frequently, for example, that his Art Nouveau buildings and their ornamentation were functional in nature. On the positive side, however, we do learn a great deal about his relationships with his fellow artists, writers, politicians, and architects. That Horta was a curmudgeon is clear enough from his comments about his collaborations with a number of artists as well as his rivalries with his architectural compatriots. For him, the camps were sharply delineated: he praised Paul Hankar, Octave van Rysselbergh, and Hector Guimard as honest designers, while he described Henry van de Velde and Gustave Serrurier-Bovy as mere decorators and *artistes*. Van de Velde is singled out for particular scorn. On the first page of the *Mémoires*, Horta suggests that his own (supposed) decline in popularity coincided with van de Velde's return to Brussels from Weimar in 1925. In later comments, Horta describes van de Velde's directorship of the Institut Supérieur des Arts Décoratifs at the Abbaye de La Cambre in Brussels as one that "toed the line of the decorative arts in a school subsidized by the government to the detriment of other existing [architectural] academies" (p. 143). Van de Velde is repeatedly impugned for considering himself an architect, for having gone to Germany to direct the Kunstgewerbeschule in Weimar, and for having designed buildings, furniture, and clothing in the manner of William Morris; in other words, Horta implies that van de Velde simply was not an architect nor Belgian enough.

Dulière's introductory essay with its careful footnotes and annotations complements Horta's text with essential clarifications, corrections, and additions. She provides important materials now housed in other archives, including several previously unpublished plans. In a series of appendices, Dulière includes complementary documents such as Horta's *Mementos*. Anyone who has read either of the two versions of the *Mémoires* at the Horta Museum will be grateful to have their many lacunae filled. Her text not only provides further documentation regarding Victor Horta's art, life, and milieu; it helps to clarify this fascinating and rich period of architectural history.

SURA LEVINE
Hampshire College


Zwemmer's architectural monographs have been highly regarded by architectural historians for many years, their respectable dark blue bindings immediately indicative, on the library shelves, of the distinctive nature of their contents—great names like Hawksmoor, de l'Orme, Chambers. So we welcome, although perhaps slightly quizzically, the introduction of a new series from the same house, Architectes in Perspective. Quizzically, not because these books are available only in soft covers, which they are; nor because the first two in the series sport lemon yellow and lime green jackets, which they do, unfortunately; but because they deal with architects and an era which are still emerging from the neglected wasteland of the "immediate past," a subject matter which is still treated more as a curiosity and a popularist fancy than a serious academic field—Edwardianism and the British Arts and Crafts Movement. Whether pompous Vanbrughesque Classicism or, conversely, pretty Voyseyesque cottages, these turn-of-the-century styles have not yet been accepted into academic curricula in quite the way the English Palladians have been for so long, although the increasing market for this material hopefully heralds its imminent adoption.

The two architects whom Zwemmer's new series initially places in perspective could hardly be more different. The first, Sir Reginald Blomfield (1856–1942), was as much a product of Edwardianism as the second, Sir Raymond Unwin (1863–1940), was a product of the Arts and Crafts Movement; and here the mutually distinguishable nature of Edwardianism and the Arts and Crafts Movement needs to be recognized. For although the Arts and Crafts Movement was, at its height, an Edwardian phenomenon, its aims were diametrically opposed to those suggested by the haughty images of empire conjured up by the term Edwardianism. And thus it is clear that Blomfield's aims were vastly different from those of Unwin.

Richard Fellow's *Blomfield* and Frank Jackson's *Unwin* set up fine comparisons and offer considerable contrasts for students of this period. And the similar format of the two books allows easy cross-referencing. Both studies treat their subjects chronologically, each moving from a chapter on "Beginnings," to discussions of their buildings and their writings and, finally, their significance. Summary biographies are followed by bibliographies and the whole thing is wrapped up in fewer than 200 pages.

Richard Fellow's *Sir Reginald Blomfield* comes across very much as a lonely prophet in the increasingly idolatrous world of the early 20th century. A university degree from Oxford was not the most usual basis for a career in architecture and this academic upbringing provided him with the scholastic foundation for his many later historical treatises, and in all probability drew him away from the fashionable Arts and Crafts world to one of public works and Wrenaissance grandeur. As an Arts and Crafts man Blomfield had held his own. His early involvement with the Art Worker's Guild and the Arts and Crafts Exhibition Society and his setting up with Lethaby, Macartney, Barnsley and Gimson of the furniture firm Kenton and Company demonstrate both his ability and acceptance in this field. Indeed, his familiarity with Norman Shaw's "family" of young men, with William Morris himself, and with the principles of Art Socialism (for which he had no time), might suggest a career very different from that which he was to follow. We are told, more than once, "that by nature Blomfield was radical and ready to stir up the 'establishment,' but by background and intellect he was conservative" (p. 132). And so, too, was his architecture, essentially, conservative. Blomfield's dalliance with the Arts and Crafts barely lasted until 1900 and then the use of festive yet overtly Classical, mostly Wrenaissance, imagery became dominant. Blomfield's parallel career as a writer of architectural histories clearly had some effect in directing his design development. *The Formal English Garden* (1892) was followed by a two-volume *History of Renaissance Architecture in England* (1897) and, later, four volumes covering French architecture from 1492 to 1774 (1911 and 1921). And so his architecture moved from the picturesque to the formal, from the domestic manor to the Grand Manner. And ultimately, as Royal Academician, past President...
of the Royal Institute of British Architects, recipient of the Royal Gold Medal for Architecture, and a knighthood, he is seen fighting a rear guard action against the rising tide of the 20th century in Modernismus (1934), his outcry against modern art. Blomfield was 86 when he died in 1942 and, as Fellows concludes, “many of the older generation thought of him as a guardian of values, whilst to the youngsters he was an increasing irritant” (p. 156). In many ways he was a pillar of the establishment, but a pillar increasingly out of kilter.

Frank Jackson’s Sir Raymond Unwin was, at the time of his death two years earlier in New York, far less of an apparent anachronism. Indeed, he had been appointed Director of the Town Planning Studio at Columbia University in 1936 and was in constant demand by investigative subcommittees looking into topics such as The Management of Municipal Housing Estates (1936–1938) and The Operations of Housing Associations (1936–1939); he was also unofficially advising the Tennessee Valley Authority Project and the United States Housing Authority. The difference, simply enough, was that Unwin, as death two years earlier in New York, far less of an apparent anachronism. Indeed, he had been appointed Director of the Town Planning Studio at Columbia University in 1936 and was in constant demand by investigative subcommittees looking into topics such as The Management of Municipal Housing Estates (1936–1938) and The Operations of Housing Associations (1936–1939); he was also unofficially advising the Tennessee Valley Authority Project and the United States Housing Authority. The difference, simply enough, was that Unwin, as advocator of garden city planning, had something to offer the depressed world of the 1930s whereas Blomfield, as champion of the Grand Manner, represented an epoch both outclassed and outdated.

Although remembered for his work as a town planner, Raymond Unwin was first and foremost an architect. His background lacked the upper middle-class privilege of Blomfield’s even though he was, similarly, raised in Oxford where his father was, until his sudden resignation, a Fellow of Balliol College and also in Holy Orders. It is interesting to note that Blomfield’s father was also ordained into the Church of England and that Blomfield’s maternal grandfather was Bishop Blomfield, long-serving Bishop of London. But unlike Blomfield, Unwin never attended university nor the Royal Academy Schools, but went to work, in his early 20s as a draftsman-fitter for a Manchester cotton mill. At a similar age Blomfield was working for his uncle, the successful Gothicist, Arthur Blomfield. But again, unlike Blomfield, Unwin was by now a committed socialist and soon to come heavily under the influence of Morris.

It was Morris’s vision, found in the pages of News from Nowhere, which inspired Unwin in his early schemes, whether small houses built in partnership with his half-cousin Barry Parker, or the early estates and suburbs, like New Earswick and Letchworth. But socialism, even when seen through Morris, did not provide all the answers. Unwin grew to know and appreciate the writings of Edward Carpenter, whose long prose poem, “Towards Democracy,” was very much a reflection of Walt Whitman’s Leaves of Grass. And thus Unwin learned to identify nature’s laws with a sense of “democracy”: for the real answer was in the natural environment for the enlightened person to find. Here Jackson quotes Whitman:

> The converging objects of the universe perpetually flow.
> All are written to me, and I must get what the writing means.

And it would seem that Unwin was successful, for there is in his work an inherent relationship as Jackson notes, “between the house interior, the site plan, the town plan and the regional plan as they developed” (p. 16). And thus his work often seems to have a timelessness which Blomfield’s generally lacks. Any one waiting for a bus on the busy Finchley Road in London and who looks across to the shops and flats which flank the entrance to Unwin’s Hampstead Garden Suburb, would be forgiven for mistaking them for some remnant of an earlier settlement; but later, as the bus swings down Regent Street and past Blomfield’s Quadrant, before moving into Piccadilly Circus, the viewer would be hard pressed to mistake those pompous buildings for anything but an example of Edwardianism aggrandizement.

As with so many other architects in Britain, it was the Great War of 1914–1918 which changed both Blomfield’s and Unwin’s careers. The world of country houses and the Arts and Crafts disappeared as readily as mass graves and mass housing became the prime demand. Blomfield’s health had failed in 1914 and, when he emerged again, it was not as an architect’s architect, an expert on country houses, and the gentry’s choice, but as a creator of Silent Cities for the Imperial War Graves Commission, the designer of the ultimately ubiquitous War Cross, and the builder of the stately but rather stolid Menin Gate. It is perhaps indicative—and maybe this is unfair—of the inflexibility of Blomfield and the Grand Manner into which he moved, that his design for the Menin Gate could accommodate the names of only 57,000 of the 60,000 British troops who, as Blomfield acknowledged, “had died in the war on the Ypres salient and had no known graves” (p. 110). Unwin, one suspects, would never have been so unaccommodating—but then his monuments would never have been so dumbfounding.

In 1915 Unwin had terminated his partnership with Barry Parker and had become a civil servant. His responsibilities, initially, were as a town planning inspector with the Local Government Board and, in 1916, as director of housing for the Ministry of Munitions. “Thus Unwin,” as Jackson points out, “was able to wield a certain amount of draconian authority in planning the munitions towns at Gretna, Eastriggs, Queensferry, and Mancol Village” (p. 122). He drew his inspiration from Ebenezer Howard, Camillo Sitte, and Patrick Geddes and was as cosmopolitan in his own publishing. Town Planning in Practice (1st edition, 1909; 7th edition, 1920) was translated, after the War, into German, French, and Russian. It was a book which, in demonstrating the absolute importance of the skillful and imaginative planner, emphasized aesthetics but avoided arguments of style and in so doing was unlikely to become dated and ultimately moribund. Style, for Unwin, was the result of the interpretation of individual needs and desires, and Jackson summarizes this attitude with a quote from Le Corbusier’s Vers une architecture: “Style is a unity of principle animating all the work of an epoch, the result of a state of mind which has its own special character” (p. 169). And this could have been said equally well of Blomfield.

Blomfield and Unwin are certainly central figures to the understanding of early 20th-century architecture in Britain. So different in so many ways, they express well the changing alignments of that troubled era. Thus, Richard Fellows might be forgiven for insisting, almost too often, on the worthiness of Sir Reginald Blomfield: “He provides an outstanding example of the successful Edwardian architect. A type that may never be seen again, he is surely a man who deserves to be celebrated” (p. 162). Of Sir Raymond Unwin much has been said before, although never as concisely or richly recounted as Frank Jackson...
does here. And this continued interest in Unwin is probably because he offered something which Blomfield apparently did not—"understanding and appreciation . . . in infinitely complex and subtle ways, [of] what the ordinary man expected from his environment" (p. 170).

NEIL JACKSON
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

ANDREW SAINT, 

Do not be deceived by the apparent narrow scope of this book. Around the central theme of school building, Andrew Saint has woven a tapestry of modern architecture in the Britain of the 1940s and 1950s, and has enormously enlarged our understanding of building in a period previously known almost entirely through studies concentrating on housing and town planning. It is at once an account of the emergence of a technically advanced modern architecture and a celebration of the social ideals which motivated so many of those involved in the nascent welfare state. On top of all this, the book honors the memory of one of the period's key architectural figures, Stirrat Johnson-Marshall.

Born and brought up in India, educated at an English boarding school where he excelled at games, Johnson-Marshall trained at the Liverpool school of architecture when Sir Charles Reilly's Beaux-Arts regime was slipping quietly into a low-key, socially conscious, Anglicized modernism. He was graduated in 1935, and became one of the first generation of university school-trained architects to join local government design offices in time to gain a few years experience of building before World War II turned what was left of his somewhat Kiplingesque world upside down. After a good war (highlighted by his escape in a small boat from the fall of Singapore) the 33-year-old Johnson-Marshall joined the Hertfordshire County Council as deputy county architect. Between 1945 and 1948 he formed and moulded the design group which developed the light-weight steel framed school buildings which were needed in large numbers to serve the expanding northern suburbs of London and its New Towns.

By 1948 Johnson-Marshall was chief architect to the Ministry of Education. Here he was in a position both to monitor the school building programs of education authorities throughout the country, and to sponsor design research through the ministry's in-house development group, which at the new chief's insistence was allowed to design and build schools for local authorities, as well as give advice. The ideals of teamwork fostered at the bureaucratic center of Britain's postwar school building campaign did much to stimulate collaboration elsewhere, leading notably to the CLASP (Consortium of Local Authorities' Special Programme) system of steel frame construction which was developed by a group of counties forced to build on sites liable to subsidence from coal mining. In 1956 he left the ministry and went into partnership with Sir Robert Matthew, the former chief architect of the London County Council. The high point of the next 25 years of private practice was the use of a much improved CLASP system for most of the buildings on the new campus for the University of York.

But it was Johnson-Marshall's years as a leader of public sector architecture that made his reputation. His death in 1981 took from us a man whose name appeared on few designs, who had written little, and taught not at all (at least in the formal sense), but who is regarded by many British architects as the equal of Raymond Unwin—some would say of Walter Gropius—in his contribution to the production of technically advanced, collaboratively produced social architecture.

Like both Unwin and Gropius, Stirrat Johnson-Marshall was naturally part of the establishment, and able to manipulate it successfully, where more obvious revolutionaries would have provoked opposition. Personally conservative, but a great talker and persuader, he brought together politicians, civil servants, educationalists, manufacturers, and some of the best young designers in a program of school design that has since been recognized as one of the modern movement's few British success stories.

The new schools themselves were mostly single-story buildings, generally flat-roofed, and planned around a grid of light steel structural frames, supporting a variety of concrete cladding panels, timber and asbestos siding, tile hanging, or brickwork skins. New schools elsewhere perpetuated the monotonous prewar pattern of classrooms strung along endless corridors. The Hertfordshire school planners eschewed such solutions in favor of a planning grid, 8 ft. 3 in. square, which allowed considerable flexibility in layout. In the primary schools corridors were virtually abandoned, as the first steps were taken down the road to the almost open plans of many contemporary schools. The "system" such as it was, represented a systematic approach to school planning and construction, rather than the repetition of standardized units which characterized so many proprietary housing construction systems in the 1960s and contributed so much to the bad press that today attaches to modern architecture as a whole. Modern school building had its monuments, of course, notably the Smithsons' heroic essay in the Miesian aesthetic at Hunstanton in Norfolk. But the best of the new schools were modestly scaled, relaxed groups of buildings, relying for their effect upon good siting, sensitive landscaping, bright colors, and comfortable child-scaled interiors and fittings. To adapt Pevsner's phrase, it was "architecture at ease." There was surprise as well as pleasure in the reporting of the medals awarded the CLASP school exhibited at the Milan Triennale of 1960.

Why the school building program which took its lead from the Hertfordshire initiative succeeded, where housing so often failed, is a question that underlies much of this book. The key, it is argued, was a collaborative design method which involved not just teams of architects, but users (in the persons of teachers), and manufacturers as various as Ernest Hinchcliffe (whose steel firm eventually failed because of his inventive experiments in structural framing) and the Newcastle firm of Adamsez, who worked with the Hertfordshire architects to produce a new range of child-sized bathroom fittings. These included the famous "Bean basin," which was difficult to stuff with soap and had taps tipped forward to make it easier as well as safer for thirsty children to use the drinking fountains. Alan Adams describes one incident in Ruskinian terms: "Imagine us, therefore from us a man whose name appeared on few designs, who had written little, and taught not at all (at least in the formal sense), but who is regarded by many British architects as the equal of Raymond Unwin—some would say of Walter Gropius—in his contribution to the production of technically advanced, collaboratively produced social architecture.