *The Guardian*, July 12, 2000 http://society.guardian.co.uk/societyguardian/story/0,7843,382241,00.html (retrieved on Nov. 20, 2003)} Pointing to the "gravity of the global situation" *The Ecologist* demanded "a new philosophy of life and a precise and comprehensive programme" for creating the society that could implement this philosophy.\footnote{See "A Blueprint for Survival" *The Ecologist*, January 1972, vol. 2, no. 1, p.1.} Hastings’s prophecy of doom in "The Unnatural History of Man" (1958) was vindicated in 1971 by the support of a large group of scientists that signed The Ecologist’s manifesto.\footnote{The manifesto’s opening lines stated: “The principal defect of the industrial way of life with its ethos of expansion is not sustainable. Its termination within the lifetime of someone born today is inevitable—unless it continues to be sustained for a while longer by an entrenched minority at the cost of imposing great suffering on the rest of mankind. We can be certain however that sooner or later it will end… either against our will, in a succession of famines, epidemics, social crises and wars; or because we want it to—because we wish to create a society which will not impose hardship and cruelty upon our children—in a succession of thoughtful, humane and measured changes.” Ibid, p. 2.}
Hastings also aimed to get in contact with the leaders of the environmentalist movement such as Max Nicholson (1904-2003) and Bob Boote, founders and administrators of institutions such as the World Wildlife Foundation and British Nature Conservancy. Nicholson had already written articles for *AR* during the 1960s that aimed to ally scientific research, the use of technology, natural conservation and planning. The existence of this document and the Ecologist within Hastings’s papers indicate that Hastings’s project to align *AR*’s editorial policies with the concerns of global ecology and green politics remained incomplete after he retired. To overcome the apocalyptic vision of industrialization and economic growth, Hastings had recognized that *AR*’s cultural program had to articulate a new role for science and technology within a global framework. However he realized that it was time to turn this project over to the younger generation of editors that he put in charge.
d. The Ripples of "The Second Half Century": A Failed Project?

Today, although Pevsner has reached certain fame in Great Britain mostly due to his "Buildings of England" series, it is highly unlikely that architecture undergraduates will remember the name of J. M. Richards or H. de C. Hastings, or his pseudonym Ivor de Wolfe. Their achievements were acknowledged by the "Establishment" however, if and by the Royal Institute of British Architects in particular. Pevsner was given the RIBA Gold Medal in 1967 and knighted in 1969, Hastings was given the RIBA Gold Medal for his contribution to architectural journalism in 1969 and Richards was knighted in 1972. The Review is still a very popular periodical in Britain and around the world under the editorial control of Peter Davey, however far from its generous post-war range.

How do we judge, then, the impact of AR's project outlined in "The Second Half Century?" On what basis do we establish its success or its failure? In what registers do we trace the transformation of the agendas that AR raised during the postwar period?

If we look at the underlying social reconstruction that Hastings kept revising in this period in the "The Unnatural History of Man" or even later in "The Alternative Society" we might easily attribute failure to Hastings. "The Alternative Society" does not exist while the consumer society is full-fledged with the threats that it poses to the environment as alive as ever.

If we are to look for a one-to-one correlation between the stated aims of "The Second Half Century" and the situation of architecture today, we can also attribute failure to the editors. As Richards lamented in "The Hollow Victory," there is no anonymous vernacular that characterizes every locale in dialogue with the modern, even in Britain. Architectural discourse is suffused with pluralism. Constantly enlarging its ranks, the celebrity system that Richards desired to dissolve is more visible than ever thanks to the proliferation of information technologies and the global market. While revisionist histories of the Modern Movement dismantle the early canonical histories they replace them with ever-expanding narratives, as this study itself does. Planning has become a discipline largely autonomous from architecture. Specialization is even more rampant
than the 1940s and 1950s, as interdisciplinary exchange keeps opening up new avenues to explore.

But then, what if we evaluate AR’s effort as a utopian, humanist research project imbued with a sense of nostalgia? Then AR succeeded even beyond what its editors even imagined. Like the ripples of a stone thrown into the ocean, the echoes of AR’s campaigns are present in diverse genres of architectural discourse today. The continuity of the concerns of the older editorial board has been transferred to the next generation of editors.

As I have mentioned, James Stirling openly referred to the Functional Tradition in his early work the late 1950s and early 1960s, while Edward Cullinan’s work was inspired by similar concerns. With the addition of the writing of Sybil Moholy-Nagy and Bernard Rudofsky, the vernacular has become a major resource for architects. Alexander Tzonis and Liane Lefaivre pointed to the necessity for architecture sensitive to local craft traditions, materials and typologies. Richards’s early New Left leaning and his interest in local vernaculars was unified with Tzonis and Lefaivre’s plea under the banner of Critical Regionalism by Kenneth Frampton, which has received international currency probably more than any other “ism” of the postwar period. With Peter Collins’s support, AR linked a younger generation of architects to the work of William Lethaby and C. F. A. Voysey, as well as that of Perret, and a diverse host of vernacular traditions in advocating historical continuity. In the second half of the 1980s, trying to recover some of its earlier polemical rigour, The Review continued similar concerns under the new banner of “romantic pragmatism.”

“Townscape” has been the most visibly successful among AR’s campaigns. Although separated from the neo-romantic ideology that gave it birth, Gordon Cullen’s “Townscape” is numbered among the canonical texts of today’s urban design discourse and pedagogy. When “Collage City” was published as a special issue of AR in August 551 See Kenneth Frampton “Six Points for a Critical Regionalism” in Hal Foster ed., The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture, (Port Townsend, Wash.: Bay Press, 1983) and Spyros Amourgis ed. Critical Regionalism: The Pomona Meeting Proceedings, (California State Polytechnic University: CA, 1991).

552 The label seems to have been widely adopted. A google search with the keywords “romantic pragmatism”+architecture produced 34 hits on January 3, 2004. Also see Peter Davey “Romantischer Pragmatismus: Sainsbury-Gebäude, Worcester College, Oxford” Deutsche Bauzeitung, February 1986, v.120, no.2, p.40-43.
1975, *AR*'s editorial board turned their position over to Colin Rowe, regarding Collage City as a continuation of the "Townscape tradition." David Gosling’s (1934-2002) work in partnership with the late Gordon Cullen, his teaching in Sheffield University and the University of Cincinnati helped the dissemination of Townscape as an urban design method. Townscape’s focus on the urban context and its relationship to the community of inhabitants has become a major impact on larger scale urban preservation. 1960s urban clearance projects have given way to neighborhood conservation and the acceptance of piecemeal urban intervention and high-density mixed use development. Townscape’s ideals have been incorporated into the agenda of New Urbanism.

Although Counter-Attack has not been followed as a journalistic precedent, "Outrage," still continuing as part of *AR* as a traditional insert for protest, has been taken up by periodicals around the world. Following the “Counter-Attack Bureau” advocacy planning and community involvement in urban design has become standard democratic procedure in many places starting from the mid-1970s. *AR*'s pioneering interest in the relationship of architecture to the larger environment and its unremitting challenge to industrial development has found its echoes in the discourse of sustainability and natural conservation.

According to Terry Eagleton what unites culture as utopian critique, culture as a way of life and culture as artistic creation is the failure of “culture as actual civilization” or “Culture” with a capital C, “as the grand narrative of human development.” In my opinion, culture is bound to exist as resistance to this failure. Either in the form of the image of a sought-after future, or in the image of an ancient past that resembles an “emancipated future,” culture is incessantly reformulated in interaction with the existing present.

In the form of utopian critique, culture also presupposes a way of life that defines the form of artistic creation. Eagleton warns that “culture as utopian critique...is always in danger of disappearing into the very critical distance from Realpolitik it so
devastatingly establishes." However, this is not simply a process of disappearance where culture as utopian critique fades away into invisibility. In this process culture gets transformed, re-interpreted, appropriated into forms other than the way it was actually lived, as Williams suggests. Therefore, it is the ripples of "The Second Half Century," that attests to the triumph of AR’s postwar project.

555 "What is it that connects culture as utopian critique, culture as a way of life, and culture as artistic creation? The answer is surely a negative one: all three are different ways reactions to the failure of culture as actual civilization-- as the grand narrative of human self-development. It can retain its global reach and social relevance, but recoil from the dismal present to become a poignantly endangered image of a desirable future. Another such image, unexpectedly enough, is the ancient past, which resembles an emancipated future in the sheer unimaginable facts of its non-existence. This is culture as utopian critique, at one prodigiously creative and politically enervated, which is always in danger of disappearing into the very critical distance from Realpolitik it so devastatingly establishes. See Eagleton "The Idea..." p.20
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(The information is compiled from the listing provided by the periodical and J. M. Richards’ Memoirs.)

1942-1945  
Nikolaus Pevsner and Hubert De Cronin Hastings (Acting Editors)

1945-1946  
James Maude Richards returns from the Ministry of Information joins the Review, official declaration for his taking part as directing editor printed in 1947.

1947-1949  
Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Osbert Lancaster  
Assistant Editor: Ian McCallum  
Assistant Editor Production: Marcus Whiffen  
Assistant Editor Art: Gordon Cullen

1949  
Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Osbert Lancaster  
Assistant Editor: Ian McCallum  
Assistant Editor Art: Gordon Cullen  
Assistant Editor Production: E. G. Kedge  
Assistant Editor Literary: Marcus Whiffen  
Assistant Editor Research: S. Lang  
Lancaster leaves board in late 1951

1950  
Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Osbert Lancaster  
Assistant Editor: Ian McCallum  
Assistant Editor Art: Gordon Cullen  
Assistant Editor Production: G. Bensusan  
Assistant Editor Literary: Marcus Whiffen  
Assistant Editor Research: S. Lang

1951  
Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Osbert Lancaster, Ian McCallum  
Assistant Editor Art: Gordon Cullen  
Assistant Editor Production: G. Bensusan  
Assistant Editor Literary: Marcus Whiffen  
Assistant Editor Research: S. Lang  
Lancaster leaves directing board in July 1951
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Directing Editors</th>
<th>Executive Editor</th>
<th>Art Editor</th>
<th>Assistant Editor Production</th>
<th>Assistant Editor Research</th>
<th>Assistant Literary Editor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 1951</td>
<td>Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marcus Whiffen leaves assistant literary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Maude Richards, Ian McCallum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>editor post.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1952</td>
<td>Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Ian McCallum</td>
<td>Executive Editor: Ian McCallum</td>
<td>Art Editor: Gordon Cullen</td>
<td>Assistant Editor Production: G. Bensusan</td>
<td>Assistant Editor Research: S. Lang</td>
<td>Reyner Banham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1953</td>
<td>Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards</td>
<td>Executive Editor: Ian McCallum</td>
<td>Art Editor: Gordon Cullen</td>
<td>Assistant Editor Production: G. Bensusan</td>
<td>Assistant Editor Research: S. Lang</td>
<td>Reyner Banham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1954</td>
<td>Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson</td>
<td>Executive Editor: Ian McCallum</td>
<td>Art Editor: Gordon Cullen</td>
<td>Assistant Editor Production: Ian Nairn</td>
<td>Assistant Editor Research: S. Lang</td>
<td>Reyner Banham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1954</td>
<td>Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson</td>
<td>Executive Editor: Ian McCallum</td>
<td>Art Editor: Gordon Cullen</td>
<td>Assistant Editor Production: Ian Nairn</td>
<td>Assistant Editor Research: S. Lang</td>
<td>Reyner Banham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1957</td>
<td>Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson</td>
<td>Executive Editor: Ian McCallum</td>
<td>Art Editor: Gordon Cullen</td>
<td>Assistant Editor Production: Christopher Hurst</td>
<td>Assistant Editor Research: S. Lang</td>
<td>Reyner Banham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 1957  Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson
Executive Editor: Ian McCallum
Art Editor: Gordon Cullen
Technical Editor: Lance Wright (new position)
Assistant Editor Production: Christopher Hurst
Assistant Editor Research: S. Lang
Assistant Literary Editor: Reyner Banham

December 1957  Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson
Executive Editor: Ian McCallum
Art Editor: Gordon Cullen
Technical Editor: Lance Wright
Assistant Editor Research: S. Lang
Assistant Literary Editor: Reyner Banham
(No Assistant Editor of Production listed)

February 1958  Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson
Executive Editor: Ian McCallum
Art Editor: Gordon Cullen
Technical Editor: Lance Wright
Assistant Editor Production: William Mackie
Assistant Editor Research: S. Lang
Assistant Literary Editor: Reyner Banham

December 1958  Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson
Executive Editor: Ian McCallum
Art Editor: Gordon Cullen
Technical Editor: Lance Wright
Assistant Editor Production: Moira Mathieson
Assistant Editor Research: S. Lang
Assistant Literary Editor: Reyner Banham

January 1959  Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson
Executive Editor: Ian McCallum
Art Editor: Gordon Cullen
Technical Editor: Lance Wright
Assistant Editor Production: Moira Mathieson
Assistant Literary Editor: Reyner Banham
No Assistant Editor of Research listed.
February 1959  Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson
Executive Editor: Ian McCallum
Art Editors: Gordon Cullen, Kenneth Browne
Technical Editor: Lance Wright
Assistant Editor Production: Moira Mathieson
Assistant Literary Editor: Reyner Banham

October 1959  Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson
Executive Editor: J. M Richards (McCallum leaves)
Assistant Executive Editor: Reyner Banham (new position)
Art Editor: Gordon Cullen
Technical Editor: Lance Wright
Features Editor: Kenneth Browne (new position)
Counter-Attack Editor: Ian Nairn (new position)
Assistant Editor on Production: Moira Mathieson
Two staff photographers listed: De Burgh Galwey, W.J. Toomey

November 1959  Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson
Executive Editor: J. M Richards (McCallum leaves)
Assistant Executive Editor: Reyner Banham (new position)
No Art Editor listed: Gordon Cullen leaves
Technical Editor: Lance Wright
Features Editor: Kenneth Browne (new position)
Counter-Attack Editor: Ian Nairn (new position)
Assistant Editor on Production: Moira Mathieson
Two staff photographers listed: De Burgh Galwey, W.J. Toomey

July 1960  Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson
Executive Editor: J. M Richards
Assistant Executive Editor: Reyner Banham
Technical Editor: Lance Wright
Features Editor: Kenneth Browne
Counter-Attack Editor: Ian Nairn
Assistant Editor on Production: Bill Slack
Staff photographers: De Burgh Galwey, W.J. Toomey
Advertising Manager: V. V. Tatlock (new position)

July 1962  Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson
Executive Editor: J. M Richards
Assistant Executive Editor: Reyner Banham
Technical Editor: Lance Wright
Features Editor: Kenneth Browne
Counter-Attack Editor: Ian Nairn
Assistant Editor on Production: Bill Slack
Staff photographers: De Burgh Galwey, W.J. Toomey
Advertising Manager: F. G. Dunn

November 1964
Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson
Executive Editor: J. M Richards
Technical Editor: Lance Wright
Features Editor: Kenneth Browne
Counter-Attack Editor: Ian Nairn
Assistant Editor on Production: Bill Slack
Staff photographers: De Burgh Galwey, W.J. Toomey
Advertising Manager: F. G. Dunn
Banham no longer listed as assistant executive editor

January 1965
Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson
Executive Editor: J. M Richards
Technical Editor: Lance Wright
Townscape Editors: Kenneth Browne, Ian Nairn
Assistant Editor on Production: Bill Slack
Editorial Assistants: Nicholas Taylor, G. J. Nason
Staff photographers: De Burgh Galwey, W.J. Toomey
Advertising Manager: F. G. Dunn

January 1965
Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson
Executive Editor: J. M Richards
Technical Editor: Lance Wright
Townscape Editors: Kenneth Browne, Ian Nairn
Assistant Editor on Production: Bill Slack
Editorial Assistants: Nicholas Taylor, G. J. Nason
Staff photographers: De Burgh Galwey, W.J. Toomey
Advertising Manager: Stanley Enwright

July 1967
Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson
Executive Editor: J. M Richards
Technical Editor: Lance Wright
Townscape Editors: Kenneth Browne, Ian Nairn
Assistant Editor on Production: Bill Slack
Staff photographers: De Burgh Galwey, W.J. Toomey
Advertising Manager: Stanley Enwright
Assistant Literary Editor: Nicholas Taylor
Assistant Production Editor: G. J. Nason,

December 1967
Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson
Executive Editor: J. M Richards
Technical Editor: Lance Wright
Townscape Editors: Kenneth Browne, Ian Nairn
Assistant Editor on Production: Bill Slack
Assistant Editors: Tim Rock and Sherban Cantacuzino
Staff photographers: De Burgh Galwey, W.J. Toomey
Advertising Manager: B. E. Wilkins

September 1969
(Manplan 1)
Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson
Assistant Editor: Sherban Cantacuzino
Editor: Tim Rock
Guest Editor: John Barr
Editorial Assistants: Terry Wright, Michael Reid, Peter Baistow, Ann Tilley
Production Editor: Bill Slack
Guest Photographer: Patrick Ward
Advertisement Manager: Brian Wilkins

July 1970
Editorial Director John Castledine Garrard Hastings
Directing Editors: Hubert De Cronin Hastings, Nikolaus Pevsner, James Maude Richards, Hugh Casson
Executive Editor: J. M Richards
Technical Editor: Lance Wright
Townscape Editors: Kenneth Browne, Ian Nairn
Production Editor: Bill Slack
Assistant Editor: Sherban Cantacuzino
Manplan Editor: Tim Rock
Assistants: Michael Reid, Anne Tilley
Guest Editor: John Barr

November 1970
Directing Editors JMR, NP, H. de C., Hugh Casson
Executive Editor: JMR
Production Editor: Bill Slack
Technical Editor: Lance Wright
Assistant Editors: Tim Rock and Sherban Cantacuzino
Townscape Editor: Kenneth Browne
John Castledine Garrard Hastings no longer listed...
February 1971  Editorial declares that James Maude Richards retires from The Architectural Review as well as Nikolaus Pevsner leaves the editorial board. The twenty-five year collaboration between Hastings, Richards and Pevsner ends.

September 1973  Editorial Administrator: Hubert De Cronin Hastings
Chairman of Editors: D. C. A. Boyne
Editor: Lance Wright
Executive Editor: Sherban Cantacuzino
Production Editor: Bill Slack
Features Editor: Colin Amery
History Editor: Mark Girouard
Townscape Editor: Kenneth Browne
Planning Consultant: Leslie Ginsburg

December 1973  Hastings retires.