Architectures

Modernism and After

Edited by Andrew Ballantyne

Blackwell
Publishing

Architectures

New Interventions in Art History

Series editor: Dana Arnold, *University of Southampton*

New Interventions in Art History is a series of textbook mini-companions – published in connection with the Association of Art Historians – that aims to provide innovative approaches to, and new perspectives on, the study of art history. Each volume focuses on a specific area of the discipline of art history – here used in the broadest sense to include painting, sculpture, architecture, graphic arts, and film – and aims to identify the key factors that have shaped the artistic phenomenon under scrutiny. Particular attention is paid to the social and political context and the historiography of the artistic cultures or movements under review. In this way, the essays that comprise each volume cohere around the central theme while providing insights into the broader problematics of a given historical moment.

Art and Thought
edited by *Dana Arnold and Margaret Iversen* (published)

Art and its Publics: Museum Studies at the Millennium
edited by *Andrew McClellan* (published)

Architectures: Modernism and After
edited by *Andrew Ballantyne* (published)

After Criticism: New Responses to Art and Performance
edited by *Gavin Butt* (forthcoming)

Envisioning the Past: Archaeology and the Image
edited by *Sam Smiles and Stephanie Moser* (forthcoming)

Architectures

Modernism and After

Edited by Andrew Ballantyne

Blackwell
Publishing

350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA
108 Cowley Road, Oxford OX4 1JF, UK
550 Swanston Street, Carlton, Victoria 3053, Australia

First published 2004 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Architectures : modernism and after / edited by Andrew Ballantyne.
p. cm. — (New interventions in art history ; 3)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-631-22943-4 (hardcover: alk. paper) — ISBN 0-631-22944-2 (pbk. : alk. paper)
1. Architecture, Modern—19th century. 2. Architecture, Modern—20th century. I. Ballantyne, Andrew. II. Series.
NA62 .A733 2004
724′.5—dc21

2003008642

A catalogue record for this title is available from the British Library.

Set in 10.5/13 pt Minion
by Graphicraft Limited, Hong Kong
Printed and bound in the United Kingdom
by MPG Books Ltd, Bodmin, Cornwall

For further information on
Blackwell Publishing, visit our website:
http://www.blackwellpublishing.com

Contents

List of Illustrations

Notes on Contributors

Andrew Ballantyne is Professor of Architecture at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne. He has held research and teaching posts at the universities of Sheffield and Bath, and is now Director of the Centre for Tectonic Cultures at Newcastle. His previous books include *Architecture, Landscape and Liberty* (1997), *What is Architecture?* (2002), and *Architecture: A Very Short Introduction* (2002). He is currently working on *Architecture as Experience* (forthcoming, 2004).

Elizabeth Cromley is an architectural historian with a special interest in the vernacular landscape. She teaches in the Architecture Department at Northeastern University in Boston, Massachusetts. In addition to her book on New York apartments (*Alone Together*, 1990), she has published on the resorts of the Catskill Mountains; practices of home renovation; the history of Riverside Park in New York City; and the use of Native American motifs in decorative arts. She was American editor for the history of design handbook, *The Elements of Style* (1996), edited by Stephen Calloway, and has co-edited two volumes in the series "Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture" with Carter Hudgins. Her most recent work is a co-authored book with Thomas Carter, *Invitation to Vernacular Architecture* (forthcoming, 2004).

Andrew Law is a PhD candidate in the Department of Geography at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne. He is currently completing his doctoral thesis on conservation of the built environment in Britain, and is looking at groups such as the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings,

the Georgian Group, the Victorian Society, and the Civic Trust. He is centrally interested in Englishness and with related issues of social class, landscape, heritage, and identity. He is currently writing an article on "The Revival of the Arts and Crafts in Landscapes of Class and Englishness."

Gerard Loughlin is Senior Lecturer in Religious Studies at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne. He has teaching and research interests in religion and film and is the author of *Alien Sex: The Body and Desire in Cinema and Theology* (forthcoming, 2004).

Sarah Menin is Lecturer in the School of Architecture, Planning, and Landscape at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, and a member of the Centre for Tectonic Cultures, researching and writing on modern architectural history, and the creation and perception of architectural place. She has published extensively on correlations between music and architecture in the work of Aalto and Sibelius. She is the author (with Flora Samuel) of *Nature and Space: Aalto and Le Corbusier* (2002), a book which utilizes Donald. W. Winnicott's psychoanalytical theories, and is the editor of *Constructing Place* (2003), a book of essays which address the mind and matter of place-making.

Simon Sadler is Assistant Professor of Architectural and Urban History at the University of California, Davis. His publications explore radical tendencies in late twentieth-century architecture. He is the author of *The Situationist City* (1998) and the co-editor of *Non-Plan* (2000). He is currently working on a new book, *Amazing Archigram*.

Brenda and Robert Vale both work at Auckland University, New Zealand. Their publications include *The Autonomous House* (1975) and *Green Architecture* (1991). They have also written numerous academic publications and contributed to many international conferences on sustainable buildings and energy. Their most recent book is *The New Autonomous House* (2000). This provides a concentrated discussion of the issues involved in designing the UK's first autonomous house and explains why the design decisions were made. They are currently working on another book, *The Sustainable House in New Zealand*.

Stephen Walker teaches architecture at the University of Sheffield. His research examines the boundaries between architecture and other art

practices. He has published a number of articles on Gordon Matta-Clark, about whom he is currently preparing a monograph. He is also in the process of editing a collection of works and essays on architecture and the contemporary body. This draws together contributions from a wide variety of disciplines, and is entitled *Body-Space*.

David Wood is Lecturer in the School of Architecture, Planning, and Landscape, and a member of the Global Urban Research Unit (GURU), at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne. He is also Managing Editor of *Surveillance and Society*, the international journal of surveillance studies. His current research interests include the social effects of digital surveillance technologies; science fiction and surveillance; the militarization of the city and social life; permaculture and innovative sustainable rural and urban planning and design solutions; landscape and ecology in science fiction; and orbital space policy.

Series Editor's Preface

New Interventions in Art History was established to provide a forum for innovative approaches to, and new perspectives on, the study of art history in all its complexities. This volume expands the horizons of the series to consider recent developments in architecture from a range of interdisciplinary perspectives.

The survey begins with a discussion of the impact of mechanization and industrialization on the production and consumption of the built environment in the mid-nineteenth century, and a consideration of the term "historicism" and its implications for the writing of histories of architecture. The following chapters present moments when the languages of the architecture of the past respond to cultural circumstance by their presence or apparent absence. In this way, revivalist, modern, and postmodern architecture is presented as part of a continuing dialogue between aesthetic criteria and social and cultural imperatives.

The history of architecture is a complex interplay between patterns of living, consideration of what is good architectural form, and what technical means can be deployed. It can seem satisfactory to summarize the architectural achievements of an age with a unified canonical corpus of works, but closer examination reveals that plurality and diversity are indeed very evident. The architecture-world is not coherent and unified, and its histories are plural and diverse. The object is not to arrive at an authoritative "standard" or consensus view of architecture, but to show that different views throw into prominence quite different sets of landmarks to navigate between. In this way, the concerns of this collection of essays both run parallel to and intersect with the broad intellectual base of

the series which questions the established frameworks with which we discuss the visual.

The essays provide a rigorous interrogation of the architecture by writers from a variety of disciplines, including architects, geographers, and theologians, as well as architectural historians. It is hoped that this book will provoke future research and debate which will expand the discourses of architecture. As such, *Architectures: Modernism and After* is a very welcome and timely addition to the volumes in this series.

Dana Arnold
London, March 2003

Preface

Architecture is the cultural aspect of buildings, and it happens when buildings and people meet. The essays gathered in this volume put in the foreground various processes in which buildings and architecture are involved, including education, sustainability, and self-sacrifice. In each chapter architecture is considered from a different point of view, and from one chapter to another there is an implied shift in the very idea of what architecture is. Sometimes it seems to be importantly engaged with social issues, but sometimes it seems to escape them, or to be irresponsible. Sometimes it seems to be the preserve of an elite, but at others it seems important that it should belong everywhere, even in the humblest home. Between the essays there is a sense of volatility, quite at odds with the solidity of buildings and the internal coherence of the perspectives in individual pieces.

The essays are mostly about twentieth-century buildings and twenty-first-century concerns, sometimes with a longer historical sweep, so that, for example, we can see the Crystal Palace as a twentieth-century building that happened to be built in the middle of the previous century, though it makes better historical sense to argue that the bulk of twentieth-century architecture was a working-out of nineteenth-century ideas. The title of the Introduction, "Architectures in the Plural," is an allusion to one of Michel de Certeau's books, *La culture au pluriel*,[1] which rehearsed, back in the 1970s, ideas that now seem to be very widespread in cultural studies, but are still relatively little explored by architectural historians. Architecture is plural because culture is plural. Each culture produces its own response to a given object, and in doing so generates a swarm of architectures.

Andrew Ballantyne

Note

1 Michel de Certeau, *La culture au pluriel* (Paris, 1974; 2nd edn, ed. Luce Giard, Editions du Seuil, 1994); trans. T. Conley, *Culture in the Plural* (Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota University Press, 1997).

Introduction: Architectures in the Plural

Andrew Ballantyne

Singing the Habit of Energy

The great machines of the nineteenth century were expressive and thrilling. The industrial machines in the factories made a din and produced goods in fantastic quantity to a reliable standard. Locomotives stoked with fire hurtled across the countryside, trailing smoke, linking places that before had been remote from one another. Cities spread, and were blackened by the soot that they produced, so the outskirts on the windward side became the better places to live. The industrial sublime included the engines of infrastructure, such as the huge pumps associated with reservoirs, that could move vast quantities of water, driven by pistons that could crush a man indifferently without hesitation in their thunderous rhythm.

Nineteenth-century machines could make the earth tremble and seemed to be driven by their own imperatives that were as unflinching as the forces of nature, and as unarguable. Where architecture was concerned, it seemed as if the decent thing to do was to mask them with a cloak of respectability. "What is the beauty of a building to us today?" asked Nietzsche in 1878, "The same thing as the beautiful face of a mindless woman: something mask-like."[1] The cotton mills around Manchester, which pounded out fine fabrics, were given towers and turrets, and dressed to look superficially like the palaces of a new aristocracy. The thunderous engines that

drew into St Pancras Station in London were screened from the city by a cavalcade of pinnacles and pointed arches.

The sublime is never quite polite. Victor Hugo found it in the sewers of Paris, on which he expatiated at length in *Les misérables*, before going on to make use of them in his narrative.[2] In the abstract he thought of them as a farmer might, as taking good fertilizer away from the city, and wasting it by dispersing it in the river and the sea. In their concrete evocation they are the setting for traumatic and gruesome events. In Hugo's day they were still a novelty. For every artistic celebration of the sublimity of infrastructure and machinery in the nineteenth century, there is a whole district of buildings to hide it in. We have, for sure, Joseph Turner's *Rain, Steam and Speed* (1844), but it is a remarkable exception, not a typical picture of the age. Thackeray remarked that "The world has never seen anything like this picture."[3]

Where buildings are concerned the same story can be told. The great building of industrial construction of the mid-nineteenth century was the Crystal Palace of 1851, which became one of the wonders of the age, precisely because the world had never seen its like. It amazed the crowds who flocked to see it, but John Ruskin, the most prominent architectural critic of the day, was not prepared to concede that it made any contribution to the development of architecture. Samuel Laing, the chairman of the Crystal Palace Company, in his address to the Queen at the opening, had claimed that the building ushered in "an entirely novel order of architecture,"[4] and Ruskin claimed that, in doing so, Laing was voicing "the popular view of the facts . . . one which has been encouraged by nearly all the professors of art of our time."[5] To judge by the buildings that were put up during the rest of the nineteenth century, this was certainly an exaggeration. The consensus view among the classes who actually commissioned buildings was much more like Ruskin's own. He was not willing to admit that the Crystal Palace was architecture. "We suppose ourselves to have invented a new style of architecture," he said, "when we have only inflated a conservatory!"[6] Moreover, his voice was not among those asking for a new architecture:

> We want no new style of architecture . . . But we want *some* style. It is of marvellously little importance, if we have a code of laws and they be good laws, whether they be new or old, foreign or native, Roman or Saxon, or Norman, or English laws. But it is of considerable importance that we should have a code of laws of one kind or another, and that code accepted

> and enforced from one side of the island to another, and not one law made the ground of judgement at York and another in Exeter. And in like manner it does not matter one marble splinter whether we have an old or new architecture truly so called or not; that is, whether an architecture whose laws might be taught at our schools from Cornwall to Northumberland, as we teach English spelling and English grammar, or an architecture which is to be invented fresh every time we build a workhouse or a parish school . . . Originality in expression does not depend on invention of new words . . . A man who has the gift, will take up any style that is going, the style of his day, and will work in that, and be great in that, and make everything that he does in it look as fresh as if every thought of it had just come down from heaven.[7]

This position is receptive to a degree of novelty in architectural ideas, but stylistically conservative, not because of any failure of the imagination, but as a matter of principle. As a position it can be used to account for how most nineteenth-century architecture looks, when we look back on it with hindsight. Given that the Crystal Palace was such a huge popular success, it is surprising how little impact it had on the artistic productions of its own day. It was not imitated by architects, and had a greater presence in Russian literature than in English. For the Russians it was a symbol of modernization that reminded them of their own backwardness; so, for example, Dostoevsky's reaction to it mixed a certain dazzled admiration with a sense of being reproached by it. It had in his mind an oppressive authority. "I am afraid of this edifice," he said, "because one could not stick out one's tongue at it on the sly."[8] The building is the source of the Modernist vision of a spiritualized glass architecture, developed by Bruno Taut and others,[9] but at the time that it was built it was seen as belonging exclusively to the cultural province of the engineers, and so far as architects were concerned it was beyond their pale.

There is a distance between noticing the technical possibilities of building and their cultural assimilation. It is the cultural assimilation that makes it possible to use the buildings gesturally, and for them to become architecture. It is not necessarily the case that a new technical possibility ever will be culturally assimilated into architecture. A new system of construction might be used experimentally, with satisfactory results, but never be taken up more generally. A building's services, such as its ventilation ducts, can be incorporated invisibly into the building, hidden away behind ceilings, or they can be used gesturally, by making them visible and painting them bright colors. Nineteenth-century theaters, for example, often had

sophisticated ventilation systems, using huge gas burners up above ceiling level to heat the air, which therefore rose up out of the building through vents, and lowered the air pressure in the auditorium, so fresh air was drawn in lower down. All this happened out of sight. What the theatergoer saw was a ceiling covered in decorative plasterwork, with a great chandelier hanging down from it. Around the edge of the ceiling's central area there would be a ring of pierced metal, which might seem to be there to embellish the decorative scheme, but which acted as a grille to allow the passage of air. The mechanisms of the building were incorporated into a decorative scheme that derived from rococo ballrooms, and could be lost among the ornament. There are nineteenth-century buildings where mechanisms and structures are more evident, but they were buildings where the usual decorum did not apply. In polished architecture it was seen as necessary to clothe the building in a fabric that showed knowledge of admired buildings of the past, so that the new building reflected some of their accomplishment, and showed that the building securely belonged in polite company.

At some point this changed. The Italian Futurists were successful in drawing attention to the cult of the machine as an object of aesthetic interest. They sang "the love of danger, the habit of energy and fearlessness," and affirmed that "The world's magnificence has been enriched by a new beauty: the beauty of speed. A racing car whose hood is adorned with great pipes, like serpents of explosive breath – a roaring car that seems to ride on grapeshot is more beautiful than the *Victory of Samothrace*."[10] This dates from 1909, when the motor car was still a novelty, and compares the machine with a masterpiece of Hellenistic sculpture, the canonic reputation of which is all the more secure for its being in the Louvre. The art of ancient Greece had been revered for as long as there had been anything that called itself "civilization," and the Futurists' displacement of it from the pinnacle of aesthetic achievement was intentionally radical.

If their message had not struck a chord with others, then we would have forgotten them long ago. If they were noticed at all now, then they would be seen as adolescents letting off steam, in a way that is mischievous rather than important. The enthusiasm for the machine, to which they gave early expression in the art world, was not theirs alone, but was taken up by others in various ways, in architecture most famously by Le Corbusier, who called the house a *machine à habiter* ("machine for living") and designed what he called a "Citrohan" house for mass production – the name evoking the automobile manufacturer "Citroën."[11] By the middle of the twentieth century it seemed feasible to think that we were living in the

"machine age," as if machines were now the planet's dominant life-form, and if that were so, then it was proper that art and architecture should give expression to the fact.[12]

If we subscribe to this view and look back at the nineteenth century, then what we see is a story of progress, as the burgeoning machine age took shape, first of all in technological devices that made new things possible, but which had no presence in the world of polite culture, where art, architecture, and literature belonged. It was only later that the truth of the machine was allowed its full glorious expression, without being disguised by the irrelevant trappings of historically derived ornamentation. On this view buildings such as the Crystal Palace are prophetic. They are treated as if their designers could see the future, and being exceptionally gifted, they built it early. In such a mind-set, the Crystal Palace belongs more truly to the realm of architecture than the general run of nineteenth-century buildings, even though this was not recognized at the time. Ruskin, being blind to the building's epoch-making qualities, becomes a critic of marginal interest, whose time has passed.

The way in which architects routinely use the word "historicist" is to mean the use of historical ornament, in buildings that would be better without it;[13] and it is a term that is never used of buildings older than the nineteenth century. It somehow seems to be accepted that eighteenth-century architects would imitate Palladio, or that eleventh-century church builders would aspire to build Roman vaults, but after the Crystal Palace had shown the way forward, then it was somehow irresponsible of architects not to follow where it led. On this view "historicism" is plainly a bad thing, something that architects learned to cast off, and the story of architecture from the middle of the nineteenth century onwards is the story of how it was cast off, first in the case of exceptional buildings, later more generally, as even mainstream buildings could "be themselves" without being seen as barbaric or uncultivated.

Historicism, Irony, and Redescription

The problem with this view of the matter is that it tells us nothing at all about the sensibilities of nineteenth-century architects, or any other nineteenth-century people, which might be a legitimate concern for an historian of nineteenth-century architecture. What it tells us is what in the nineteenth century was of interest to later architectural commentators.

This connects with another use of the same word, "historicism," in the sense that Karl Popper used it in his book *The Poverty of Historicism*, where again "historicism" is a bad thing.[14] Its title is an allusion to Karl Marx's *Poverty of Philosophy*, and its principal aim is to show that, for strictly logical reasons, the future cannot be known. Popper was particularly driven to dismantle the Hegelian sense of destiny that underpinned some of Marx's writings, and the book is dedicated to the "memory of the countless men and woman of all creeds or nations or races who fell victim to the fascist and communist belief in Inexorable Laws of Historical Destiny."[15]

In this sense of the word, much of the architectural historiography of the later twentieth century was historicist, even when it condemned the use of historical ornament in modern buildings. David Watkin made a study of Popper's kind of historicism in writings about architecture, especially in texts by Nikolaus Pevsner and Sigfried Giedion, two of the most authoritative and influential critics read by twentieth-century architects.[16] On Popper's reading, it is an abuse of history to suppose that we can use it to predict the future. In ancient Greek legend, Oedipus killed his father. He did not know that the man he fought was his father, and the reason for that was that he had been cast away as an infant because it had been predicted that he would kill his father. Without the prediction, the event would not have happened: Oedipus would have recognized his father, and would not have killed him. Popper coined the term "Oedipus effect" for "the influence of a prediction upon the predicted event (or, more generally, for the influence of an item of information upon the situation to which the information refers), whether this influence tends to bring about the predicted event, or whether it tends to prevent it."[17] Historicism in this sense is something that any rigorous historian would take pains to avoid falling into. It is nevertheless used when an historical account is set out with a view to establishing the validity of a particular "next step forward." In such cases, even when the historical method is flawed, one might in practice be prepared to indulge the author if the case presented were supportive of a cause that one endorsed. It might after all persuade an audience to do the right thing. If the historical account supported an unacceptable course of action then the methodology's incoherence would be very evident. Popper's argument theoretically makes all such uses of history unpersuasive for those who have read him, independently of whether the ends to which they are used are good or bad.

There is a third sense of the term "historicist" in circulation, which means something else again, and this time the term can cheerfully be

adopted by those to whom it is applied, as descriptive of their approach. It is set out very clearly and embraced by those whose work it describes. It is set out clearly and concisely by James Conant, in an essay about Richard Rorty, whose position he is here describing:

> Historical processes are not governed by laws. They are fundamentally *contingent*, influenced by human agency and unforeseeable chance events. Historical understanding is always *situated* and necessarily coloured by our present values and interests. Historical accounts are stories we tell to provide a coherent narrative about who we are and how, through interacting with each other and the world, we got here. Such stories are inherently *retrospective* – each community in each age will tell the story differently – and they are *constructed*. The only sense in which a historical narrative can "get things right" is by telling a story which proves to be both acceptable and enabling to the members of a community; and the only sense in which one such narrative can be "better" than another is – not by offering a more faithful description of the objective sequence of events, but rather – by *redescribing* the events in a novel and helpful way.[18]

Conant's italics here signal words that are used in a particular sense and have special importance in Rorty's vocabulary. It is plain that the historicism embraced by Rorty steers clear of the historicism condemned by Popper. There is no "destiny," but some things happen, while others do not. Some of the things that did not happen, might have happened, without violating any law. A rigorous history will do its best to take account of any relevant evidence, but the evidence that is relevant will depend on the story to be told. And the stories that we tell each other and ourselves will depend on who we think we are and what we are trying to do.

The collection of essays gathered in this volume was shaped by a concern to explore a range of possible ways of conceiving architecture, and to show a variety of possibilities for the kind of story one can tell. Each essay tells us something about an aspect of architecture, and is in accordance with some kind of evidence: the facts that each essay makes use of should all be verifiable and correct. Each, however, generates its own world of facts, which may be incommensurable with others. There is little mention of architectural style here. The essays tend to deal with processes rather than discussing buildings as finished objects. Some essays discuss aspects of the production of architecture, while others discuss aspects of its consumption – which is to say, the ways in which it is used. In them we are often a long way from common sense, the received wisdom of the age.

Here again it is helpful to draw on Rorty's vocabulary and position myself as an "ironist," which means the same thing as an "anti-essentialist" in the vocabulary of critical theory.[19] The essentialist conflates common sense with self-evident truth, and mistakes ingrained habits of mind for reasoning. Architecture is complex and can be approached in many different ways, and no single way can make an exclusive and permanent claim on our understanding. Some ways, however, have been used repeatedly, and have yielded up as much of interest as they are likely to do, while others, such as those presented here, can open up fresh possibilities and new directions in enquiry.

The process of *redescription*, mentioned above, is at the heart of the enterprise. We redescribe a building (or whatever) when we situate it in a story that is not the habitual story of routine common sense. A single building can be redescribed in many different ways, and when that happens it will have various different cultural connotations, and can therefore be said to produce different architectures. The Crystal Palace, for example, was both a shimmering vision of future possibility, and a nightmarish reproach. It was experienced as a radically different kind of thing by Ruskin, Dostoevsky, and Samuel Laing (of the Crystal Palace Company), who seems to have had the general public on his side. "The Crystal Palace" as a cultural construct, which is to say as architecture, was quite distinct in each of their redescriptions, even though they were all looking at one and the same building.[20] A building's cultural value is volatile, and will depend on the story into which it is asked to fit.

In a given culture (or "community," to use Rorty's word for it) there will be various shared points of reference, which everyone involved in that culture is more or less expected to know. These are the landmarks that give us our bearings in the culture, and while some of them may be personal and idiosyncratic, others are known to everyone who seems to belong to that culture, and they therefore come to have the status of a canon. For example, the traditional canon of Western architecture would certainly include such buildings as the Parthenon in Athens and the Pantheon in Rome, and we would be surprised if a Western architectural historian had not heard of them.

If culture these days seems to be more pluralist than in the past, it is at least partly because we now feel that a wider range of people have a right to make their voices heard.[21] At times there seems to be a very great gulf between educated and popular culture, but it is often the case that an individual who has a highly developed "high culture" view in one field,

turns out to have a "popular" view in another, and there are "low-brow" and "high-brow" ways of engaging with any given cultural artifact. For example, a recent film aimed at a popular audience, *Minority Report* (2002, directed by Steven Spielberg and starring Tom Cruise), was discussed at some length in *The Times Literary Supplement* under the heading "The Commodification of Paranoia."[22] (The narrative is, incidentally, about a self-fulfilling prophecy, and is a clear example of the "Oedipus effect" in action.) There is a "high culture" of architecture, and, while it is not altogether unified, there is a surprisingly high degree of consensus among architects as to which buildings are important and which ones beside the point. It is a consensus that breaks down somewhat as we look at buildings of the recent past, but even there we can find a general acceptance of examples of "good design" of buildings, which can be quite different from what the generality of public opinion would have selected. In just the same way as there can be a distance between "serious" and "popular" music, there can be a distance between the buildings that are promoted by the architectural profession as representing "good design" and those that are intuitively enjoyed by others. "Architect" is a protected title, and can only be used by someone who has completed an extended course of socialization in the architecture-world, developing a range of knowledge and skills, and usually being formed with a certain range of tastes and proclivities in design.

A Modernist Canon

There is scope for a Modernist academy, which would take iconic examples of twentieth-century buildings into its canon, and include such important "precursors" as the Crystal Palace. It would be possible for such a school to work in much the same way as the old École des Beaux-Arts used to, with the students learning to incorporate gestures from Le Corbusier into their work, instead of learning their repertoire from Roman ruins. There is plenty of evidence that this is just how architects give meaning and status to their work. If I look out of my window here at the university (and it is a *fenêtre longue*, as promoted by Le Corbusier) I can look across to a building raised on *pilotis*, with bands of window running across it, and a balcony inset near the top which brings some columns into view and makes the top part of the building echo the general arrangement of the Villa Savoye (but in bands of brickwork rather than white stucco).

Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown have drawn attention to the way in which various prominent buildings have echoed the massing of Le Corbusier's monastery of La Tourette.[23] And La Tourette is echoed again in the headquarters building that Richard Meier designed for the French television company Canal +. One side overlooks the Seine and is highly glazed, but the other has narrow strip windows at eye-height, apparently held up by cuboid blocks. These buildings make use of form in such a way as to show that they are immersed in the culture of the architecture-world, in just the same way as late eighteenth-century buildings showed knowledge of recent publications of the antiquities of Athens. On another reading, though, Modernism is concerned not with the transmission of a culture of approved building form, but with constant re-invention and experiment. The idea of an avant-gardist academy is more problematic, and is examined in Simon Sadler's essay (chapter 1). How does one transmit a culture of unorthodoxy?

In the nineteenth century there was a fierce debate about architectural style, with outlandish claims made for the merits of classical or Gothic architecture. By the early years of the century there was already, within the general view of classicism, the idea that the ethos of ancient Greece had a high cultural value, and drew together the artifacts and way of life in that society in an ideal way that should be emulated if at all possible.[24] The artistic products of ancient Greece, and even everyday objects, were caught up in the ideal way of life and could therefore be valued, alongside the morals, philosophy, and literature. The crucial point here is that the artistic products were seen to be intimately linked with the way of life, so that there was a conflation of ethics and aesthetics. In theory it might be possible to follow an ideal "Greek" line of thought, and come up with a highly original artifact that responded in an entirely appropriate and harmonious way to the changed culture and circumstances of the present day. (On the other hand, what architects did much more readily was to incorporate recognizably "Greek" elements in their designs: Doric columns, meanders, acanthus leaves.)

This kind of argument was taken up by A. W. N. Pugin, who displaced the Greek paganism with Christian morality and argued in favor of "Christian or pointed architecture," by which he meant what we think of as Gothic.[25] With the construction of the Palace of Westminster from 1836 he seemed perhaps to have won the argument, but in 1857 George Gilbert Scott's Gothic designs for the new Foreign Office building in Whitehall were rejected by the Prime Minister, Lord Palmerston, who wanted a

classical design. The controversy that followed became known as the "battle of the styles." Scott kept the commission but changed the design for the Foreign Office to an Italianate style.

It was against the background of such stylistic disputations that Ruskin wrote, apparently believing that the outcome of the battle would not be crucial to the quality of the architecture. In France, Eugène Viollet-le-Duc proposed that a new nineteenth-century style of architecture would develop from the serious consideration of new building materials, especially iron, and the Art Nouveau movement of the 1890s was an attempt to overcome traditional stylistic quarrels by proposing a fresh start and an architecture derived from first principles. The great success of the Modernist architecture of the 1920s stemmed at least in part from the fact that it could be presented as the resolution of these, by then traditional, problems. The quarrel about which historical ornament was best was dispatched by saying that all historical ornament was to be avoided. The exorbitant cost of Art Nouveau decoration was avoided by favoring machine-produced artifacts and mass-produced housing. The spirit of the age revealed itself through the machine, and anything that did not engage with the imperative to make this manifest in the world was beside the point and could be ignored.

Sigfried Giedion's hugely influential work, *Space, Time and Architecture: The Growth of a New Tradition*, located the new architecture in a cultural framework that showed why it had to be taken seriously.[26] The story he told showed how the new architecture was prefigured in such buildings as the Crystal Palace and the Eiffel Tower, and, going further back, how the fluid sense of space to be found in open-plan interiors was prefigured in Baroque churches. Giedion's story therefore shows how, by looking at the architecture of the past, we can see how it points the way to the future. The book was revised and more buildings were included once they had been built, fulfilling the prophecy. As architectural polemic, persuading architects to design in a particular way, the book was staggeringly successful. As history it is methodologically dubious, and "historicist" in Popper's sense.[27] As an account of nineteenth-century architecture it is extraordinary because it involves ignoring almost all nineteenth-century architecture, acknowledging only the very few buildings that helped him to make his points, while neglecting to draw attention to the fact that they were exceptional rather than typical, and would not have been accepted as belonging in the architecture-world of the nineteenth century, when they would have been seen as the work of engineers. On this view of