

The early masters, pioneers of M A, disparaged styles of arch.
They wanted to produce & promote a single real & true arch 20th C
— one arch above styles & fads & petty visual hillbilly. "Vers Une A",
Le C wrote — "Towards AN arch", not a NEW arch, as translated...

— just ONE which, w/d to the 20th C what CLASSIC w/d to G & Rome & Gothic to M
[Yet by mid 1950s, when world had recovered from WW2 & was
about to swing into a frenzy of new construction, what the 4 main
Masters in effect handed the generation that was going to do the bldg
were 4 different style images, or visions.

[In the 10 or 12 yrs since, the number has increased. We have been
thru a period of great shapes, led by E. Saarinen; now in a
period of Great Debate. The subject: (crudely) THE ART of arch v. the TECH
Can the expressive qualities of arch justify departure from strictly
FUNCT'L/STRUCT'L building? It's an old argument, revived strongly
as visual fads & fashions continue to sweep across arch just as
they did in the 19th C... GOTHIC - REGENCY - SCOTTISH BARONIAL.
Fads used to last at least 10 yrs... now only 2 or 3, yet the bldgs
which they shape still last a generation or so... Can't be put in
the cellar when the novelty-interest lags, like a tired bit of junk sculpt

[One, good, real & true arch still seems as remote as ever.
Good? Dull prospect if everyone followed one style. It would be, but
agreement on the aims & ethics of arch would not stifle creative
talent capable of producing personal styles, while it wd. bring dignity...
background. Yet we are not as optimistic as the Masters were,
we see: the one good & true arch. is not likely ever to come. Or rather,
when it does come it won't be recognizable as the ancient art of arch,
which will have been swallowed alive, or dead, by technology.
But till then architects, motivated largely by art, feeling themselves
more or less in control of technique, remain the greatest influence on arch.

Every arch'l problem becomes form