Modern Movement and the Architectural Situation in the Sixties of the Twentieth Century

Dr. BADI` AL-ABED

Consultant Architect
President Of The Jordanian
Society For The History Of
Science
Amman – Jordan

ABSTRACT

This paper is devoted to highlight the theme of the Modern Movement and to demonstrate the architectural situation in the sixties, through the views of its founders and opposers. This paper explores the theme of Modern Movement as a beginning that has a formative stage and an endeavor (established thought). In so doing an attempt will be made to highlight the contribution of two founders, namely, the French architect Le Corbusier and the German architect Bruno Taut. Another attempt will be made to demonstrate the role of two schools of thought of Modern Movement, those are the Bauhaus and Di Stjil. This paper explore the attitude of Modern Movement towards history and demonstrate the role of CIAM (Congres Internationaux d`Architecture Modern), in forming its theme. It argues that the collapse of CIAM on the hands of young architects led to the chaos of the architectural situation in the sixties of the twentieth century and paved the ground for the advancement of alternative trends, like Post-Modern and Deconstruction.

One more attempt will be made to demonstrate the views of opposers of Modern Movement through trends like: New Brutalism and Archigram; groups like Procrustes Club and CASE (Conference of Architects for the Study of the Environment); and personal approaches. This paper will display the role of architectural critics and historians in their attempts to dress the practice of personal approaches a theoretical mold that contain theory and practice.

This paper will focus upon the personal interest and ambitions of opposers of Modern Movement and concluded that this reason was behind the chaos that took place in the sixties of the past century and continued until now.

Introduction

This paper is endeavoring to highlight the theme of Modern Movement and to demonstrate the architectural situation in the sixties of the twentieth century, through the views of its founders and opposers. It explores the theme of Modern Movement as a beginning that has a formative stage and an endeavor (established thought). In so doing an attempt will be made to highlight the contribution of two of its founders namely, the French architect Le Corbusier and the German architect Bruno Taut. And the role of two schools of thought that constituted its theme, those are the

Bauhaus and Di Stjil. Another attempt will be made to explore the attitude of Modern Movement towards history and to demonstrate the role of CIAM (*Congres Internationaux d`Architecture Modern*).

This paper will explore the architectural situation in the sixties. It will display the views of opposers of Modern Movement through trends like New Brutalism and Archigram; groups like Procrustes Club and CASE (Conference of Architects for the Study of the Environment); and indicate personal approaches of architects and the role of architectural critics and historians. This paper will focus upon the personal interest and ambitions of opposers that motivated their attack on Modern Movement. And argues that the collapse of CIAM, so much so the collapse of Modern Movement, on the hands of young architects led to the chaos of the architectural situation in the sixties and paved the ground for the advancement of alternative trends, like Post-Modern and Deconstruction.

Modern Movement

After general acceptance of Modern Architecture in the Western world[1] and, perhaps, into other regions of the world, particularly in the early years of the post-war[2] period. The situation seems to have changed, a setback occurred, and severe criticism[3] of Modern Movement took place. However in order to understand these situation it seems necessary to understand the theme of Modern Movement.

The theme of Modern Movement goes back to the early years of its beginning, to the individual and collective contributions of its founders, to the Bauhaus school De Stijl and to CIAM *(Congres Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne)*. In this paper I shall be focusing on the views of two individuals and their collective contributions. For instance, Benevolo (1971:471) indicated the unity of Modern Movement via the collective experience of individuals like Mendelsohn,[4] Le Corbusier, Oud, and Dudok, despite their different cultural, environmental, educational, and perhaps political backgrounds. I shall also highlight the ideas and achievements of CIAM.

As a case in point, an attempt will be made to highlight the individual contribution of Le Corbusier and the German architect Bruno Taut. For although both had different cultural,

environmental and educational backgrounds, they both arrived at almost the same views in their attempts to theorize the Modern Movement.

Le Corbusier

The contribution of Le Corbusier extended over two stages: firstly, his individual contribution, which extended from his early practice until 1928 or the beginning of CIAM; secondly, his contribution in CIAM, as will be displayed later, as part of the collective contribution in the Modern Movement. The following discussions will be devoted to his individual contribution.

The outcome of the first stage consisted of the five points and the three reminders to architects. In 1926 Le Corbusier and his partner P. Jeaneret published a document[5] which emphasized their views, for the new architecture. They indicated five points as major principles in design process, these are:

1- Pilots
2- The free plan
3- The free facade
4- The length way windows
5- The roof garden

Giedion (1978:524) considered these points as a liaison between contemporary architecture and contemporary construction. Benevolo (197:470) argued that the five points were standard elements of the new architecture, and they gave rise to endless debate between modernists and traditionalists. He also argued that the five points, on one hand, presented a method of design, and on the other hand, they were the only means that the new architecture could find its right place in culture. More to the point, Hatje (1975) indicated that the five points constituted a theory of aesthetic and a radical functional renovation. Where in the first case, buildings reduced to their pure geometrical shapes of rectangle, plane, surface, cube and cylinder. In the second case, the five points enhanced and emphasized the famous notions of Le Corbusier: "the house is a machine for living in", [6] "style is a lie" and "architecture is the masterly, correct and magnificent play of masses brought together in light". The point at issue in Le Corbusier's views is the interaction between aesthetic and function (beauty and utility). Le Corbusier

(1960) *Towards A New Architecture*, emphasized this interaction via his three reminders to architects:

1- Mass
2- Surface
3- Plan

He argued that mass is the element by which our senses perceive, measure and effect. The surface is the envelope of the mass, it is the means of diminishing or enlarging the sensation given by the mass. And the plan is the generator of both mass and surface, in which, the whole is determined and fixed. Le Corbusier highlighted the role of the plan in the design process and emphasized the inseparable relation (unity) between aesthetic and function, when he argued that when a thing responds to a need, it is beautiful.

Finally one may argue that the five points and the three reminders demonstrated the first stage of the contribution of Le Corbusier, which in my view constituted essential part of the theme of Modern Movement. However one may argue that this contribution influenced and partly is still influencing the practice of architecture. Nevertheless the second stage of the contribution of Le Courbiser will be interpreted later in the discussions of CIAM in this paper. But for now I shall take the time to highlight the contribution of the German architect Bruno Taut.

Bruno Taut

Interesting enough, another five points were put forward by the German architect Bruno Taut[7] in 1929, these are:

1-The essential requirement in every building is the fulfillment of the utmost possible utility.
2-The construction material and system must be totally related to its primary need.
3-The "beauty consists in the direct relationship between building and its purpose" (function).
4-The plan is the generator of the facade, consequently the generator of aesthetic. He also argued that anything which works well must look good.
5-The house is no longer an isolated entity, but it has a relationship with the Surrounding buildings. As a result of this relationship, the house is the outcome of a collective and social way of thinking.

From the previous points one may argue the similarity of the contributions of Le Corbusier

and Bruno Taut. Both were emphasizing the role of the plan as the generator of design along with the unity between aesthetic and function. This unity, in its turn, created two phenomena: one of a technical tendency, and the other of a cultural one, in which both were interrelated. The first one initiated a new process or method of design, in which, Bruno Taut[8] argued: there is no "separation between facade and plan, between street and courtyard, between front and back …and no detail is valid on its own, but it is a necessary part of the whole". The technical tendency, in its turn, stopped and perhaps attempted to suppress the traditional process of design. As a result of this, the cultural tendency took place. Furthermore, this situation had been termed culturally by historians; like Giedion (1978); Scully (1976) and Tafuri (1980b), and critics like Jencks (1977a) and Brolin (1976), and architects such as Gropius (1976), Venturi (1977), Eisenman (1963) and Stern (1980a); as a break with history.

Nevertheless, these tendencies were indicated by other architects in their contribution to Modern Movement, like the German architect Gropius, the Dutch architects Oud and Dudok. But our concern will center upon their contribution as members of groups or a body of persons, who joined a school of thought or other intellectual disciplines like the Bauhaus school or De Stijl "movement", which will be highlighted in the following discussion.

The Bauhaus

For instance, the Bauhaus was representing both: an educational institution and a school of thought. The endeavors of the first as indicated by Gropius (1976) *The New Architecture and the Bauhaus*, were:

1-To unite art and craft by using architecture as "intermediary";
2-To establish a type of team-work and to encourage the collaborative spirit among the faculty and student body of the school;
3-To create "type-forms" that fulfills the technical, aesthetic and commercial demands.

As a school of thought, the Bauhaus embraced the belief that architecture is the outcome of the intellectual, social and technical conditions of our age, Gropius (1976). The Bauhaus, also, initiated the notion that "architecture cannot be limited to the fulfillment of its structural function".

Consequently, the Bauhaus endeavored to purify the new architecture from the ad-hoc[9] interpretation of its theme and the "true motives" of its founders, like: "functionalism and fitness for purpose equal beauty", "rationalism" and "standardization" were anti craft. The Bauhaus adopted standardization as an exemplary principle that artistic design[10] is an integral part of the stuff of life. It also adopted rationalism[11] to purify the new architecture from the dominance of ornament and to create a new aesthetic conception[12] via the natural relation of the parts of buildings.

Gropius (1976:111) negated the claim that the "New Architecture is based on an anti-traditional obsession for mechanistic technique", despite the fact that Gropius (1976:19) argued that "a breach has been made with the past, which allows us to envisage a new aspect of architecture corresponding to the technical civilization of the age we live in". This negation also contradicts the contribution of Le Corbusier[13], which was based on an interest with industry. What matters, in my view, is more than this contradiction. This negation may affect the whole process of establishing the New Architecture: as a beginning, a formative stage, and an established thought with an endeavor, and more importantly, as a revolution against an established thought (style or movement). But, as far as the New Architecture went over this entire process[14], one may argue that the negation of Gropius had no grounds and did not change the fact that the New Architecture is anti-traditional and obsessed with the technology of the ages.

Here one has to clear a contradictory point concerning the relationship of the New Architecture with history. For although both Le Corbusier and Gropius initiated a break with history, both were influenced by it to some extent. For instance Le Corbusier (1960:31) recorded his admiration of the pure forms of the historical architecture of the Egyptian, Greek and Roman, such as the Pyramids, the Parthenon and the Coliseum. While he did not admire the Gothic architecture because of its "complex" geometry. Gropius (1976:112) also recorded his relationship with the tradition of the German architect Schinkel. Consequently both were influenced with history.

One may explain this paradoxical attitude of the Modern Movement to history by displaying the process of its establishment. As a

beginning[15], Modern Movement needs to establish relationships with existing architecture of either continuity or discontinuity or an amalgamation of both. In our case, it was discontinuity. As a result of this, the founders of Modern Movement accepted the rupture with traditional architecture (past or history). But when they found that they could not continue as they were, because "it is very difficult to begin with a wholly new start". Particularly when they measure the old commitments[16], "loyalties", and pressures inhibit the substitution of traditional architecture, add to this that the beginning made the focus of attention[17] and started to occupy the foreground, so it has the status of actuality. The founders, then, found that it was easier for them to inflect and perhaps retreat from the rupture with history. However, the retreat of the founders did not escape the accusation of the Modern Movement of being anti-traditional, as will be displayed in the contribution of De Stijl.

De Stijl

The break with tradition was a main point in the "ideology" of De Stijl, Hatje (1975). De Stijl, according to Hatje, was a group of artists and architects formed in Leiden in 1917. Mondrian, Van Doesburg, and Oud were remarkable members of this group. The architecture of this group was influenced by cubism, where right angles, smooth walls and open space were in order. De Stijl introduced a new relationship between material and form, Hatje (1975). For instance, colors were used to define space and no longer for decorative purposes. Bricks were excluded as a finish building material because it gave a color effect that contradicted the smooth surfaces of walls. Nevertheless, Hatje (1975) indicated that De Stijl was an aesthetic theory that differed from "functionalism and the international style" because it had fixed notions of aesthetic, while Modern Movement aesthetic was based upon the unity of form and function. However, Benevolo (1971:410) indicated a retreat in the theme of De Stijl, particularly in the main points: right angle forms, smooth walls and colors were no longer demarking the end product of De Stijl. Instead, they emerged in a new way. Oud, after his break, accepted the traditional building types and used bricks in his buildings. This retreat in the theme of De Stijl was displayed by Oud[18]:

"...through this process of decomposition I gained a new sense of proportion, of space, atmosphere, line and mass, color and construction, but I realized that the building that later derived from it was developing the most superficial aspect of my early works. Such a development seemed to me superficial for architecture: it had really more to do with painting and as far as form was concerned it was too hard and static. I abandoned it and began to move in another direction: a healthy, broad, universal social architecture could never come from this, from so abstract and aesthetic. There is no doubt, though, that neo-plasticism has given us architectural values which I would not like to see lost; but as far as I am concerned it has done this indirectly. My position is similar to that of the alchemists of the past, who did not find gold in their search for gold, but some other precious metal."

It seems clear from the previous discussion that the views of Gropius (Bauhaus) and Oud (De Stjil) did not consider rupture with history as a major issue in the ideology of Modern Movement; in fact, they emphasized their retreat from this issue. However in the following discussion I shall be highlighting the relation of Modern Movement and history.

Modern Movement and History

This retreat emphasizes the view I have indicated earlier, that it is difficult to have a wholly new start. It also emphasizes that a new beginning needs to reconsider its advancement after getting the focus of attention. What I am trying to show is that such modification in the ideas of a beginning seems to be natural; as ideas need more time to be tested before already reached the status of established ideas. As a result of this, some ideas proceeded, others were modified and others were left behind.

The first (proceeded ideas) represented the revolutionary aspect of a beginning. Those are the distinguished ideas of any new beginning. They mark its differences and constitute its

change from established beginnings (thought). In the case of Modern Movement those were the ideas that claim rupture with history, such as the five points of Le Corbuiser and Bruno Taut, modern technology and standardization of the Bauhaus.

The second (modified ideas) represented the constant aspects of society and culture, in other words, the presence of history. Those, Said (1978:34), *Beginnings Intentions and Method,* called them: "old habits and loyalties"; and Gropius (1975) called them tradition. Those were the ideas that either continued or neutralized, they could not be alienated in any new beginning because they were the ideas that prevented beginnings from having a wholly new start. In the case of the Modern Movement, these ideas partly continued as in the pure forms of Le Corbusier and partly neutralized as technical and constructional ideas. Ornaments in Modern Movement were replaced, as aesthetic ideas, by structure and alienated as architectural elements. Here one should be aware of this contrast and that some principles of architecture remained untouched and continued, but in different techniques and may be in new values and concepts. This in turn proof that history cannot be alienated from any new beginning.

Finally, the third type of ideas (left ideas), that they neither supported the cause of a beginning nor prevented its advancement, such as, whether windows should be horizontal or vertical, or whether roofs should be flat or pitch, Benevolo (1971).

In the previous discussion I highlighted the relation of Modern Movement with history. I traced three types or phases of this relation via analysis of the theme of Modern Movement as a new beginning. The first represented the claimed rupture with history. The second emphasized the presence of history in the theme and production of Modern Movement; consequently it disputed the first one. The third one neutralized the relation between Modern Movement and history. In conclusion one may argue that history was not alienated from the theme of Modern Movement.

Having indicated the contribution of individuals, schools of thought (institutions) and the role of history, I found that the Bauhaus and De Stijl despite their different environmental and cultural background, seem both to share the same principles. For instance,

Benevolo (1971:406-435), indicated that both intellectual disciplines had the same beginning, both were seeking pure figurative expression.[19] And both consisted of artists and architects, even Van Doesburg of De Stijl attempted unsuccessfully to join the Bauhaus,[20] and both adopted the same attitude to history and the "ideology of the plan." [21]

However, one may argue that the contribution of the two intellectual disciplines coincided with the individual contribution of Le Corbusier and Taut. This emphasized the unity of contribution among participants of Modern Movement: individuals and institutions (groups). In the following discussion I shall have the time to display the role of CIAM (*Congres Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne*) in interpreting and unifying the principles of the Modern Movement.

CIAM

The similarity of the contributions of different architects from different European countries in founding and forming the theme of Modern Movement seems to have its fruits in the competition of the League of Nations where similar design methods[22] were used. This presumable unity aroused the need to be translated into association. Interestingly enough, the opportunity was offered by Madame Helene de Mandrot[23] - a "sincere and intelligent lady"[24] and a "patroness of art" - who suggested a reunion of "creative spirits" at her *Chateau at La Sarraz*, Switzerland. But her project was turned to a more purposeful one after consultation with Siegfried Giedion and Le Corbusier.[25] The first CIAM[26] took place at *La Sarraz* in 1928. Hatje (1975) indicated that the aim of the first CIAM was "establishing a program of action to drag architecture from the academic impasse (it was, in fact, to drag it into another) and to place it in its proper social and economic milieu." An agenda of six points was prepared by Le Corbusier and put forward before the participants; these points were indicated by Benevolo (1971:498):
1-Modern technical knowledge and its consequences
2-Standardization
3-Economy
4-Town planning
5-Education of the young
6-Realization: architecture and the State

The discussions of these points were ended with agreement and a statement[27] was issued emphasizing the views of the participants and widening the theme of Modern Movement. However the statement could be summarized in the following points:

1-"Building" is an elementary human activity tied to the development of life. Architecture should express the spirit of the age, which required a new concept of architecture that will satisfy the material, spiritual and emotional needs of contemporary life.
2-Architecture should meet the transformation of social and economic structure of modern life.
3-Architecture should escape from the influence of the academies.
4-The production of architecture should not be treated as merchandise that required high "profit", instead it should meet the human requirement with less profit.
5-Rationalization, standardization and industrial production should applied in design and employed in the production of architecture.
6-Town planning is a functional discipline. It should concern itself with: living, (housing), working, recreation, landuse, organization of transport, and legislation.
7-Architects should have a role in forming public opinion in order to make the means and resources of Modern Architecture known particularly the problems of housing.

The outcome of discussions of the first CIAM emphasized the theme of the new architecture as interpreted via individual architects and groups or institutions, not just as an aesthetic or formalistic appeal but rather as an established body of thought (movement) that has an endeavor (end). Its endeavor spread over a social concern and a technological interest. This endeavor in its turn created a kind of interrelation between society and technology.[28] It was demonstrated not only by the use of new products of technology in architecture, but in facilitating accommodation for the new production in terms of architecture and planning. This interrelation was oriented to enhance the living, working and recreation facilities of the public.

It is from this endeavor that perhaps Tafuri (1976:101) argued that Modern architectural ideology was defined technically. For although,

one cannot escape the social concern of this ideology, but one has to agree that the "wind" was in favor of technology. For instance, housing projects (habitat) were more technically approached rather than socially, and standardization[29] was the ideal solution[30] for these projects. In fact, the forms and schemes of industrial production became part of the architectural design and thinking.[31] As a result of this ideology, aesthetic experience was revolutionized, and considered as a process to be lived.

Finally, one may argue that the role of the first CIAM helped in forming an ideology, which in my view ended the formative stage of the modern movement, and brought it to an established one. It possessed a body of thought and a conceptual world that governs the practice of the new architecture and explains its production. This ideology gained its existence and acceptance, in place and time, from the semi-international recognition demonstrated in *La Sarraz*.

Nevertheless, the role of CIAM continued over 11 meetings, partly advancing the ideology of the Modern Movement, gaining new grounds and acceptance and partly bringing it to an impasse. For instance, the purpose of the CIAM 2 that took place in Frankfurt in 1929, was directed at the advancement of the ideology of the Modern Movement.[32] Hatje (1975) traced the aims of CIAM 2 as follows:

1-To state the contemporary architectural problems,
2-To restate the idea of modern architecture,
3-To disseminate this idea throughout the technical, economical and social strata of contemporary life,
4-To remain alert to the problems of architecture.

The discussions in this congress were a continuation of those of the first, so much so, the case of CIAM 3 and in some since CIAM 4, where the first was held in Brussels in 1930 and discussions were devoted to town planning. In this congress, Hatje (1975) argued that CIAM "was neither intellectually nor organizationally prepared". Here, Hatje alert to the beginning of the impasse. In CIAM 4, which was held in Athens in 1933, Hatje (1975) indicated that discussion was devoted to the

conditions of towns and five subjects were put forward before delegates, those were:

1- Dwellings
2- Recreation
3- Work
4- Transportation
5- Historic buildings

Although these subjects were discussed in the two previous congresses, discussion in this congress was general, and less specifically related to immediate practical problems than were in the Frankfurt "Charter", or Brussels Report, Hatje (1975). However, discussions in this congress had resulted in what has been known as the Athens Charter. For Hatje (1975), the Athens Charter initiated the beginning of the "destruction" of CIAM, because he argued, that the Athens Charter became more central than the Charter of 1928 and the Brussels "Statutes" of 1929. Nevertheless, the congresses that followed were continued in much the same way. The delegates of CIAM8 were described by Hatje (1975) as unprepared intellectually as those of CIAM4 of Athens, and the result of discussions was "fashionable cliches" which caused the "failure" of CIAM8. This failure paved the way for CIAM9 to claim a "clean break with both the mood and the content of the Athens Charter". [33] Team x (CIAM10) took the chance and "set up the personal, the particular and the precise". [34]

"Habitat" was the agenda of Team x, and each delegate architect was asked to present a project of his design and ready to commit himself.[35] A new spirit existed in Team x, which constituted a direct challenge to the established members of CIAM, as a result of this, a split occurred at the end of the congress.[36] CIAM was in ruins, and Team x proposed itself to be the alternative to CIAM. But in 1959, another CIAM took place, which was similar in content to Team x, where particular projects were discussed and individual responsibility was accepted, Newman (1961). At the end of this congress a dispute occurred among the young delegates and the founders, the young ones voted to dissociate their activities from the word CIAM. Hatje (1975) described this event as neither a productive nor a

dignified outcome to thirty years of international activity. This psychological event ended the role of CIAM as "the major instrument through which the ideas of Modern Architecture and town planning were made known to the world", Hatje (1975).

The collapse of CIAM marks the beginning of the retreat of the ideology of Modern Movement and led to the unstable architectural situation of the late sixties. It eases the way for young architects to claim new trends, to form groups and to claim individual approaches. It also paved the grounds for some critics and historians, who find this event, perhaps invest it, as opportunity to claim a body of ideas and to formulate a conceptual world for each approach. Needless to mention the role of the architectural journalism in increasing the unstable architectural situation of the sixties via publishing the views of architects, critics and historians. However in the following discussion I shall be highlighting the architectural situation of the sixties.

The Architectural Situation in the Sixties

Most of cultural phenomena if not all, in the Western World, like: music, movies, paintings, literature…etc. were experiencing, in the sixties, radical changes or a kind of revolt against their established structure. Architecture was not an exception. In the following discussion I shall be highlighting the architectural situation.

The architectural situation was a mixture of presence and absence of a will established Movement, namely Modern Architecture. It was experiencing a retreat of recognition, after the collapse of CIAM as I indicated earlier, and ignorance of its conceptual world. Architects and theoreticians attacked it and emphasized the need for change. For instance the American architect Venturi devoted his book *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*, (first published 1966) to attack the theme and practice of Modern Movement and to manifests his personal approach to architecture. The American architect Stern also recorded in his book *New Direction In American Architecture*, (first published 1969), the rebel of the architects of the "third generation modernist (white architects)" against the formal manifestation of Modern Movement. The American historian Vincent Scully, in his introduction to Venturi's book, praised the views and practice of Venturi and described him as he was " able to free himself from the fixed patterns of thought and fashions of his contemporaries [Modern Movement]". The English historian Reyner Banham attempted to invent a body of thought to the architectural practice known as New Brutalism.

However this situation resulted in forming trends like New Brutalism and Archigram; groups like Procrustes Club and CASE (Conference of Architects for the Study of the Environment); and personal approaches as alternatives of Modern Movement. In the following discussion I shall be highlighting these alternatives starting with New Brutalism.

New Brutalism

New Brutalism represents the irony of the architectural situation in the sixties. The term according to Banham (1966:10) had two versions: the first was Swedish and called "Neo Brutalist"; and the second was English called "New Brutalism". The latter was derived from "Brutus", the neck name of the English architect Peter Smithson. Banham (1975:10) dissociated between the two versions of the term. He argued that Neo Brutalist is a stylistic label like Neo-Classic and Neo Gothic, whereas the second New Brutalism is in the "Brutalist phrase an ethic not aesthetic". It describes a program or an attitude to architecture. Banham indicated that the term New Brutalism was spread and been adopted by young architect in England.

Nevertheless the two terms were coined to describe the design of Hunstanton school made by the English architects Alison and Peter Smithson. Since the school was built in 1954 the term New Brutalism refers to the austere quality of architecture demonstrated in the honest presentation of structure, building material and exposing hidden material of the mechanical and electrical installation. In spite of the fact that the austerity of design went beyond the ruthlessness design of Mies van der Rohe and *beton brut* of Le Corbusier, but these elements constituted part of the theme of Modern Movement and not invented by the Smithsons or New Brutalism.

Furthermore, according to Hatje (1975), the intended content of the phrase New

Brutalism was a mood of frustration because of the difficulties of building in Britain after the Second World War. And because of the domination of the stylistic preferences of the New Humanism of the Political Left and the New Empiricism of the Political Right. Hatje indicated that New Brutalism as a phrase was intended as "a mockery" of both styles, although the phrase drew attentions to certain physical qualities in the architecture designed by the Smithson's and their generation.

Thus the beginning of the term New Brutalism was initiated to describe the physical quality of buildings. It has no body of thought or a conceptual world that govern the production of architecture that might be labeled or described as New Brutalism.

The irony of this term, then, is that it remained as a label referring to the physical qualities of architecture since it was coined in the mid-fifties until 1963, where the term gained rapid currency during this period of time. In this year Banham was asked to make a study[37] about New Brutalism by the "editor of Documents of Modern Architecture Jurgen Joedicke, who surprised Banham with a proposal that the New Brutalism was a suitable subject for a serious study." The point at issue here is that the practice known, as New Brutalism required a theoretical frame in order to elevate it to the statues of intellectual architectural discipline that possess theory and govern practice.

The attempt of Banham to produce a theoretical frame from the practice and writing of the Smithsons and other concerned seems not to be succeeded. For although he indicated that New Brutalism during its rapid currency acquired some depth of meaning through things said and done, but he was unable to drew a structure for New Brutalism. In fact his contribution was limited to a stylistic [38] interpretation; even the Smithsons themselves were unable to structure a body of thought to New Brutalism. They interpreted it as "the only possible development for this moment from the Modern Movement", Banham (1966:45).

On these grounds the Smithsons themselves did not consider New Brutalism as an alternative to Modern Movement in spite of the fact that its austerity exceeded the ideal of Modern Movement, namely, honest presentation of building material. But it did challenge the aesthetic ideals of Modern Movement, via its ethical claim and dominant presence during the late fifties and early sixties.

Finally one may argue that New Brutalism was not an intellectual beginning. It did not prove to be a project underway. It had no formative stage, nor had an endeavor or established thought. But as a practical beginning it made the focus of attention and acquired a quiet good presence. Furthermore the Smithsons gained a good deal of publicity and perhaps satisfied their ambition.

In the previous discussion I highlighted the contribution of New Brutalism and emphasized its role in the architectural situation in the sixties. In the following discussion I shall demonstrating the role of Archigram.

Archigram:

Archigram was a British contribution to architecture. It was a group of six architects[39] came together in 1960. They publish a magazine under the title Archigram. The first issue appeared in 1961 and the group where known by the same name of the magazine soon after its distribution, Lampugnan (1986:16).

Banham (1976:89) considered the first issue as information sheet intended to record the forgotten projects of students and failed competition entries. He ascribed the reasons for this publication to the fact that the group wants to take revenge of the "Establishment", to by pass the decaying Bauhaus image and the dissemination of information. The magazine was a means of telling students and young architects about the extraordinary goings on which were concealed by official professional press and faculties.

However the theme or rather the technique of Archigram as recorded by Banham (1976:85-104) was: architecture by drawing, fantasy, science fiction, kits of parts, bits and pieces and do it yourself. The group went on, according to Jencks (1980c: 280-298) to oppose every modern "ideal" and to liberate man from all the constraints and categories of the past and sensed the idea of absolute freedom.

Finally Archigram trend as a practical beginning made the focus of attention. It's clearly mark the opposers' views of Modern Movement and demonstrated part of the architectural situation in the sixties. However in the following discussion I shall be highlighting the role of the groups, Procrustes

Club and CASE, in the architectural situation in the sixties.

Procrustes Club:

Procrustes Club and CASE were representing the role of American architects in the architectural situation in the sixties.

Procrustes Club as defined and interpreted by the Greek historian Tzonis and his wife Lefaivre (1980), was a group of American architects[40] mainly of Yale University. They were interested in the "pleasure of form", "elitist" and "anti-functionalist", searching for identity as well as clients, Tzonis and Lefaivre (1984 b). The authors argued that the club was not even a club but a causerie among friends. They indicated that the causerie discussions were published in several issues of the Yale architectural Magazine *Perspecta*.

This group failed to form architectural trend. The failure perhaps ascribed to the fact that attacking Modern Movement and being non functionalist were not enough to form a trend and because their contribution was being too much based on personal interest. In spite of the fact that some of its members were distinguished Americans architects like, Philip Johnson and Paul Rudolph, but it did not make the focus of attention. It ended from where it was begun. However in the following discussion I shall be highlighting the group of CASE.

CASE:

Similar to Procrustes Club, CASE (Conference of Architects for the Study of the Environment) was another group of American architects, critics and historians. The first meeting of this group was held at Princeton University in 1964. The number of CASE members[41] was reduced in the meeting of 1969, which took place at the Museum of Modern Art, to five architects and known as the New York 5. This group, like Procrustes Club, had no chance of establishing architectural trend, because its beginning had no ideological grounds or social concern, but motivated against Modern Movement by personal interest.[42]

This group ended without being able to make the focus of attention and failed to establish a body of thought. Even the New York 5 with their claimed spatial approach and notable publicity accompanied their meeting

had failed to establish a body of thought and to continue as a group.

Nevertheless Venturi and Eisenman were among many other members of CASE group. Both were played a remarkable role in attacking Modern Movement and both retreated from CASE in different times and showed a high egoism and egotism in demonstrating their views. For instance Venturi, as indicated earlier, conducted his attack on Modern Movement from a personal point of view. He started his book *Complexity And Contradiction In Architecture* (1977:16), with phrases such as: "I like", "I welcome", "I am for" and "I prefer"…etc. This egotism emphasized the personal ambition and psychological role of architects in the sixties and paved the ground for Post-Modern Movement to take place as alternative to Modern Movement, Jencks (1977a).

Eisenman and the rest of Jews architects of CASE and New York 5 were preoccupied by their belief system (religion). They adopted those trends, particularly: ruins aesthetic and Deconstruction, to serve the Talmuding role of the, so-called, remembrance of the destruction of Jerusalem.[43] However I shall discuss their role in forming those trends in a forthcoming research.

In the previous discussion I demonstrated the role of trends, groups and personal approaches that manipulated the architectural situation in the sixties. In the following discussion I shall be highlighting the role of critics and historians.

The Role of Critics and Historians

After the failure of groups, personal approaches took place. Some of these approaches were interpreted by architects who initiated them like Venturi and Eisenman. Critics and historians interpreted other approaches.

Venturi and Eisenman attacked the theory and practice of Modern Movement in favor of their own interest, and belief system, to obtain commissions and to satisfy their ambitions. The first indicated his approach earlier in this paper which paved the way for Post-Modern to dominate the theory and practice of architecture in the seventies. The latter kept jumping from one trend to another. In the sixties he claimed the spatial approach to counter the social approach of Modern

Movement. Eisenman continued his jumping in the seventies and eighties, motivating by his belief system, as a Jew, he preached for deep structure, ruins aesthetic and lately he embarked on deconstruction.

Critics and historians introduced the other personal approaches. I already demonstrated the role of Banham in the interpretation of New Brutalism and Archigram. And the role of Scully in his introduction to the book of Venturi *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*. However I shall take the time here to demonstrate the role of the German historians Cook, W.J. and Klotz, H. in introducing the personal approaches of architects.

The two historians published a book under the rubric *Conversation With Architects*. They interviewed nine American architects. The authors concentrated upon certain features for each architect and dressed him an individual approach or direction.

For instance the approach of Philip Johnson was eclecticism because he freed himself from the influence of Mies Van de Rohe and made a break with Modern Movement. The approach of Louis Kahn was the Beaux-Arts tradition. And that of Bertrand Goldberger was technological approach. The approach of Paul Rudolf was form creator and so on for the others.

In much the same way, the American architect Robert Stern published another book under the rubric (1977a) *New Directions in American Architecture*. He selected six architects out of the former nine architects mentioned in the book of Cook and Koltz, in which he also adopted, more or less, the same technique.

It seems that personal interest and ambitions of opposers of Modern Movement motivated the personal approaches. These approaches together with the trends and groups demonstrated the architectural situation in the sixties.

The role of historians partly increased the chaos via coining, inventing and publicizing bodies of thought and conceptual world for trends and personal approaches to architects. And partly alert the fear from the chaos of the sixties. For instance Geidion (1963:24) described the architectural situation as playboy architecture. He indicated that architecture was treated as "playboy treated life, jumping from one sensation to another and quickly bored with everything." He argued that trends and playboy attitude of the sixties will vanish as other trends before them vanished.

Furthermore Stern (1969:119) described the situation in the sixties as a battle of styles between white architects who opposed Modern Movement and gray architects who defended it. The two historians Cook and Klotz (1973:9) emphasized this view. They indicated that "American architecture was represented in a pluralism styles" by many voices of architects who exemplify the variety of established directions.

Finally one may argue that the views of historians clearly demonstrated the chaos of architecture in the sixties that diminished the presence of Modern Movement in favor of Post-Modern architecture and Deconstruction.

Summary

The argument in this paper has been devoted to displaying the theme of Modern Movement and the architectural situation in the sixties.

For the first purpose discussions extended over three stages. The first stage focused upon the contribution of two of its founders: Le Corbusier and Bruno Taut. Discussions emphasized the similarity of their contribution. The second stage centered upon the contribution of two schools of Modern Movement: the Bauhaus and De Stjil. Discussions emphasized that the contribution of both schools coincided with the individual contribution of Le Corbusier and Taut. Discussions also emphasized that both schools shared the same view to history.

Discussions turned to display the relation between Modern Movement and history. It interpreted Modern Movement as a new Beginning that contained ideas. Some of these ideas proceeded, others modified and others left behind. Discussions emphasized that the proceeded ideas represented the revolutionary aspects of a beginning and the modified ideas represented the constant aspect of society and culture or the presence of history. And those left behind they neither supports nor prevents the advancement of a beginning. Discussions concluded that history was not alienated from the theme of Modern Movement.

The discussion that follows interpreted the contribution of CIAM and its role in unifying individual contribution and thought of Modern Movement. Discussion turned to delineate its collapse.

For the second purpose discussions displayed the architectural situation in the sixties. It displayed the views of Venturi, Scully, Stern and Banham and their role in opposing Modern Movement. The discussions turned to highlight the role of New Brutalism and Archigram. It turned again to highlight the role of groups: the Procrustes Club and CASE.

Finally discussions displayed the role of historians in initiating bodies of thought for new trends and individual approaches for architects. Discussions emphasized the chaos of architecture in the sixties. It concluded that this chaos diminished the presence of Modern Movement and paved the grounds for new trends, namely, Post-Modern and Deconstruction architecture to take place.

NOTES

(1) See: Tzonis, Alex. and Lefaivre, L., (1981c). The Mechanization of Architecture and the Birth of Functionalism, *The Harvard Architecture Review*, pp. 121-143, the MIT Press.

(2) The Second World War.

(3) Criticism of the modern movement took place by different critics, historians and architects, see:
a-McEwen, M. (1974). *Crisis in Architecture*, RIBA. Publication, London.
b-Brolin, B.C., (1976). *The Failure of the Modern Movement* Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York.
c-Jacob, J., (1977). *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. Penguin Books, U.K.
d-*Newman*, O., (1977). *Defensible Space*, Architectural Press *London*.
e-*Venturi*,R.,(1977). *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*, The Museum of Modern Art, New York.

(4) Mendelsohn, Erich, is a German architect who immigrated to USA. Le Corbusier *(*Charles-Edward Jeanneeret), is a Swiss architect by birth, French by nationality, and one of the most notable founders of Modern Movement. Oud, J.J. Pieter, a well-known Dutch architect and one of the founders of De Stijl. Dudoke, W. Marinus, a well-known Dutch architect. See: Hatje, G., (1975). *Encyclopaedia of Modern Architecture*, Thames and Hudson, London. :Murray, P.L., (1979). *The Penguin Dictionary of Architecture*, Penguin Books, London.

(5) See: *Le Corbusier (1960). Towards A New Architecture*, Pagers Publisher, New York. :Benevolo, L., (1971). *History of Modern Architecture*, Kegan Paul, Vol. 2, pp. 435-470. :Giedion, S., (1978). *Space, Time and Architecture*, Harvard, Mass., p. 524.

(6) See: *Le Corbusier*, (1960*). Towards A New Architecture*.
Hatje, G., (1975). *Encyclopaedia of Modern Architecture*.
Benevolo, L., (1971). *History of Modern Architecture*, Vol. 2.

(7) The view of Bruno Taut was summarized from his book (which was published in 1929) by Benevolo (1971), *History of Modern Architecture*, Vol. 2, p. 493.

(8) Ibid.

(9) See: Gropius, W., (1975). *The New* Architecture *and the Bauhaus*, MIT Press, Mass., USA.
Hatje, G., (1975). *Encyclopaedia of Modern Architecture.*
Benevolo, L., (1971). *History of Modern Architecture*, Vol. 2.
Giedion, S., (1978). *Space, Time and Architecture.*

(10) *See*: Gropius, W., (1975). *The New Architecture and the Bauhaus*, p. 84.

(11) Ibid.

(12) Ibid.

(13) See: Le Corbusier, (1960). *Towards A New Architecture*.

(14) See: Said,W.E., (1978). *Beginnings, Intentions and Methods*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, N.Y.

(15) *See*: The conditions of *establishing* a Beginning, Said, W.E., (1978). *Beginnings, Intentions and Methods*, p. 34.See also the editorial of *The*

Harvard Architecture Review in his article: Beyond the Modern Movement, Vol. 1, Spring 1980. Stern, R., (1980c). The Doubls of post-Modern**,** *The Harvard Architecture Review*, Vol. 1, Spring.

(16) Said, W.E., (1978). *Beginnings, Intentions and Methods*, p. 34.

(17) Ibid., p. 42.

(18) Quoted in Benevolo, L., (1971). *History of Modern Architecture*, Vol. 2, p. 410.

(19) Both Mondrian of De Stijl and Feininger of the Bauhaus declared that the work of art should have a universal representation, and be detached from the pressure of nature in order to achieve pure figurative expression. See: Benevolo, L., (1971). *History of Modern Architecture*, Vol. 22, pp.409-415. :Tafuri, M., (1976). *Architecture and Utopia*, MIT Press, pp. 90- 415.

(20) Benevolo, L., (1971). *History of Modern Architecture*, Vol. 2, p. 411. See: Giedion, (1978). *Space, Time and Architecture*, pp. 488-489.

(21) Tafuri, M., (1976). *Architecture and Utopia*, p. 93.

(22) *See*: Benevolo, L., (1971). *History of Modern Architecture*, Vol. 2, p. 495.   :Jencks, C., (1980c). *Modern Movement in Architecture*, p. 36.

(23) Ibid. See: also Giedion, S., (1978). *Space, Time and Architecture*, p. 696.

(24) *See*: the entry of *CIAM*: Hatje, G., (1975). *Encyclopaedia of Modern Architecture.*

(25) Ibid.

(26) Ibid.

(27) The statement is recorded in Benevolo, L., (1971). *History of Modern Architecture*, Vol. 2, pp. 497-499.

(28) *See*: Tafuri, M., (1976). *Architecture and Utopia*, pp. 93-125. :Tzonis, A., and Lefaivre, L., (1984). The Question of Autonomy in Architecture*, The Harvard Architecture Review*, Vol. 3, Winter, p. 27.

(29) *See*: Le Corbusier, (1960). *Towards A New Architecture.* Gropius, W., (1975). *The New Architecture and the Bauhaus.*

(30) Ibid.

(31) Tafuri, M., (1976). *Architecture and Utopia*, p. 101.

(32) Newman, O., (1961). *CIAM '59 in Otterlo*, Alec Tiranti Ltd., London.

(33) Hatje, G., (1975*). Encyclopaedia of Modern Architecture*.

(34) *See*: Smithson, A..(1974a). *Team 10 Primer*, The MIT Press, Cambridge Mass. USA. Newman, O.(1961). *CIAM '59 in Otterlo*, Alec Tiranti Ltd., London. Hatje, G., (1971). *Encyclopaedia of Modern Architecture.*

(35) Ibid.

(36) *See*: Benevolo, L., (1971*). History of Modern Architecture*, pp. 495-506. Hatje, G., (1975). *Encyclopaedia of Modern Architecture.*

(37) *See*: The preface of Banham book. Banham, R., (1966). *The New Brutalis Ethic or Aesthetic***,** The Architectural Press, London, pp:.45.

(38) Ibid. pp. 66, 77

(39) The names of the six architects are: Warren Chalk, Peter Cook, Dennis Crompton, David Green, Ron Herron and Michael Webb. See:

Lampugnani, V.M.(1986). Encyclopedia of 20th Century Architecture.

(40) Some of the members of the Procrustes Club were: Paul Rudolph, Philip Johnson and Robert Stern. See: Tzonis, A., and Lefaivre, L., (1984b). American Architecture seen from a dark alley, *Forum*, pp. 87-88.

(41) Some of the members of the CASE were: Stanford Anderson, Peter Eisenman, Kenneth Frampton, Michael Graves, Richard Meier, Colin Rowe and others. But the N.Y. Five are: Peter Eisenman, Michael Graves, Gwathemy, John Hejduk and Richard Meier. See: Plunz,R.,and Kaplan, K.L.,(1984).On Style, *Forum***,** pp. 78-86, 45.

(42) *See*: Tzonis, A., and Lefaivre, L., (1980). The Narcissist Phase in Architecture, *The Harvard Architecture Review*, Vol. 1, spring 1980, pp.54-62.

(43) *See*: Batsheva Goldman-Ida, (1997-98). Black On White – A Remembrance Of Jerusalem, published in *The Real And Ideal Jerusalem In Jewish, Christean And Islamic Art*, pp.203-209.

العمارة الحديثة والأوضاع المعمارية في ستينيات القرن العشرين

ملخص:

هذا البحث مكرس لدراسة الأوضاع المعمارية في ستينيات القرن العشرين، وذلك في محاولة للتعرف على الظروف التي مهدت الطريق لظهور عمارة ما بعد الحداثة ثم التفكيك. وسيعنى البحث بتوضيح فكر العمارة الحديثة من بدايته وحتى اكتمال بنيته، وذلك من خلال بيان إسهام اثنين من روادهما، وهما المعماري الفرنسي لوكوربوزييه (Le Corbusier) والمعماري الألماني برونو توت (Bruno Taut) وكذلك من خلال بيان دور مدرستين معماريتين حديثين هما: البوهاوس (Bauhaus) ودي ستيل (Di Stjil). كما سيبين البحث موقف العمارة الحديثة من التاريخ، وسيركز على دور المؤتمرات العالمية للعمارة الحديثة CIAM (Congres Internationaux d`Architecture Modern) والتي عقدت في الفترة من (1928- 1959م)، في تشكيل فكرها وإرساء أسس وقواعد ومعايير ممارستها. ثم يبين البحث كيف استغل المعماريون الشباب- في حينه- هذا المؤتمر لتقويض العمارة الحديثة. وكيف تسبب هذا التقويض في إحداث الفوضى المعمارية التي عمت ستينيات القرن الماضي والتي ما زلنا نعاني منها حتى الآن. وسيعرض البحث للممارسات المعمارية التي ظهرت في الستينيات ويبين دور النقاد والمؤرخين المعماريين في ترويج هذه الحركات ومحاولة إلباسها ثوبا نظريا، وتصنيفها كحركات معمارية تتضمن نظرية وممارسة، كما هو الحال في الوحشية الجديدة (New Brutalism) وأرشيغرام (Archigram). وسيخلص البحث إلى أن محاولات تقويض العمارة الحديثة كانت لمصالح شخصية قادها المعماريون الشباب ضد مؤسسي العمارة الحديثة.