

two or three fine laboratory buildings is that, by managing to be art while serving science, they have suggested a bridge between the two. ^{yet} Notwithstanding these successes, the thought of architecture in everyday non-laboratory use constituting a third culture seems to me noble wishful thinking; and however much architecture needs nobility at this time it needs realism even more.

A consciously Third-Culture architecture, instead of bridging between the two, often falls, like a land-locked ~~ship~~ ^{flurry of white sails on a harbor edge,} between two stools. Unfortunately, ^{most} buildings tend to be not art and science but art or science. One at a time - [Considering first The science, or technology, of building ^{it} is inevitably dedicated to universal problems. ^{This is an exciting era of} New structures, new processes, new surfacing materials ^{Now all these things} are never satisfied with specific solutions. Prefabrication ^(c 1850) may be old hat as an idea, but it still promises to be ^{the technique of the near future -} the largest part of ultimate building technology, and of course it relies on the utmost universality of application ^{It assumes no human differences} even when it allows a touch of humanistic individuality in assembly ^{the of its parts.} Scientific planning and shaping is newer hat and ^{this} is even more devoted to universal values, to the kind of information that one could with a straight face feed into a computer programme. Tomorrow's architecture will be ruled by these ^{scientific} values (assuming the best: that the human race is lucky enough to escape semi-annihilation by a more physical domination by science). And if a sensitive aesthete is allowed into the back room at the right time to feed the ^{Golden Rule of proportions} ~~Modular scale as well~~ into the computer, then the result might not be too distressing. The result could even be in its own square ^{way} ~~way~~ the most beautiful world of ^{ansterdy} building since they finished the Acropolis. But a world without art in building.

3

The art of architecture, on the other hand, is nothing if not concerned with ^{human} problems / specific to the people being sheltered, to the ^{human} function, to the ^{human} environment, ~~and so on~~. And it is nothing if in its solution it does not exploit the medium of space in a way that is appropriate to the ^{specific} occasion but would be quite ridiculous in a universal solution. Any such 'art building' no doubt will gratefully use various products and processes of science along the way, but these ^{techniques} don't make a bridge strong enough to support a third culture.

The proportion of universal or 'science buildings' to once-only 'art buildings' is growing fast in this country as in most others and will continue to grow, ~~and~~ ^{really} there's nothing intimidating in this thought. The science will never swamp the art entirely because there will always be someone who wants a specific, appropriate statement for some private ^{reason} or extremely public ^{reason} ^{as in an Opera House}. A satisfactory balance may be found when no buildings are made by the ^{artistic} one-off technique except those which have an artistic reason to ~~build that way~~ ^{be unique}.

None of this means that architecture is or must be split asunder by the two different approaches. A rational theory of the aim of design can include both. The key ^{is} being appropriateness. Some problems call for a universal ^{scientific} solution by reason of a general function and a mass-human context. Others serve functions so narrow and personal that anything other than a one-off ^{artistic} structure and individual form would be out of place. One architect in one working day may receive a commission of each kind and may produce eventually a building of each kind - one a 'science building', one an 'art building' - with the

greatest integrity and consistency in his professional approach. In other words, he will size up each problem as it is set to him and decide whether its solution is best achieved through science or through art.

Thus, while architecture itself can rarely be the Third Culture, architects can, and should be, Third Culturalists all the time.

But you will hardly be surprised if I confess that in fact they are not. The real Third Culture of Australia — the effective culture of modern Australia, is not a reflection of her few vital creative artists or her scientists, or of her many passive consumers. It is a reflection of the small proportion of people who control our manufacturing and construction industries, and who promote and direct all private and governmental enterprises that keep the wheels of our materialist society churning round. The men who select and direct the shape of our houses, appliances, entertainments, magazines, advertising. These men don't create, but they hire creators, and their tastes dominate the tastes of many of their hirelings.

It may be argued that the taste shown in the activities and products that these men (they are never women in Australia) promote is a reflection of public taste, since these men are out to give the public only what it will buy, literally or figuratively. Yet the consumer can only choose between the things that are offered him. The Australian consumer, in our isolation, has always had a smaller range of things to choose than the Northern Hemisphere consumer, and is much more dependent on the entrepreneurs of commerce, of theatre, of cinema, of publishing and importation for the range from which to select his culture.

The taste of the stay-at-home ^{Australian} consumer is thus appreciably affected by the taste of the doers: often clever, eager, self-driving men whose faith in Australia

is usually limited to an enormous and justifiable faith in themselves. In the creation of any sizable product requiring a moderate amount of co-operation, the attitude of these active, ~~then~~ ~~urgent~~ men is inclined to dominate. Thus the requirements of originality and polish essential to a professional result are seldom achieved, and most of the cultural interest in modern Australia is at no higher level than first-class amateur. The visitor from overseas who is an amateur artist, architect, scientist, actor, musician, decorator, or creator in any field is likely to find much to admire in competently executed reproductions of ideas which originated elsewhere. But the professional visitor in any field is not likely to feel the need to stay and study.

For example, ^{again} in the field of architecture ^{but commercial architecture -} the visual background of life, the artistic aim of nearly all commercial Australian design - excepting ~~the unloved villas, and~~ the sincere individual's creative works - is to simulate Statler-Hilton culture. This statement may seem exaggerated, and indeed there are exceptions, ~~but for an initial understanding of the situation the truth of this generalisation must be recognised.~~ ^{but} The Statler-Hilton vision is the one etched in the retinas of ^{most of} Australia's home-coming men of action. This is what they attempt to re-create in all the patterned products they make. They have been trying for years and years to reproduce the look. They have been carrying home the brochures to show their designers, keeping up with the latest magazines, packing their stylists off at intervals for refresher courses. But for years and years the best they could do was a fairly pathetic parody. But quite recently something happened.

The fact is they can sometimes succeed nowadays in making an almost perfect reproduction of ^{Statler-Hilton} culture ~~as in the newest hotels.~~ ^{ES.} ~~This gives rise to the thought that this period of abject emulation and imitation may at last be nearing an end. Having reached the stage of almost complete understanding of the particular~~ ^{American-} international

Sydney - American hotel by Ansett's Own Round World Airline? And delicious as Salami & dill pickles on Friend

standard that has impressed them, they might be on the verge soon of tolerating a touch of original thought. This could even lead to a new era in which Australia might be prepared to back research in science and the unfamiliar in art.

I'm being optimistic because for me this is an optimistic occasion. Perhaps in fact Australia's third culture, the Statler-Hilton-Surfers Paradise Lost culture, is still very far from moribund.

But perhaps that is not such a bad thing. In the face of such a Third Culture, the first two cultures of Australia, science and art, have no alternative but to be drawn together in mutual support. They recognize sympathetic strains in each other. For myself, while I have the smallest understanding of most scientific technique I often seem to recognize soul-mates behind scientific attitudes in Australia. The original two cultures, in short, sometimes look like a single crew in the same boat, battling against the tide of the real Third Culture of the Australian Way.

I hope they succeed in the battle, because, if they don't, I think the next generation of Australian intellectuals may escape on the new super-sonic jets and 800-passenger air buses coming here next decade, and we will never see them again.

Mr. Chancellor, again many thanks to you