

the revival of such non-committal terms has permitted a return to an undisciplined holiday from rational design: a return to irrelevant ornament, and period influences stylishly done over in the modern idiom. And this indiscipline at the top level of architectural creativity - not just here, but the world over - has done nothing to discourage the vulgar mess in the streets. It has confused even the well-wishers among the public.

The architectural profession is the obvious choice for a leader and really is the only group in society that can lead society out of the mess of the modern urban environment. *This we must do even if our own house is not in perfect order*  
But to do ~~this~~ it must know, in concrete terms, in positive terms of design, where it wants to go.

This is no time even to suggest alternative possible answers to that question, but I will merely leave the question hanging in the air:

Assuming that all external social and professional obstacles to perfection in architecture were swept aside tomorrow and we were left with only the functional and structural problems directly related to each building, how many of us know with conviction and clarity what shape we would like architecture to take?

*indeg - looks for it. (Haddon.)<sup>Layman</sup> Anti-ugly - No. But  
all the way -- Govt subsidy.*