INHABITING THE DOODLE
Juan Coll-Barreu

A kid, faster than the camera's shutter, looks at the photographer while waling home with his mother, followed by his pet. The photographer was Julius Shulman, the picture was always dated in 1950 and the house was Model 301 of L.A.'s Mutual Housing Association built by A. Quincy Jones, Whitney R. Smith and Edgardo Contini between 1948 and 1950.

The photograph has been widely published thanks to the popularity of the photographer and the beauty of the scene. He filled with permanence an architectural shot as he had done with Richard J. Neutra's Kaufmann house and would later do with Pierre Koenig's Case Study House #22.

On top of a natural hill somebody, with pioneer economy, had layed down a path, totally adapted to topography. The unmarked terrain of the west of the U.S. extends on both sides of it. The family group i s already close to their home, which occupies a large fragment of the picture. Against the backdrop of the hill, the house appears as a sharp doodle, without a defined shape nor accurate boundaries. The number of floors can not be made out, apparently between one and three. It is not easy either to figure out if it is a large or humble house. The photograph does not have a horizon and therefore it seems that the house overlooks an infinite landscape from the top of the hill. The viewer can easily imagine the plains by the shore in L.A. and behind them the ocean and infer from the shadows that the picture is taken from the south and therefore the group is returning home at subset. The plants in the foreground and the elevated point of view make the image more intriguing. The photographer, or viewer, are hidden, until spotted by the kid's glance. Shulman's shutter superimposed the dis figuration of the house, the virgin wildness of the place, the day-to-day domesticity of the characters and a strange suspense piercing the different planes of reality.

The image transported the moment to the Californian Olympus of 20th century architectural moments. It appears frequently in publications on Los Angeles's architecture. Shulman included it as full-page spread in his firs global monograph, prologued by Esther McCoy and published by Rizzoli in 1994. It has been included in all important studies on the photographer, and, naturally, is on the front page of the monograph on A. Quincy Jones, the most comprehensive written document on the architect, published for the first time by Cory Buckner in 2002. However, the circulation of the image has never been paired to the knowledge of the house. Its floor-plan was never published. Neither an elevation nor sketch, nor a single drawing or reference have been known of the famous house in the picture Not even the caption claiming the building to three authors has been able to be verified

The blueprints of the building that we can now see, have also waited for half a century in a diminished set of plans whose old lines have almost disappeared due to time and humidity. We have used modern computer tools and some working hours to turn dark stains into something similar to plan of black points on a white background. We published the basic graphic documents of the project and an enlargement of the floorplan, which reveal the geometric complexity of the house. The first conclusión is the absolute match between the blueprints and Shulman's picture, and the caption of the original picture with the name of the project and the legal authorship appearing in the drawings.

Another set of significant drawings goes together with this presentation. Original and until now unpublished: floor plans, elevations and drawings that, along with a written description made up the project's advertising brochure, in other words the image of the house the architects wanted to render to potential buyers.

We did not redraw the floor-plans. We let only the architects build their project without interfering in the definition of their architecture. We prefer the blurred dot map derived from the original intentions to an interpreted drafting. However we have drawn. Based on the construction documentation and aiming at studying the building more clearly, in the same way a doctor uses as a diagnosis a collection of images, we designed a virtual model of the house, and from then a physical model scale 1:100.

The discovery of the graphic documents allows us to use the architect's tools –critique, drawings and models– to come closer to the ideology produced by the chaotic architecture of that domestic test.

FINDING FACES
Daniel Naegele

Picasso's 1924 "Mandoline and Guitar" [fig. 1] depicts a wall-papered room with an open window. In front of the window is a table. On the table is a bowl of fruit and two musical instruments. The painting is the last in a series of paintings that Picasso began in 1919 with the gouache "Still-Life in Front of a Window at St. Raphaël". [fig. 2] Each painting in the series depicts the same room, and each is a modification of the painting done before it. That is to say, in this series, Picasso does not paint from 'real life'; he paints a painting of a painting. He re-presents representation.

The painting's title, "Mandoline and Guitar", identifies the two instruments as its subject. The title tells us what to see. The mandolin and guitar are obvious, seemingly irrefutable. Obvious, too, are fruit, bowl, table, room and window. But it is exactly this sense of certainty, of our knowing the subject definitely and absolutely, that Picasso undermines. For should we momentarily not read the painting's lines and planes and colored patterns as guitar, mandolin, fruit, and table; should we instead suspend our biases and abstract the content of this large colorful canvas, an enormous yet surprisingly precise head appears –a head not hidden, but at the same time not readily perceived. [fig. 3]

The apparition offers a lesson in representation. Yet something else is conveyed as well. There is about the painting a sense of the uncanny. It is duplicitous and secretly inhabited; its cult value is accessed only by momentarily suspending its exhibition value. With this duplicitous imaging, Picasso suggests that there exist 'other worlds' not recognized by us –though situated exactly within those worlds that we do recognize. Special receivers are necessary to know them. Called to mind are the invisible presences of life in the 1920's: radio waves, X-rays, and infrared light –spectrums of otherness, already sent, waiting to be received. Our visible world is inhabited, yet we 'see' only a small fraction of that which inhabits it, that with which we share space.

"Mandoline et guitare" was one –perhaps the best– of several still lifes completed by Picasso in 1924-25 that assume in overall composition the appearance of a comic head inhabiting clearly defined space. Others were featured without titles when published in "Hommage à Picasso" in *Documents 3*, 1930 [fig.'s 4, 5, 6]. Their 'physiognomic declarations' –that is, their 'face-likeness'– went undetected by all writers, this despite the Surrealist persuasion of the journal and a review by the renowned critic, Carl Einstein, in which he described Picasso as "the strongest argument against the mechanical normalization of experiences".

Later, in a book titled *Picasso: His Life and Work*, in a section devoted to "The Great Still-Lifes", the Surrealist painter Roland Penrose discussed "Mandoline and Guitar". Penrose noted that in 1924-25 "the still-life took new proportions in [Picasso's] hands", but said nothing of these paintings as physiognomic declarations. He did note, however, the image of a classical, plaster, "bearded head" in Picasso's 1925 oil, "The Studio, Juan-les-Pins" [fig. 7] –perhaps the plaster bust that served as model for the hidden face in "Mandoline et guitare".

Somewhat surprising, an insightful commentary on the possibility of apparitions in an age dominated by physics and science is found Amédée Ozenfant's highly influential *Art* of 1928. Ozenfant was a renowned painter, the editor of *L'Elan* in 1915-1916, the co-editor of *L'Esprit Nouveau* in 1920-1925 with Le Corbusier (and, initially, with Dada poet Paul Dermée), and Le Corbusier's partner in Purism from 1918 to 1927. A champion and master of ambiguous imagery, he underscored the important influence of contemporary science on Surrealists, who he supported in their "striving for entirely new ends". Ozenfant recognized in the Surrealists' "impulse towards lyricism" an objective "common to all great artists", one which manifests itself in many ways. "Materialistic minds affirm that [the Surrealist technique] is all rot", he wrote, "but others (myself among them), less convinced by the transcendental virtues of common sense, cannot help having a certain degree of feeling about the matter". He concluded that "simultaneously with categorical art, which imposes its imperious edicts upon us, another form of art can be conceived, passive, accommodating, rubbery, coffee-groundish: not like the other, molding us to its shape, but ready to take on ours. A web of art governed by ourselves, instead of governing us". But to this description of an art decidedly different than Purism, Ozenfant added a warning: "The danger is", he wrote, "that not every spectator is necessarily creative".

To be sure, 'not every spectator is necessarily creative;' and though "Mandoline and Guitar" is reproduced in numerous books, is on display at the Guggenheim Museum, and in 1992 was featured in the world-wide traveling exhibition "Picasso and Things", its most remarkable feature –its physiognomy– seems to have gone unnoticed. On the one hand, the painting's ambiguity is subtle; on the other, once discovered, its hidden face seems blatantly obvious, unavoidable. This quality –that which is always there and utterly evident, yet almost always goes unseen– gives the painting tremendous power.

There can be little doubt that Picasso consciously contrived to hide a face in this work. He was sensitive to such apparitions and were the face not intended it would not be in the painting. In her 1964 *Life With Picasso*, Françoises Gilot, Picasso's partner for many years, recounts a story Picasso once told her, a tale intended to illustrate his close working relationship with the Cubist painter Georges Braque. Gilot recalled Picasso having said:

I remember one evening I arrived at Braque's studio. He was working on a large oval still life with a package of tobacco, a pipe, and all the usual paraphernalia of Cubism. I looked at it, drew back and said, "My poor friend, this is dreadful. I see a squirrel in your canvas". Braque said, "That's not possible". I said, "Yes, I know, it's a paranoiac vision, but it so happens that I see a squirrel. That canvas is made to be a painting, not an optical illusion. Since people need to see something in it, you want them to see a package of tobacco, a pipe, and the other things you're putting in. But for God's sake get rid of that squirrel". Braque stepped back a few feet and looked carefully and sure enough, he too saw a squirrel, because that kind of paranoiac vision is extremely communicable. Day after day Braque fought that squirrel. He changed the structure, the light, the composition, but the squirrel always came back, because once it was in our minds it was almost impossible to get it out. However different the forms became, the squirrel somehow always managed to return. Finally, after eight or ten days, Braque was able to turn the trick and the canvas again became a package of tobacco, a pipe, a deck of cards, and above all a Cubist painting.

It should be noted that Picasso told this story to Gilot in the late Thirties, long after he had painted "Mandoline et guitare", at a time when 'paranoiac vision' was extremely popular with Surrealists and was often manifested in their consciously construing hidden faces in their work. Examples abound: the 'Rayographs' of Man Ray [fig. 8] as well as his 'bull's head torso' frontispiece for the 1937 *Minotaure* 7 [fig. 9]; the many physiognomic paintings of René Magritte [fig. 10]; the revival of Arcimboldo in *Minotaure* and at the Museum of Modern Art [fig. 11]; the 'metamorphosis' paintings of Paul Klee [fig. 12], Brassaï's photographs [fig. 13]; the many drawings of André Masson [fig. 14] and, of course, the far too obvious paintings of Salvador Dalí [fig. 15]. The subject was discussed regularly in Surrealist journals by Max Ernst, Georges Limbour, Georges Bataille, and Carl Einstein; and in 1931 Dalí wrote a concise, illustrated exposé on the topic, "COMMUNICATION: Visage paranoïaque". In this short article, and in reference to a photographic image reproduced in a popular press journal [fig. 16], Dalí recalled:

Following a period of study during which I had been obsessed by a long reflection on Picasso's faces, in particular those of his black period, I was looking for an address in a pile of papers when I was struck by the reproduction of a face I thought was by Picasso, an absolutely unknown one.

Suddenly the face disappeared and I realized my illusion (?). The analysis of this paranoid image allowed me to discover, with symbolic interpretation, all the ideas that had preceded the vision.

André Breton interpreted that face as belonging to Marquis de Sade, which corresponded to a very particular interest of Breton's in de Sade. In the hair of the face Breton saw a powdered wig, while I saw a fragment of unpainted canvas such as often occurs in Picasso's work.

Dali's essay included three images: the reproduced photographic image oriented horizontally, the same image oriented vertically to reveal a face, and the latter enhanced to convey its likeness to a Picasso portrait [fig. 17]. For him, this apparition served as a revelation of the inner psyche of the viewer. His description suggests a world created as much by the receiver as by the sender. Implicit in Dalí's exposé is the notion that representation, far from being unequivocal, is frequently duplicitous, conveying multiple meanings. Ultimately, the viewer's 'vision' determines what is seen.

"I do not seek, I find", proclaimed Picasso, who, according to Gilot, cultivated in his paintings "oscillations from nothing, to somethings, back to nothings". Much earlier, shortly after Picasso painted "Mandoline and Guitar", the famed critic Waldemar George described Picasso's oscillating images as a unique "mixture of mysticism and rationalism", concluding that Picasso "[…] should be recognized as the first artist who embodies the spirit of his times [because he] has satisfied the secret and invisible relationships that exist at the latent state between the phénomènes de la pensée et de la vie moderne […]".

Mysticism and rationalism: to have mixed these two seemingly antithetical notions in the mid-Twenties was, one suspects, an artist's natural inclination. At the time, psychology was a novelty as was Einstein's relativity. Novel, too, was the 'extra sensory perception' available with binoculars, telescopes, radios, automobiles and aerial vision, and made manifest in the images of X-rays and infrared photography. Often initiated as instruments of science and research, these media challenged the traditional beliefs that formed humanity's foundation for millennia.

A lesson in perception and in the nature of representation, "Mandoline et guitare" exudes a sense of the uncanny, of the slightly terrifying. It is secretly inhabited –accessed only by momentarily suspending painting's capacity for easy depiction. It insists that there exist other worlds not recognized by us but located exactly within worlds that we do recognize. In his purposeful creation of duplicity, by consciously construing visual ambiguity, Picasso insists relativity a possibility inherent in 'seeing' and at the same time imbues the work with a temporal dimension. For the content of Mandoline and guitare can be read as either musical instruments or face, but not both at once. Time is made manifest in the move from one reading to the other.

It should be noted, however, that though this 1924 painting presents a 'paranoiac vision,' and therefore belongs to the domain of Twenties' Surrealist thought, it is also a variation on Cubist themes and, as such, another way of accomplishing Cubist goals. "The eye quickly interests the mind in its errors", wrote Gleizes and Metzinger in *Du Cubisme* in 1912. "Certain forms should remain implicit", they insisted, a dozen years before Picasso painted "Mandoline et guitare", "so that the mind of the spectator may be the chosen place of their concrete birth. " And years later, when recalling the early days of "Cubism", Picasso himself noted, "We tried to get rid of trompe-l'oeil to find a trompe-l'esprit. We didn't any longer want to fool the eye; we wanted to fool the mind".

Visual ambiguity was fundamental to the Surrealist enterprise, encouraging the artist to understand all of life as comprised of multiple layers, but so what? In what way might this insistence on 'seeing' be relevant to life outside the museum? Perhaps the issue of making known this essence of 20th Century life was a concern for the artist only, never to be announced to the uninitiated.

"Il faut toujours dire ce que l'on voit", wrote the architect, Le Corbusier, as motto for several of his later books, "surtout il faut toujours, ce qui est plus difficile, voir ce que l'on voit". Yet, Le Corbusier was unique among those who built 'art' for public habitation. And here it is important to remember that Le Corbusier was not always Le Corbusier and he was not always an architect. In 1924, when Picasso painted Mandoline and guitare, Le Corbusier was regarded as Charles Eduoard Jeanneret and had only just begun to design buildings –very small, very minor– in the modern idiom. By reputation he was a Purist painter and, as noted above, co-editor with Amédée Ozenfant of the important and widely read journal *L'Esprit Nouveau*. Like Ozenfant, Jeanneret appreciated Surrealism; yet his critical appraisal of the movement was reserved. He understood Surrealism largely in terms of Purism, viewing it as a kind of symbolist variation of the philosophy of art that he and Amédée Ozenfant had defined in their paintings and writings beginning in 1918. He recognized in Surrealist work the "supremely elegant relationships of […] metaphors", and declared the effects of their art to be "very clearly dependent on the products of straightforward conscious effort, sustained and logical, cross-checked by the necessary mathematics and geometry, [...] the necessary exactitude for the functioning of mechanisms, etc". Surrealism, to Le Corbusier, was like Purism both in its subscription to rational strategy and in its attempt to exact from the observer a calculated response. Purism, however, dealt in primary and objective relationships, whereas Surrealism dealt in what Le Corbusier described as "emotive relationships" –relationships he believed, nevertheless, to be based "on objects [...] objects with a function". The poetics of Surrealism, he concluded, were rooted in "realism, this realism which is the magnificent fruit of the machine age [...]".

Following this declaration, from 1925 to 1933, Le Corbusier published books and built buildings for which he is justifiably renowned today. During these years, he was known as an architect –perhaps the most influential architect in Europe.

In 1933, at the onset of the Depression and with little to build, Le Corbusier continued to paint and to elaborate on art in writing. Both in painting and in writing, he revised his earlier positions. Though adamantly opposed to the decorative in 1925, in 1933, at the insistence of the client, he adorned the walls of his recently completed Pavillon Suisse with a photomural and in so doing elicited praise from André Breton. In the same year, having painted privately for nearly a decade, he re-introduced himself as an artist, showing his canvases at the John Becker Gallery in New York City. In 1935, he put both his atelier and his paintings on display –together with paintings and tapestries by Léger, Laurens, and Picasso, and with 'primitives' from the Louis Carré collection– in an exhibition staged in his Porte Molitor apartment. The following year, 1936, he acknowledged the painted mural, noting its capacity to "dynamite" walls and to "open all the doors to the depths of a dream, just there where actual depth did not exist". Later that year, he painted his first mural, 'translated' a painting into a tapestry, and wrote an article for the Surrealist journal *Minotaure*.

In 1937, Picasso's politically charged Guernica, a painting the size of a wall and centerpiece for José Luis Sert's Spanish Pavilion at the Paris Exposition Internationale, achieved immediate acclaim. Celebrated in contemporary art journals as both a formal and rhetorical masterpiece, Guernica instantly established a standard for the synthesis of the arts. For the same exposition, Le Corbusier designed his *Pavillion des Temps Nouveaux*, a pavilion of colored light containing spatially intriguing murals, both painted and photographic [fig. 18]. In each instance, the space of representation –that is, the space elaborated and conveyed mostly in paintings, but also in photographs– was enlarged to the wall. Art became architecture, and the space of this art 'contributed' to the new space –what Le Corbusier would later call 'l'espace indicible'– of architecture.

When enlarged to the size of architecture, art could bring to buildings not only a new spatial dimension but a 'temporal' dimension lacking in most Modern architecture. Surrealism, in particular, offered a key to that dimension, though Surrealist art seldom was successful when construed as architecture. By 1937, when Surrealism was at the height of its popularity and long after Purism's cessation, Le Corbusier understood the former as "a noble, elegant, artistic, funereal institution", contrasting it now with *Cubism* which he described as a "lucid gesture of constructive spirits seeking the conquest of new times". Surrealism, he said, appealed to the past, while Cubism had looked to the future. Surrealism was "a ceremony in memory of so many things that were [:] the evocation of ghosts, desubstantialization, dematerialization". And the Surrealists worked in "symbols, abbreviations, evocations [...]." They "are weeping over the dead", Le Corbusier declared with approval, exclaiming this to be "an excellent thing" then qualifying his enthusiasm by noting that Surrealism "is reaching its end. The new world is waiting for workers!"

This capacity of art to probe the subjective –in contrast to 'objectivity,' seemingly an essence of Modern architecture– was the primary theme of a major retrospective of Le Corbusier's art held in Zurich in 1938, an exhibition complemented by a book titled *Le Corbusier, Oeuvre Plastique*. The eighth and final issue in *L'Architecture Vivante* series devoted to the work of Le Corbusier and Pierre Jeanneret, Le Corbusier, *Oeuvre Plastique* is a forty-plate portfolio of works by Le Corbusier including twenty-nine paintings, four original color lithographs, and five images of his *Pavillon des Temps* Nouveaux. It features a forward by Jean Badovici and an introductory essay by Le Corbusier titled "Peinture". Without denying his earlier Purist convictions, in this short treatise Le Corbusier reveals a fascination with the literary and the symbolic; that is, with associational values deemed entirely secondary in "Le Purisme". The titles Le Corbusier gave to sections of this treatise –'Existence du "sujet", 'Révélation révélable,' 'Les mots,' 'Le rapport,' 'La poésie parole neuve imprévisible'– suggest writing as metaphor for plastic works.

Combined, the art of Oeuvre *Plastique* and the essay "Peinture" constitute a significantly revised theory of art from that to which Le Corbusier subscribed a decade earlier –a theory of art complemented after the War by a revised theory of architecture in "L'espace indicible" and *Le Poème de l'Angle Droit*. In "Peinture", Le Corbusier defined a work of art as a "[…] un jeu dont l'auteur a créé la règle", and noted that "la règle doit pouvoir apparaître à ceux qui cherchent à jouer". The game, Le Corbusier insisted, should be comprised of "signes d'une intelligence suffisante", not obscure or private

signs, but "objets expérimentés, révolus, usés, limés par l'habitude, susceptibles d'être reconnus à un simple schéma". He illustrated this section with a personal inventory of signs comprised of sketches of logs, of melded human bodies, of folded hands, of curious faces, and of the machined objets types of his Purist period: lanterns, plates, bottles, pitchers, pipes, and books both opened and closed [fig. 19].

In the key section of this treatise, "L'événement créateur", Le Corbusier expressed beliefs about creativity and about the nature of art, beliefs not unlike those expressed by Surrealists nearly two decades earlier. He described the creative spirit as "une pensée en effervescence permanente; un esprit scrutateur; un oil qui ne cesse de voir, de mesurer, d'enregistrer". No longer did he view painting as exclusively an "objectification of a 'world'". To be sure, a painting was a certifiable, measurable structure– "la construction de l'oeuvre avec tout ce que la plus rigoureuse science (riche, profuse, illimitée) peut apporter de concentration, de concision, d'épurement". Yet now, too, Le Corbusier understood painting as a lyrical event, a profoundly personal investigation, what he described as "une enquête illimitée dans le monde apparent et une appréciation constante des réactions de l'objectif sur le subjectif: transposition, transfert des évènements extérieurs dans l'intérieur de la conscience".

Thirteen of the paintings featured in *Le Corbusier, Oeuvre Plastique* are from 1935-1937, presumably manifestations of the beliefs expressed in "Peinture". Of these, the painting most relevant to Surrealism, to Picasso, and to the theme of hidden faces, is surely "Deux musiciennes au violon et à la guitare" from 1937 [fig. 20]. A re-working of Le Corbusier's "Trois musiciennes" of a year earlier [fig. 21], "Deux musiciennes" marks the culmination of a series of paintings portraying paired figures done by Le Corbusier over a period of four years. It plays dark against light, left against right, solid against void.

This pairing is not incidental in Le Corbusier's work. Compositional strategies of a similar sort were employed by Le Corbusier fifteen years earlier in the illustrative text of *Vers une architecture*. On typical opposing pages in that book, the image on the left page is directly related by composition and content to the image on the right. For example, in a photograph captioned "Hispano Suiza, 1911", a black-bodied car with white sidewall tires is shown being driven by a man with a black coat and white hat. A photograph on the facing page, "Bignan-Sport 1921", features a white-bodied car with black sidewall tires being driven by a man with a white coat and a black hat [fig. 22].

he images are the same size and exactly aligned; the cars face one another. While the "Suiza" image is definite and clear, the "Bignan-Sport" image is faded and patchy. One has the impression that the two are mechanically related, that by opening of this page, the reader has peeled the patchy image from the clear image. This relationship of opposing images persists in Vers une architecture, underscoring the photographic image as a figure 'grounded' in the space of a page –the page itself a figure grounded in the space of the book. The reader is made aware of the book as a construct, as "another architecture", to be experienced both visually and tactually in space and in time at the turn of the page.

One senses that Le Corbusier re-worked "Trois musiciennes" into "Deux musiciennes" imbuing the latter with expansive spatial and temporal dimensions similar to the illustrative text of *Vers une architecture*. He removed from Trois musiciennes the middle figure and replaced the Cubist backdrop on its left with seaside motifs. More importantly, however, he construed "Deux musiciennes" as a 'pages of an open book' composition: the shoulders of the figure on the right describing the book's upper edge and echoed on the left by a sinuous line. Relative to the figures, the book is gigantic. The juxtaposition of scales expands the apparent space of the painting.

The expansion continues when, as if in opening the book, another giant is released. Like Picasso's "Mandoline et guitare", "Deux musiciennes" is unmistakably physiognomic. Violin and guitar conjoin to become psychedelic eyewear hung on an appropriately sized bottle-nose which hovers in front of a two-legged, toothy-grin table. Thighs become jowls; the two small heads are raised eyebrows; and this enormous face –imply due to its size and willingness to rest on the picture's bottom edge– defines a new foreground and with face as foreground the apparent depth of the canvas again expands.

When found, the hidden face renders the work spatially expansive, evokes a sense of the marvelous, and imbues the painting with a significance that extends beyond that of an ordinary still life. "Evènements extérieurs" are transferred to "l'intérieur de la conscience". An "enquête illimitée dans le monde apparent" is initiated. An "apprécia-

tion constante des réactions de l'objectif sur le subjectif" is evident. A "pensée en effervescence permanente", a "siège de l'infini": "Deux musiciennes" is the plastic manifestation of convictions expressed by Le Corbusier in "Peinture".

That Le Corbusier would construe a hidden face to make manifest his convictions is hardly surprising. It was a conservative move, conservative not only because his revered Picasso had done it more boldly a dozen years earlier, or because it could be viewed as a variation on a Cubist theme and thus as a "lucid gesture of constructive spirits seeking the conquest of new times", but also because, like "Mandoline et guitare", it neither violated earlier established principles nor contradicted a firm belief in the 'machine civilization.' Rather, the apparition is benign, the product of "straightforward, conscious effort, sustained and logical structure". Its effect ordered and calculated. We have not created this face; it was left there for us to find. In the words of Ozenfant and Le Corbusier, we have been "placed in the state desired by the creator". Our thoughts have been predicted, our discovery prescribed. Yet in the act of discovery itself, one experiences the reading of a painting.

In painting "Deux musiciennes" and recording in "Peinture" the theory that motivated it, Le Corbusier cultivated a belief in the curious, the inexplicable, the 'ineffable.' He made manifest the subjective dimension of reality. During the war, as he himself noted, "stones and pieces of wood led [him] on involuntarily to draw beings who became a species of monster or god". After the war, beginning in 1946 with the publication of *L'espace indicible* and later in 1955 with *Le Poème de l'Angle Droit* and the completion of the chapel at Ronchamp, what once might have been deemed mere curiosity emerges as nothing less than a new theory of architecture. Without refuting the old theory –articulated most clearly in the verbal text of his 1923 *Vers une architecture*– Le Corbusier proposed a new one seemingly in contradiction of the old.

When in 1945 the bombing of Hiroshima placed humanity at the brink of extinction, high technology seemed a questionable ally for modern architecture. In the Twenties, this same technology was a manifestation of progress, of modernity, of the capacity of the Industrial Revolution to benefit all of mankind. The tremendous destruction of the war suggested that technology was an unstable platform for architectural theory. It preferred the objective and neglected the subjective. Le Corbusier's architecture –as articulated at Ronchamp, the creation of which brought accusations of treason from architects just beginning to be modern– was in sympathy with a worldview that held technology in suspicion. It strived to imbue building with life, and with a significance that transcended the time of the rise of mechanization. As the world began to re-build itself, an interest in biology replaced that in physics. Finding a face for architecture must have seemed a necessity to the aging architect, the most influential architect of the Western World. In 1929, Picasso painted "Monument, Woman's Head" [fig. 23]. That same year, Le Corbusier completed his first church design, the eglise Tremblay [fig. 24] remarkably similar in shape, proportion, and materiality to Picasso's painting, yet highly objective and without trace of anthropomorphic manifestation. After Surrealism, after the War, as art became the size of architecture and architecture was permitted to become art, with the building of the chapel of Ronchamp and the inescapable presence of its uncanny face-like east façade [fig. 25], Le Corbusier anticipated Picasso. Less than a decade later, Picasso enlarged his life-size "Femme aux bras écartés" of 1961 [fig. 26] to a six-meter-high concrete giant. In so doing, he began to populate the real world with colossals of a surreal size.

Beginning in the Sixties, artists usurped the domain of the 'natural world' in which architecture resides, continuing to probe art's significance to the subjective. With rare exception, architects turned elsewhere, to the objectivity of technology in a now global world of digitalization. Anthropomorphic additions to art and architecture in often hidden formation remain a reminder of a time when technology was viewed with suspicion, a time when the ubiquity and blatant obviousness of objectivity sought subtle contrast in the subjective.

THEORIES OF REPRESENTATION – STRATEGIES OF DESIGN
Laura Martínez de Guereñu

In the last issue of journal *G: Zeitschrfit für elementaren Gestaltung* (G: Material for elementary creation) the key proponents of architectural modernism in 1920s Germany published an image with the following caption: "two different perspectives/

one single object". Objects –buildings, works of art– were not only seen in one single way; getting different perspectives for a single object was then possible because, due to the technological advancements of modernism, new perceptive possibilities have emerged. Objects could no longer acquire meaning by themselves; they had to be experienced.

This image explained two notions of the pure form –the elemental and the constructive– as well as two scientific theories of representation –physiognomy and visual penetration through the X-ray. This image rendered the two essential components of matter: the structure and the enclosure, the constructive and the compositional, the perfectly objective and the spiritual. Two components of matter that were made explicit when objects were experienced tactily and visually; two opposed –but complementary– ways of seeing.

These two theories of representation were also strategies of design, means given to the architects who could rationalize the design process and limit the arbitrariness of their creative decisions. By means of these tools, architects could clearly define their field of action, exclude any decision that was not directly connected to the architectural project, and make explicit their creative ideas to the modern subject. Due to their abstract quality, these strategies of design had the ability to surpass the mere formal reading of the architectural work and established instead a tight link between society and the architectural project. Published in 1926, this image can explain today the two poles that have limited since then the field of action of the architectural project.

20 RUE JACOB. LE CORBUSIER, THE PHOTOGRAPHIES BY BRASSAÏ AND MS. BARNEY
Jorge Tárrago Mingo

For seventeen years, between 1917 and 1934, Le Corbusier lived with his wife Ivonne Gallis in a little rented apartment on the second floor of 20 rue Jacob, in Paris' St. Germain-des-Prés, on the Rive Gauche. Before that, for one year approximately, he had lived in the attic below the mansard of the same building. An environment, both of them, quite distant to that supposed for one of the instigators of change in domestic architecture and the modern dwelling. The building is quite unique, it posses a few secrets and is probable better known for being the residence of another one of its inhabitants, the Natalie Clifford Barney, and host her legendary literary receptions on Friday evenings, which gathered together a more than important part of the intelectual circles of Paris for over sixty years. Le Corbusier was never invited.

Its in the second floor's apartment where LC found the ideal space to develop his activities, think, write, paint, which called for intense emocional intimacy. The authorized biographer Jean Petit refers to these years' work as "silent and tenacious", with four or five hours every day dedicated to painting.

It must have been little before moving to the higher levels at Nungesser-et-Coli, when the Hungarian photographer Gyula Halász, better known as Brassaï, was invited for dinner at the apartment and probably around the same time when he took some of the better-known photographs of its interior.

As it must have happened to Brassaï, we become puzzled when we visit the apartment through the photographs. It looks as if the expected relationship between the way of thinking and the way of life –never neutral nor aseptic– would vanish. As if that what we expect, a certain unity between life and thought would be buried under the paradox. How is it possible that this is the apartment of the LC that does not only build, but spread a radical change in living habits? The LC that reclaims and subjugates others to "rigorous and formal architectures, so pure and simple as machines" while living here?

Searching for disciplinary or philosophical explanations might yield unexpected results. Even, probably, away from a reality that could be simple seen under the scope of a single concept: domesticity. Because is the everyday, the domestic after all, what we see in those pictures and rules over those modest rooms. It is not necessary to deepen into the master's texts of the time to confront them with the apartment and become puzzled and think, why not, about the inhabitant's schizophrenia. Unless we understand the apartment as a life-oriented place. Unless we link this stage to life and make the small places in life and domestic activities as a place of retreat and create a private space.

"LE CORBUSIER TRANSLATED. CREATIVE UNFAITHFULNESS IN THE CURUTCHET PROJECT"
Daniel Merro Johnston

"The other day, already at dawn, we have walked for a long time through the streets of La Plata". Amancio Williams first and then Simón Ungar received with the Curutchet house a statement in the shape of a preliminary sketch and built afterwards new textual warps with the received plot as if they were links in a chain of senses, assuming the inter textual condition of their interpretation, in other words, the construction of reality by crossbreeding different texts.

The most singular thing in this story is that maybe none of them were concious of being in the same team, participating in the building of a common story.

Amancio Williams, one of the most conceptually relevant Argentinian architects, became in charge of adjusting the project and managing its construction as suggested by Le Corbusier himself, from the beginning until the completion of the concrete structure. Later on, due to misunderstanding with Dr. Curutchet, Simón Ungar, another member of the local vanguard, conducted the construction works.

During that time, in the space of silence separating the potential music from the music in action, there where many uncertainties, and countless decision and action moments, where every translator had to choose one road or another with uneven consequences for the building. We have chosen three of them to illustrate this process of exchange of ideas, this collective refinement of the script that managed to gather different attitudes, diverse points of view that contributed to the architecture.

In a natural way, almost without knowing the process of the Curutchet project in the atelier at 35 Rue de Sévres, its prior moments nor its compositive actions, the verification and correction processes, it seemed that the translators-interpreters are integrated into the team in an efficient manner, becoming another designer, sometimes playing as the author in the genesis process and stressing what seems important.

In a retrospective point of view, understanding this project as a consequence of the author's previous experience and at the same time, looking forward considering the building as a transition towards future configurations. This might be the real essence of a true interpreter, a calm reader, intrigued in discovering the version that the original text holds, as if it was waiting for him.

WE ARE LATIN. SPANIARDS DRAWING IN NEW YORK, 1930
Carlos Montes Serrano

The Spanish architectural scene during the 1920s is not too remarkable. The isolation and cultural backwardness, far from promoting the search of innovative solutions of other European countries, continued to insist upon the idea sketched towards the end of the 19th century on the need to deepen in the essence of the Spanish spirit, aiming to produce a true nacional architecture.

Within that context, architects would rarely travel to foreign countries, at most the closest European countries and focusing mainly in historic buildings, but almost never to the United States. We should mention only two exceptions. During the early 20s Roberto Fernández Balbuena was granted a scholarship and stayed during two years in New York.

Modesto López Otero made a long trip through the U.S. during 1928 visiting different university campus in order to obtain plenty of information to design the great project of the Ciudad Universitaria of Madrid. Young architects Sánchez Arcas, Bergamín and Miguel de los Santos went along with him.

Its revealing to realize that due to this American experience, all these architects would develop a modern and renovating architecture, not quite not avant-garde though, during the years of the Republic (1931-1936).

It is thus very difficult to find travel sketches of Spanish architects in North America. The great exception being the drawings produced by architects Luis Moya Blanco and Joaquin Vaquero Palacios during their stay in New York in 1928 and 1930. Trips and drawings were are going to focus on in this essay.

THE COLISEUM'S ICONOGRAPHY
Juan Manuel Báez Mezquita

For centuries, the coliseum has been a mandatory reference for painters and architects, who have drawn it and painted it intensively, attracted by the various values it represents; depending on their training, every artist has searched for different aspects of the amphitheater.

Painters have been interested by its placement in the city, its image from different viewpoints, the beauty of the ruin, the contrast between architectural remains and the vegetation covering it. Architects have studied the architectural typology, the functionality, its orders and everything that could help to understand the building, relying on various ways of drawing; sometimes floor plans, elevations and section, or others, perspective views or non canonic systems, free, such as perspective sections or much elaborated drawings tending to portray the interior and exterior structure in a single image.

The graphic information is so varied and broad that, in itself, it conforms an independent body of work parallel to the building. We could assert that the building exists in its physical reality, but that there is another one with its own life and values that is found only in the visions and impressions that many people have had of it. Drawings might be classified in two large groups:

Temporal. Tied to a time and conservation status of the amphitheater, but where fragments of the city surrounding it also appear, generating documents that turn these images into historical proof, documenting the graphic live of the buildings.

Timeless. Focused on the permanent values of the building, its architectural reality, without reference to its conservation state or the urban surrounding. It's the building itself what is represented, studying its composition, structure, details, and the elements shaping it.

Both visions complement each other, demonstrating that the immutable values of architecture are the sum of the much subjectivity of the viewers.

PLANNING IN SHARP'S TOWN AND COUNTRYSIDE
Izaskun Aseguinolaza Braga

This article presents Thomas Sharp´s contribution, a glance to the past with the objective of rescuing valid ideas to face sustainable urban development. His contribution is known fundamentally for his protection of the role that urban form should play in planning. Nevertheless, the impact of his plans for historic cities, such as Oxford, Exeter and Durham, should not hide the interest and the ambition of his first approaches, very well reflected in his first publication, *Town and Countryside*. In this book Sharp´s proposal for facing planning goes beyond the scope that comes off his most known works.

In view of the way urban developments are ocupying the country, Sharp condems separate and scattered single cottages spread in the territory that are leading the disappearance of the contrast between the country and the city.

This author bets on the logic antithesis between this two elements. His objective is to preserve the natural character of the country and repair the urban character of cities in order to be able to live in them.

For that he identifies the necessity of recovering the role given to two practises that he considers forgotten in developments of post war period; landscape design and civic design. In Sharp´s opinion this two practises must be combined in Town Planning.

Landscape design makes it possible to set up appropriate relations between new elements that are going to be included in landscape and the surrounding in which those are placed. On the other hand, according to Sharp's approach, the function of civic design is the creation of different urban scenes that give the physical framework for the development of civic life.

This way, it is shown that the attention paid to the urban form of new settlements can not be reduced to visual or perceptible matters. Rather, the attention must be paid to a wider and more complex reality, the one of the "cultural" landscape that are streched along all the territory.

TOWARDS A POLYGRAPHY OF CONTEMPORARY ARCHITECTURE
Jorge Otero-Pailos

A CRISIS OF INTERPRETATION

As globalization has taken root in the past decade, the circumstances within which architects work have changed dramatically. But a correlative transformation of our interpretative tools for understanding Spanish contemporary architecture has not taken place. Take for instance the traditional historiographical categorization of architectural production through its identification with political units. The old question of which political unit is more appropriate (Spanish, Basque, Catalonian, etc.) appears less meaningful in light of the fact that political boundaries no longer coincide neatly with the territories that are brought into relation through the production of buildings (global financial markets, telecommunication systems, transportation infrastructure, and international social networks).

Other intellectual frameworks are also loosing relevance. Regionalist theories that defined Spanish architecture in terms of local craft and materials seem anachronistic in light of the real conditions of production. The construction industry employs mostly immigrant labor, and imports many materials at a lower cost than manufacturing them locally. Formalist or typological theories that sought to anchor contemporary production in the morphology of the traditional city and its historic buildings, are less useful in the sprawling urban peripheries and new towns where most construction takes place. The lack of convincing ways of interpreting architecture as "Spanish" and "contemporary" signals a decisive stage, a crisis, in architectural theory. The merits of any attempt to develop a new and more adequate interpretative framework for Spanish contemporary architecture will hinge on its ability to re-conceptualize current architectural production in relation to the present circumstances. Yet circumstances, as José Ortega y Gasset (1883-1955) famously noted in *Meditaciones del Quijote* (1914), are unstable, historically determined and changing in relation to the person living them. This apt reminder also called attention to the fact that, in order to re-orient oneself towards our present conditions, we must re-consider how we understand history. In other words, our capacity to grasp the present state of architecture is contingent upon our ability to fundamentally rethink architectural historiography. What follows modestly attempts to move in that direction by sketching the outlines of a new polygraphic historiography.

SELECTION VS. SELF-SELECTION

Let me to briefly remark on monographic historiography, the dominant mode of writing architectural history, before I return to sketch out what a polygraphic historiography could be. Monographic historiography has dealt with the question of contemporary architecture in either of two ways: by focusing on individuals or on self-identified groups. Of these two types of monographs the latter would typically have been used to write, for instance, the history of a symposium involving multiple participants. When symposium organizers have had monographic proceedings in mind, they have invited groups of architects that had already expressed some affiliation towards each other. The clearest cases of monographic organization are those in which the organizers themselves were also part of the group –think of the CIAM events, to cite just one famous example.

When writing the history of architecture, we must be careful not to unwittingly fall into the monographic trap towards which we are gently predisposed by the availability of records, already prepared an packaged monographically for us, by symposium organizers and self-selected groups of architects.

The fact that some architects, at one point in time, thought it advantageous to portray themselves as a group, does not necessarily mean that we must take them at their word, or that the monograph is the best way of capturing a chapter in the history of architectural ideas. Selection and self-selection are related social phenomena, but they are not the same thing, and it is important not to unwittingly conflate the two.

The conflation that I am arguing against is the kind perpetrated by historians who choose to limit their writing to self-selected groups of architects (e.g. the Parpalló Group in 1950s Valencia, or the Equipo 57 group in 1950s Cordoba). In such cases, the historiographical operation of selection follows the contours of the architects's self-selection. There are some benefits to a historiography that shadows self-selection. One advantage for the historian is the appearance that an objective self-evident

selection has been made. When applied to intellectual history, the historian describes an idea that was explicitly embraced by a group of architects, which shows that idea to have common currency. Over the course of the twentieth century, countless architectural groups have formed in Spain and elsewhere to uphold specific ideas. The GATEPAC of the 1930s famously sought to advance the technical and aesthetic principles of rationalist modern architecture in Spain. More recently, the Academia del Partal was founded in 1993 to promote the idea that restoration should be a central concern for contemporary architects.

The historiographical conflation of selection and self-selection clearly has its benefits, but it also has its downsides, especially with regards to intellectual history. A major drawback is that it must remain silent before ideas shared between non affiliated individuals, and cannot explain what gives intellectual coherence to the larger field of architecture. The monographic selection of self-selected groups skews the portrayal of the intellectual field in favor of the exceptional and the intentional. It also wrongly identifies the particular views of small groups with the entire field. Those ideas that might have been commonly debated among architects, yet for one reason or another were not explicitly espoused by a self-selected group, get relegated to a second plane. Thus, what is central to the field as a whole is rendered as peripheral, and loosely portrayed as context.

Once one enlarges the historiographical frame beyond self selected groups, the question becomes how to describe contemporary production without forcing a unity upon it that simply is not there. Many architects do not consider themselves to be part of a group. Even the most seemingly innocuous groupings, such as trying to fabricate a "collective" out of architects who developed their careers in Spain, or that have their practices all based in Spain, are anathema to the realities of contemporary practice. Many architects today have built their careers in and out of Spain, and have, at one time or another, been based in a different country.

National identity is a hotly debated topic, and it is not unusual to hear architects question the very notion of Spain as a political unit, and to propose smaller regional or larger continental units as a more fitting frames of interpretation. It is fair to say that there is little or no "working consensus", to use Erving Goffman's much criticized expression, among architects aimed towards understanding their production in collective terms. One would be hard pressed to find a tentative agreement by all architects on a system of interpretative predicates, and there is little evidence of a cooperative pursuit of collectivity as a shared objective. To attempt to portray contemporary architecture as the product of a group would be to impose a positivist pattern or unity on what in reality resisted that sort of orderly representation.

It is not easy to resist the pressure to lump contemporary architectural production together under one rubric. Monographic historiography is so deeply engrained in architectural history that it exerts its force in ways that are often hard to see, because they have become so conventional that they appear natural to us. When historians working within the monographic tradition have moved beyond the study of isolated groups, and looked at the wider field of Spanish contemporary architecture, they have searched for common causes, and assumed common effects. Such is the case in recent attempts to describe contemporary architecture in Spain as the effect of the Iberian climate, cultural character, the institutional and legal framework provided by the regional Colleges of Architects, and so on. These studies unwittingly perpetuate the sort of historiography initiated in 1864 by Hippolyte Taine (1828-1893), who introduced the positivism of Auguste Comte (1798-1857) to the architectural history curriculum of the *École des Beaux-Arts* in Paris. Taine attempted to make the history of architecture courses more scientific by adopting the positivist methods of sociology. Although Taine did not rule out artistic genius, he thought individual talent played only a minor role in the production of buildings. The architect's expressive range was limited by larger causes such as race, environment, and time. Each of these categories was broken down into smaller classifications.

The influence of family, national customs, religion, prevailing intellectual conditions, building traditions, the region's mean temperature, its percentage of sunshine, position above or below sea-level, precise latitude and longitude, all were necessary knowledge for the historian, whose task, Taine explained, was to demonstrate how these infinite causes determined the combined effect: the building. Taine's historiography was appealing because it seems to account for the relationship of the individual architect to the collective.

The positivist emphasis on history as a scientific recounting of the circumstances affecting the architect downplayed, or even repressed the agency of the architect, the subjective element involved in interpreting those facts. By the early twentieth century, American pragmatists like John Dewey (1859-1952), and German phenomenologists like Martin Heidegger (1889-1976), had called into question the strict separation between subject and object presupposed by French positivism. In Madrid, Ortega y Gasset, a student of Heidegger, advanced a similar critique in 1932 with his famous university lectures on Galileo Galilei (1564-1642). He argued that facts acquire meaning only in relation to life projects. "Reality is not a fact, something given, gifted –rather it is a construction that man makes with the given material". Put simply, our circumstances only become our reality through our interpretations.

These critiques of positivism are well known by now. But surprisingly, they have not been fully assimilated within architectural historiography. For instance, architectural historians continue to impose order on contemporary architecture by drafting lists of contemporary buildings simply on the basis of their date of construction. They might, for instance, group together buildings built during a particular decade. At first glance such historiographical groupings appear logical, since buildings can be said to be contemporary when they occur together in time. But upon closer scrutiny, they cease to make sense.

GENERATIONS

The identification of what is contemporary on the basis of chronology gives the appearance of historical unity, but actually skirts the question of what is the contemporary historical period. To understand historical periods we cannot follow an absolutely regular chronological stream (i.e. year by year, or decade by decade). We must take into account the individual, and indeed the social, experiences of time. Historical time is qualified by ruptures and discontinuities that are chronologically irregular. One cannot decide a-priori when Spanish contemporary architecture begins and finishes. The limits must be established from the point of view of those operating within Spanish contemporary architecture. By definition, that will never one individual, so the historian cannot become the sole spokesperson for the collective.

In order to contextualize individual points of view within a collective framework, historians have modulated their chronological boundaries to coincide with political or cultural events. For example, the history of Spanish contemporary architecture has been variously organized to fit within the years of The Transition from Franco's régime to monarchic democracy, or the decade between the 1982 world cup and the 1992 Olympics, etc. Such periodizations allow historians to group together unaffiliated architects on the basis that they were all equal participants in the same society. In order to make such groupings, they must also make fundamental assumptions about how individuals relate to society. For instance, they must assume that all architects experience social events equally, that is uniquely, with each person's experience being completely different than the next. Ortega y Gasset maintained that this assumption was not entirely true. Although he respected the idea that every individual experiences reality uniquely (i.e. everyone is in their personal world), he also noted that not every experience of reality was possible at any time. After Galileo's interpretation of Copernican astrology, the medieval interpretation of the world as the center of the universe was anachronistic. Individual interpretations were circumscribed to world views that were historically determined. Since only a certain number of people were alive at any one time, interpretations were also generational. Ortega y Gasset referred to these generational world views as "interindividual" phenomena, which he situated as interpretative hinges between individuals and the larger society, in which multiple generations struggled for control. Against sociologists like Georg Simmel (1858-1918) and Max Weber (1864-1920), who described society as the combined effect of inter-personal exchanges, Ortega y Gasset viewed society as something pre-existing the personal interactions of any single generation. For him, society was there, manifested through customs (or uses), what is said, believed and done by people, by anyone, by no one individual specifically. Society was a structure of possible positions and attitudes that were ontologically impersonal, but which people could assume or take up. Individuals were born into societies that imposed a system of customs on them, and each person could freely accept or reject them. But their choices had consequences, since social efficiency required that dissent be repressed and punished.

Ortega y Gasset argued that people's choices in relation to the customs they encountered were inflected by their generational world view. The same action would have a different historical value and meaning depending on one's generation. That is to say, a person's generation provided the first order of historical structure in their interpretation of customs. This elucidation had important implications for historiography: a historian writing about an event would have to take into account the multiplicity of generational perspectives from within which that event acquired historical meaning. To account for changes in social customs, or for the transition from one historical era to the next, Ortega y Gasset thought that historians needed to look closer at the struggles between generations. Without a grounding in this generational struggle, macro-historical changes would appear to happen magically, as if propelled by an impersonal will or spirit.

"In 'today,' in every 'today' coexist, therefore, various articulated generations and the relations that are established between them, according to the condition of their ages, represent a dynamic system, of attractions and repulsions, of coincidence and polemic, which constitute in every instant the reality of historic life. And the idea of generations, converted into a method for historical investigation, consists only in projecting that structure upon the past".

Following Ortega y Gasset's argument, in order to grasp Spanish contemporary architecture, we would have to begin by asking: under what conditions, by whom and for whom is architecture interpreted as contemporary? The conditions are those of an inter-generational struggle. To illustrate the point, let's take a single building, say Alejandro de la Sota's Gobierno Civil (Tarragona, 1957) and consider it from the multiple perspectives of architects from different generations. An architect like Rafael Moneo (b. 1937), a child of the Spanish Civil War, was twenty years old when the building opened to the public. The young Moneo would have rightly interpreted the building as contemporary architecture. That same year saw the birth of architects like Enrique Sobejano (b. 1957), Patxi Mangado (b. 1957), and a year later those of Blanca Lleó (b. 1958) and Arsenio Pérez Amaral (b. 1958). De la Sota's building is coetaneous with their life, but it is unlikely that they would consider it "their" contemporary architecture. It was built before their generation had gained consciousness of the architectural world, and established itself as part if. The distance is greater still for the generation born in the late sixties, like that of Enric Ruiz-Geli (b. 1968), which encountered the Gobierno Civil Building already canonized in university history courses. The building appears within the narrative of each professional life as a circumstance with an entirely different meaning and magnitude. Some buildings will appear contemporary and alive to one generation and simultaneously appear dated and dead to another. Yet all three generations are active and productive, and may legitimately consider themselves contemporary. It would be biased for a historian to try to argue that Vicente Guallart (b. 1963) is more or less contemporary than Carlos Ferrater (b. 1944). They are each acting on Spanish contemporary architecture at the same time, with the same power and plenitude, and in the same context. However, their projects and interpretations are indexed by their generational difference, they speak from different positions (the young architect, the established architect), and therefore their works have different senses and effects within the field.

CURRENCY

In order to begin to account for how generational perspectives inflect the meaning and structure of Spanish contemporary architecture, we must first reconsider the term "contemporary". Rather than a stable period of time (i.e. today, the present), it is an unstable category with contents that are constantly changing in relation to the tensions and power relations between different generations of architects. For a building to appear contemporary to an architect it must respond to what is current and relevant to his or her generation. What is current is what every architect must take as a given; the customs inherited as impositions from previous generations that every architect must count on in order to operate, whether he or she accepts them or rejects them. What is current can be defined as the set of buildings, ideas, practices, social positions (i.e. the master architect, the young architect, the star architect, the critic, the curator, the enthusiast, etc.), and institutions that together form the cultural order of the discipline of architecture. What is current is important because it is the system of significance within which works acquire meaning as contemporary.

The degree to which contemporary intellectual and aesthetic production references postwar modern architecture serves as an index of what is considered current today. Interestingly, the most common references are to the generation which re-established the currency of modern architecture in Spain after 1948: Alejandro de la Sota (1913-1996), Josep Antoni Coderch (1913-1984), Antoni Bonet i Castellana (1913-1989), Antoni de Moragas i Gallissà (1913-1985), and Francisco Javier Sáenz de Oiza (1918-2000). Take for instance Blanca Lleó whose thinking and projects consciously reference the work of Sáenz de Oiza as a way to return to the origins of Spanish modern architecture. Her work reveals the degree to which the postwar generation's interpretation of modernism has in fact become the normative understanding of modernism in Spain. Contemporary attempts to define Spanish contemporary architecture in relation to Holland follow connections first made by the generation of '48, which was influenced by the Dutch model of social housing. In this vein, Benedetta Tagliabue (b. 1963) discovered Scandinavian architecture through the eyes of Moragas, who interpreted the work of Alvar Aalto for Catalonian architects during the postwar.

The collective acknowledgment of the postwar generation recognizes its decisive role in establishing the system of significance that continues to be current today. As architects alive today embarked on their architectural careers, they encountered that postwar system of significance there, functioning as an objective ingredient of the world of architecture that they had to contend with. Each architect has reacted differently to it. So we cannot conclude that because architects operate within a common system of significance they therefore constitute a group. We can only conclude that their reactions, different as they may be, are reactions to a shared reality.

INTERPRETATION

Seen under this light, a building acquires the meaning of contemporary architecture when it is positioned in a specific way in relation to the current system of significance. Architects, historians or critics position buildings through interpretation, be it written descriptions, photographic representations or other means. Under the current system of significance, the building's date of construction is not necessarily what makes it contemporary. Juan Domingo Santos (b. 1961) has argued that "the Alhambra, despite its age, is a very modern construction, because it is built from multiple interpretations of the landscape". If we pause for a moment to consider this sentence, we can see how interpretation works to position buildings within the current system of significance. The Nasrid builders of the Alhambra might, or might not, have understood architecture as a way to interpret the landscape. Either way, they did not, indeed could not, have a "modern" understanding of the relationship between architecture and landscape. By using the passive voice, "it is built", Domingo Santos created the necessary ambiguity to elide the fact that he was the author of the interpretation that projected the current system of significance back onto the 14th century. The Alhambra appears contemporary, but only when viewed through the point of view of Domingo Santos's interpretations.

Significantly, Domingo Santos's interpretation is not entirely personal and subjective. Rather, it is current in the sense that he encountered it there, as an interpretation that pre-existed him, and that was as old as the mid twentieth century. As historian Juan Calatrava (b. 1957) has made clear, the current interpretation of the Alhambra dates back to 1952, when the leading postwar Spanish architects held a meeting in the Nasrid palace to debate the nature of Spanish contemporary architecture. The meeting brought together an older generation of established architects like Secundino Zuazo (1887-1971) and Pedro Bidagor (1906-1966), and the young postwar generation including Fernando Chueca Goitia (1911-2004), Francisco Cabrero (1912-2005), Rafael Aburto (b. 1913) and Miguel Fisac (1913-2006). These two generations agreed that the Alhambra was the touchstone of Spanish contemporary architecture, but they disagreed on how to interpret it. Zuazo and Bigador saw the Alhambra as the source of their classicizing functionalism. After all, Juan de Villanueva (1739-1811), the father of Spanish neo-classicism and architect of El Prado, had travelled to the Alhambra in 1766 in search of the roots of a new Spanish architecture. By contrast, the postwar generation viewed the Alhambra as an abstract architectural lesson in terms of the construction of masses, volumes and spaces. The stamp of the new generation was visible in their collective *Manifiesto de la Alhambra* (1953), which attempted to reclaim the monument for modern architecture by re-interpreting it as a contemporary building. At times, the interpretations were quite forced, like the idea that the Alhambra's towers offered similar architectural lessons as North American

skyscrapers. According to Calatrava, the Manifiesto crystallized a postwar modernist way of interpreting architecture, which de-historicized and de-ideologized buildings in order to evince "pure lessons" of modernist architecture from them.

We can now see how, even when an architect speaks about a medieval or neo-classical building, he can be making an indirect reference to the postwar generation and their modes of interpretation. The authors of the *Manifiesto de la Alhambra* arrived at an interpretation of contemporary architecture that today is taken as reality itself. What constitutes the reality of architecture is nothing more than a palimpsest of interpretations handed down to us, and with which we must contend. What we deem to be Spanish contemporary architecture is there as a function of what happened before. The sources of the beliefs, opinions, and forms of practice are found in the past. At the same time, these sources are seldom recognized as sources at all, but rather experienced as norms, pressures, and possibilities that condition current practice and restrict its future. The generational struggle over Spanish contemporary architecture is waged through interpretations, which are the tools and stakes of the battle. I use the term "interpretation" here in contradistinction to "theory", which in my view is too restrictive to capture the nature of intellectual work in architecture. An interpretation is what makes architecture appear as cultural work. Interpretation can take the form of a written document, a drawing, a picture or a photo essay, a moving picture, a scaled model, a full scale building, an exhibition, a class syllabi, a teaching curriculum, and countless other forms. The notion of interpretation attends to the multiple media of architectural intellectuality without giving primacy to one over the other. One could say that there is no mother tongue to architectural communication. Rather, interpretations function as seizures of power, as ways to gain cultural capital and to take up a position within politically charged disciplinary multiplicities.

POSITIONS

For instance, a successful interpretation may allow a young architect to seize the position of star architect. Interpretations are both instruments through which architects achieve their positions, and also the measure of their investment in those positions. An architect's interpretation, say a drawing, always intends a particular position. To take that position, it must display the forms and conventions expected of that position. Today, for instance, a particular kind of sketch, drawn preferably on the napkin of some exotic hotel, intends the position of star architect. Everyone in the architecture world, consumers and producers alike, recognizes that the real intention of the napkin sketch is not really to serve as the "origin" of a design, but to mark the architect's particular position as a star within the field. The napkin sketch is an interpretation that is so structured and codified that entire books are devoted to it as an index of the position of their authors. Anyone can draw on a napkin, but the value of that sketch as a measure of an architect's investment in a position, will depend on its reception, publication, consecration, and admiration by people in other positions, like publishers, curators, students, enthusiasts, etc. Hence the importance of those people involved in interpreting interpretations, for they remake the works of the architects one thousand times and give them cultural value in the process.

To speak of the multiple agents involved in producing cultural works does not take anything away from the work of architects, it simply puts it in context. In fact, there is even a tradition of architects openly embracing the idea that the production of architecture is a collaboration. In fact, the aesthetics of Spanish contemporary architecture has been shaped by prominent photographers such as Francesc Català Roca (1922-1998) in the 1950s, and Hisao Suzuki (b. 1957) in the 1990s. Vicente Guallart has a radical understanding of collaboration, describing it as the fundamental source of innovation. With this idea, Guallart effectively displaced the postwar interpretation of the architect, as the genius-creator of new architecture, with a new one: the architect as a hacker of systems of significance. With extraordinary lucidity, Guallart has explained how the imposition of a new interpretation is in fact the means by which reality itself is changed: "Because a hacker is a person that can maybe look at the system, and the system says, 'no, you must make a box.' And then, what you do is to change the reality, to generate something new, but with a very important social approach". If every interpretation that pretends to be Spanish contemporary architecture has to contend with the system of significance of the postwar generation, then Guallart's work is certainly contemporary. But insofar as it begins to move beyond that postwar system it also offers the promise to redefine the collective understanding of Spanish contemporary architecture.

It is too soon to know whether the younger generation of architects will succeed in imposing a new interpretation of Spanish contemporary architecture. If they do, it would mean that, historically speaking, the chapter of Spanish contemporary architecture that begun roughly in 1948 is coming to a close sixty years later. But to identify it and to understand it, we must elaborate a new historiography that can grasp the intellectual contribution of each generation, while remaining critical of our own participation and generational position. Monographic models are unfit for this task. It is important to remember that the monograph is a form of interpretation, a cultural work, that is deeply imbricated in the objective appearance of the current system of significance. The monograph's conflation of selection and self-selection creates a first order of ambiguity between interpreter and interpreted, between the historian's interpretation of that of the architects being studied, which elides the subjective element in the work of the interpreter. This elision is the foundation for other interpretations of Spanish contemporary architecture as a stable self-same reality. So long as monographs remain current, we will only be able to grasp Spanish contemporary architecture as the mid-century generation wished us to see it.

GENERATIONAL HABITUS

In conclusion, I would like to return to the idea of a polygraphic historiography, as a way to reflect more explicitly on what I have tried to accomplish above. If we are to move towards a new interpretative framework, a theory if you will, that can grasp architecture in relation to its contemporary circumstances we require a historiographical approach that can account for the instability and mutability of the current system of significance, but that does not seek the cause of its changes only in macro-collective events (e.g. social history) or in micro-individual intentionalities (e.g. biographies of architects). Polygraphic historiography also dispenses with the idea that self-selected groups are the agents of intellectual changes in architecture, and tries to avoid the identification of those self-selected groups with an intermediary vehicle of change/exchange between the social and the individual. Rather than limit itself to architects who have self-selected into groups, polygraphic historiography expands the frame to include the work of architects from different generations working at a particular time.

By focusing qualitatively on representative individuals from various generations, the polygraphic historian unearths the ideas, references and practices that each generation believed gave coherence and meaning to their work as "architecture" and "contemporary". Another key feature of polygraphic historiography is to compare and contrast generational ideas and practices in order to highlight points of contact (e.g. the things that architects from different generations agree are worth arguing about), and to draw forth resonances, silences, similitudes or differences between different generational responses to the same circumstances. An unbiased description of this changing field of ideological conflict is the ultimate aim of polygraphic historiography. It offers that description as the best approximation of what gives intellectual coherence to architecture at any one time. Finally, polygraphic historiography explores the manner in which the cohered field of architecture functions in relation to the social and the biographical.

The field of architecture is not reducible to any one person nor extendible to the whole of society. Those who choose to pursue polygraphic historiography will benefit from the work of Michel Foucault (1926-1984), whose concept of disciplines partially captures that elusive middle layer between the individual and the collective. They will also benefit from the writings of Theodor Adorno (1903-1969) and other members of the Frankfurt School who analyzed how cultural works functioned as mediators between social ideology and personal life. Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002) engaged and developed both of these intellectual precedents with his notion of the fields of cultural production. He conceived fields as disciplinary microcosms within society, with their own structures, laws, and membership. He defined them as social and intellectual spaces articulated into limited numbers of positions (the orthodox master architect, the heretical young challenger) through the unequal distribution of cultural capital. To take up a particular position, say the position of "master architect", one had to have amassed a certain amount of cultural capital by earning the recognition of other architects, critics, students, etc. Bourdieu likened fields to games, governed by rules that limited the number of positions and possible moves. To be in a field one had to believe it was a game worth playing. For Bourdieu this belief, which he called *illusio*, was what kept fields operating, people playing, and cultural capital flowing.

According to Bourdieu people were predisposed towards particular fields and *illusios* through habits acquired in the course of life. The *habitus*, to use Bourdieu's term, was an important mediating layer between the individual and the collective. It functioned as a structuring structure, a life-long disposition or second-nature where the society and the individual intersected dynamically. *Habitus* was therefore doubly historical, combining the evolving histories of the individual and the group. It set the limits to one's expectations and explained how behavior could be regular without being the direct product of obedience to regulations.

Although Bourdieu did not study Ortega y Gasset, his concept of habitus came close to the latter's notion of generation. Indeed, both the *habitus* and the generation described an inter-individual phenomenon (neither personal, nor collective), which both authors defined as the effect and structure of the social and historical struggle between individuals.

Yet both concepts had different emphases. Habitus stressed the importance of fields of cultural production, something Ortega y Gasset did not consider in depth. The idea of generation weighed the biological and existential limits of life, something Bourdieu did not sufficiently address in accounting for changes in the cultural order of fields. The combination of both ideas into what could be called a generational *habitus* a touchstone of a polygraphic historiography of the field of architecture. Whether a polygraphic historiography will enable us to move beyond the intellectual box we've inherited remains an experiment, the soundness of which we will only be able to gauge by the results of works yet to be written.

THE MYTH OF THE FIRST SPANISH MODERNS AND THE PROBLEM OF FORM
José Manuel Pozo

Setting out from Mies' famous quote: "We refuse to recognize problems of form; we recognize only construction problems (*G*, 1923)" and to celebrate the ninetieth aniversary of the foundation of the Bauhaus (December 1919), sometimes denounced as an artistic rather than architectural movement, we will discuss which was the first work of modern architecture built in Spain, using it to question 'formalism' as a generating principle for architecture.

In the light of this questioning of the architectural value of the form as a generator for architecture, we will revisit the true value of the works formerly proposed by Bohigas and Flores as the 'first Spanish rationalist' buildings, and we will propose a new starting point for the beginning of the trail of modernity.

In 1961 Carlos Flores situated the stating point for the modern movement of Spanish architecture in 1927, represented by Mercadal, Fernández-Shaw and Bergamín, each one of them contributing to that matter with a piece of work. Since then nobody has questioned that statement, although seen from present time, their modernity can be seen as a mere formal issue. In this article we will analyze the value of all three of them and question the coherence of their modernity, recognizable only in their formal aspects.

Following that train of thought we will question the value of the Bauhaus as architecture school, recognizing only its pioneering value as Academy of the Form.

Both elements are related among themselves through Mercadal, who was the author of one of the three studied works, a major promoter of the new architecture in the 1930s, and maintained a pretty close relationship with Gropius at the time.

The interest in form observed in those two facts contrasts with Berlage and Mies' ideas after the Behrens-Mies conflict; in that sense we will state that the true modern, international, functional,… architecture was really born in Spain in the 1950s, coherently with the tectonic statements of modernity, and we will propose the Capitol building as the alternative precedent to the other three.

Eventually we will relate the previous considerations with the growing formalism observed in the academic and professional practice favored by the commonly used virtual renders as origin or end in itself of the architecture, with a sort of neobeauxartian academical praxis. We point out the dangers involved in it and finally reassure the need to bare in mind Mies' warnings about the shape and tectonic concerns.

FIRST BIENAL DE ARQUITECTURA LATINOAMERICANA IN PAMPLONA
Rubén A. Alcolea

The first Bienal de Arquitectura Latinoamericana (BAL) took place in Pamplona in May 2009. It is a new young event promoted by the AS20 research team that aims to show in Spain the most recent and outstanding work of young latin american architects. For the first edition, the selected teams were: Tristán Diéguez and Axel Fridman; Sebastián Adamo and Marcelo Faiden; Nicolás Campodonico; FGMF Fernando Forte, Lourenço Gimenes and Rodrigo Marcondes Ferraz; Carla Juaçaba; Mauricio Pezo and Sofia von Ellrichshausen; Grupo Talca –Macarena Ávila, Cecilia Cullen, Martín del Solar, Alejandra Liébana and Rodrigo Sheward; El Cielo –Armando Hashimoto and Surella Segú; Pablo Pérez Palacios and Alfonso de la Concha; Juan Manuel Peláez Freidel; Camilo Restrepo; Felipe Mesa; Marcelo and Martín Gualano; Gonzalo Díez Ponce and Felipe Muller.

Besides the main exhibition and presentation of the selected works, BAL also included some conferences and roundtable discussions with the participation of Manuel de Solà Morales, Jorge Moscato, Enrique X. de Anda, Carlos Ferreira Martins, Fernando Pérez de Oyarzun, Antonio Garza, Helio Piñón, José Ramón Moreno, Luis Fernández Galiano, Alberto Campo Baeza, Juan Miguel Otxotorena, Mariano González, Luis Tena and Jorge Tárrago.