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Archetype encourages the submission of all types of material relating to Art, Architecture and Design.
A discussion about making a new magazine occurred in the late months of last year in and about Northern California. It has been collocated and spliced, edited and, in some cases, censored into the form in which you may read it. Participants were Editors 1, 2, 3, and 4.

1: Could we have one meeting without arguing endlessly about the name ARCHETYPE and talk about the substance of the magazine?  
2: The mag is publishing things second or third hand. It took years to catch up to High Tech, and only now are they catching on to New Eclecticism; New Rationalism is still foreign to the American press.  
3: Editorials all seem to say the same thing: they greet the reader, they state their morals, and they define the field of research and reference. Some even invite their readers to participate in shaping their policies. I think we should offer bits and pieces of ideas which could enrich and justify the personal notions and hunches of the reader.  
4: This copybook attitude is harmful. The magazines seem to be afraid of mixing history and design, and there are few sources outside of the Universities.  

2: These magazines we are talking about have been showing what the press-agent oriented architects give them to publish. And then it becomes a copy book for students and clients.  
3: That's important because those who are commissioning the work are getting their information from entirely different sources as those who are carrying it out.  
4: So that's why we're bearing this child?  
1: Yes, I think so. It's the mix between scholarship, relevance, novelty and beauty that we're after. We are setting out to search for the austere, flowering, thoughtful, amusing, elaborate and broad understanding of our environment.
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The theme of the 16th century Venetian villa is surrounded by a number of interpretations and analyses, each conducted with finality yet with profoundly different and even openly contrasting methods. The very volume of studies makes it difficult to single out from a purely architectural angle the main features of a problem by now subjected to excessively analytical and compartmentalized studies. This development is not without irony when one considers the organic character of 16th century villas.

One type of historical analysis perceives the villa as the functional and administrative center of an agricultural activity whose techniques were presumably imposed by Venetian reforms. This perception is marked by an overextension of the methodological definitions of economic historians. Links are established between the agricultural economy and the architectural forms of the villas on bases that are far too schematic and partial. If precise structural definitions have been effectively singled out of an only apparently homogeneous Palladian oeuvre, at the same time the most immediate implications of differences in the economic mentality have been ignored. More attention is paid to the superstructure — itself not a secondary component — than to its true historical motivations. Various proposals attempt to define the villa as a "highly specialized agricultural agency." Because this concept tends to be expressed in an unproblematic and definitive form, it has ended up diverting attention toward less determining aspects of these 16th century feudal landholdings.

All of these investigative methods are marred by a more or less superficial evaluation of even the most provisional conclusions of economic historians about the Venetian "agricultural revolution." A further complication is the pervasive notion that 16th century treatises on the typological treatment of the villa had a "persuasive" effect on contemporary production. Primarily because of Palladio's theoretical work, this influence is so pervasive as to condition the conceptual image of the villa in univocal form, even today. Although it is true that the Venetians increased the quantity of investments in the terra-firma with respect to the 14th and 15th centuries, it is also true that the most reliable studies indicate that this quantitative accumulation of agricultural funds was not matched by an appreciable modification of earlier economic concepts.

Systematic reclamation and improvement of infrastructures, the introduction of rational criteria in crop rotation, and above all, offering incentives to farmers by loosening feudal constraints did not occur before the 7th decade of the 16th century, and even then only partially in some areas of the Padovano, Trevisano and Veronese. That is, at the end of Palladio's design period. Before this date Venetian action was limited to administrative awareness and to verifying the holdings.

Fig. 1: Villa Godi in Lonato di Lugo (Vicenza)
of various landed properties and the existing network of roads and services.

In some territories, in particular the Vicentine, the political conditions for more decisive action did not exist. Almost entirely of feudal and anti-Venetian extraction, the local aristocracy permitted only minimal penetration by foreign proprietors, demonstrating extraction, political conditions clear they continued regardless they refused to con-serve products (corresponding to establishment own equipment of liberty) for the central state.

The Vicentine aristocracy's line of conduct aimed at conserving the status quo, in the first place by limiting even strictly technical interventions by Venice. It was clear that any form of territorial modification from external forces meant reducing part of the production processes that were under direct Vicentine control. In the second place, the Vicentine nobility refused to permit modifications in their relationship with farmers. For example, the nobility did not accept the principle of the so-called boaria (contract between the farmer and landlord), or payments of fixed sums to farmers; but they continued to require pre-established quotas of certain products (corresponding to the canone dominicale) regardless of the size of the harvest.

Any form of interference in this system of relations led the Vicentine nobility to tighten control over their own possessions and created the conditions for the establishment of villas serving as nodal points for the reinforcement of territorial control.

The villa definitely was not the technical center — the locus of the transformation and conservation of products of primary activities — of an improbable territorial productive system, superimposing upon and annihilating a preceding order. On the contrary, precisely because it preceded a major attempt at radically modifying the historic and economic bases of feudal institutions, it did not offer any conceptually innovative components. Functionally and politically it was a conservative expression.

Further proofs emerge from an analysis of villa configurations and their territorial placement. The greatest concentration was in the socially backward Vicentine territory; elsewhere Palladian residences appear with far less frequency. Their functions were tightly yoked to medieval economic principles, such as exercising direct protection over the property and not least, constraining farmers to observe feudal pacts. At times they served as bases for repressive action.

The functionally 'rural' quality of some of them can be attributed in large part to the image of them transmitted by I Quattro Libri. This includes, among others, the Villa Pisani in Montagna, where the debate over the most appropriate classification — villa or palace — risks further ossification if economic readings are not integrated with typological and stylistic ones.

The imposing neighboring buildings — stables, storerooms, equipment sheds and housing for farmers — present an almost totally abstract configuration, in most cases found only in the graphics accompanying the treatises. Consider, for example, the design of the portici and the barchesse of Villa Trissino in Meledo.

Here Palladio's planimetric discourse is founded primarily on archaeological bases and lacks any coincidence with the economic reality of the estate. Analyses of a practical-scientific character do not come into play at all in Palladio's work, although such analyses furnish Vincenzo Scamozzi (at the beginning of the 17th century) with concrete examples for arranging the various components of the rural house. Few Palladian villas initially were endowed with these kinds of ancillary functions.

Beyond manualistic codification, typologically these are parts added a posteriori, not the qualifying elements of the real villa whose principal coordinate instead would be the position with respect to agricultural properties. Although the criteria for these parts are not worth elaborating here, they can be seen as bound to need for a formal recovery of aristocratic Vicentine action in the major programs not only in the technical but also the social evolution of the farmer's world.

Even in the rare instances where the villas seem to be provided with architectural apparatus somehow related to agriculture, there are quantitatively fewer than theoretically would be required in technical structures and houses for farmers for the large estates exploited by the proprietor.

The reasons are clear: in the Vicentine territory the conservation of the concept of passive revenue worked in such a way that beyond being a nucleus of surveillance, the villa was only a clearing house for 'finished'
agricultural products already worked and dried by farmers with their own equipment. The villa was generally extraneous to any transformation process. This emerges clearly in the few inquiries conducted on the subject of villa administration: along with the occasional introduction of rational systems, such as the calculation *a partita doppia*, there were inexplicable forms of backwardness. For example, the proprietor frequently rented the house of the fattore (who was responsible for coordinating and programming on the farm) to persons clearly unable to acquit these chores. This occurred not because the proprietor was unaware of the circumstances, but because the basic phases of the agricultural process were explicite at a level of production in which he had no interest to intervene directly. From his standpoint, it was essential only that the farming classes continue to assure him of the expected revenues in line with the modalities sketched above.

The chronic absence of storerooms and stables (present only in the limited quantity necessary for the needs of the lord residing there) in Palladian villas contrasts sharply with an abundance of decorative and ‘representative’ elements which are not in conflict with but rather complement the observations offered here. These decorative elements were joined with the specific architectural theme of the villa, with all of the implications bound up with the culture of the period as elaborated by numerous and thoroughly researched studies.

The presence of elements from classical architectural language signifies the transposition of aristocratic politics into the rural ambience, policies pursued amid great difficulties in Vincenza with the construction of palazzi in the middle decades of the sixteenth century. These were costly urban buildings, but for the nobility there was no corresponding identification with exigencies and manners of life that were truly “of the city.” For the Vicentine aristocracy the urban dimension was substantially deprived of interrelations with its supporting economic structures, the indirect exploitation of agriculture.

In this respect the villas were strongholds in the process of urban modification of the territorial reality. The nobility of the terraferma undertook these actions once they realized the uncertainty of the outcome of the contest with Venice over the external “decorum” of the city.

The principle of direct identity between the theoretical typology of the villa and the material concepts of agricultural politics must be recalculated from the ground up. Also to be re-evaluated is the meaning of post-Palladian theorizations on the theme of the relationship between villa architecture and the cultivation of the land. Up to now this has been considered in the sense of *rentier*, although as in the case of Scamozzi they in fact represent one of the very few examples of a deliberate overcoming of typological schematism in favor of a less superficial adherence of architecture to historical and economic dynamics.

— Ugo Soragni

Translated by Diane Ghirardo.

Ugo Soragni is an architectural historian working at the University of Rome, and an editor of the international journal, *Storia della Città*.


7. This is what Ventura argues when he speaks of “substantial detachment from economic problems.” An explanation of this type does not seem acceptable. It is important not to undersize the fact that the Vicentine nobility managed to retain until the end of the XVIII century its own landed patrimony, proof of a high level of management.

HOUSE IN TRANSVAAL

Stanley Saitowitz
The site is a six acre piece of grassland. The owners and builders are Scott and Linda Brebnor.

The house began as the simulation of the act of habitation on a piece of paper. A circle beginning at the rocks is marked out on the ground. The contours, man's abstracted interpretation and dimensioning of the landscape, are terraced into the circle, and planted in two alternating strains of grass.

The terraces are continuous and sweep up along the rim of circle as roofs, weaving the ground into the sky, containing in their thickness the sheltered habitable part.

The roofs as pieces of floating ground, weave the layered flickering grass and the high sky.

The section is the archetypal house with its roof burst open by the trusses, whose hollowness supports the space and traps the clouds. The roof steps down to the ground to be walked on. The house is a horizon.

The circle of buildings walling the oasis are, from the rocks, counterclockwise, the house; workshop and garage; the cottage, three separate huts loosely woven with the ground, an ancestral vernacular plan; and the sprung neck sleek eyed stables, tied to the contours.

The house extends the most habitable part of the site, the rocks. The house is a process of making the rocks habitable; the house is a hollowing rock. The morphology of the rocks as whole shapes, with sections broken off, revealing cross sections, is echoed in the cuts of the roof. A moat, the gutter, marks out this cut on the ground.

Two independent intersecting geometries exist; the roof above as a contour of the landscape scale, and below, at its own scale of human contours, the more particularised geometry.

The intersection of these two geometries has a certain arbitrariness, indicating a purposeful indifference.

The scale of human contours is generated by activity ripples; the swing of the front door establishes the waves of the platforms of habitation. Each time the front door is opened, the generation of the plan regenerates.

The living landscape is an eddy in the space running through. The bedroom is snug between the rocks. The kitchen leads out to the land. The smallest scale of ripples are the naked body contours of the bathroom.

The original ground focused by the imprint of buildings, geometric clearings, dimensioned with pathways, reaching to the limits.
Stanley Saitowitz was born in South Africa. He practices and teaches architecture in the Bay Area.
After saturating West Coast sensibilities, Ernest Callenbach's inventive *Ecotopia* will be made into a movie. These images by Craig Hodgetts, the set designer, portray the modification of the environment after the secession of the West Coast from the United States. The rendering of a futuristic utopia has allowed Architect Hodgetts, who is perpetually innovative anyway, to work with an unencumbered imagination.

The Confidential Report re-printed here is the Anti-Ecotopian force appraisal of the capabilities and design discoveries of the Ecotopian nation. We publish it at some risk, in the shadow of Three Mile Island.

Craig Hodgetts lives in Los Angeles and teaches at U.C.L.A.
SOLAR COLLECTORS ARE EMPLOYED TO CHARGE
THE CAPACITANCE-DISCHARGE CELLS WHICH
POWER THE MAGNETIC TRANSPORTATION
SYSTEM. EXCEPT FOR THIS FEATURE, FUNCTION
IS SIMILAR TO OUR SIDE BUS-VAN
CORRIDOR. THEIR SIDE PORTLAND TO SAN
FRANCISCO IN TWO HOURS PLUS.
THE ELEVATED PORTION OF THE SUBJECT
SYSTEM QUOTES LIFTING BODY VEHICLE
WITHOUT A RESULTANT DYNAMIC STRESS ON
THE STRUCTURE BUT RESULTS IN A PECCULAR
STRAINING OF VEHICLE UNACCEPTABLE TO OUR
SIDE.

NATIVES CLAIM THE VISUAL EFFECT, EDU-
CATIONAL VISITS, PICNICS ON THE BALL
ARE SUBSTANTIAL SPINS, OFTEN CIFTING
THE ANACHRONISTIC CABLE CAR AS PRECE-
DENT AGAIN...NO PARITY WITH DELorean
VEHICLE OUR SIDE.
ELEMENT IN FOREGROUND ACCOMODATES SIX
PERSONS FOR "MAINTENANCE." THERE IS NO
CONTROL OVER ACCESS.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE GENERATORS FOLLOWS
THE NATIONAL PRACTICE. WOOD AND LOW
TEMPERATURE ALLOYS ARE EXTENSIVELY
EMPLOYED. WEIGHT PENALTY BY OUR STAND-
ARDS IS SEVERE, BUT IN THE SUBJECT
CASE OFFSET BY FEEDBACK VENT LOOP TO
CONSERVE INITIAL CHARGE.

"KEEPER" IN YELLOW JACKET IS USUALLY
AN ARTIST OR WRITER WHOSE DUTIES ARE
CONFINED TO GENERAL MAINTENANCE AND
OCCASIONAL ATTITUDE CORRECTIONS, BUT
MAY SERVE AS HOST TO BOUTIQUE VISITS OF
SCHOOLCHILDREN AND SIGHTSEEERS. LOW
EFFICIENCY HERE SUGGESTS REPLACEMENT
OUR SIDE BY AUTO ELECTRONIC DEVICE.
OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

This portion of the building is constructed of California redwoods, typically heavy, as these "metropolis" tend to be, yet nevertheless affords to Ms. Fairchild the opportunity to relax with friends in a setting which is sympathetic to her nature.

Nature expert such structures to be endlessly modified throughout their period of use by different persons for fit, to be ceremoniously removed from the base buildings if they are no longer useful.

Outside, of course, such structures must be carefully sealed.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Traffic in the subject building is varied by now ubiquitous school children far outnumbering official visitors and the few staff members Fairchild chooses to employ. As with most facilities their star, there is little or no control over access.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Subject aircraft is aerodynamically similar to so called "hang glider" as the hydraulically stressed membrane forming the wings can be modified to optimize speed and attitude, combined with a reflectance targeting system for its laser armament and magnetic deflection, the machineability thus achieved ensures strategic superiority. Their side in typical combat situations, pilot and family assume responsibility for maintenance - thus dual seating has mixed motive as well as function.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Subject station is entirely underground with the exception of a small house and the laser alert system which seals off the entire complex. System analogues our side are in old Florida when the "haunted house" was a feature in what was to become U.S. Capitol. Processing underground is expected to include bacterial decontamination, oral testing, biographic screening, and something called "values evaluation" by the natives.
ARCHETYPE

In light of the current reconsideration of Beaux-Arts architecture, and post-modernism, one is apt to forget the architecture of the immediate past. The legacy of the Los Angeles modernists from the first half of this century, however, should not be ignored. The work of Raphael Soriano, spanning the period from the 1930's to the present, is characteristic of this modernist movement and is, like his personality, unforgettable and deserves careful attention.

Soriano was born on the island of Rhodes in 1908. In 1942 he came to Los Angeles and attended the University of Southern California, graduating in 1934 with a degree in architecture and French literature. After working in the offices of Richard Neutra and R. M. Schindler, he started his own practice in Los Angeles, later relocating to Tiberon in 1953. Among his best known works are the George and Ida Latz Memorial (Los Angeles Jewish Community Center, 1937), the Hallawell Seed Company building (San Francisco, 1938), the Schulman House (Los Angeles, 1950), the Case Study House for California Arts and Architecture (Pacific Palisades, 1950), and a project for a World University on Alcatraz, in the San Francisco Bay (1969).

Soriano continued the modernist tradition established in Los Angeles by Neutra and Schindler, providing a link between this first generation and a third generation of modernists consisting of such architects as Craig Ellwood, Pierre Koenig and Charles Eames. Soriano considers his commitment to technology to be a moral one, based on his belief that technology can and will better humanity. His housing models perpetuate the Los Angeles tradition of the single family house and exhibit novel solutions to the problems posed by prefabricated and modular construction, and the need for easy assembly, flexible interior spatial arrangements and low cost. While complying with changing economic requirements throughout his career, Soriano constantly reevaluates man's housing needs, envisioning revolutionary changes in domestic construction.

Soriano's unfailing commitment to technology and "the process," based on the relationship of technology and architecture to natural processes, has set him at odds with today's architecture. Far from bothering him, this stokes his fire and lends credence to his belief in a current architectural malaise, which he attributes to architects' indulgence in "sculptural attitudes" and historicism. (The following interview was conducted by William Ted Georgis on November 25, 1978.)

Interview:

RAFAEL SORIANO

Archetype: Can you say something of your youth? Why did you come to America?
Soriano: I came to America when I was sixteen. I was born on the island of Rhodes in the Aegean Sea, they were Italian islands, now they're Greek islands. But there was no future there. I wanted to go to university but only rich people could be sent to Europe. So I came as an immigrant to America, because I had two aunts here. Immediately I wanted to pursue a profession. I wanted to be a composer; that was my great joy and today to this day, I am still tinkering with this.
A: You came directly from Rhodes?
S: Yes, I came to America and worked in a fruit stand at 5th and Hill Streets in L.A. I went to U.S.C. and worked at night.
A: When did you finish school?
S: In 1934, I graduated in architecture and French literature. I worked in the fruit stand at night from five till one in the morning and carried sixteen units of course work. I did poorly in architectural courses because I used to question my professors constantly. They didn't like to answer anything and I said "Why? Why that?" And they said "Go to the library and look it up."
A: In what way did you serve California Arts and Architecture?
S: I didn't serve the magazine at all. All the names of the members of the editorial staff were there for prestige. John Entenza was the editor and he was capitalizing on those names.
A: Did he ask to publish your houses in the magazine?
S: Yes, he published the buildings of several fine architects. You see at that time there was Neutra, there was Schindler, there was Soriano.
A: And Craig Ellwood?
S: Craig Ellwood came afterwards. He came to work on my apartment house and then Pierre Koenig also worked for me. The son-in-law of Siegfried Giedion, Paffard Clay worked for me, as well as Dan Dworsky and Joe Fujikowa (Mies' assistant). This is all history.
A: At the time also there was Harwell Harris who was doing imitations of Frank Lloyd Wright, and Gregory Ain, who worked for Neutra.
A: What about Charles Eames?
S: Eames was designing furniture, he was associated with Saarinen at the time. He was more a designer of furniture, and the house he did for himself looked like a Mondrian, nothing really so startling. He also did the house for Enzena which was not very good.
A: What was it like working with Enzena?
S: I think Enzena didn't like me very well because I would not kow-tow, I'm not the one who makes an 'Allah' of anybody. I used to criticize things. I remember once we were at a cocktail party and he said "Are you beyond publicity?" I said "Yes, I am what I am and that's it."
A: How does an architect make his work known if he doesn't allow it to be published?
S: I don't know. I'll tell you the way mine happens to be known. When I did my first house I didn't even know anything about architecture to tell you the truth, but somehow my sensitivities directed me and the music always guided me. Somehow music told me a great deal. This may sound very far fetched but it isn't really because you can see the lucidities in the music of Bach, Vivaldi, or Scarlatti, how marvelously they are. The music teaches you something and then you look at nature, you look at the flowers, you see how unified nature is. Everything in nature is done simply, structurally and with order. There are no tricks. And that began to form my thinking process, and when I did realize this somehow my sensitivities told me to design in the simplest terms possible and at the time I was influenced by Neutra, certainly.
A: Did you work in his office?
S: I worked in his office for a few months. I was working on the city planning project: the Rush City Reformed, that's all I did.
A: And then right after that you started on your own?
S: No, when I was with Neutra, Schindler saw a city plan I did, a big one, it was exhibited in the Architect's Building in L.A., and somebody stole it. But he saw it and he called me and said "Soriano I saw your plan, I like it, come and work for me, I'll give you one dollar a day." Neutra had no money to pay me so I went and worked with Schindler. Neutra did not like this.
A: Was that because they were fighting?
S: No, they were not fighting. They were in different offices. There was not a feud, however, their ideas were totally opposite. I was more appreciative of Neutra's work than I was of Schindler's. Schindler's designs were of a very sculptural quality.
A: Specifying of sculpture, and changing the direction of this interview a bit, what do you think about the addition to the National Gallery?
S: It's awful, nonsensical juggling. I know Pei, he was serious enough, but not very serious.
A: You mean he wanted to make money?
S: Of course. He's interested in money. Also in sculptural attitudes. He is following fashion. This is not architecture.
A: Have you seen Philip Johnson's design for the A.T.&T. building?
S: Yes, the building with the armoire, directorie type of thing on its top. When he went to get his A.I.A. gold medal I had a telephone chat with him. He said, "Raphael you know we are the only two left." Now I'm thinking of writing him a letter saying that there are two of us left, but only one is alive. After that awful mess he's created, what a tragedy!
A: Johnson is considered by many to be the foremost practitioner of architecture in the U.S. today, and yet you imply that his architecture is dead. What then do you think of the state of architecture today?
S: I'm very critical. As a matter of fact, the last time I was at the California Council of Architects meeting in Newport Beach in 1978 I served on a panel. Attending the meeting unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately, was
an Italian architect born in Argentina — Pelli. I was giving a slide lecture at the time, and it happened that he was at the door of the conference room where I was speaking. I said: "Cesar Pelli, come va? I’m just showing a slide of your San Bernardino Civic Center building," which was a horrible mess. He just whimsically chopped off the corner of a rectangular building, and then he made another cut at an angle. That’s what he does. It’s becoming a Hollywood movie type of thing, like fantasies. I would think he would have better taste and much more intelligence, but unfortunately he doesn’t. This man creates horrible messes and I took him to task after the lecture, I said “Cesar, perché ha fatto questo? Why did you cut the building like that?”

And his answer was, “Why not?” I happened to be accompanied by a dear friend who poked at his eyes with her two pointed fingers and said, “Suppose I do this to your eyes? Would you answer ‘why not?’” I am absolutely concerned, and concerned with great misgivings because I don’t think we should have these kind of manipulations by such unknowledgeable people. I said some very significant things at that conference. I said that the architectural profession is in bankruptcy! We aren’t producing anything intelligent. We are acting more like painters and sculptors rather than real architects. Architecture should be more like a scientific thought process, like an objective statement.

A: Could you comment on the New York Five, on the work of Peter Eisenmann for example?
S: I don’t know who he is.
A: Here are examples of the work of Eisenmann and Michael Graves in the March 1972 issue of Progressive Architecture.
S: It’s a reprint of some LeCorbusier. What are they contributing? What are they telling you here? What’s all of this mean? It’s decorated nonsense. They are playing with gimmicks rather than processes.
A: Here are drawings of the operations Eisenmann performs on a building to reach a final design. Starting out with a cube he shifts, pulls and manipulates the solid; the operations reflect a mental process.
S: Do you manipulate things in scientific research?
A: Often a scientist makes an hypothesis and then manipulates variables in an attempt to confirm or reject that hypothesis.
S: Is that a scientific process? Is the process of life? Have you ever thought about it?
A: Are you thinking about organic processes?
S: We can use myriads of words, the organic has been used and used and used. I knew Frank Lloyd Wright very well and he wasn’t the originator of the term organic, it was used before him and of course once Frank Lloyd Wright used it everybody ruminated. To me I say organic, organic, organic, what is this organic? It’s been used already until the cows come home. It means absolutely nothing. It’s just a word. You see, we must think of architecture from the standpoint of a process of life. That means you, the flowers, the birds, all of nature, the whole system, the whole universe, is a process. We are here because of that. You are a collection of elements which are processes, with each one performing in a higher process collectively, to be what you are.
A: Should architecture try to make sense of the process? S: Architecture should be in the nature of your nature, of which you are a process. Your brain is very important. You don’t play with gimmicks, and this is the tragedy today of what has happened. I gave a lecture once about this process. I showed the Barnsdall House. Now everybody says, “Oh! The Barnsdall House!” I asked the audience, “What is the Barnsdall House? What did he do that is really meritorious there? What do we learn from this architecturally? Zero! This was nothing but a whim of Frank Lloyd Wright’s.” He took, for example, the hollyhock bush and repeated its likeness in a frieze for the Barnsdall House. I said, “I don’t understand this.” And Schindler’s wife, who was in the audience, said “Oh, Mr. Soriano, I know! Mrs. Barnsdall loved the hollyhock bush so much that Mr. Wright obliged here by doing this free all around the building and the lamp posts.” And so I always show in my lectures what Frank Lloyd Wright did and what the real plant is. The plant is a living process, however the frieze is an interpretation or a misconception or a self-expression, call it anything you want, a sculptural nonsense of a living integrity, which is the hollyhock bush.
A: So you feel Wright could have been more perceptive in understanding the hollyhock bush and that he could have said something more creative about the hollyhock bush rather than just copying it in a sculptural fashion?
S: It’s growing there; why do you need to put it in a sculptural form? To me the appreciation and the thinking process should be to study what is it that exists in the universe. Is it pictorialism? Is it our abstractions of the universe? Or is it the real process which is very deep to understand? The scientists study that. Scientists do studies, but we do not, and it’s very difficult for us to try to make life, this complexity of the universe, into pictorialism. It’s impossible.
A: So how do you translate this process into architecture? Can you give an example from your own work?
S: Yes, for example here is an interesting cross sectional drawing for a one hundred story building for a World University on Alcatraz (see illustration). It’s all made of aluminum. Every single architectural member you see has a reason for being there. It’s not there as a decoration, it’s not there because I like it, or because I like to express myself or because I want to indicate a flower. This happens to be a solution of a problem for a certain particular performance. I am always eager to tap the new materials and techniques. With aluminum for example I can easily send prefabricated buildings to underdeveloped countries. I have designed things with space materials which are very light, which can be done with computers. You send a roll for example of this material, completely computerized, to the desert and it will weave a structure as you weave a sweater.
A: What about the extraordinary color in the univer-


Courtesy of Louis Fier

sity tower drawing? Isn’t that self-expression?
S: No, no, no. The colors are my own choice. Color I accept as anything natural. Color is an energy, like sound is an energy, which are processes. Now if you put a story into color or if you put a story into sound then it ceases to be this natural process. Then you are creating a non-operative thing. Those who have been doing research on color haven’t been the painters at all nor the artists, only the scientists. So let’s think of color and sound as energy forms which are processes.
A: You don’t think architecture is to some extent self-expression?
S: There is no such thing as ‘to some extent’ any more than there is a ‘little pregnant.’ It’s either you are or you’re not. You think in the right direction of understanding life, understanding the process of life and that means the process of structure. The question that should be immediately asked by the architects whenever they do something, whatever they do, is, ‘What am I doing with this thing I am doing?’ You see we don’t question at all. The French have a saying: Penser c’est dire non. Which means a very interesting thing, that is, when you really think, you question a great deal. And architects don’t have the habit of doing that. They don’t question anything, anything goes, everybody is alright, whatever you do, it’s self-expression, and that’s a dangerous area, self-expression. And because we have let architects become like artists, painters, and sculptors, they self-express.
A: Can architecture be art?
S: No, because of what we understand art to be. Art, to begin with, was a craft, something people did. Artisans, shoemakers, candlemakers, they were artists.
A: What about the construction worker?
S: Yes, they were artisans too. And then it degenerated into this so called art that became a fad of our museums, our schools, and our humanities. The artist-architects are all trying to do gymnastics as if they were doing sculpture, painting or graphics rather than architecture. Again it’s this mania for decoration, for painting, and for sculptural qualities in architecture.
A: And this has no place in architecture?
S: No! No! Place, never has been.
A: Not even in the work of the Renaissance architects?
S: Look at the work of Michaelangelo for example. He made lovely statues, he had tremendous dexterity in making beautiful things. However I’m not one who buys those things that have been acclaimed as great works of art — for this reason I look at not only what he does artistically but what he says. When he shows me, at the Sistine Chapel, God as a man with flowing robes creating the world, I, as a thinking man today in 1978, know that it’s the most simplistic nonsense in the world. What of intelligence is he telling me? He’s just brain washing people. All these frescoes were done in the cathedrals; why were they in the cathedrals? The people didn’t have newspapers, television or radio to preach the Bible, therefore they used to gather in the most viable places which were the cathedrals. That’s what they were built for, to bring the public together and to teach them biblical scenes and religion. Therefore all the subject matter was religious. They had the clever artists paint these didactic frescoes. To me, already, the Renaissance was a decadence.
A: What about the role of fantasy in your designs? Do you ever use fantasy as a basis for your built projects?
S: This is the big tragedy we are talking about: fantasy comes under the heading of entertainment and self-expression.
A: How does one envision the future? Does one only envision ways of expressing or of serving this society today by adding little pieces here and there, aren’t there also some creative, imaginative leaps, some fantasy?
S: We (the architects) have to relate everything to our society whatever we do, we cannot work in the past or in the future because we don’t know the future, the past we don’t know either. We have to work in the present — what is today. We must be able to tap all the energy and technology, all the life that we have today and use that. If you don’t do that you are not operative at all in our society and architects should do that but they don’t. Architects still think they are artists, they’re acting like that, and like the Venturis and the Pellis, they’re juggling, they’re jugglers because they are incapable of being operative in our society, and they are just playing like Hollywood actors, like entertainers. This is another tragedy of America, everything is contaminated by entertainment. Getting back to your question, any creative imaginative leaps should be in the form of an investigation. Your brain is an extremely beautiful one. We have a cortex which is an exquisite thing of the human being, therefore we can make such operations, we can send some marvelous structures to the moon. And what was that? Call it fantasy if you want to. But nevertheless that wasn’t decided as a fantasy, that was decided as a performing reality. Every single thing that went in that capsule and everything that the astronauts used, from their shoes to their clothing, to the air they breathed, was decided with precision and investigation. Decided, not fantasized, no, never, never. It was decided with a performance of the process, otherwise the whole thing would have been completely a failure.
A: Do you feel any architects actually employ this scientific method?
S: Frei Otto is such a man; he is intelligent, and investigates in the same manner as Buckminster Fuller and Nerri. They are investigators. These are the scientists, these are the process searchers. Look at Fuller’s American Pavilion at the Montreal World’s Fair and look at a chrysanthemum. Look at the way nature creates, it is not a copy, but one member is used to create a unified whole and this is what I call a process. The flower which grows with a structural integrity is the result of this natural process, not of whims, not of imagination, not of self-expression. It has to do with an operational process. That every single thing you put in here must do work. All the remaining adjectives are insignificant. You have to choose whether you belong to the twentieth century or to the medicine man era.
A: Isn’t the architect much more than an engineer?
S: We have a mania for dividing architects and engineers. It’s wrong. They’re all the same. Look at Buckminster Fuller, he’s not an architect, he’s a scientist, an inventor, well what are you going to call him? Scientific thinking, which is order, I believe, is the thing that will save society and humanity, really. Anything else will destroy it.

William Ted Georgis has studied architecture and architectural history at the Illinois Institute of Technology and at Stanford University.
Building of the Quarter

Annex

Each issue of Archetype will feature a "Building of the Quarter." The editorial staff has selected Rincon Annex Post Office in San Francisco as the first centerfold. A particular urgency adheres to this choice because Rincon Annex is slated for demolition. When the building was erected 40 years ago, south-of-Market land was cheap. Escalating land costs and the steady sprawl of mammoth office complexes finally caught up with Rincon Annex and brought this modest construction to the attention of eager developers.

Although it cannot be hailed as a trend-setting example of the best of 1930's architecture, in its own way Rincon Annex is a vivid example of a different era of building, less for an innovative plan than for the attention lavished on details. Polished brass railings, Albersesque terrazzo floors, cast aluminum grilles and Art Deco aluminum counters set it apart from the dental-office moderne of its newer neighbors. Stylized grey dolphins cavort along the exterior frieze in recognition of the proximity of the Port of San Francisco.

Rincon Annex Post Office is only one of the many post offices constructed under the auspices of the Treasury Department during the Depression. The economic collapse hit the building industry with particular force and led to enormous government outlays to "prime the pump" with public works projects of all types, from dams and resettlement housing to court houses and post offices. In many towns, the post office was the single representative of the Federal presence, often doing double duty as a Federal court house. Nearby St. Helena in Napa county and Salinas also boast post offices from the 1930's. All of these post offices were designed by the Treasury Department, Louis A. Simon, Supervising Architect; the architect responsible for Rincon Annex was Gilbert S. Underwood.

Rincon Annex, begun in June 1939 and completed in October 1940, is a reminder of the New Deal era, but it also recalls the history of San Francisco and the McCarthy era. In 1941, two years after construction, the Public Buildings Administration of the Federal Works Agency announced a competition for a series of murals for Rincon Annex. Anton Refregier of Woodstock, New York, won the competition with a series of murals depicting the history of San Francisco. World War II delayed completion of the murals for nearly two years, but once the war was over, Refregier set to work in earnest. Controversy marked the murals from 1947 on; first Refregier was required to change the title of one panel from "Importation of Chinese Labor" to "First Labor Demonstration on Market Street." Then two panels, "Maritime and General Strike" and "First Labor Demonstration on Market Street" met a storm of protest over their allegedly socialist details. Nearly two years of wrangling followed, with the Commission of Fine Arts in Washington, D.C., called in to arbitrate. Even after the murals were completed with the required changes, they continued to annoy segments of the public. In 1953 Congressman Scudder introduced a bill in the House of Representatives (H.J. Res. 211, 83rd Congress) to remove the paintings from Rincon Annex. The bill stated that civic groups, veterans' organizations, patriotic and fraternal societies and numerous individuals found them "artistically offensive and historically inaccurate" and that they "cast a derogatory and improper reflection on the character of the pioneers and the history of the great State of California." Despite the storm of protest, the combined efforts of the Commission of Fine Arts and the three museums in San Francisco managed to save them.

Real estate developers may succeed where misguided patriots failed years ago unless Rincon Annex achieves the status of a historical monument. Should such a move fail, the City will be impoverished once again by the loss of this elegant and still entirely serviceable building.

ANNEX
THE PHOTOGRAPHY OF COMPLEX SPACE

The simple, unocular, projective system of the camera reduces the experience of space to cryptic artifacts which evoke states of mind often at an unknown degree of variance with the actual experience. The translation process involved can be better understood if it can be turned around. That is if the photographic activity can be seen as a repeatable (mechanical) process governed by certain constraints and principles, the photograph itself can then be understood and the experience implied, accurately translated.

The purpose of this series is to develop a photographic vocabulary suitable for use by the architect such that pictures may be specified and incorporated into a system of sets of photographs. For the photographer this series will demonstrate the effect of camera placement on composition and the effects of sequential repetition. This is made obvious by the elimination of variables.

Once the conditions of its origin are clearly understood the photograph acquires a more exact meaning and becomes useful in unforeseen ways. It is possible, for example, to compare different types of spaces by comparing photographs which have been made according to the same program. The photographs become calibrated tools with certain built-in standards. As the redundancies become clear the limitations of the program and the realities of the subject come simultaneously into focus. This is the necessary first step toward making and understanding more illusionistic, connotative pictures.

The photographs shown on pages 22 and 23 were made from specific points within the geometry of the plans and become thereby extensions of the plans. The angles indicated are derived from the relationship of film size to lens focal length. In the examples shown the picture plane (film plane) is centered on the lens and is kept vertical. Overlaps and redundancies within each set of pictures suggest possible minimal combinations. Variations of these conventional alignments and the problem of redundancy within the set will be examined in future articles. The following topics will be discussed in the series: scale, visual angle distortion, converging horizontals and converging verticals, perspective limitations, aspect ratios, visual ellipses, random placement, and the photography of detail. —Henry Bowles
SET 1, DATE: 12 FEB 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATION</th>
<th>ANGLE A°</th>
<th>ANGLE B°</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARCHIPUNCTURE

TRIPLE MASKS:
THE NEW DISEASE OF PATRIOTIC SHINGLES

After the international orientation of architects since the war, Vincent Scully now attempts to rekindle "special American realities and fiercely American traditions" (p. 3). He hopes to accomplish this by embracing the New Shingle Style of recent years and anchoring it in the nineteenth century Shingle Style movement. I suspect that The Shingle Style Today, or The Historian's Revenge (New York, 1974) will suffer the same fate as the airy transports of prepuculent embraces, generally ending in awkward fumbling only to be recalled with pained embarrassment in subsequent years.

Lauding architecture's liberation from the Modern Movement, Scully celebrates single-family houses that "most openly mirror the character and feelings of their architects" (p. 2). Retrieved from the sterile and historically congealed forms that bore the unforgivable blush of a European birthmark, Scully's New Shingle Style lays claim to being indigenous, liveable, and not least, to being reincarnated at Yale (p. ix). The hero is American and Yale-connected, and the enemy is European and abstract, the International Style and its offspring: "highly intolerant and increasingly abstract European sources [that] bred a contempt for [American] realities and traditions" (p. 3).

Anyone is entitled to opinions and preferences, but when something is offered up as a critical historical analysis, the reader rightfully expects an intelligent and thoughtful presentation. Scully's slim volume falls short; he explains little and assumes much, offering tautologies instead of theories. His panegyric puff's and wheezes through a maze of disconnected images and pompous utterings, quoting only American novelists, critics and poets and serving up an image of a homogeneous American culture best represented by shingles, barn-raising, homespun shirts and pioneer virtues, while rejecting anything that smacks of Europe or abstraction as unsuitable for America.

Before addressing some of the larger questions this book raises, it is worthwhile to take a closer look at the text, since it is characterized by inconsistencies and vacuities that are not trifling. One of its chief embarrassment is the shifting criteria of truth. Abstraction is alright for Frank Lloyd Wright and his followers (p. 11), but not alright for those who are aligned with the Modern Movement; alright for Charles Moore to be influenced by Alvar Aalto, Bjovet and Daiker (European but non-International Style), since Moore acknowledges his primary debt to the Old Shingle Style via Scully's own publication, The Shingle Style (p. 18), but not alright for Richard Meier to be rooted in Le Corbusier (p. 38); alright for Le Corbusier to design in a "hermetic labyrinth of the mind" (p. 38), but not alright for Peter Eisenman to design in a similarly "hermetic" way (p. 39).

If the criteria shift, so does language itself. Scully offers a definition of tradition that is bewildering (p. 3), and it does not become any clearer when he describes Jacqueline Robertson's Seltzer House: "It all feels more like 'tradition' than 'influence' . . ." (p. 25). Scully also comments on the "paradoxical but equally essential American determination to be protected against the continent's aggressive climate" (p. 9). Protection against the climate has always been one of the chief functions of shelter, and neither this desire nor an aggressive climate is limited to America. The International Style, he tells us, is unsuitable for the American climate (p. 38) — but which one? Maine, Louisiana, Los Angeles or Seattle? Here as elsewhere Scully confounds New England with America.

This leads to one of the most puzzling features of Scully's book: a strident nationalism and nostalgia for a purified past animating every page. He is entranced with a masculine, rugged and heroic vision of America and its architects in terms reminiscent of the rough-and-tumble, Iaconic cowboy mythology of a John Wayne movie. American architects are "isolated like lumberjacks on this violent continent" (p. 41); their buildings tap the "soul of the Workman" (p. 42); Venturi's houses are "humble and bold" (p. 41) and seem "lonely . . . as Americans have somehow always felt themselves to be. How stiff their backs!" (p. 35). Scully misses "authentic American tall talk and corn," as sometimes delivered by Wright (p. 35). In Scully's Manichaean world, the forces of good and evil are locked in mortal combat, the good guys clad in shingles and the bad guys clad in white. The Shingles are emerging triumphant, Scully suggests, lonely and courageously standing for traditional American values and "the roots of American decency" (p. 42).

Scully's nostalgic nationalism and antipathy for the third generation of the Modern Movement bring to mind some of the polemics of conservative architects and critics in Fascist Italy, for whom the enemy was the first generation of the Modern Movement. Much ink was spilled then too in favor of an architecture that was indigenous rather than foreign, and critics such as Ugo Ojetti were no less selective than Scully in their choices of ancient models from which to collate a new Fascist architecture. The architecture of the Roman empire and the Romanesque architecture of the Middle Ages were seen to embody the ideals of true Italianità. The protagonists of the Modern Movement in Italy, the Rationalists, also felt compelled to claim that their designs were imbued with a Mediterranean spirit. Fortunately, their American descendents have not yet been constrained to cloak their work in the American flag.

The situation in Italy in the 1930's differed markedly from that of America of the 1970's. Italy was a nation only recently unified, struggling to give itself a recognizable political physiognomy, and architecture seemed one way to achieve this aim. The infant Fascist state, while pursuing an expansionist foreign policy, also sought to repel foreign influences, especially in the wake of Italy's nearly eight hundred years of foreign domination. Although later accused of being responsible for suffocating the Modern Movement in Italy, Marcello Piacentini nonetheless recognized the poten-
tial of the Modern Movement and of Le Corbusier at an early stage. Even after the alliance with Nazi Germany and the turn to monumental Roman architecture, Placentini saw it that the work of the Rationalists was published in the Fascist architectural journal, Architettura, and in his capacity as juror for many competitions, even saw to it that their work got built.

Rabid xenophobia not uncommonly accompanies periods of political and social instability, as in Italy during the 1930’s; foreigners and foreign influences are blamed for supposed ills and appeals are made to a past free of such blemishes. To be sure, not everyone during such periods succumbed to xenophobic nationalism; it requires a special lack of thoughtfulness to do so. By contrast, America of the 1970’s is neither newly unified, nor emerging from foreign domination, nor is it promoting an expansionist foreign policy. Perhaps Scully’s strident effort to retreat to the safer and saner world of an embellished past is a symptom of American ills than of ills at Yale. Although not a fledgling nation, the United States is attempting to redefine itself after a number of catastrophes in recent decades, cutting extended commitments and patching up internal divisions. Despite the house cleaning, it has not attempted reform.

Scully’s book is explicitly political, but fails to deliver convincing arguments on either architecture or politics. With the facades slapped onto underpinnings that have not been re-examined, this is an architecture of restoration, an American Biedermeier. Its sole mission is to assert that there is an indigenous American architecture and that it is free of the divisiveness that accompanies any architecture past. This ideologically motivated housecleaning effort is a smokescreen to evade radical action in housing.

In all fairness, the architects cannot be held responsible for the excesses of their promoter, so let us take a closer look at the constructions Scully so lavishly celebrates. These houses reveal an irresolvable dichotomy between structural practice and the industrial origin of their materials on the one hand, and their idealized and historicist forms on the other. They are only facades; where plans are included, they merely serve to bind the new examples more tightly to their hallowed forebears. Scully fabricates a continuous lineage from the nineteenth century for these houses, his own “poor man’s version" and his The Shingle Style negotiating the gap between the old and the new. Here we are asked to don seven league boots, suspend our disbelief and pretend that the events of the last sixty years never happened. In precise contrast to their often artless ancestors, these buildings are hightrow and clearly not vernacular. This need not be a defect, but Scully seeks to make them something they are not. Additionally, all are simply single family dwellings (often second homes), well removed from the workplace and financially beyond the reach of the majority of potential home buyers. Concerns about shrinking resources, low-income housing, and the need for viable systems of public trans-

portation have no place in the works celebrated here. To be sure, the low priority traditionally assigned to such concerns in American society cannot be dropped entirely in the laps of architects, but they fail to offer potential solutions to the problems that even the most optimistic forecasters predict will be upon us in the next decades. Apparently architects will continue to languish behind industry in attempting to engage the most pressing social concerns. Beyond the style of the European Modern Movement, one of its hallmarks was the effort to adapt technology to mass housing needs, as Le Corbusier, Bruno Taut, Placentini and others recognized after the devastation of the First World War. Scully’s architects have perhaps abdicated the Modern Movement here more than in their disdain for the International Style box. These houses are in fact triple masks: their external shells belie structure and building technology; they have no claim to being a modern vernacular because they are designed in a highly idiosyncratic manner; and they are masks elaborated to conceal pressing social realities.

Masquerade becomes itself the subject of architecture in the works of the so-called ‘post-Modernists.’ Not only do Thomas Gordon Smith and others collage their designs from a collection of apparently random sources, they also airlift them willy-nilly into suburban tracts. The irony that Scully and Charles Jencks happily locate in some of their architects is no defense for thin architectural and social portfolios; irony is the last refuge of the uncertain. Clearly even the post-

Modernists feel themselves to be living in an inter-
regnum, symbolized by the use of the word ‘post,’ which presents a paradox, as Daniel Bell commented, because it is a prefix denoting posteriority that is instead used here to define the age in which we are living. I find little cheer in Scully’s jubilant shift from banal box to banal shingle, or for that matter from banal box to banal eclectic as celebrated by Charles Jencks in Post-Modern Architecture. Too often these constructions are empty efficiencies of an idealized past, offering laconic facades to the world precisely because they have much to be modest about.

—Diane Ghirardo

NOTES


Edoardo Persico (1900–1936) was editor of *Casabella* and *Belvedere* in the late 1920's and 1930's in Italy, positions he shared with other avant-garde architects and critics in Fascist Italy. As an editor and as director of the Galleria Del Milione in Milan, Persico stood at the forefront of the Modern Movement in Italy. Particularly during the early years of the Modern Movement, Persico and others waged a struggle on behalf of modern architecture in Italy. By the mid-1930's, Persico found himself at odds with other figures in the Modern Movement, such as Giuseppe Pagano, Pier Marie Bardi, and Giuseppe Terragni, all of whom enthusiastically supported Fascism. They believed in the Fascist revolution, and argued that such a modern and novel government experiment merited expression in an equally new and modern architecture. By 1934, in fact, Pagano believed that the battle for modern architecture had been won. As co-editor of *Casabella*, he proposed to drop the polemical stance and engage in dialogues about technique, materials, and prices; Persico began to write exclusively about foreign developments for *Casabella*. This in itself was a rebellious act, since the Fascist regime stressed nationalism and looked with deep skepticism on anything foreign, from names to words to architectural styles. Persico remained profoundly dubious about Fascism, and maintained contact with exiled anti-Fascists from the early 1920's. At the same time, he did accept Fascist propaganda commissions, including a display in the Galleria Vittorio Emanuele in Milan for the plebiscite in 1934. Arrested in the summer of 1935 but soon released for lack of evidence, harassed by the State Police, Persico died under the state of emergency in 1936.

For Persico, the value of an architectural work depended on an internal order rather than on an external style or imagery. In its early years Rationalist architecture seemed to him to be animated by social ideals and an internal order that made it the legitimate heir of the revolutionary banner of the upper middle class. By 1934-5 Persico no longer believed this to be true. He began to realize that the monumental classicism of the anti-Rationalists and the "functionalist modernism" of Rationalist architecture both took their cues from Fascism. He accused the Rationalists of advancing a program distinguished only by its abstraction; in substance if not in style both the classicist and the Rationalist programs were merely variations on the same theme.

He continued to support modernism over classicism, but perhaps his most profound doubts registered against an architecture so neutral that it could lend itself with equal facility to Weimar Germany, Communist Russia, and Fascist Italy. To Persico such architecture was simply an empty formalism; it revealed a moral deadness that resolved polemics through a contrast of two rhetorical worlds, an absence of belief and a political opportunism. The debate in Italy was simply over taste, not substance. He lavished praise on the new Frankfurt of, Ernst May, which in Persico's view embodied a faith, an order, and an internal coherence of idea, will and form absent in the works of the Italian Rationalists. May's Frankfurt quarter expressed this internal logic in a particular style, but to Persico style was merely a function of taste; it was the underlying principle that mattered.

There is room for disagreement with his assessments of the work of some of the Rationalists. Although Terragni, Sironi, Pagano and Moretti all profoundly believed in Fascism, their architecture has long outlasted the Fascist regime. Their work was not empty of substance, for it embodied Fascist ideals as these artists saw them. Persico's quarrel was with Fascism itself, and with any art form that would seem to serve it.

"Prophecy of Architecture" is Persico's last major text, delivered in Turin in January 1935. It is translated into English and published here for the first time; part two will appear in the second issue of *Archetype*.

To Persico, the city of Ernst May, which in Persico's view embodied a faith, an order, and an internal coherence of idea, will and form absent in the works of the Italian Rationalists. May's Frankfurt quarter expressed this internal logic in a particular style, but to Persico style was merely a function of taste; it was the underlying principle that mattered.

There is room for disagreement with his assessments of the work of some of the Rationalists. Although Terragni, Sironi, Pagano and Moretti all profoundly believed in Fascism, their architecture has long outlasted the Fascist regime. Their work was not empty of substance, for it embodied Fascist ideals as these artists saw them. Persico's quarrel was with Fascism itself, and with any art form that would seem to serve it.

"Prophecy of Architecture" is Persico's last major text, delivered in Turin in January 1935. It is translated into English and published here for the first time; part two will appear in the second issue of *Archetype*.

"Torino, this city spoken of respectfully because of its patriotism but with a smile of commiseration for its tiresome monotony, would be the most beautiful city in the world if its plan were different, if its streets were not perpendicular, if its houses had another aspect, and if the Torinesi resembled their houses and streets less; but above all if it had not had the misfortune to be baptized by a people without taste."

This invective, as you know, is not mine: it is from Enrico Thovez. I am in accord with Nietzsche, not just for today or this occasion: "[Torino is a] large city and yet tranquil and aristocratic, with an excellent breed of men in every social class."

I began by reading the tract from Thovez in order to tell you that I love this city precisely for its plan, its perpendicular streets, the aspect of its houses; but above all for the taste of its people who foresaw the most elegant fashion of art nouveau and yet today boast the architecture of Fiat:

> Factories lying like grand steamers on the outskirts of the cities as Blaise Cendrars wrote.

It is because of this love that the modest man before you is anxious. I know that your "seriousness" (to use a word from Thovez again) and the coherence of your moral world made Torino the most frankly European city in Italy. Thus, standing before you, it seems that any discourse must be ruled by an identical intelligence about history, and in speaking not only of Torino but of Paris, London, and at one time Berlin as well, restoring to the word its dignity and universality. Tonight an undertaking of great ideal beauty is entrusted to your kindness more than to my powers.

In Brussels recently, Erich Mendelsohn, the architect of the Einstein observatory in Potsdam, builder of the Schoken Stores, author of the Columbiahaus in Potsdamerplatz in Berlin, spoke on the *Creative Spirit of Crisis.*

Among the new German architects from before the advent of Hitler, Mendelsohn is a moderate; one of his disciples, Posener, said that he is a poet of architecture, alluding perhaps to a certain grace in his designs that have the softness of the Jugendstil; and if you ask a German avant-garde artist about Mendelsohn, you will always receive an unfavorable opinion. In fact, Mendelsohn is not Gropius; the Krasnoje Snami that he constructed in 1925 in Leningrad for the textile trust is not worthy of Gropius' Bauhaus; his propaganda is not in the style of Gropius' preachings.

I chose such a balanced man precisely to evaluate better his vision of a modern architect.

The world crisis, Mendelsohn said in Brussels, is of more than an economic order. It is a total, absolute crisis. The same biological laws that govern the bee and the antihill govern the great mass of human beings. I translate Mendelsohn's text literally: to give renewed satisfaction to adversaries of modern architec-
Guiseppi Vaccaro, Plan for the center of Lugo, 1934. This project, like many others in Fascist Italy, straddled classicism and modernity, and ended up being vacuous.

Giuseppe Terragni and Marcello Nizzoli, facade decoration for the Casa del Fascio, Como (1936). Like the Persico-Nizzoli displays, the Casa del Fascio is a simple grid to which propaganda panels were to be added.

Guiseppi Samonà, Post Office for the Appia Quarter, Rome, 1933. This is one of four post offices built in Rome by the Fascist government during the 1930’s, all but one in the Milvio Quarter designed by Rationalist architects.

Giuseppe Samonà, Post Office for the Appia Quarter, Rome, 1933. This is one of four post offices built in Rome by the Fascist government during the 1930’s, all but one in the Milvio Quarter designed by Rationalist architects.
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Giuseppe Samonà, Post Office for the Appia Quarter, Rome, 1933. This is one of four post offices built in Rome by the Fascist government during the 1930’s, all but one in the Milvio Quarter designed by Rationalist architects.
Saint-Simon’s visionary ability, his capacity to imagine a world renewed by administration.

Here is Isaac Pereire’s balance sheet for Saint-Simonism: “There is one school more positive than all the others, a school that in basing itself on the philosophical study of the past sought a law for all phenomena in order to establish the process and to deduce the future from it; the work of this school is nothing other than the study of civilization. It renewed the bases of philosophy, history and political economy. It touched every aspect of human activity even up to the fine arts, science and industry. It traced a program for the works of the twentieth century. It promoted the railroads in France. It took up the idea of cutting a canal in the Suez isthmus, and organized its execution. It suggested fecund ideas for the reorganization of credit. Last, it produced men who were useful in every activity, men who were able to realize and to diffuse its ideas at every level of the social hierarchy.”

What a beautiful occasion for a colorful piece on Stephenson and Lépine, on Lafayette’s America and the abbey of Mémélonmontant, on Laffitte and Thierry; lands of pioneers and romantic landscapes, locomotives and riverboats, men in top-hats and men with glasses.

A lost chance, because Saint-Simonism did not want to provide the setting for a literary re-evocation, but to give a particular content to the action of 1848, that is a crucible in which all the new ideas melted together: those of industry, science, the fine arts, as Pereire said. And those of architecture. Charles Duveyrier, who dreamt of a new plan for Paris, is a Saint-Simonist, a man of 1848, 1848 . . . Joseph Monnier. The invention of reinforced concrete: let us take the date into account, and proceed further.

Here is Duveyrier’s prophetic sermon: “The good Lord said through the mouth of the man he sent: I will establish in the midst of my chosen people an image of the new creation that I want to extract from the heart of man and the entrails of the world. I will build a city that will be a testimony to my munificence. Foreigners will come from afar at the news of its appearance. The inhabitants of cities and the country will crowd to it, and they will believe me when they see it . . . Paris! Paris! On the banks of your river, and within your boundaries I will imprint the seal of my new largesse and I will seal the first engagement ring of man with the world! Your kings and your people have obeyed my eternal will, though they may have ignored it when they proceeded with their palaces and their houses from south to north, toward the sea, the sea that separates you from the great bazaar of the world, from the land of the English. They have traveled with the slowness of centuries, and stopped in a magnificent place. It is there that the head of my apostolic city will rest, my city of hope and desire which I will rest just like a man on the banks of your river.”

Forgive me this long quotation, and the terrible reading. Only my poor pronunciation and the difficulty of translating such a poetic text spares you the rest of the vision.

Charles Duveyrier imagined a plan of the new Paris in the shape of a man: “a man ready to walk.” “The old city will rest on the shoulders of the new. A light load because the colossus so burdened by his old parent, with his son under his arms, will be like Aeneas, the symbol of a religion of man that departs from war and invokes woman.”

These images, in the taste of a bizarre neoclassicist, are somewhat puerile; but they fully reflect the aspirations of 1848: England, the new Christianity, the industrial obsession need not be confused with much of the “haranguing and decreeing and crying and singing and flagwaving” of which Croce spoke. Even if Duveyrier harangued the people as no less than the Lord’s mouthpiece, decreeing rest-homes for invalids “from sheds and yards,” sounding the end of the king, singing the praises of the wise (in Lettres d’un habitant de Genève, even Saint-Simon wanted to gather a committee of scientists around Newton’s tomb to deliberate on the lot of mankind); even if Duveyrier broadcast the fate of Aeneas, he nonetheless established the first concept of the world city: “The first engagement ring of man with the world.”

Later the new architects and the historians of the new architecture only remembered the committee of scientists: they fastened on the technocrats, the urbanists, the manipulators of plans; and little by little, they ignored the major premise of modern architecture.

In the first pages of architectural histories one can read not only the dates of the invention of cement, iron structures or walls of glass, but also some names that are totally unknown to the profane: for example, that of Schinkel. Listen to what historians think of him: “Among the builders of the nineteenth century, in German-speaking countries we find realizations of a truly classical spirit in only one architect: Schinkel, for the nobility and sobriety of the lines of his work, distant precursor of the reborn architecture who worked in the first half of the last century.” I implored you not to place any faith in these ingenious chroniclers; you now have proof that I was right. Schinkel is not a classical architect, and like any true artist, was not a precursor of anything. Schinkel is only a romantic argument.

(End of Part One.)

Adalberto Libera and Mario De Renzi, Italian Pavilion, Chicago Exposition, 1933. Libera was one of the founders of the Rationalist Architect’s group in Italy. The Libera-De Renzi team also designed the Italian pavilion for the Brussels World’s Fair in 1935, and the Fascist Exposition facade for the ten year anniversary of the Fascist revolution facade in Rome, 1932.
A retreat from the noise and confusion of vacation crowds in the harbor of St. Tropez. The retreat is to be easily accessible from the client's existing waterfront house. Silence and solitude are primary concerns.

The retreat is to be underwater, anchored in front of the existing house at the edge of the harbor. Floating 4cm below the surface of the water, the chamber will be invisible except for the hollow glass block towers for light and air. The towers extend upwards to guard against waves and to increase air circulation via the principle of chimney draft.

The effort required for entry contributes to the sensation of a retreat; one must row from the mainland, secure the rowboat, and with shoes off and trousers rolled, cross the submerged deck to the tower containing the entry stair.

The area of the plan is stretched into a cruciform, like a catamaran leaning in two directions, to minimize rocking. Within the plan one can retreat towards the ends to hammocks, or sit in the central meeting area which has a transparent bottom. The hollow glass block towers are at the endpoints of the plan for best distribution of light and air. One tower is equipped with a ladder allowing eccentric guests the opportunity of diving off into the bay.

The structure will be a resin-coated ferroconcrete, a thin shell construction with layered wire mesh. Automatic sump pump and adjustable ballast in the double bottom will maintain flotation and protect against overloading and listing. The towers will be steel-secured glass block with silicone joints and acrylic rain flaps. Floors and walls will be polished pigmented concrete. The hammocks will be uncolored canvas.
(a propos Tigerman’s Daisy House)

1964: Peter Blake includes “Big Duck of Long Island” among the exhibited flotsam and jetsam of God’s Own Junkyard. 1972: Bob Venturi and associates, in a public relations masterstroke, produce the same “Big Duck” as an example for others to follow in Learning from Las Vegas. 1977: Blake throws in the towel and proclaims the uselessness of all hitherto-modern ideals without, however, hitting upon the solution of replacing them with kitsch.

At the end of the 18th century, Lequeu had already proposed a stable in the form of a cow, though without an accompanying theory of expressive form. Venturi himself speaks imprudently of “symbolism,” while Cesare Ripa and other sixteenth century ‘iconographers’ had been more subtle in their contention that meaning was only a secondary attribute. But never mind the subtleties, we find that in a duck-shaped rotisserie form also “follows” function! Here then is a new way of being up-to-date, and so much more comfortably so than in the European manner of Gropius and the Puritans: even if symbolism never consisted of applying to an existing program the image of that program, what does it matter if Venturi relieves us of our scruples in the name of a new criterion, “fun?”

Without this reversal of values, Stanley Tigerman would never have been able to design the Porter Beach residence in Indiana, known as the Daisy House (Fig. 1). The program: living space for a couple with two daughters. The plan: a penis with accoutrements, including an ejaculation-staircase. The house above all would be “extremely functional and practical.”

Is this plan a solitary instance or the exemplar of a resurgent tradition? The reader immediately thinks of the famous plan for the Olkema of Ledoux, equally explicit in any of his three proposals (Fig. 2). While the Marquis de Sade was in prison writing of his frenetic sexual engagements, a good many architects were evidently also contemplating the connections between the house and sexual organs.

Masculine anatomy: besides Ledoux’ horizontal erection, we must also mention the vertical one which Lequeu envisages “in a holy place, dedicated to God, the Lord of all that exists . . . situated at the edge of a wood of towering timber” (Fig. 3). But one will not only find phallic images! It is Ledoux again who, for the feminine form, designs a truly strange plan for the Hôtel Montmorency (Fig. 4). On either side of the entry extend stumpy wings like thighs open at 90 degrees, while diagonally the suite of porch-vestibule-stairway speaks with the precision of an anatomical plate. Is this an isolated phenomenon? Let us take the architectural alphabet of Johann David Steigbruber (1773) and consider Sheet XXV (letter V): is it totally innocent? (Fig. 5). At first glance there is not much reason for suspicion, and one may need a twisted mind in order to insinuate the feminine apparatus in Sheets II (letter A), XIV (letter M), and XXVI (letter W).

Well, then, are these the obsessive ravings of this author? But consider a plan of 1811, attributed to Fried-
rich Weinbrenner (Fig. 6), which doubtlessly combines the Okema with the shape of a V: it would be quite difficult to deny its erotic import. Neither are we witnessing a unique phenomenon in the "grotto with waterfall" executed in 1783 by Jean-Jacques Huvé, whose plan and section (Fig. 7) leave no doubt that they represent coitus. One can find still more examples, even among archaeological reconstructions, now indirectly corroborated by recent excavations.

This research may, in its turn, clarify other projects. Thus the virile character of Sir John Soane’s Mausoleum for the Earl of Chatham (1779) (Fig. 8) confirms that the phallic theme had become a sort of commonplace at the end of the 18th century. But had not the layout of the Hôtel Montmorency already been adumbrated in a drawing of Giovanni Antonio Dosio (Fig. 9)? And has not Germain Boffrand’s Malgrange, a pleasure palace (1712), anticipated Weinbrenner (Fig. 10)? And finally, what is one to think of the curious "architectural composition with the letters of the name of Louis le Grand," where Gobert has been able to hide allusions (flattering or not) to the monarch’s priapism, at least in the letters I, G, and R (Fig. 11)?

So we do find Tigerman in good company. But even in the 20th century he is far from unique. Without counting Nikki de Saint-Phalle’s Nana (an artist with a pre-ordained name), we find a good number of projects and buildings that are patently sexual in the work of the German and Dutch Expressionists. In 1919, Theo van Doesburg’s projected Theater in Amsterdam appeared as two open members centering on an arched entry which suggests a yoni;* in the following year, Mendelsohn built the Einstein Tower at Potsdam which yokes the dual nature of the male and female; Bruno Taut had just drawn his Grosse Blume, also linking the two sexes; in 1923 Paul Thiersch also sketched a design for a truly phallic villa. One could add to this list Ricardo Porro’s anthropomorphic models and other projects.

There is an important difference, however, between these examples and the Daisy House. First of all, the sexual allusions of ancient architectural morphology were generally articulated on the surface of other contents, which does not seem to be the case with Tigerman — though it may be prudent to leave the question open. With Lequeu, an element of fun and derision may be assumed, but never with Ledoux, who espoused the Virtuous. If Steingruber is perhaps innocent, what of Boffrand and Gobert? And for Mendelsohn and Vandevelde, they certainly precede the era of sexual kitsch, which publishes the Kumascra as a simple "how-to" manual for excitement.

*Editor’s note: Yoni is Sanskrit for vulva and the name of a figural or symbolic representation of the female reproductive organ venerated among Hindus.

Notes

2. "This instance and Fig. 8 were brought to my attention by R. M. Mason, Printroom of the Geneva Museum, Switzerland.
PETER SAARI

The traveling art shows are turning people away. Tut, Dresden, Pompeii A.D. 79 are mass media events and are phenomenally popular. The Met is forced to allocate time slots to members to view objects with a few square feet of free space apart from the crush of the culture-seeking hordes. The fascination with ancient remains is greater than ever. This is a recurring phenomenon, of course. The 15th Century and the 18th Century turned this passion into contemporary style, and the 19th Century saw the foundation of the great museums devoting their space to the veneration of artifacts of earlier civilizations.

But now there is a dearth of objects. When William Beckford assembled a vast collection of antiquities it was easy. One could go, take and ship home; when Sir John Soane gathered a respectable collection of antiquities it was relatively easy. One could buy at auction for reasonable prices. But now the Met acquired their booty of ancient relics it was complex but possible. They could house for tax reasons and then be bequeathed the lot. Now only the Villa Papyri at Malibu can afford to do this.

One traditional method of supplying this want has been the craft of the forger. Most likely his handiwork has found its way into most of our hallowed museum collections.

But Peter Saari invents antiquity. He is a young artist trained in Italy and Yale, living in New York. He brilliantly analyzes the conception of ancient art and decoration and constructs the invention in his own way, using canvas and plywood, acrylic and plaster, resembling something old and decayed and mysterious. By doing his art he is inviting a re-examination of our relationships to these sacred, venerated relics. Saari describes his relationship to them: "The art of the past changes as our attitude towards it. Every period sees the art through a differently conditioned set of eyes. My own initial interest in the art of Etruscan tomb painting came about from an interest in the mythological subjects of the figurative scenes depicted, but from the abstract qualities created out of the interaction of erosion and decay on the geometric motifs that made up the decoration."

Saari is painter, sculptor and craftsman and his influences reflect this multi-faceted approach to his work. He acknowledges acquaintances with painters Hubert Robert, Piranesi, Ingres and the influence of object makers Joseph Cornell, Karl Schwitters and sculptor Tony Smith. Also an important ingredient was the background of the historian and his teachers Polit and Clark at Yale in Hellenistic and Roman art, and Bohmer in art history.

Apart from his erudition, the purely abstract qualities of his work assure the viewer. Much of this uniqueness comes from apparent aging and repair. "In many of my paintings I exaggerate or amplify the additions or restorations made to ancient paintings by restorers. I do this to call attention or emphasize the patches, fillings or restorations which I feel are an important part of what we see when looking at an ancient work of art."

"Each mark tells a story about the attitude of the restorer towards the work. The tendency among restorers today is to distinguish clearly that which is original from that which is reconstructed. Exemplifying this attitude is the repainting of missing areas in a lighter shade or muted version that could not be confused with the originals. Speculative reconstruction is kept to a minimum."

"Another thing that interests me when I look at Etruscan and Roman wall paintings is the traces of a black sooty material found toward the upper portions of the walls and on ceilings. This is the result of torch light visits before the days of electricity. Other things I find interesting are: The hastily scratched graffiti encountered on almost every wall mural. The defacing of the surface of wall paintings by early excavators. These chisel marks are often found just above the floor level. Waterstains, efflorescence, the dislodging of the intonaco, buckling and the cut outs or holes in the middle of large plates or panels of color where small figurative images were removed, are all features of ancient painting I find particularly telling."

The gradual disintegration of ancient painting reflects the fate that all things made by man eventually require. D. H. Lawrence in his book "Etruscan Places" describes the figures painted on an end wall of a tomb depicted in a small banquet scene as possessing a vitality and life undiminished despite the ravaging effects of erosion and time. It is this glimmer of life, the presence of a human hand struggling after all these centuries to withstand time, that I've found very affecting."

Saari anticipates working at a larger scale than here-tofore. "I would like to transform a room sized space by painting it in a style that would derive from a Roman or Etruscan painting. But unlike past adaptations of mural subjects I would include and emphasize the transforming features produced by time and the elements." He notes that, "the Roman house displays a blend of art with architectural space. In many instances the subjects of wall paintings were designed to complement or reflect the function of the room."

This seems the logical progression from the kind of comprehensive display that his work requires. In previous shows he has organized the objects in an overall scheme and prefers this approach. "I like my work displayed in a manner that is similar
to the way they might be seen in and out of the way archaeological museum. Archaeological museums display their collections in different ways, and it is these differences that are of interest to me. For instance, the Archeological Museum of Florence crowds objects together virtually filling showcases with potshards or walls with Etruscan sarcophagi. How different is the more contemporary installation in the Villa Giulia where Etruscan objects are set apart and their provenance carefully labeled. Individual pieces that are acquired and displayed privately will eventually be brought together again in museums. This is what happened to many of the originals that were removed from their original settings."

Saari's archaist art signals the new primitivist tendency in painting and coming as it does at the same time in architecture, this 'low tech' aesthetic is gaining acceptance. Painstaking, meticulous technology founded on basic primitive techniques points to the rediscovery of the simple material employed by ancient cultures. —Andrew Batey

"One function of architecture is to create spaces to intensify the drama of living."

from *Design of Cities* by Edmund N. Bacon
Opening to Architecture

To further this investigation it is necessary to compare current "foreign" ideas, concepts and tendencies with the regional stock of architectural consciousness. Contributions and donations from local and national sources are needed to continue this center of architectural interrogation.

Believing in the link between Architecture as a humanistic and value-oriented discipline and professional practice, W.A. tries to evaluate and to discuss the architectural climate of the Bay Area.

W.A. invites anybody who has something to say about Architecture to join the active and the passive in the quest for a more conscious environment. For more information call (415) 956-0664.
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