

*A forty year encounter with Hans
Scharoun*

Commentary on the submission of a
Ph D by publication

Professor Peter Blundell Jones

School of Architecture, The University
of Sheffield, June 2013

(The primary vehicle for this submission is the book
Hans Scharoun by Peter Blundell Jones published by
Phaidon Press, London, 1995, ISBN0714828777)

Western Bank Library AR Q 720.943 (S)

Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	pp 3-4
<i>A Forty Year Encounter with Hans Scharoun</i>	5 – 61
Endnotes	51 – 63

Appendices

Appendix 1: List of writings on Scharoun	64-67
Appendix 2: <i>Scharoun Houses</i> , (AR 1983)	68-77
Appendix 3: <i>Lure of the Orient</i> , (arq 12 / 1)	78-92
Appendix 4: <i>Modernist Abstraction</i> , (Block 2)	93-97
Appendix 5: C.V. Peter Blundell Jones	98-108

Introduction to the submitted documents

The main submission for the PhD by publication is the monograph on Hans Scharoun which exists in two versions, that published by Gordon Fraser in 1978 and the much revised new edition by Phaidon of 1995, but appended are more specialised and recent texts that extend the interpretation. The accompanying 15,000 word commentary draws this material together in an autobiographical account to explain the pursuit of sources and the evolution of ideas and methods. Having started at the Architectural Association and forged an early relationship with Architectural Press, both leading centres of architectural discourse in the 1970s and 80s, I built a career largely through publication. I have specialised in building analysis from early on, and the Scharoun books broke new ground in this, but they also challenged the inherited story of modern architecture, with some success. My scepticism about the scientism which lay behind so many accounts of modernism also developed early, for even at school I was caught between 'the two cultures', and found solace in reading George Berkeley. Literary and philosophical reading shifted me towards a social constructionist view of the world, which was further encouraged by immersion in the anthropological theories of Clifford Geertz and Mary Douglas. If pressed to identify with a particular philosopher, I would choose Nelson Goodman, author of *Ways of Worldmaking* and *Languages of Art*. In consequence of my anthropological interests, my focus of study has gradually moved from the architect-hero to the case study. This has not wholly displaced my interest in architectural biographies, and Scharoun's work was, I think, a good training ground because of his attention to what it is that makes buildings particular, and his avoidance of reduction to the normative. But I have moved on from modernist key-works to buildings of all kinds, and readings of the ways they reflect society, so my research

questions now tend to focus on how a building works, socially, technically, contextually, exploring the whole field in which it sits. I make narratives, tell stories, struggle to make sense of things, and the direction of the investigation shifts with what is thrown up. Sampling, looking at a part instead of the whole, I find an angle of attack that is productive, and some of my best insights have come during writing, during the rethinking and restructuring necessary to construct a fluent narrative. I hesitate to prescribe a precise methodology because the targets are so often mobile. There are basic rules, like assuming a chronological structure if there is nothing better, and pursuing analysis from context to detail, but usually a particular theme offers itself. So my commentary is not only about Scharoun and his buildings, but about a growing and changing reading, and my own position as author within a socially constructed discourse of which I have become increasingly conscious.

PBJ 17/1/13

A forty year encounter with Hans Scharoun

The accompanying publications track progressive stages in interpreting the work of the German architect Hans Scharoun (1893-1972), which began when I was a student around 1970. I completed the first ever monograph on his work in 1973 although it was not published until 1978, made my debut as a critic writing up Scharoun's posthumous buildings for *The Architectural Review* (henceforth AR) as they were completed, and published a revised monograph in 1995 in late celebration of his centenary, while also curating an Arts Council funded exhibition with Nasser Golzari at the RIBA. My interpretation has been extended with new work over decades, publishing recently on Scharoun's interest in abstraction and his connection with China. The project continues, for Phaidon have agreed in principle to another revised edition of the monograph. All this will be explained as an unfolding narrative, in which I hope also to throw light on the following questions:

Why did it fall to me to 'discover' and publicise Scharoun's work in the English-speaking world, and why have I been allowed to maintain such a monopoly?

What made Scharoun such a strong candidate to inspire me in my late 1960s British context?

What made Scharoun the key representative for the construction of an 'alternative modernism' and how alternative is it really?

How has Scharoun's work served as a more general education in architectural thinking - at least for me?

I never expected to centre my entire career on Hans Scharoun, or indeed to become primarily an architectural historian and writer. During my six student years at the Architectural Association, and long thereafter, I fully intended to become a building architect, and I have designed and built several buildings, three of them published, one even included in Pevsner's *Buildings of England*.¹ I have often also undertaken parts of the manual work myself, ghosting many trades, and I pride myself on possessing a good technical understanding. As late as the mid 90s, I still hoped for a breakthrough as a designer, but I found I had understood far too late the need for skills on the business side, while I had necessarily developed other skills in the academic realm. I have collaborated with colleagues on architectural competitions and have continued with small private projects, but writing and teaching took over as a way of earning a living, and it is for those skills that I am now known. I never wanted to admit being a better writer than designer, but it seems to be the case: perhaps one always takes for granted what comes easily.

At the AA and before

Since my 'discovery' of Scharoun dates back to my time as a student and relates to the way I was taught architecture in the late 1960s, the story must begin at least there, but perhaps I should also briefly note earlier influences. My childhood was spent in the Exe valley, which nurtured a love of small-scale landscape and of purposeful enclosed spaces both indoor and outdoor. Stoke Canon, the village, and Culm Vale, the house I grew up in, have been

described and analysed in the *Journal of Architecture*: suffice it here to say that we occupied an Italianate villa of the 1860s built onto a cob farmhouse, with many outhouses and an elaborate garden.² I was free to roam the surrounding countryside with its waterside meadows and extensive woods, I developed a passion for collecting butterflies, and I spent my early childhood playing around the adjacent farm. After attending an Exeter preparatory school I was sent to board at the local public school, Blundell's in Tiverton, and hated it, always feeling oppressed, always an outsider, but not until I later saw Lindsay Anderson's film *If* did I understand it as part of a more general culture: his depicted school was much the same as mine, and my anger echoed his. My main refuge from its brutal culture was the art room of William Lyons-Wilson, then in his seventies visiting part-time, a kind and liberal man and a skilled watercolourist with a wonderful narrative gift.³ I started to paint in a manner inspired first by Giorgio de Chirico and later by Léger, and as I proved hopeless at chemistry which seemed far too abstract (my doctor parents had pushed me into the science side), I was allowed to switch to A level in art as the sole pupil so engaged in the school. My interest in Purism culminated in a series of abstracts on glass pursuing composition and colour with a passion. I organised them with regulating lines based on the golden section, but I also discovered the advantage of taking a random shape as a starting point, playing off its irregularity against the geometric system. For this Duchamp was the leading inspiration. For A level art I studied the Modern Movement in painting and architecture, and took to heart Ozenfant's *Foundations of Modern Art*, lent to me in the original 1931 edition by Lyons-Wilson.⁴ In my third year at Blundell's I was invited by an older pupil to share writing an article on modern architecture for the school magazine *The*

Blundellian, for which we gained a school prize. That I suppose was my first architectural publication, but I thought nothing of it.

Arriving at the AA in September 1966 at the age of seventeen meant London, loneliness and liberation. The lack of discipline was a shock and a relief, the need to fend for oneself in pricey London a sudden cold plunge into adulthood. The Head, John (later Michael) Lloyd, told us on our first day that he did not know what architecture was and it was up to us to find out, but we soon found ourselves bowled along by Elia Zenghelis's well-organised and Bauhaus-inspired first year, undertaking design exercises in form, colour and space, and working in the top floor studio side by side on trestle tables.⁵ Keith Critchlow schooled us in geometry and we were soon planning with squares, hexagons and octagons. We were taught to draw in ink on tracing paper with ruled lines and stencilled lettering, in order to present our work 'professionally' as dyeline prints, and the neat black and white drawings in books, reduced for publication, gave us an over-mechanised model to emulate. My early projects leaned heavily towards my compositional techniques in painting and my limited understanding of the modern movement, and it was not until the main project at the end of the year that I learned to integrate form, space, and structure. A disastrous first version of that Dance School project had no wall thicknesses and long inefficient corridors, but I do remember imagining those corridors and being excited by what I thought were the spatial progressions.

Paul Oliver taught in the studio, but he also organised a whole lecture series by anthropologist Anthony Forge about the Abelam people of New Guinea, which sparked off an interest that has never left me. I no longer recall what he said of their basic wooden buildings, but their customs and morality

were fascinating for the way they threw my own rather limited cultural background into perspective. We attended history lectures by Dennis Sharp and by a young, amusing and very American Charles Jencks still engaged in his Ph D with Reyner Banham up the road. The most magisterial history performances were by Thomas (Sam) Stevens, who poured out a fluent narrative on the history of modern architecture, noteless and carried by the slides, which he would turn on for an hour and just as suddenly turn off. I later learned that he was a product of Liverpool alongside Colin Rowe and Bob Maxwell, and also that he had been the conversation partner of Banham, Stirling, and the Brutalists.⁶ It is a pity he published so little. He was a music fanatic, possessing a huge and very expensive Philips professional tape recorder which he brought in for a concert of Xenakis's electronic music, introduced by the composer in the AA's front lecture hall. He was very friendly and I often took part in discussions with him at the AA bar.

Stevens showed images of many buildings that have remained familiar and he talked about them intelligently. It was a foundation. Here I saw for the first time both Hugo Häring's Garkau farm, in colour slides dominated by green painted boarding from the AA's collection, and black and white slides of Scharoun's Schminke house living room, which seemed to represent better than almost anything else the freedom and transparency promised by the Modern Movement. These two exerted an immediate visual appeal, but I do not remember encountering or understanding them in plan at that stage, and later when I became enthusiastic about Scharoun, Stevens dismissed the architect's work as 'throwing walls up around the circulation diagram'. With my second year tutor James Madge there was much discussion about Le Corbusier and Frank Lloyd Wright, and examination of the way they put

buildings together, yet such worship of the masters was already frowned on as old hat, and our discussions were almost surreptitious. There seemed to be a conspiracy of silence about what were regarded as the aesthetic aspects of architecture, for the idea of systems was taking over, flexibility and mass-production being assumed to be inevitable. Cedric Price was engaged in his Fun Palace and similar projects. He had taught at the AA, was frequently present, and engagingly outspoken. His lesson 'it does not have to be a building' was widespread, joining the more general chorus about flexibility and expendability.⁷ Denying the architectural image, Price deliberately cultivated the banal, but Archigram, running in parallel and AA based, were more visual, publishing their journal and moving into the ascendant with their aphorisms and collages, though we saw from the start that it was skin-deep. By the time my student year reached Peter Cook's Fifth Year we were fairly cynical about it, and relatively unimpressed by the Archigram 'Opera' put on with a huge battery of slide projectors and a romantic recording of the orchestral version of Schönberg's *Verklärte Nacht* played loud through big speakers (what right had they to borrow that? I thought). But Cook was a gatherer of teaching talent to rival Alvin Boyarsky, and assembled an astonishing cast to tutor the Fifth Year of 1971-2, including James Gowan, Dalibor Vesely, Bernard Tschumi, Colin Fournier, Fred Scott, various Archigram members, and even a psychologist. Cook also brought in foreign visitors, including the Superstudio group, and organised a field trip to Amsterdam.

Throughout my time at the AA, confidence about reinventing the wheel was high: at the beginning of the Third Year in 1968 we were assigned a gigantic project to replan the transport interchange of Victoria Station, with

intersecting cars, buses, taxis, trains and tubes. But we were thrown into it without much history or real technical advice, and how they expected naïve students to solve such large-scale and complex planning issues I cannot now imagine. There was no study of the station's earlier development and history. The aim, I now suppose, was a megastructure, but I failed to get a grip on it, needing a recognisable body to work on, for I still thought of buildings in terms of objects or at least of sculpted spaces, and I needed to work at the human scale. We had little technical help, for construction teaching at the AA had been retitled the 'Department of systems studies', apparently to distance it from bricks and mortar and in the hope that it would grow into a new discipline. We went to them to ask for advice, and they were friendly, but they told us to design it first, then they would tell us whether or not it would work. Chicken or egg, you surely need one or the other. Meanwhile the old skills of drawing were slipping away, people in art schools were doing political and conceptual projects, politics came to the fore with the revolutions of 1968, and the exploitation of architecture as a form of personal artwork was frowned upon.

But simultaneously there was a growing dismay about the 'failure of the modern movement' or at least that of the reductivist orthodoxy that 'modern architecture' had become. Ronan Point blew up in 1968,⁸ just as Charles Jencks and George Baird were putting together their book of essays *Meaning in Architecture*, which pinpointed what was missing and presaged the post-modern revolt for which Jencks became a primary apologist.⁹ But that was to come in the mid 1970s. Even so, the celebration of modernist heroes had not altogether ceased. One great advantage of the AA was the number of evening lectures by famous architects passing through, which we attended

weekly as a matter of course. There must have been dozens, but I particularly remember Aldo van Eyck talking about his orphanage and Stirling and Gowan sharing a lecture about the Leicester Engineering Building, a model that I tried to emulate along with its functionalist credentials in my main third year project for a paper mill, based on a personal study of the one close to my parent's home in Devon.

The AA's teaching policy under Lloyd was very loose, and we were generally allowed to choose our own topics and to address them in our own time, given regular tutorials and deadly crits in which the conversations went this way and that, and we were regularly shot down in flames. I learned to argue my case, but I never drew enough, being hampered by the retreat from freehand due to the mechanical drawing style, and a temperamental lack of precision with a pencil that could surely have been improved. I always spent far too long struggling with the initial planning issues, but the urge to get the fundamentals right was perhaps of crucial importance. Where was the form to come from? The grid-based and T-square dominated planning and the manipulation of hexagons and octagons advocated by Critchlow came to seem like a straitjacket, and the best parts of my main second year design – a museum of modern art on the South Bank based on Le Corbusier's Carpenter Centre and the Modulor – were the irregular parts where I had dared break away from the primary geometry. With the paper mill I made a hash of taking the travelling crane around a corner, but this was conceptually the most interesting part of the project and prevented it becoming an endless system.

My year out was spent painting and film making, and I made some money building Hifi systems in Devon which was another of my enthusiasms, constructing amplifiers from scratch as well as loudspeaker

enclosures. I spent my life enveloped in the sound of the classics, from Dufay to Stockhausen on beloved vinyl records, and tinkering with the machines was a substitute for not playing the music: I only later understood the huge filtering effect of mechanical reproduction. While I was away the AA passed through a political crisis with the collapse of negotiations to merge with Imperial College, and Alvin Boyarsky had been appointed as chairman (rival candidate Kenneth Frampton), although it took some time for the changes to be felt.¹⁰ Returning for my fourth year in 1970, I discovered for myself radial buildings and the power of the centre, producing the first version, for some real clients, of what was to become the Round House six years later. I also designed a radial monastery with a church in the middle and a ring of cells equidistant from the altar, though I remember no knowledge at that stage of the Panopticon which must have been 'in the air' and was already of concern to Robin Evans who was teaching. Although my project looks diagrammatic in plan, I still recall moving through that building in my mind's eye and enjoying the sense of discovery so engendered. In my final year I dared redesign the monastery as a linear structure terraced into the hillside precisely following the contours of the site, while the chapel was of free form enfolded by a significant wall, and elements played against the ground. I also presented round and linear versions side by side, trying to illustrate the very different patterns of life that were implied. For the linear version Giancarlo De Carlo's Collegio del Colle in Urbino, known only from books, was a strong influence. I and fellow students, reading it from plan and photos, marvelled at the free geometry in plan and intimate use of the hillside site. In retrospect our puzzlement over this only exposes the degree to which we had been taught to start always with a regular geometric figure on the drawing board,

neglecting the shape of the ground. And we never properly surveyed a site: when I started to build the Round House in 1975 I had to be taught how to use a dumpy level by the local surveyor, whom we paid to make the initial site survey.

Working on my final year project, I felt at last that I had managed to get the relations and the experienced sequences or promenades between the parts as I wanted them. I had finally freed myself up, but had little idea of how the thing could be constructed, and never developed it in any detail. I had spent all my time on the spatial relationships, and at the end of the year I just scraped through. But I received an A from Dennis Sharp for the dissertation about Scharoun, over which I had spent much time, and I had also been a prominent voice in the fifth year debate. A group of us were discussing where architecture was going, particularly with James Gowan, who also brought in his own projects and sketches. I have no memory of precisely what I contributed, but Cook reported me as going on about Scharoun morning noon and night.¹¹ I had taken a group of fellow students in my Citroen DS to see his work as part of a holiday tour extending as far as Florence in the summer of 1971. We saw the Weissenhof house and Romeo and Juliet in Stuttgart, but most important for me was the Geschwister Scholl school in Lünen, which for the first time allowed experience of the space in those extraordinarily irregular plans. I visited the Philharmonie and other Berlin buildings at the end of the year, moving on alone by train from the Amsterdam field trip in November to find Berlin under inches of snow. I stayed about a week with Winnetou Kampmann and Ute Weström, a chance contact through John Smith, then AA President. Weström's mother was working for Scharoun and that gave me an entry, so I visited the office at

Heilmannring 66A, but as a mere student I was not admitted into the presence of the great man, then in his final year of life and not in good health. I was politely fended off by his wife Margit, formidable aristocrat and former fashion journalist, who was later to prove very helpful. However I was given some photographic prints of the Philharmonie. I also attended my first concert there: I think it was the Brahms Requiem.

The discussions about Scharoun and self-generating architecture in the Häringian manner were just a small part of the debate in that AA Fifth Year. As well as by Gowan I was also tutored by Dalibor Vesely, recently arrived from Czechoslovakia and still open-mindedly reconstructing his world, hardly the doctrinaire figure he later became. I also remember the reapplication of the human figure to buildings, best exemplified by Alex Marshall's project Gloria, but also pursued by Alain Bevan-John in a project for the AA School involving two gigantic figures like bookends set up against the adjacent party walls – 'and research of course should be in the head'. Tutoring this, James Gowan himself produced sketches of various animals stretching as bridges across the Thames, legs on either bank, and remarked with typical dry wit that the pig worked rather well because you could include so much accommodation. A group of us was pursuing an irregular aggregative architecture. Most talented was Gill Smith, who designed a house by stages shaped around particular activities, added room by room. The trio of David Ashton-Hill, Leonie Emerson and Graham Noble under the tutorship of Dalibor Vesely invented a project to grow irregular additions on the sides of the Aylesbury Estate, the most oppressive and monolithic modernist housing estate in London, anticipating the work of Lucien Kroll of which we then knew nothing.¹² I started to publish accounts of these goings

on in the AA Newssheet, which seemed to go down well, and which led to my first contact with Peter Davey and the Architectural Press. Fittingly perhaps, my first publication in the Architects' Journal (henceforth AJ) a year later was a review of the Archigram Exhibition at the ICA, which was respectful enough to gain both the approval of Peter Cook and Davey's acknowledgement that it had helped him understand what they were about.¹³ Among fellow students of that AA year, the best known now are Tony Fretton and Ken Yeang, though Jon Broome also made a name for himself as successor to Walter Segal, Simon Conder has produced good published work, and Andy Holmes made paintings of American trucks. Gill Smith became a senior architect with Fielden Clegg. The most famous architect of the previous year was Piers Gough and of the subsequent year Will Alsop. It was a time of transition prior to Boyarsky's nurturing of international heroes.

The first Scharoun monograph

On finishing at the AA in the summer of 1972, I spent about a month with an AA group led by Paul Oliver and Harrison Dix studying the medieval town of Martel in France for the Patrimoine Historique et Artistique de la France. It was a valuable lesson in medieval irregularity,¹⁴ but when I returned I needed to get a job. After various unsuccessful interviews and a couple of days making a survey for John Brandon-Jones in Hampstead,¹⁵ I landed a place with Timothy Rendle in South Kensington, a civilised man of fastidious tastes who had done a couple of simple Scandinavian-looking houses and was building up a small practice. He had just established himself as consultant architect to Blue Circle Cement, and during the 9 months or so I spent there, I worked mainly on the development of their projects. A couple of small

buildings were eventually realised, but the club conversion at Dunstable I never saw, and the new small office at Theale was tied excessively to Rendle's standard system. I also made some of the first drawings for a small footbridge at Northfleet that shows the virtue of Rendle's simple detailing.¹⁶ Rendle was kind and it was a living, but when in the summer of 1973 I received a contract to write a book on Scharoun I felt compelled to leave, since he would not let me reduce to part time. The contract was the result of a chance encounter: fellow AA student Joan Scotson formed a relationship with – and later married - Stephen Gardiner, then architectural correspondent at The Observer, and it must have been at some AA event late in 1972 that I told him of my work on Scharoun, while he told me in return that Scharoun was on the list of Sherban Cantacuzino, so I should contact him. It transpired that the publisher Gordon Fraser, already big in greetings cards, was moving into books and wanted to launch a series on neglected modern architects, for which Cantacuzino had been appointed editor. Cantacuzino himself wrote about Wells Coates, Walter Segal was to do Asplund and Joseph Rykwert Eileen Gray, but only the Coates and the Scharoun ever appeared. The gentlemanly Cantacuzino invited me to a good restaurant for lunch and I must have leant him the dissertation, for I soon received a contract from Gordon Fraser, and visited their premises in Primrose Hill to meet publisher James Fraser and the firm's designers.¹⁷

In July 1973 a further study opportunity with the Patrimoine Historique et Artistique de la France led to some expenses-paid weeks in Tulle with the former AA team, including Gill Smith, with whom I had worked closely at Martel. This time we surveyed an extraordinarily layered medieval building and worked out how to recast it as flats, and while there

also visited a group called ARIM in Limoges who were making sympathetic conversions of old fabric. It was another lesson in the virtues of the grown aggregative town and the idea of the architectural palimpsest. Mme Abravanel, the Patrimoine's founder and paymaster, loved to have our reports to wave around, but I never saw any real impact, and it seems that the organisation died with her.¹⁸ I had taken a car to France – another DS – and when the work was over drove on to Germany accompanied by Gill to look at more Scharoun buildings: again the school at Lünen but also the one at Marl, and we went on to West Berlin, trying to see as many of the buildings as possible, again enjoying the generous hospitality of the Kampmanns.¹⁹ This was the time when I visited the Akademie der Künste and met Peter Pfankuch, former Scharoun assistant who was head of the *Bauabteilung* and working on the Scharoun documentation.²⁰ He seemed a little put out that I was doing a book, but became more helpful when I explained it would be in English and an outsider view, and he agreed to let me have at cost price prints of the primary drawings that he had collected and photographed. Having suffered from labouring in the salt mines during the Nazi years, Pfankuch was in a delicate state of health, and died in 1975 at only 50 years old, so I never saw him again and had no chance to discuss in detail his experiences as assistant to Scharoun in the 1930s. However, I later made contact with his widow Lisa Pfankuch who spoke fluent English and held a shrewd view of Scharoun and his circle, and I have maintained contact with her. Scharoun himself had died in November 1972, but his office was still in full swing, and I was well-received by Margit Scharoun, who opened doors, made contacts, and was generally sympathetic. But records and drawings were all over the place: the abundant material deposited with the Akademie was not to be fully

sorted for another twenty years, although Pfankuch's preliminary selection had covered all the main works. Even general material on Scharoun's work was very limited, consisting of three accounts which were all rather short: Margit Staber's essay in *Zodiac* 10, a special issue *Allemagne* of *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui* of October 1967, and the catalogue from the Akademie's Scharoun Exhibition, also of 1967. The latter included a fairly complete work list with publication references²¹ and a bibliography of writings by and about Scharoun. Without it I could never have started.

A crucial catalyst and adviser on my Scharoun project was Julius Posener, then Professor at the Akademie der Künste, and on his way to becoming Germany's most respected architectural historian. He had studied architecture in Berlin in the 1920s at the Technische Hochschule under Hans Poelzig alongside Walter Segal, and soon started to write, making his name as critic and editor on *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui* in Paris in the early 1930s. He later worked in Palestine for Erich Mendelsohn, but then came to England where he taught at the Brixton School of Building. By the mid 1950s, rather bored, he applied for a teaching job in Malaysia, and soon found himself setting up a school of architecture from scratch in Kuala Lumpur that is now a huge institution. In 1961 he was invited to return to Berlin, and built up a new academic career publishing books and campaigning in the press for retention of historic buildings, particularly houses by Hermann Muthesius. He gained such a reputation that in his last years an hour-long television documentary was made of his life and a long autobiography was published.²² Posener spoke and wrote German, French and English equally well, was a mine of information on Berlin's architectural culture and an enthusiastic guide. Probably at the invitation of Dennis Sharp (they were both leading members

of CICA)²³, he had given a course of lectures at the AA during my time there in 1970 or 71, which included one on the Philharmonie, and I first met him then. The series was later published as AA Papers no.5, *From Schinkel to the Bauhaus*.²⁴ If I did not see him on my first brief winter visit to Berlin, I certainly saw much of him when I returned in the summer of 1973. He was both enthusiastic and supportive, and arranged my first visit to Scharoun's Baensch house, the subject of my book's first chapter. He became a good friend to visit on every subsequent trip to Berlin, read and corrected the typescript of my book, and wrote a generous and enthusiastic foreword to the German edition.²⁵ In his teaching and writing he had made much of the fact that Mies and Häring had shared an office while working at opposite ends of the Modernist spectrum, although he liked to set Le Corbusier between them as a kind of mediator. This Mies/Häring dichotomy became central to my interpretation of the Modern Movement, and has remained so.²⁶ Other important ideological influences in my late student years were Robert Macleod's *Style and Society* which opened the door to readings of Pugin and Ruskin and their ideas about responsiveness and irregularity, and Bruno Zevi's *Towards an Organic Architecture* which as early as 1945 had posited an alternative modernist tradition following in the footsteps of Walter Curt Behrendt's *Modern Building*.²⁷ I only met Zevi much later and all too briefly, but he was an enthusiastic supporter of my 'Organic' issue of AR in 1985 and prompter of my CICA prize,²⁸ besides later republishing many of my pieces in *L'Architettura* that had already appeared in AR. I also recall that in 1970 or 1971 I and my student friends read and discussed Robert Venturi's *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*, which bolstered our belief in irregularity, though I was more curious than convinced by Venturi's work.

It was Posener who sent me to see Walter Segal, saying 'you might not like what he says, but you should hear him out'. I had met Segal as a visitor at AA crits and knew of his interest in construction and his temporary house, but I thought his obituary of Scharoun in the AR with its condemnation of Häring's 'confused thinking' rather dismissive.²⁹ But when I rang up Segal and was invited to his house in Highgate, I found him friendly and enthusiastic, eager to talk about his own background and to gossip freely and wittily about the world of architecture. A friendship started which went on until his death in 1985: I would arrive in the afternoon, join a meal in the evening, and not get away until two in the morning. I once even stayed overnight in the temporary house. Segal had a good appreciation of Scharoun's ingenuity in designing flats around 1930, but was inclined to dismiss his less regular work as 'Expressionist' in the then customary manner, connecting the term with his difficult father Arthur Segal who had been an Expressionist painter and had brought him up in Monte Verita, a hotbed of 'cranks and eccentrics' as Segal put it. But Segal had maintained an immense respect for Bruno Taut, whom he had known personally, and it was soon clear to me that he was not the small-minded construction-obsessed figure that some took him to be. Scharoun was soon no longer the excuse for our discussions, and the conversation moved on far and wide. When in 1975 I showed Segal the radial house I had planned for my parents he readily accepted the idea, considering it fair enough if I was going to solve my own problems, and he was generous with construction advice as well as bolstering my confidence. Then as his own Lewisham self-build project got underway, I accompanied him a couple of times to the site and witnessed his relationship with the owner-builders, later writing about it in the AJ obituary issue.³⁰ Segal

introduced me to Florian Beigel, another young architect for whom he had become mentor, which resulted in a long friendship and some part-time teaching work at the North London Polytechnic. Segal also prompted Charlotte Ellis, editor at the AJ, to commission my article about Peter Sulzer and Peter Hübner's self-build project in Stuttgart in 1983, the contact that led eventually to my Hübner monograph.³¹

But I am running ahead of myself. Returning to 1973 and the first half of 1974, I was writing my Scharoun book in my flat at Guilford Street in London, living off money saved while working for Rendle. I had visited and photographed in black and white as many buildings as possible in West Germany and West Berlin, but not yet those in the DDR and Poland. I dug out of the AA and RIBA libraries the books and mainly German journals with articles about Scharoun's works, taking photocopies and translating rather slowly from the German, for although I had studied it for two years to Ordinary Level at school, my vocabulary was limited. I thought of undertaking a Ph D, but the AA had no provision, and an enquiry to the Bartlett revealed that I would have to pay substantial fees and was unlikely to get a grant. I felt I could hardly ask my father, after he had paid my whole time at the AA and was already impatient at my irregular employment. I therefore decided to go it alone, free to carry on with my own polemical and sometimes naïve interpretation without a supervisor breathing down my neck. At least my enthusiasm remained uncurbed, if it could have been more scholarly, but had I been persuaded to scrape the bottom of the barrel, the task would surely have become impossible. I showed parts of the evolving work to Dennis Sharp, I recall corrective comments from Dalibor Vesely, and doubtless I discussed it much with architect friends. It was written out

longhand with a fountain pen, then rewritten in longhand to clean it up, and finally typed up for a fee by Jo Bradford, wife of an architect friend. This was the way I wrote until the purchase of my first computer in 1986: I never used a typewriter.

My fascination was with Scharoun's work – his buildings and plans - and I must have possessed a facility to read and describe it, for the drawings said much more to me than the texts. Posener paid me the compliment that I had interpreted buildings unseen which had never existed, like the project for the Rosen Gallery of 1948 for which no prior explanatory text existed.³² The structure of the book prefigured my interest in case studies, for it started with a house of 1935 that illustrated the dramatic division in the architect's career, then went on to tackle the post-war work in studies organised by building type. Those critics who grumbled that it was written 'from the architect's point of view' were surely right, for I strove to understand and explain how the buildings were designed and intended to work.³³ The architect's biography was built around this. I underplayed the Expressionist drawings and paintings because I felt they had been so overplayed elsewhere, and because the Expressionist tag had been given such negative connotations by Nikolaus Pevsner. In any case the historical interpretation of the material from that early phase was still limited, despite Wolfgang Pehnt's excellent book arriving just in time.³⁴ My interpretation was backed up by years of discussion at the AA and by my own struggle as a designer to find socially appropriate form. This had nurtured a strong belief in working from the inside out to discover how a thing 'wanted to be' rather than starting with preconceptions about what it should look like (style) or handing it over to dominance by a technical or economic imperative (orthodox modernism at its

worst). It was clear to me too, the more I looked, that here could be seen an alternative modernist tradition, easily linked with Zevi's idea of the organic, which he had built around Frank Lloyd Wright and Alvar Aalto, though in ignorance of Scharoun.³⁵

By the early autumn of 1974 a complete typescript was handed over to James Fraser the publisher, and Sherban Cantacuzino as editor suggested some minor corrections and changes. There were some discussions about illustrations, and Gordon Fraser had some photographic prints made, but then followed years of delays, always with another excuse, so the book did not actually appear until 1978. Awaiting its launch, I began to write for journals and to teach. In the wake of my AA dissertation, Dennis Sharp had commissioned a polemical piece for AA Quarterly, for which he was founding editor, entitled *Organic versus Classic*.³⁶ I now find it embarrassingly crude, and Sharp told me that Berthold Lubetkin was greatly annoyed by it, which amused me at the time. Following the Archigram review, Peter Davey commissioned a couple of articles on recent British work for AJ, but he never printed them, probably because they were unfocused and overworked. I had little sense for the size of an article and tried to include too much, as I often see students doing now. My debut with AR was less speculative and more precise, as it recovered territory already explored in the book. It appeared in March 1975, commissioned by Sherban Cantacuzino who was one of three editors there. It concerned late works of Scharoun: Wolfsburg Theatre, Marl School, and the Zabelkrügerdamm apartment block in Berlin.³⁷ It was beautifully laid out by Bill Slack with my black and white photographs, and I visited the offices in Queen Anne's Gate to write the captions. In due course I was asked by AR to write up other late works as they were completed,

including the Bremerhaven Maritime Museum in March 1976 and Berlin Staatsbibliothek in June 1979, the latter commissioned by Peter Davey, who by then sat in the editor's chair.³⁸

The Round House

For around a year in 1974-75 I earned a living through part-time teaching at the AA, at the North London Polytechnic, and in the Product Design course of the South Bank Polytechnic. Then my parents let me build them a house, while the Scharoun book languished at the publishers. I moved to Devon in the autumn of 1975 to plan and prepare, and remained there until the spring of 1977, concentrating almost entirely on the building of the house, lucky that the main external work fell in the hot summer of 1976. Gill Smith joined me for about six months, helping out with the drawing and then the building, and my school friend Jonny Ison, who had done a variety of jobs, came to help out with the labouring. We hired two local bricklayers, a digger driver, and an on-site carpenter. A local plumbing firm dealt with all the services and a joiner made the non-standard windows. My father owned the site, a former orchard, and allowed a budget of £33,000 which we just about met. It was the current price for an ordinary house of that floor area, but not to cover extras and irregularities like the radial geometry and circular walls, the level changes, extensive retaining walls, the external paving, or the built-in sofas, cupboards and kitchen. I was rebelling against the mantra that everything should be straight and square based on standard sizes, and I was prepared to embrace every complication. It proved a baptism of fire, but we worked everything out as we went, laying drains, levelling hardcore, and assembling the roof carpentry ourselves. Although I subsequently suffered a recurring

nightmare that my parents were still living next door and making polite excuses as to why they had not yet moved, they took to it quickly and lived happily there for the rest of their lives, my mother making a marvel of the garden. The radial plan allowing outlooks in all directions turned out to be of great value when they could no longer go outside but moved around the house as the day unfolded, and when my father failed to manage the four step upper level change, a chairlift was installed. My mother insisted on remaining there alone with daily help until she died in April 2012 aged 97. She had lived there 35 years.

The essential concept of the radial house was born in my fourth year house project at the AA, in a moment of what seemed like clarity after endless juggling with untidy plans. One attraction was the strong contrast of centre and periphery, with the elemental gathering around the fire contrasted with the different view and orientation for every room. Another was the way the dividing walls between segments could run out and divide up the site, especially when retaining differences of level, which meant that in some places there was more spatial continuity between inside and out than between one segment and the next. Scharoun never planned a radial house, but I was seduced by the built-in sofa of the Baensch House, and indeed by his use of the sofa more generally as space-defining element. Following his example I also dared break with my radial system, using two different radii to make the central wall turn into a spiral to produce an entry, and combining bays irregularly on the west side to make the lower living-room into a great bay window. The spaces in the front part of the house turned out delightfully successful, especially when flooded with afternoon sunlight, and the ten-seater sofa curling around the open fire was the only place to be of a winter's

night, but was well lit in daytime by its clerestorey. The promenades in and around the house were fluid and bright, the great drum of brickwork a dramatic declaration of centre, but I have long felt that the bedrooms were too subservient to the general concept, especially the southern one at the end of the line where design freedom was most geometrically constrained.

Cambridge

The Round House was published in *Building Design*, *The Architectural Review* and *House and Garden*.³⁹ There was also local interest including a regional television programme, and I hoped to start a career as a house architect, but it was too unconventional and difficult a building, particularly in the Devon context. No further commissions were forthcoming, so I returned to London, eking out a living with part-time teaching at the North London Polytechnic and the University of Bath. At the end of the construction period in Devon, however, I had received an unexpected telephone call from Colin St John (Sandy) Wilson, the new Professor at Cambridge, inviting me to apply there for a teaching job. He knew of my work on Scharoun and had read my pieces in AR, although the book was still 'in the press'. I was invited for interview but not chosen, then I was invited again the next year and given an assistant lectureship of three years extendable to five. The book appeared in the autumn of 1978 just as I was taking up that job, and most of the reviews were positive. I was invited to give a public lecture at the RIBA which was nerve-racking but well received,⁴⁰ and there followed over the next couple of years invitations for lectures at architectural schools across the country. I felt that my career was launched and that with the book I had won some authority, while fortuitously the Round House appeared in AR at the same

time. More journalistic commissions also started to come my way. I was in my thirtieth year.

The Cambridge job was not very demanding, consisting of two days a week studio teaching, initially in third year, and a lecture course of eight lectures over one term. But Cambridge provided a more scholarly context and higher intellectual standards, even if there was also a greater intellectual snobbery. I discovered the riches of the University Library and the possibility of digging out obscure and arcane material on other subject areas such as philosophy, sociology, and anthropology. The library in the department, stocked by Robin Middleton, had original German periodicals from the 1920s and earlier. Sandy Wilson encouraged me in further pursuit of Scharoun, wrote a prominent review of my book in *AR*,⁴¹ and arranged a contract with Cambridge University Press for a second book on Scharoun's mentor Hugo Häring. I and other staff members joined him at university expense for the first Alvar Aalto Symposium in 1979, and he drew my attention to Gunnar Asplund, lending me his copy of the then rare Swedish monograph. This led eventually to my *Masters of Building* pieces in the *AJ* around 1990 commissioned by Dan Cruickshank and Peter Carolin, and later still to my Asplund monograph with Phaidon. Naturally, Sandy also followed my coverage of the emerging Scharoun buildings and my further research on early ones, so that by the time he published his book *The Other Tradition* we had exchanged ideas over a decade.⁴² My lecture course at Cambridge which started in 1978 continued each year until 1993, always focused on the topic of an alternative modernism centred around Scharoun, Häring, Aalto and others, but it expanded as a theoretical topic as I learned more. There were many spirited discussions with other staff members, particularly John

Sergeant with his deep interest in Wright, but also Brian Frost, Julian Marsh, Nicholas Ray, Nick Hare, Bob Allies, Eric Parry, Dean Hawkes, Stephen Greenberg and many others. Dalibor Vesely was present, arriving when I did, and I shared his rejection of the narrow positivism still lingering through the legacy of Leslie Martin, who had done so much to make architectural study more scientific. But after some teaching together at the AA, Vesely had lost patience with me, and was even at times contemptuous. At Cambridge he initiated his own student sect, scorning outsiders and causing an ideological split that plagued the school for years. More helpful to me at this stage and much more tolerant was Joseph Rykwert, whose Socratic seminars I joined, teasing out ideas with the students. He gave me a copy of his *The Idea of a Town* and useful advice on which anthropologists to read.⁴³ The arcane *Threshold Covenant* by H. Clay Trumbull (present, of course, in the UL) was a discovery of his which had particular resonance, not for its faulty theories but for its rich assembly of accounts about what thresholds could mean.

One was supposed to reside within ten miles of Cambridge and I took this advice to heart, buying a derelict farm cottage in the village of Oakington which was all I could then afford. It became my first family home, for I married Rosalind Barron in the summer of 1979 and our children were born in 1980 and 82. Much of the next two years was spent reconstructing and extending this building, adding an octagonal tower which looked out across the flat landscape.⁴⁴ I remember a conscious interest in repossessing traditional elements like steeply pitched tiled roofs and small four-pane windows, while the memory of tower houses studied in France undoubtedly played a part, but the project was also about adding layers to an existing palimpsest and making contrasting and purposeful rooms using the available

views in a Scharounian manner. The top of the tower was the study looking in the four directions, the bottom a perfect container for a round table which I designed and commissioned from Timothy Ison. Even a built-in sofa was drawn on the plan, but it was never added. Money was tight, and I had to build the entire tower roof myself, carpentry, tiles and all, shivering in the October wind.

Engagement with Hugo Häring and more research

Hugo Häring's centenary was to fall in 1982, and I offered an article to Peter Davey at AR which was accepted and printed on time to the month, with the Garkau cowshed plan on the cover.⁴⁵ I had been in touch with Jürgen Joedicke, the architectural historian at Stuttgart, who helped commission the German edition of my Scharoun book. It appeared in 1980 translated by Manfred Speidel, who has since become the leading expert on Bruno Taut.⁴⁶ Joedicke was planning Häring celebrations at Biberach, Häring's home town, and I was invited to undertake an hour-long lecture, so I wrote it in English and he had it translated so that I could read it in German, and the whole proceedings were later published.⁴⁷ On that occasion I met for the first time both Margot Aschenbrenner, Häring's former assistant, and Andrea Schmitz, daughter of Häring's last client and his patron of the last years. Both became close friends with whom I kept in contact by letters and visits until their respective deaths, and from whom I learned much: Aschenbrenner contributed a postscript to my Häring book.⁴⁸ Joedicke had also arranged an exhibition of work in an 'organic' direction that included the buildings of Rolf Keller, which I wrote up for AR in 1985, and Günter Behnisch was also there, though I did not establish contact with him at that stage.

In the summers of 1981 and 1982 I booked a room for a couple of weeks at the Akademie der Künste, Berlin, in order to work on the Häring and Scharoun archives, and received much friendly assistance from Achim Wenschuh who had taken over the Bauabteilung after Peter Pfankuch's death. Matthias Schirren was there undertaking his own intended doctorate on Häring, and we went through the relatively unsorted portfolios together, I photographing them on 35mm with a copy-stand using Dia-direct film for black and white slides, and agreeing to shoot two copies, one for the Akademie and one for me. This became my main source of material. I also worked through the letter files and photocopied those I considered significant, though gothic script and handwriting made it difficult. On other days I visited Margit Scharoun, Posener, and various members of the Scharoun office, including Edgar Wisniewski and Peter Fromlowitz. I also interviewed Karl Böttcher, technical consultant to both Scharoun and Häring, then still living in a Häring flat at Siemensstadt. I visited the Scharoun buildings again, and with the help of student enthusiast Christian Villiers tracked down several more of the private houses from the 1930s. Out of this came a long AR article published in December 1983 about Scharoun's 1930s houses, exposing for the first time many not included in my book, some not yet published anywhere.⁴⁹ I revisited the Baensch house, but also saw the houses Endell, Scharf and Mohrmann and the site of the destroyed Moll, as well as the two late ones from the 1960s, Tormann and Köpke. It was probably in the summer 1982 that I made a trip across the iron curtain and spent a night in sleepy Brandenburg, as part of a visit arranged by Villiers to the houses Pflaum, Mattern, and Bonk.

These houses in and around Berlin had been ignored in Germany. Because of their compelled vernacular exteriors they were found distasteful, associated with the period of *'Blut und Boden'*. The Italian historians Borsi and König even disparaged them as 'full of mistakes that even a provincial engineer would not make'.⁵⁰ But they had been Scharoun's main creative outlet and vehicle for experiment during the 12 years of the Nazi period and were unprecedented in their spatial planning. Far from being conformist, they could be seen as an act of resistance, for Scharoun engaged in a witty struggle against the bureaucrats to see what he could get away with. He was pushed to plan even more from the inside out, to create free private worlds turning their back on the Nazi state. He greatly extended his vocabulary in plan and section, but was prevented from pursuing the aesthetic composition of external form in which around 1930 he had been masterly and innovative. He never returned to that kind of external aesthetic view. Years engaged in the domestic realm nurtured a predominant concern for the small scale, and this arguably set his post-war work on a different course, working from the room upward rather than from the masterplan down. The twelve years under Nazi rule were therefore no mere interruption or repressive interlude but an essential part of the development of his architectural sensibility and a preparation for what was to come.

Freelance historian and critic

In 1983 my job at Cambridge came to an end. Assistant lectureships were not extendable, and though I could have been promoted, three of us stood on that threshold and Sandy found it a difficult choice. It did not help that the reference I had requested from Posener never turned up, doubtless buried

forgotten in the mountain of paper on his desk, as I now understand only too well.⁵¹ I should have telephoned to remind him, but hesitated to interfere. In retrospect it was a blessing, for it resulted in five productive years of journalism and free-lancing, but it caused me much soul-searching at the time. I was invited to continue the Cambridge lecture course for a pittance, and did so as a matter of honour for a decade, but I earned a small living with other part-time teaching, mainly at the North London Polytechnic. Fortunately rights to use the UL were preserved, so my enquiries in anthropology and other areas were not constrained. But I could work on journalistic assignments full time, and made the most of opportunities given by the editors of the AR and AJ. My first *Masters of Building* assignment for the latter, commissioned by Dan Cruickshank in 1985, was Philip Webb's Red House. I was astonished to find how little had until then been published, and surprised how easy it was to attain an authoritative stance, given careful study and the possibility of seeing the building and **all** the drawings.⁵² I went on in that series to cover two buildings by Lethaby, two by Asplund, and a general piece on the almost unknown work of Häring's teacher Theodor Fischer.⁵³ It was a perfect training in the business of architectural case studies.

The articles I had written on Häring and on Scharoun's 30s houses had been much appreciated by Peter Davey, prompting further commissions from the AR which were to continue until his retirement. He even allowed me to guest-edit whole issues, the first of these being *Organic Response* published in June 1985. It had considerable impact, earning me the CICA award of best periodical of the last three years, and I recently heard that the leading Czech historian of modernism Vladimir Slapeta (whose father worked for Scharoun) was showing it to a group of architectural visitors to the Mies house in Brno

in 2012. This issue of AR contained some hitherto unpublished works by Häring and a début piece about Fehling and Gogel, the closest Berlin architects to Scharoun. Among things I wrote personally were an article about Rolf Keller, architect of Seldwyla and author of *Bauen als Umweltzerstörung*, and another called *Social Process* bringing together examples of participation including Kroll and Hübner. But perhaps my most significant contribution was *Implicit Meanings*, my first publication overtly discussing how buildings frame social rituals and drawing examples from anthropology. Behnisch was represented in an article by Richard Reid, and Scharoun through a piece by Eckehardt Janofske, author of a Scharoun Ph D, which I translated.⁵⁴ By this time a Scharoun society had been formed in Berlin to protect the legacy of his work and promote the continuation of his ideas against the attacks of the Postmodernists. I was invited to lecture there in June 1986, again reading a translation prepared by others, under the title 'Where do we stand?'. It was subsequently published both by Toshio Nakamura in the Japanese journal A+U and by Giancarlo De Carlo in Spazio e Società.⁵⁵ In that year I also gave a lecture on Hugo Häring at the AA that was subsequently published in AA Files.⁵⁶ By this stage, although I was still teaching part-time one day a week in term time, most of my energies were devoted to writing, lecturing, and a growing role as an architectural critic.

I might well have continued this stimulating free-lance existence despite the poor remuneration had not Hans Haenlein invited me to become the history man at the South Bank Polytechnic in 1988, where I entered at the level of Principal Lecturer. I restored history, which had been criticised on the previous RIBA visit, to a stronger role in the curriculum. I reorganised the dissertation, hosted several themed public lecture series, one of which gave

rise to the AJ series *Authenticity*,⁵⁷ and enjoyed a lively debate with colleagues until I left for the chair at Sheffield in 1994. All the while my book on Häring was gently growing, with regular visits to Germany and continuing correspondence with Aschenbrenner, Schmitz, and others. I managed also to keep the architectural criticism going and extended the range, covering the work of Behnisch, De Carlo and the Grazer Schule among others. It earned me a good rating in the first Research Assessment Exercise, bringing a grant that was spent on initiating Clare Graham's Ph D about the history of the English law court, my idea which she completed and published after transferring with me to Sheffield.⁵⁸

To return to the topic of my publications on Scharoun and step back slightly, I was invited as consultant editor to another issue of AR in 1988, in which I published a lead article entitled *From the neo-classical axis to a perspective space* which both extended the discussion of a perspective, indicating its roots in the theory of Jean Gebser, and included comparisons setting works of Asplund and Aalto alongside those of Häring and Scharoun.⁵⁹ This was later one of the articles chosen for inclusion by Michael Spens in his book celebrating the history of the AR.⁶⁰ The topic of a perspective was also addressed in an AA lecture of 1987 about the Philharmonie, later published in *Spazio e Società*,⁶¹ and I must have been taking new photographs for Phaidon's republication of my monograph when I revisited Scharoun's Stuttgart apartment blocks Romeo and Juliet in 1990 and republished them in AR.⁶² On one of my visits to the Akademie in Berlin I had obtained copies of the entire set of photographed drawings for Scharoun's house at the Weissenhofsiedlung, and it was around this time that I made sense of them and put on record the full evolution of the design,

producing a text published bilingually in a catalogue for an exhibition at the Weissenhof Gallery in the winter of 1991/2, and later repeated in AR.⁶³

Deducing Scharoun's intentions and design priorities was not only helpful in better explaining his work for the revised edition of the monograph, but also laid the foundations for the opening chapter of *Modern Architecture Through Case Studies* a decade later.⁶⁴

The Centenary and a revised edition

When the Gordon Fraser edition sold out the publishers declined to reprint, so the rights reverted to me and it was David Jenkins at Phaidon who commissioned a new edition. It was actually contracted in July 1992 with the Scharoun centenary of 1993 in mind, but not in print until 1995. In retrospect this delay was an advantage because of new material which arrived with the centenary which I could peruse, but there was also the risk that a new and more sophisticated interpretation by someone else might appear. My collection of material had admittedly been thin: for the first book I had not even profited from Pfankuch's documentation, for my typescript was delivered before it appeared. Books by Eckehard Janofske and J. Christoph Bürkle were published in the interim, but both had effectively taken my lead, and though adding useful details had not substantially changed the picture.⁶⁵ Johann Friedrich Geist became interested in Scharoun as part of his enormous three volume study *Das Berliner Mietshaus*, and produced a wonderfully rich documentation about the housing programmes of the 1950s in which Scharoun was involved.⁶⁶ Clearly Scharoun had become for him something of a hero, but the presentation was dry, objective and very detailed, without much hope of English publication. In celebration of the centenary Geist also

produced a chronology of Scharoun's work illustrated with carefully chosen photographs and a timeline to put it in cultural context, again a useful and scholarly document.⁶⁷ The Akademie in the person of Achim Wendschuh, Pfankuch's successor, assembled a revised edition of Pfankuch's documentation with an extended work list and also produced a companion volume of selected sketches, catalogued by style and period. It was interspersed with significant period writings by and about Scharoun, adding to those earlier collected by Pfankuch.⁶⁸ A much richer documentation was therefore available from that time.

Another small book was produced by a group of critics and historians writing about different parts of Scharoun's career from a more political viewpoint which opened up neglected areas, particularly his activities during the Nazi time, that were neither as innocent as I had painted them nor grossly compromising: he had ghosted for other architects in the design of housing for the Luftwaffe.⁶⁹ In many ways the best new book to come out of the centenary was that by two teachers at the University of Bremen, Jörg Kirschenmann and Eberhard Syring, who with their students had made new models of many projects and who like me concentrated on describing and analysing the work.⁷⁰ Their emphases were in places different, but generally their interpretation agreed with mine. Theirs is the only new account from that time that has made it into English, in shortened form and under the budget press of Taschen.⁷¹ There were centenary celebrations in Berlin to which I was invited, which involved some valuable encounters with Scharoun's former assistants, including Friedrich Mebes, Merete Mattern and Alfred Schinz, with all of whom I remained in contact. There were lectures about Scharoun's obsession with marine imagery and its possible sources, and

about the colour scheme of the Lünen school and the artists who had been involved. I listened with interest and took notes, but when I tried to take part in the general discussions I became tongue-tied. You have to be pretty fluent to compete in a group.

What was I to do with my revised monograph? I knew that Phaidon would make a glossy book with lots of colour, which was all to the good, and I could add several significant buildings completed since the mid 1970s: Phaidon even commissioned new photographs by Dennis Gilbert to add to the ones I was now taking on medium format with a professional camera.⁷² Obviously I had to correct errors and naïve assumptions, and to add adjustments for advances in interpretation that had accrued over 20 years. I could not continue to ignore the famous sketches, and I needed to explain their role in relation to the built work. I also needed to make more of the white buildings of the late 1920s that I had underestimated, and to include more houses from the 1930s. What I was not allowed to do was greatly to extend the book, and nor did I wish to change its essential structure, so I rewrote it more or less sentence by sentence, needing to shorten somewhere else when extra material was added. So even given this second chance I was far from exhausting the subject, and I had no hope whatever of scraping the bottom of the barrel. It will be a long time even in Germany before the last word has been said about Scharoun.

The London Scharoun Exhibition

Intending initially to catch the centenary, Nasser Golzari and I applied for an Arts Council grant to mount a Scharoun Exhibition that was finally held in February 1995 at the RIBA in London, moving on to Edinburgh and Brighton.

We produced a catalogue with essays by Patrick Hodgkinson, Mathew Wells, Colin St John Wilson and myself, and we had a number of models made, mainly by students, which were the essential focus. We decided to concentrate on ten projects showing the history and diversity of the work, and the largest and most elaborate model of all was undertaken by Fifth Year students at Sheffield, where I was in my first year as professor. This was the competition entry for the National Theatre Mannheim of 1953, which had originally only been modelled at small scale in solid plaster to show site and context. But there was a complete set of drawings which were remarkably consistent, reflecting the fact that Scharoun's office had already been working for a year on the development of the winning Kassel theatre project, so had entered into the fine details of theatre requirements. So we built a large model at a scale of 1:50 of the whole building and another of the interior of the auditorium. As colleague Prue Chiles remarked at the time, the model seemed surprisingly contemporary alongside the so-called Deconstructivism of the mid 1990s, and the experience of building it brought home to us how well worked out it had been, and gave a lively sense of the spaces, for being able to walk around it and look into it relieved it from the constraint of static photography. One of the students engaged in this project was Andy Groarke now of Carmody Groarke, a rising practice that has won national competitions including the memorial for the 7th July bombings. He told me recently that building the model had been for him an essential educational experience, and that it had influenced the work of their practice.⁷³

From this point on, I came to regard the Mannheim theatre project as the summit of Scharoun's creativity, which is why I later chose it rather than the concert hall for inclusion in *Modern Architecture Through Case Studies of*

2002. It was more radical than the Philharmonie in two ways: first it showed to advantage the architect's contextual intentions, drawing on the changing geometry of the city, and second it exemplified his most extreme bid for asymmetry and aperspectivity. I had long been in contact with Häring's assistant Margot Aschenbrenner, who had contributed to the competition submission a supporting essay on the history of theatre, and so I was able to question her about it and to translate it.⁷⁴ I also discussed the contextual intentions with Alfred Schinz who had been an assistant at the time and had researched and drawn the city plan drawings as part of the submission. My new perspective on this work appeared in the AR in February 1995, precisely coinciding with our London exhibition.⁷⁵

The Hugo Häring Book and Exhibition

Revising the Scharoun book for Phaidon and mounting the exhibition, let alone other continuing journalistic and academic activities, had interrupted my continuing work on Hugo Häring. With him there were fewer realised buildings and they were less spectacular, so I never managed to persuade the editors at Phaidon to take the kind of highly illustrated monograph that we produced for Scharoun (and later Asplund). On the other hand, there was a lot of writing, and Häring had been important in the 1920s both in architectural politics and in theory. I had been able to see the entire drawn archive and to visit the known surviving buildings, and there was a wealth of printed essays to get to grips with. Scraping the bottom of the barrel therefore looked more possible, but the more I investigated the 1920s, Häring's thinking, and possible sources, the more strange and distant that period seemed to become. For years I was embroiled in a long correspondence with

Margot Aschenbrenner who had studied philosophy under Ernst Cassirer at Hamburg, and remained in her last two decades fascinated by her time with Häring. We made steady progress in our discussion, she writing in German and I in English, but it went on and on from revision to revision, and she just would not leave it alone. Finally I gave her her say in the postscript, which is wonderfully clear with no hint that she was already in her late nineties, dying at 99 in 1999, just after the book was published. My original contract with Cambridge University Press had been for a much smaller text with far fewer illustrations, and they would not allow expansion, so it was finally taken on by Axel Menges.⁷⁶ Menges made a neat job, but there was no colour except on the cover, there were no funds for material beyond what I could provide, and since my record of the drawings was 35mm slides, we had to use those, and many are too small and unevenly lit. The book had therefore less impact than the Scharoun, and its main virtue is to clarify the intellectual and political background as well as showing Häring's slower and more contemplative way of working. Struggling to translate seemingly endless essays by Häring did gradually improve my German, and wrestling with the more philosophical parts increased my awareness of the extent to which thought is conditioned by language. Since the eleven-years-old Häring was Scharoun's mentor, much of the book is related to Scharoun's career, but there is a specific chapter in which their sensibilities are compared.⁷⁷ I think now that a shorter and slighter book finished ten years earlier might have helped Häring's reputation more, but the long slog and detailed analysis of every essay and every project enriched my understanding of the whole field. There was also an exhibition: Nasser Golzari and I managed to gain another Arts Council grant and our Häring Exhibition opened at the RIBA in London in January 2001, moving on

to the provinces. It included a series of models made at Sheffield, pride of place being given to Garkau farm with all its unbuilt elements, a labour of love by Alan Williams and Rachel Hain.⁷⁸

Continuing work on Scharoun in the last decade

My arrival at Sheffield in 1994 soon led to meeting Jan Woudstra of the Landscape Department, and we began to collaborate towards the end of the decade on a series *Some Modernist Houses and their Gardens*, lavishly published in English by Die Gartenkunst. The first was about Erich Mendelsohn's house and its garden by Wiepking, but then we turned to Hermann Mattern, whose own house had been planned in the early 1930s by Scharoun,⁷⁹ and who had henceforth designed many gardens for Scharoun houses and collaborated with him on equal billing for the prize-winning Kassel Theatre Project of 1952. Mattern was the most important German landscape architect of his generation and an early advocate of ecological awareness. Reciprocally, Scharoun was acutely aware of landscape, and his concept of town-planning he called *Stadtlandschaft*, city-landscape. With all of his houses of the 1930s, and even those planned later, the garden and its relation with the house was always a top priority. Woudstra and I invited Merete Mattern, Hermann's architect daughter who had worked for Scharoun, to lecture in Sheffield, and we paid reciprocal visits to her. We initiated a Ph D on Mattern with Lars Hopstock which is still ongoing. Our series on modernist houses is continuing, with the eighth article just published devoted to Asplund's summer house.

In 2005 I was invited to visit Scharoun's newly restored Möller house of 1937 at Zermützelsee in Brandenburg, about an hour by train from Berlin. Visiting it before 1989 would have been difficult, but after reunification it had

been rediscovered and made into a foundation for Ferdinand Möller, the art dealer for whom it was originally built. I found it beautifully restored and appropriately furnished, though no plan of the Mattern garden had reemerged, so the planting remained in question. I was able to take good pictures, and was starting to speculate about whether the need to concentrate on domestic interiors had instigated Scharoun's shift of interest to interior space, a difficult matter since, experienced in reality, the spaces of the unrestrainedly modernist Schminke house are already moving towards the qualities of the later pseudo-vernacular houses. This led me to offer a paper at the Dorich House Conference in Kingston of 2006, and eventually to a chapter in the book that grew from that conference.⁸⁰ I also used my photographs of the Möller house in a lecture about architecture and photography at East London University which appeared in the book *Camera Constructs*,⁸¹ but I have yet to succeed in publishing those photos in colour.

A discussion of the inside-outside spatial relationships of the Schminke house had appeared as part of the article with Woudstra on Mattern's house cited earlier, but the arrival at Sheffield of a colleague who was an expert on Le Corbusier, Flora Samuel, prompted another look at it from the point of view of the architectural promenade, making a comparison with the Villa Savoye.⁸² That piece of work prompted me to think also about the tectonic fictions so happily indulged by Scharoun in that house, taking advantage of steel framing which was completely concealed. This allowed a new reading of his early modernist buildings in relation to what I called 'the hanging wall'.⁸³ One other curious and unexpected theoretical excursion resulted from my East-West studies with Ph D students at Sheffield, and my dawning understanding of traditional Chinese architecture. Among photocopies I had

made in the Häring Archive in 1982 were some minutes of a series of meetings held in 1941-2 about Chinese architecture, involving Hans Scharoun, Hugo Häring, Chen Kuan Lee and John Scott. Lee was a young architect from Shanghai who worked with Scharoun on the houses of the late 1930s along with Peter Pfankuch, and who later made a name for himself building houses and flats around Stuttgart. John Scott was a non-architect friend whose wife worked at Häring's art school. The revelation for us came from examining the now obscure books they were looking at, by Ernst Boerschmann and Rudolf Kelling, which were advanced for the time and showed a good understanding of spatial structure in Chinese architecture and its Daoist roots.⁸⁴ As a result of this study, Häring produced an essay on Chinese roof profiles and a detailed city plan for a proposed Chinese Werkbund, while Scharoun wrote a long paper on Chinese City Planning which later became the basis for his university lectures. They in turn inspired his student and assistant Alfred Schinz to undertake a Ph D in the history of Chinese town planning which was finally published by Axel Menges as *The Magic Square*.⁸⁵ My report on discovering these things was published in *arq*, along with my translation of the Häring essay.⁸⁶

Conclusion: knowledge and 'reading', dissemination and impact

Having outlined the chronology and content of the work, I can now attempt some answers to the questions posed at the beginning.

Why did it fall to me to 'discover' and publicise Scharoun's work in the English-speaking world, and why have I been allowed to maintain such a monopoly?

Architecture in the modern period has been disseminated largely through books and professional journals, which have tacitly if not explicitly defined the canon. It does not matter how good the work is if it remains unrepresented, and it needs to be disseminated at the right time to have an effect.⁸⁷ In retrospect, I came along at an advantageous moment just after Scharoun had died, while material on his work was being gathered. I was therefore in an advantageous position to disseminate it to an English-speaking audience, though my German was poor. Initially I struggled with the texts to glean the information to support the buildings, though now I read German as fast as English. I was seduced in the beginning mainly by the drawings, particularly plans, though sections were also important, and the buildings immediately made sense in direct experience, so perhaps I possessed a predisposing spatial sensibility. The naïve simplicity of an outsider view had some advantages, perhaps making it easier to construct a clear picture and to avoid the pitfalls of local political history. A visually biased approach concentrating on buildings and the ideas behind them was undoubtedly appreciated by designing architects, and the fact that the book was taken up by Joedicke and published in Germany shows that it had some use there, even if German scholars onto whose territory I had strayed loved to pick holes. The longevity of the book surely reflects an interpretation that was in essentials correct. It could be that it blocked possible others, but the opportunity left by the long gap between Gordon Fraser and Phaidon editions remained untaken. A reciprocal question is whether, if I had not undertaken the task, anyone else would have stepped forward, and if not, what would have been the loss to Scharoun's reputation.

What made Scharoun such a strong candidate to inspire me in my late 1960s British context?

I now think this resides in my experiences at the AA, which is why I have included them in such detail. British architecture was then excessively stiff and rectangular as well as being cramped by a pseudo-scientific approach that drew a hard line between objective and subjective. The then burgeoning stars of today, like Foster and Hopkins began at the Miesian end of the Mies/Häring axis, and the universal building, so strongly presaged in the work of Cedric Price and Archigram, was epitomised by Centre Pompidou. That competition was won by AA-linked people during my time at the AA, and it remains the monumental example of everything Scharoun and Häring stood against: building as technical apparatus responding neither to content nor to context. I found myself fighting against the idea of the system and the systematic, as well as the single-themed or homotopic, so breaks, exceptions, heterotopias were the fresh air. By contrast I became interested in the irregular, in accumulated layers, in freehand, in the wrinkles of the ground, in place, in history, in participation, in spaces with which one could identify and where one could comfortably dwell. Peter Cook was right to identify 'the search for a non-style',⁸⁸ for the Häringian viewpoint sees style if at all as result, not as premise.

What made Scharoun the key representative for the construction of an 'alternative modernism' and how alternative is it really?

I have learned over the years that movements and isms are generally invented by art historians after the event, like Hitchcock and Johnson's 'International Style', and Bernard Tschumi told me in 1989 a propos Deconstructivism that 'there never was a movement, we are all guilty to participate'.⁸⁹ So-called movements are not necessarily related to the intentions of those corralled within such categories, but are instead mainly a convenient way of simplifying and giving shape to history.⁹⁰ I started with Zevi's Organic Architecture as an inspiration, which made credible links with the Arts and Crafts movement and also had roots in the ideas of Behrendt and even Adolf Behne.⁹¹ As early as 1923, Behne had set Mies and Gropius's Rationalism against the Functionalism of Scharoun, Häring and Rading. But seeing the things gathered together today under the label 'organic' I have lost my enthusiasm for it. In *Modern Architecture Through Case Studies* I tried to identify many different architectures, to discriminate between them, and to show the virtues of a thicker description. If there is one general idea that has survived this revision, it is the polarity between Mies and Häring: the ideal of an autonomous monumental architecture set in contrast with a messy engaged one that takes its identity from the circumstances.

How has Scharoun's work served as a more general education in architectural thinking - at least for me?

I have described my struggle to get away from prescriptive design based on rigid rules. I now see that the problem of the empty grid relates equally to modern universal ceiling systems and Durand's universal building types: in both it is the abstract generalisation and lack of specificity that produced such

emptiness. From Scharoun I learned first a freedom of design, in which departure from the right angle recovered the choice of direction, both literally and metaphorically, and second the significance of articulating content to make recognisable territories. Not far beyond lay response to site, neighbours, and terrain. These issues have remained central for me as designer, critic, and historian, and I have pursued them into other buildings and places. Nurtured on Scharoun, I found I could look at Aalto in more or less the same way, and that his irregularities and articulations, still weakly dismissed as 'personal' by some old British critics,⁹² made the same kind of sense. When in the late 1980s I came to study Asplund seriously, I found my Scharoun-trained approach equally applicable, and that his escape from Classicism as taught in his youth was not so different from those of Scharoun, Häring or Aalto, who rejected the same academic conventions.⁹³ The tell-tale shifts of angle in the plans of Asplund's teacher Ragnar Östberg show a taste for irregularity already present in the previous generation and related to their interest in the vernacular.⁹⁴ The sensitivity to site that became so highly developed in Asplund's work was also learned from them. Recently I had the chance to analyse closely Aalto's own house of 1936 and to compare his approach with contemporaneous works by Asplund, Scharoun and Häring.⁹⁵ There were many similarities, not only in the functional planning and flowing spaces, but also in the open-minded way that the appearance of the building was discovered and adjusted during the design process rather than being imposed as a preconception.

My Scharoun-trained approach further served in the description and analysis of the work of several younger architects whom I took as following in his footsteps. Günter Behnisch had in the early 1960s been a leader of

prefabrication in Germany, collaborating with the concrete firm Rostan to produce an efficient system for schools, but he soon discovered that it impoverished the architecture too much and declared it a blind alley. He and his firm then reacted against such systems, declaring them inhuman, and found virtue in imperfection and improvisation. For the Munich Olympics they produced a landscape-based proposal with a tent roof, and increasingly adopted the kind of multiple angularity pioneered by Scharoun. Although Behnisch never admitted to direct imitation, certainly for his generation Scharoun represented a pole of the debate at the opposite to Miesians like Egon Eiermann,⁹⁶ and he acknowledged the debt in a lecture we invited him to give in connection with the Scharoun exhibition.⁹⁷ I wrote a short monograph on Behnisch after covering specific works in numerous articles in AR.⁹⁸ It was the AR too that got me involved at Graz, Austria, for a special issue in 1988.⁹⁹ Peter Davey had recognised the Scharoun-like irregularity as a reason for sending me, and architects like Domenig, Huth, and Szyszkowitz-Kowalski were reacting against the systematic just as Behnisch had done. I also found that one of the best Graz architects, Volker Giencke, was a great Scharoun fan and had actually started with my book: he told me he was caught up immediately with the description of the Baensch House in the first chapter. His Benedeck house was a kind of homage to Scharoun.¹⁰⁰ Other notable architects for whom Scharoun was a formative influence turned out to be well acquainted with my book. These included Peter Wilson of Bolles+Wilson, whose work I have followed and documented, and Enric Miralles, who invited me to Germany more than once to lecture his Frankfurt students on Scharoun. Zvi Hecker wrote to me out of the blue praising my writing and invited me to see his work in Berlin. Rem Koolhaas admitted

being familiar with my book when I met him to prepare a critique of the Netherlands Dance Theatre for Bouwvelt.¹⁰¹ More recently Daniel Libeskind declared 'I have all your books' and was generous enough to say that books might be more influential than buildings.¹⁰²

Häring's architectural ideal, fully endorsed by Scharoun, was that the building should be allowed to grow out of the local conditions: the place and the needs of the inhabitants. Commitment to this idea led me to explore what people had done when they built for themselves, so to look at the vernacular, and at anthropologist's accounts of how buildings were used and what they meant. This is a long story for another occasion,¹⁰³ but I now think the 'crisis in architecture'¹⁰⁴ we have suffered over the last half century has arisen largely because people have been expropriated from producing their own environments by an overwhelming technical and bureaucratic system. I believe that

Scharoun appreciated something that had been present in the vernacular and had been ousted by the academic tradition, about the nature of dwelling and place as opposed to the architectural object, and that he did his best to reinterpret that for the modern age. From start to finish of my engagement with his work, an essential aspect was the articulation of social content, in which he was the leading modernist master. Invited in September 2012 to a conference about Scharoun's school in Marl, I found myself being publicly congratulated that my letters to the mayor of six years earlier had turned the tide from demolition to conservation – apparently it needed an international outsider – that a new and appropriate role for it as regional music school had been found, and that a faithful restoration was under way. I wrote an article for AR about the school's fate, but also about the continuing relevance of the

idea that the territories within buildings should be differentiated in accordance with their uses and meanings. I dared call the design for Marl 'the classic plan for an aggregated school' and I am convinced that the spatial ordering developed by Scharoun has a continuing relevance.¹⁰⁵ He understood the importance of identification with rooms and spaces, their value in terms of memory and habituation, in fact their ritual importance. Most vernacular architecture had possessed this, but modern methods of planning and building intervened to deny it. At a time when most architects pursued function in the lowest most utilitarian sense, and allowed building form to be dominated by technical imperatives, he kept a sense for this kind of spatial meaning alive.

Peter Blundell Jones, 1 December 2012

¹ The Round House Stoke Canon, Dove Cottage Oakington, and Padley Mill Grindleford, published respectively in AR December 1978, pp 37-38, AJ 2nd November 1983, pp. 49-55, and AR July 2001, pp. 61-63. The Round House is mentioned by Bridget Cherry in the revised Pevsner Devon volume of 1989. Recent enquiries by Simon Bradley about Dove Cottage suggest that it will be mentioned in the next Cambridge volume.

² The Journal of Architecture vol. 17, no. 2, April 2012, pp. 191-212, *History on the margin: unravelling the changing fortunes of a Devon house and its relation to the locality.*

³ R Lyon Wilson, P Blundell Jones and J.E. Rae, publs. *William Lyons-Wilson 1892-1981*, catalogue for an exhibition of the artist's work at Blundell's School June / July 2004, essay entitled *Painter and Teacher* pp. 20-27.

⁴ Amedée Ozenfant, *Foundations of Modern Art*, first French edition 1928, English edition 1932, reprinted by Dover Books, New York 1952.

⁵ Elia Zenghelis was later founder partner of OMA with Rem Koolhaas and the first winner of the Annie Spink Prize for architectural teaching.

⁶ There is material on this in Steve Parnell's PhD dissertation *Architectural Design 1964-72* at the School of Architecture, University of Sheffield, 2012, which I supervised.

⁷ I wrote about the influence of Price in *Sixty-eight and after* pp. 127-140 in Peter Blundell Jones, Doina Petrescu, & Jeremy Till, eds. *Architecture and Participation*, Spon Press, London & New York, 2005.

⁸ The London housing estate point block: on 16th May 1968 a gas explosion blew out prefabricated panels and a corner collapsed like a house of cards, killing several people. This accident threw doubt both on system building and on the safety of high-rise more generally.

⁹ Charles Jencks and George Baird, *Meaning in Architecture*, G. Braziller, New York 1970.

¹⁰ Some of this is discussed in Andrew Higgott's book *Mediating Modernism*, Routledge, London, 2007.

¹¹ 'Scharoun, Scharoun, Hans Scharoun. This we heard daily from Peter Blundell Jones. The convenor, and the spokesman for a gaggle of students who recreated the mood of Expressionist Germany..' See Peter Cook's essay *The Electric Decade: An Atmosphere at the AA School 1963-73* in James Gowan A

Continuing Experiment: learning and teaching at the Architectural Association,
Architectural Press, London, 1975, pp. 137-146.

¹² We first saw the Mémé through Dennis Sharp's publication *The Soft Zone* in *Architectural Association Quarterly* vol. 7, no. 4, 1975.

¹³ Peter Blundell Jones *Archigram at Nash House*, *AJ* 17/1/1973, pp. 273-75.

¹⁴ There was a report, unpublished, and a chapter *Martel and Tulle*, in Sherban Cantacuzino, *Architectural conservation in Britain and Europe*, Architectural Press, London, 1975.

¹⁵ Brandon-Jones was the surviving representative of the Voysey office and was living in a Philip Webb house.

¹⁶ Published in *Concrete Quarterly* no. 115, December 1979, p. 7.

¹⁷ The contract, surprisingly, is dated 15 November 1973 with delivery of the typescript on 1st January 1974 and an agreed length of only 35,000 words. I deduce from this that I must have been well on with it by that time, that they let me overrun the deadline, and that they were ready to make a larger book. In those days a contract was more of a formality, a gentleman's oral agreement being regarded as binding, and I certainly had earlier meetings with James Fraser at which I discussed progress, illustrations, and so on.

¹⁸ It was intended to become a French version of the National Trust, but Mme Abravanel was erratic and unable to delegate, and I never saw proof that she had even properly read our material. Her retired husband had been the main agent in France for Singer sewing machines, and other Abravanel were involved in that company. I had no contact with her after 1976 and have found nothing on the web.

¹⁹ Winnetou and Ute became good friends and I visited them many times, finding them personally very likeable and generous, and enjoying his larger-than-life humour. His father had been a sculptor who suffered under the Nazis, but Winnetou was of a more technical bent typical of the post-war generation, and once remarked to me in irritation at my Scharounian interest: 'Konstruktion is alles'. He was responsible for the conversion of the Martin Gropius Bau in Berlin and was later in charge of reconstructing the ceiling of the Philharmonie, making him the enemy of Scharoun's partner Edgar Wisniewski, who believed that the construction changes were unnecessary and would damage the acoustics.

²⁰ Pfankuch, Peter, ed. *Hans Scharoun: Bauten, Entwürfe, Texte*, Akademie der Künste Berlin 1974, (revised edition with updated worklist 1993).

²¹ 215 items, as opposed to the 247+83 items in Achim Wendschuh's comprehensive list in the later edition of Pfankuch from 1993.

²² Posener's autobiography *Fast so alt wie die Jahrhundert* was published by Birkhäuser in 1993; my obituary AR April 1996, pp. 9-10.

²³ Comité International des Critiques d'Architecture, see <http://www.cicarchitecture.org>

²⁴ Lund Humphries, London, 1972.

²⁵ *Hans Scharoun: eine Monographie* published by Karl Krämer Verlag, Stuttgart, 1980.

²⁶ Peter Blundell Jones *Modern Architecture through Case Studies*, Architectural Press, Oxford, 2002, see first chapter.

²⁷ Behrendt was a friend of Hugo Häring and client for a house project. He published *Modern Building* in 1938 after fleeing from the Nazis to the United States.

²⁸ Award 'Best periodical of the last three years' July 1987, and also elected as a member of CICA (see note 23).

²⁹ *Scharoun*, AR February 1973, pp. 98-102: 'a less gifted man might have lost his way in the maze of Häring's absurd reasoning' p.100.

³⁰ Peter Blundell Jones *The path to Lewisham*, Segal special issue, AJ 4th May 1988, pp. 42-54.

³¹ Peter Blundell Jones *Student self-build in Stuttgart* AJ 27/7/1983, pp. 32-50: Peter Blundell Jones *Peter Hübner: building as a social process*, monograph, Axel Menges, Stuttgart, July, 2007.

³² Posener in his *Vorwort* to the German edition: Peter Blundell Jones *Hans Scharoun eine monographie*, Karl Krämer Verlag, Stuttgart, 1980, p. 5.

³³ Review in the Times Literary Supplement, 1978-9.

³⁴ Wolfgang Pehnt, *Expressionist Architecture*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1973.

³⁵ It was published in Italy in 1945 as *Verso un'architettura organica*, following 12 years of silence from Modernists within Nazi Germany; English edition Faber & Faber, London, 1949.

³⁶ AAQ vol. 10, no. 1, 1978, pp. 10-20.

³⁷ Peter Blundell Jones *Scharoun, late works*, AR March 1975, pp. 140-154, article on Wolfsburg theatre, Marl school, and Berlin housing block. Endorsed in leader by Lance Wright.

-
- ³⁸ Peter Blundell Jones *Ship shape Scharoun*, AR March 1976, pp. 154-161; Peter Blundell Jones *Scharoun's Staatsbibliothek*, AR June 1979, pp. 330-341.
- ³⁹ AR December 1978, pp. 384/5; *Building Design* October 14th 1977, and *House and Garden* June 1979, pp. 104/5.
- ⁴⁰ AJ review by Peter Davey, 27 September 1978.
- ⁴¹ Colin St John Wilson, *Light on Scharoun* AR 1979, no. 986, pp. 194-197.
- ⁴² Colin St John Wilson, *The Other Tradition: The Uncompleted Project*, Academy Editions London 1995; in 2009 I wrote a long preface for a Chinese edition that has not yet appeared.
- ⁴³ Joseph Rykwert *The Idea of a Town*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 1976.
- ⁴⁴ *Village vernacular*, AJ 2nd November 1983, pp. 49-55.
- ⁴⁵ AR April 1982, pp. 40-47, *Hugo Häring*, long centenary article with hitherto unpublished material. Cited by Bruno Zevi in editorial of *L'Architettura*, August/September 1982.
- ⁴⁶ Manfred Speidel, *Bruno Taut: Natur und Fantasie*, Ernst & Sohn, Berlin, 1995.
- ⁴⁷ Peter Blundell Jones *Scharoun und Häring aus englischer Sicht*, in *Hugo Häring in seiner Zeit: Bauen in unserer Zeit*, 1983, pp.19-35, edited by Christa Otto and published by the municipality of Biberach recording the Häring centenary symposium, 1982.
- ⁴⁸ Peter Blundell Jones, *Hugo Häring: the Organic versus the Geometric* published by Edition Axel Menges, Fellbach, Germany, March 1999, postscript by Margot Aschenbrenner on pp. 195-197.
- ⁴⁹ Peter Blundell Jones, AR December 1983, pp. 59-67, *Hans Scharoun's private houses*, an examination of houses built during the Nazi time including much hitherto unpublished material.

⁵⁰ Franco Borsi and Giovanni Klaus König, *Architettura dell'espressionismo*, Vitali and Guinada, Genoa, 1967.

⁵¹ We remained good friends until his death, and I visited him every time I was in Berlin. I even persuaded him to come to London to give a lecture at the South Bank.

⁵² Peter Blundell Jones, *Red House*, AJ 15/1/86, pp. 36-56; detailed analysis of Philip Webb's house for William Morris, in *Masters of Building* series.

⁵³ Peter Blundell Jones, *Lethaby pieces: All Saints Brockhampton*, AJ 15th August 1990, pp. 24-43; *Melsetter House*, AJ 10th October 1990, pp. 36-57; Asplund pieces *Gothenburg Law Courts Part 1& 2*, AJ 14th October 1987, pp. 32-49 and AJ 11th November 1987, pp. 32-50. *House at Stennäs*, AJ 20th January 1988, pp. 34-50; Fischer piece: *Theodor Fischer*, AJ 12th April 1989, pp. 38-55; all in *Masters of building* series.

⁵⁴ AR June 1985, special issue on Organic Architecture guest-edited by Peter Blundell Jones; leader *Organic response* pp. 23-24, *Implicit meanings*, pp. 34-39, *Unknown Häring*, pp. 40-45 (descriptions of von Prittwitz house and 1943 farm project), *Fehling & Gogel*, p. 58, (a short general note with illustrations of major works), *Keller and context* pp. 67-75, *Social process*, pp. 76-81.

⁵⁵ Peter Blundell Jones *Spazio, funzione e significato* Spazio e società no. 36, December 1986, pp. 40-61, bilingual English and Italian, republished as *Where do we stand?* A + U, March 1987, pp. 14-30, full length version with original slides.

⁵⁶ Peter Blundell Jones *Hugo Häring and the search for a responsive architecture*, A.A. Files no.13, Autumn 1986, pp. 30-43.

⁵⁷ Peter Blundell Jones *In search of authenticity*, A.J. 30th October 1991, pp. 26-30 (part 1) AJ 6th November 1991, pp. 32-36. (part 2) A.J. 4th December 1991, pp. 22-25 (part 3) and A.J. 8&15th January 1992, pp. 29-32 (part 4).

⁵⁸ Clare Graham, *Ordering Law*, Ashgate, London, 2003.

⁵⁹ Peter Blundell Jones, *From the neo-classical axis to a perspective space*, AR March 1988, pp. 19-27, lead article in special issue *Organic: a living tradition* on which also consultant editor.

⁶⁰ Chapter *Departure from the right angle and critique of Behnisch Hysolar* Institute reprinted in *The recovery of the Modern*, a book about the recent history of The Architectural Review edited by Michael Spens, Architectural Press, Oxford 1996, pp.174-189.

⁶¹ Peter Blundell Jones *Hans Scharoun and the Berlin Philharmonie: the discovery of a perspective space*, Spazio e societa. Jan/March 1989, no. 45, pp. 6-23.

⁶² Peter Blundell Jones *Romeo and Juliet in middle age*, AR October 1990, pp. 90-95.

⁶³ Peter Blundell Jones *The Scharoun house at the Weissenhof Exhibition 1927*, catalogue essay in *Hans Scharoun: Bauten und Projekte*, for exhibition at Architektur-galerie am Weissenhof, 6th November 1991 to 12th January 1992 (bilingual text, fully illustrated). Peter Blundell Jones, *Scharoun at Weissenhof*, AR September 1993, pp. 78-84.

⁶⁴ Peter Blundell Jones, *Modern Architecture Through Case Studies*, Architectural Press, Oxford, 2002.

⁶⁵ Janofske was author of *Architektur-Räume: Idee und Gestalt bei Hans Scharoun*, Vieweg, Braunschweig, 1984: Bürkle of *Hans Scharoun* published by Artemis in 1993. Janofske had pursued a PhD and was in correspondence with me.

Bürkle, whom I met in 1993, confessed that he had taken my book as his starting point. Klaus Kürvers, assistant to Johann Friedrich Geist and author of a Ph D with him on Scharoun's Schminke Haus, said of my book at the centenary meeting: 'das war ein wichtiger Schritt' – it was an important step forward.

⁶⁶ Johann Friedrich Geist and Klaus Kürvers, *Das Berliner Mietshaus 1945-1989*, (vol. 3) Prestel, Munich, 1989.

⁶⁷ Johann Friedrich Geist, Klaus Kürvers and Dieter Rausch, *Hans Scharoun, Chronik zu Leben + Werk*, Akademie der Künste, Berlin, 1993.

⁶⁸ Achim Wenschuh, ed. *Hans Scharoun: Zeichnungen, Aquarelle, Texte*, Akademie der Künste, Berlin, 1993.

⁶⁹ Andreas Tönnemann in Hoh-Slodczyk, Huse, Kühne and Tönnemann *Hans Scharoun Architekt in Deutschland 1893-1972*, C.H. Beck, Munich, 1992.

⁷⁰ Jörg Kirschenmann and Eberhard Syring *Hans Scharoun: Die Forderung des Unvollendeten*, DVA Stuttgart 1993. I wrote a review of this and other new books on Scharoun as *Scharounfest*, AR May 1994, pp. 96-97.

⁷¹ Jörg Kirschenmann and Eberhard Syring *Hans Scharoun: Outsider of Modernism*, Taschen, Cologne, 2004.

⁷² After my 35mm slides had appeared even on the cover of AR, I decided to move to a larger format, and in 1988 bought a Sinar monorail camera with 65mm Schneider lens which could be used for 5x4 inch transparencies or reduced to 6x9 cm on rollfilm for less wide shots. Results were excellent, but it was big and heavy. Around 1993 I moved to a medium format Corfield Architect taking 6x7 cm shots on rollfilm with a 47mm Schneider lens.

⁷³ Conversation with Groarke in Sheffield when he visited for a student review, March 2013.

⁷⁴ There are letters in my personal files: she also sent me copies of original typescripts.

⁷⁵ Peter Blundell Jones *Irrational theatre*, AR February 1995 , pp. 68-73.

⁷⁶ Peter Blundell Jones *Hugo Häring: the Organic versus the Geometric* Edition Axel Menges, Stuttgart, Germany, 1999.

⁷⁷ Ibid, pp. 191-194.

⁷⁸ Peter Blundell Jones *Hugo Häring and the Secret of Form*, 48 page illustrated catalogue for the Häring Exhibition at the RIBA, January-March 2001, published in association with A3 Times and printed by University of Sheffield Printing Resources Unit.

⁷⁹ Peter Blundell Jones and Jan Woudstra, *Some Modernist Houses and their Gardens Part 2, The House of the North and the Pleasure Pavilion*, Die Gartenkunst vol.1, 2002, pp. 123-134.

⁸⁰ Peter Blundell Jones *Hans Scharoun and the Interior*, in Penny Sparke, Anne Massey, Trevor Keeble, and Brenda Martin, eds. *Designing the Modern Interior: From the Victorians to Today*, Berg publishers, Oxford and New York, 2009, Chapter 9 pp. 159-169.

⁸¹ Peter Blundell Jones *The Photo-dependent, the Photogenic and the Unphotographable: How our Understanding of the Modern Movement has been Conditioned by Photography* in Andrew Higgott and Timothy Wray, eds. *Camera Constructs: Photography, Architecture and the Modern City*, Ashgate, Farnham, 2012: Chapter 3 pp. 47-60.

⁸² Flora Samuel and Peter Blundell Jones. *The making of architectural promenade: Villa Savoye and Schminke House*, arq vol. 16, 2012, pp. 108-124.

⁸³ Peter Blundell Jones *Modernist Abstraction: Hans Scharoun and the Hanging Wall*, Block issue no. 2, July 2011, pp. 14-17.

⁸⁴ My helper in this was Hyon-Sob Kim, Korean Ph D student who helped gain an AHRC grant and stayed on as Research Assistant.

⁸⁵ Alfred Schinz, *The Magic Square: Cities in Ancient China*, Edition Axel Menges, Stuttgart, 1996.

⁸⁶ Peter Blundell Jones *The Lure of the Orient: Scharoun and Häring's East-West Connections*, arq vol. 12, no.1, pp. 29-42.

⁸⁷ Comparing the reputation of Asplund with that of Aalto, for example, Siegfried Giedion took the latter into his Pantheon while apparently not registering the significance of the former, so now books on Aalto greatly exceed those on Asplund, but it was Asplund who opened the Modernist revolution in Scandinavia. To take another example, the Austrian Modernist Josef Frank who built relatively little has been left even more in the margin, while the leading role of Czech modernists in the 1930s, unsung because of later totalitarian régimes, never exerted an influence it might have had and now never will have. On the influence of the journals, see Stephen Parnell's Sheffield PhD thesis on the history of the magazine *Architectural Design*, which I supervised, see note 4.

⁸⁸ 'The search for a non-style was with us for the first time in fifteen years...' Peter Cook's essay *The Electric Decade: An Atmosphere at the AA School 1963-73* in James Gowan *A Continuing Experiment: learning and teaching at the Architectural Association*, Architectural Press, London, 1975, p.146.

⁸⁹ Taped interview with Tschumi in Paris in preparation for the write-up of La Villette for AR.

⁹⁰ I published my own critique of the International Style in the opening chapters of *Modern Architecture Through Case Studies*, Architectural Press, Oxford, 2002.

⁹¹ Adolf Behne *Der Moderne Zweckbau*, Drei Masken Verlag, Vienna / Berlin. Reprint: *Der moderne Zweckbau*. Ullstein Bauwelt Fundamente, Frankfurt am Main / Berlin, 1964; and Gebr. Mann Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

Translated as *Modern Functional Building*, ed. & intro. Rosemarie H. Bletter. Getty, Oxford UP, Santa Monica, 1996.

⁹² Robert Maxwell *Explaining an enigma* in AR September 2012, pp.98-9, book review.

⁹³ See *From the neoclassical axis to a perspective space*, as note 58 above.

⁹⁴ Peter Blundell Jones *Gunnar Asplund*, Phaidon, London, 2006.

⁹⁵ Article submitted to the Aalto Foundation 2011, another version in collaboration with Jan Woudstra accepted by *Die Gartenkunst* and forthcoming.

⁹⁶ Wolfgang Pehnt in his preface to *German Architecture 1960-1970*, Architectural Press, London, 1970.

⁹⁷ Günter Behnisch *The influence of Hans Scharoun*, arq, winter 1995, pp. 42-49, lecture in connection with the Scharoun Exhibition.

⁹⁸ Peter Blundell Jones *Günter Behnisch*, Birkhäuser Studio Paperback series, Berlin, April 2000.

⁹⁹ The Graz special issue appeared in AR December 1988.

¹⁰⁰ Giencke's Benedeck house was presented in AR December 1988, pp. 86-88.

¹⁰¹ Bauwelt. 6/1/89, p40-48. *Von der gefährlichen Schönheit und der surrealistischen Schönheit*, criticism of Netherlands Dance Theatre by Rem Koolhaas and O.M.A.

¹⁰² We met in Bucharest, May 2013, at the second SOCAD conference where I was a keynote speaker and he was awarded an honorary doctorate.

¹⁰³ Work is in progress on a book provisionally entitled *Architecture and Ritual*.

¹⁰⁴ Title of a special issue of the RIBA Journal by Malcolm Mc Ewan 1974.

¹⁰⁵ Peter Blundell Jones *Learning from Scharoun*, AR November 2012, pp. 67-77, revisit to the school at Marl of 1960-68 by Hans Scharoun after the successful campaign to save it.