The Hard and the Brut: a journey through Parisian Brutalism
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hidden stories of the picturesque

In 2016, I and the photographer Nigel Green (working together in the art practice collaboration Photolanguage), were commissioned by the publisher Blue Crow Media to research and illustrate a Brutalist Map of Paris. This article reflects on the period of research, site exploration and recording that led to the production of the map, and a recent journey of return to social housing projects by Jean Renaudie and Remi Gailhousteau.

Our response to Parisian brutalism was not simply architectural and historiographic, but emphasized the peripatetic and experiential circumstances of the commission as a project of urban photographic documentation. The official architectural itinerary gave us a project to reason the notion of brutalist material aesthetics in general terms and in relation to the contemporary city as found. We applied an understanding of brutalism in general terms and in relation to the architect: the British practice of Alison and Peter Smithson; the ten covers, two featured anonymous found objects and brutal gardens, incorporating fallen, patched and neglected urban spaces as part of an official legacy of the brutalist canon.

Title pages: Nigel Green and Robin Wilson, Photolanguage. Two covers of the imaginary French architectural journal, La Revue Générale Brutaliste, prepared for exhibitions at the Institut Français in London.

Selections of images within the main library space of the Institute as the covers of an imaginary French architectural journal, La Revue Générale Brutaliste, bordered by invented editorial titles and notations. Printed on hand-made Japanese paper, these postcards as archival items from the history of the fictional journal from the 1950s-70s, with its core design evolving as it ever time in a manner inspired by the covers of period editions of journals such as 21er (Hayward Gallery). Of the ten covers, two featured anonymous found objects and brutal gardens, incorporating fallen, discarded and neglected urban spaces as part of an official legacy of the brutalist canon.

Edition titles and editorial notes open the presentation of architectural brutalism beyond the language of architectural history and authorship to more indeterminate, speculative modes of expression, registering contingent urban details and events of a brutal character. These include graffiti, signage and the comments and interactions of individuals encountered at each site.

The project began, and still grapples with, a question of definitions: the identification criteria of a brutalist building or space, and how to transfer a certain historical understanding and experience of brutalism from the UK context (British buildings, British criticism), to the Parisian one. Necessarily, we returned to Reyner Banham’s definitions of brutalism in his December 1955 essay in The Architectural Review, ‘The New Brutalism’, and found a quite fluid set of terms, aesthetic genealogies and qualifications, almost exclusively directed to establish the brutalist credentials of the work of a single architect: the British practice of Alison and Peter Smithson.

Significantly, this originating thesis of brutalism was not conceived through the medium of concrete, but through the steel and panel system construction of the Smithson’s 1954 Hunstanton School in Norfolk. It was developed through the production of imagery, in relation to exhibitions produced by the Independent Group, principally, The Pursuit of Art and Life, 1953, which included the work of photographer Nigel Henderson.

Rather than functioning as the basis of an architectural movement, ‘The New Brutalism’ article is better understood as a discursive vehicle for Banham’s broader project of cultural criticism at that time – a temporary scaffolding erected in episodic activities of journal criticism and discarded when the focus of Banham’s critical allegiances shifted. That said, one can extract from Banham a set of working principles for identifying brutalist buildings: memorability, the ruthlessness of the spatial system as image (the clarity of a building’s visual identity, and formal legibility as a programme); a clear exhibition of structure; materials as fixed. Active within this set of values is a propensity toward primitive or essential material expression, drawing influence from the use of beton brut (raw concrete) in the later works of Le Corbusier, as well as from examples of Art Brut and Arte Povera.

The Australian architectural historian John Macarthur makes the point that Banham’s articles in this period were published within the wider frame of a set of editorial campaigns in The Architectural Review from the 1950s onwards championing, through diverse and sometimes contradictory forms of expression, the revival of the eighteenth-century aesthetic category of the picturesque as the basis of a renewed urban aesthetic of dynamic contradistinctions. Banham’s declared stance was to reject The Architectural Review’s concern for the picturesque as a parochial reaction to modernity. Macarthur, on the other hand, refers us to a broader understanding of the spectrum of the picturesque as inclusive of a theory of ugliness and disgust, a longer philosophical reflection on material aesthetics to which brutalism can quite plausibly be understood to be an extension. Within the context of this programme of aesthetic reflection on the tensions between new forms of post war modernity and, broadly speaking, Romanticism, Macarthur defies brutalism as a form of ‘hard picturesque, which is aesthetically challenging, as opposed to a soft and fissile picturesque which panders to familiar sentiments’.

One would have to concede that with the arrival of projects like the Brutalist Map series, and the abundant appreciation of brutalist architecture on social media, its status as ‘hard’ aesthetics is itself transitioning, or has already transitioned toward the wider urban site. And that brutalism has lost its shock value, its inherent material and aesthetic force of critique as an aestheticism dominant, ‘soft’, aesthetic sensibilities. This signals a moment in which we can re-look and re-assess the impact of the work of the period and, importantly, to begin a process of more acute differentiation within the overall categorisation of brutalism, through acts of return, reflection and re-presentation.

Within our documentation of Paris and acts of return we re-propose and reposition the material values of the ‘as found’ and the ‘hard’. We explore anonymous and ephemeral urban formations with equal interest, and look to differentiate a hard from a soft brutalism – pockets of the hard picturesque persisting or reconfiguring within the recognised or authorised sites of the architectural itinerary.

The work of Nigel Henderson provides a useful bridge between brutalism as an ambition for reductive rigor within material and architectural expression and that of its manifestation as urban observation and representation. The historian Andrew Higgott proposes that the brutalist values in Henderson’s photography have to do with the recording of an ‘authentic inhabitation’ of the city, the witnessing of its incident and patterns of life. While we should be wary of the photograph as a means to access social truths, Henderson’s photography provides a useful point of convergence for many of the complex cultural vectors of the time, in the way it channels older picturesque, Surrealist and Dadaist concerns, alongside the emergence of pop culture and a new socio-political awareness of its urban subject matter. It emphasises a heightened material awareness of the city as a space of accretion and contingency. Henderson’s concerns parallel those of the Smithsons in their complex reflections on the social and environmental implications of the ‘as found’ sensibility, which continued into the 1980s and across the spectrum of their built, written and graphic production.
To journey in search of the brutalist architecture of Paris – and to follow the itinerary of the map – is to travel beyond the Parisian périphérique in all directions, to the new town zones of the 1960s and 1970s. Bobigny, Criteil,iry and parts of la Defense were the particular sites of our attention. The brutalist element of Parisian urbanism does not represent a simple shift in the style and materiality of the city’s renewal or extension – a brutalist strata within an accumulation of historical styles – but was also an attempt to manifest wholly new Parisian environments: satellite cities of a new, multi-polaire solution to urban growth.

Examples of brutalism within the city centre are rare. The concrete, concertina-like conference building within Buren, Nervi and Zehrfuss’s UNESCO complex (1958) is perhaps the most powerful example. This is, itself, disconnected from the surrounding historic city of the seventh arrondissement by the perimeter fencing and landscaping of UNESCO site, subject to a layered administration by the perimeter fencing and the medium of construction. Historian Adrian Forty provides a diverse discussion of the ‘discourse of concrete’ in the modern and late modern periods as a combination of the trace of both the ‘primitive and the sophisticated’ in the dialogue between engineering, or system, and its execution.

The term lets but itself derives originally from an item of correspondence by Le Corbusier and describes the material finish of his later works in the post-World War Two period, particularly the Unité d’Habitation in Marseilles. Whilst the notion of the material finish ‘as found’ has come to define brutalism within the current understanding of the canon, and even, as it were, to William Morris, craft revival and the authentic expression of materials, it was more a product of the conditions of the building site – the fact that there were multiple contractors working on the Unité’s construction, with different levels of skill. A similar material discourse is in evidence at Le Corbusier’s Maisons Jaoul in western Paris, Neuilly-sur-Seine (1951 – the earliest building recorded on the Brutalist map). Here, within a ‘raw’ palette of materials, the trace of the making hand is discernible in the cementing of the brick work, the working of the exposed sections of the concrete slab (producing an expression of the barrel roof profile and of the lower floor slabs on the end elevations, like a section cut). However, Forty notes that there is a level of contradiction between means and ends at the Maisons Jaoul in relation to materials, in that the brick work was executed by a skilled and experienced craftsman, but who was instructed to conduct the work with a loose hand; and that a less experienced contractor for the concrete made a particularly bad job of the first-floor concrete slab and then overcompensated with a very precise and crisp moulding of the roof slab. The loose hand of the skilled, the over-compensation of the less capable; a now largely indecipherable material and ideological dialogue between restraint and excess, across the professional classes of design and construction.

A 1962 housing complex by Paul Bossard in Créteil expresses something approximate to Le Corbusier’s treatment of materials at the Maisons Jaoul. Forty makes interesting observations here about the logic of construction. For, with Les Bleuets, as they are called, there is a combination of the hand-made with a precast panel system. Bossard evolved the design from his student diploma project and, against the norms of professional roles within the French building industry, undertook to design the precast system himself and oversee the detailed assembly on-site. The large pieces of steel embedded in the roughly textured concrete panels were placed by the construction workers at the site whilst the concrete was still wet, with the variability of skill in this process of ‘primitive’ application embraced as a part of the material ethos of the project.

Forty, with reference to the work of architect Vilanova Artigas in São Paulo, makes a useful comparison between the play of the primitive and the sophisticated across European and South American brutalism. For Artigas, as Forty quotes, ‘the ideological content of European brutalism [...] brings with it a cargo of irrationalism’. Within this cargo is the content of the persistence of an aesthetic of austerity – of the primitive inflection of the hand of the unskilled labourer – way beyond the actual period of post-war material shortage in Europe. Within South America, on the other hand, unskilled labour remained a fundamental part of the economics of the building site.

However, whilst a late Le Corbusian aesthetic may have continued to influence the manipulation of the concrete surface well into the 1970s within aspects of architectural practice in the UK, the scene in Paris by no means yields evidence of such an allegiance. In assembling the itinerary of the map we quickly realised the necessity of abandoning the material relationship to the traces of manual labour as an essential benchmark of the brut and, instead, reconfigured the terms of brutalism according to the material and technological cultures of the precast system and the machined surface. Here I focus (among the many possible examples) on our encounters with the work of Emaudier and Guilleaume.
Within the multi-phased project at Ivry and subsequent smaller developments at la Cité Rateau, la Courneuve by Jean Renaudie (1987), and la Cité de la Maladrerie, Aubervilliers by Renée Gailhoustet (1984), it is the complexities of the plan and its social thesis – to be achieved at scale – that dominate the material and constructive regime. Through the vertical layering of a triangulated or star-shaped plan, subsequently subjected to morphing actions of cut and rotation, Renaudie and Gailhoustet’s architecture accedes to a radical principle of difference. The combinatorial system of Les Étoiles, as Irénée Scalbert has identified it, of overlap and interconnection proposed a unique space for every household that prioritised the spaces of collective living over provision for the individual. This allowed complexity and irregularity within the plan to generate an evolving appropriation of space, from interior to exterior.

The work of spatial complexity, variation and interrelationship – the ‘effect of one apartment configuration upon another necessitated never-ending adjustments’ – is ultimately directed toward facilitating self-management by the inhabitants within the evolution of different patterns of communal encounter and life across the commercial, professional and domestic strata of the cité.

Certainly, as Ivry and the other Parisian sites of Renaudie and Gailhoustet’s combinatorial architecture, the honesty of material expression in relation to structure and the traces of labour is not an absolute value. In these sites, there is little conception of a model or ideal viewer; no desire to play with the perceptual acuity of a sophisticated eye at a material level; there is no conception of a material aesthetic and an ideological implication of labour, have no place. The present temporal immediacy of the material and spatial system is thus made ‘neutral’ in support of the project’s programmatic futurity.

This particular category of space within the work of Renaudie and Gailhoustet lead us to the complex threshold spaces between the architecture of the ‘combinatory’ system and its surrounding urbanism. As producers of the brutalist map we capture the external, iconic image of the architecture of our itinerary. As architectural tourists to the work of Renaudie and Gailhoustet we cannot experience the architecture as do inhabitants of the interior life of the ‘combinatory’ system. However, we can, as travellers within the urban conditions at the fringes of the wider city, validly report back our experience of the contact, or, indeed, contract, between the city in the spatial inter-zones and thresholds of transition from the older, normative urban order to the space of ‘difference’. Spending sometimes uneasy periods in these zones, we recorded them with uneven levels of care and detail. I realise now that their conflicting combination of attributes might define them to be pockets of the hard picturesque of the contemporary city – difficult urban space posing within the more formally recognised and accepted brutalist environment. It is an ‘ugly’ brutalism, one that has evolved, not toward broader popular acceptance, but to a more virulent state of repulsion: unmappable.

Another reflection on the discourse of the material surface here is time: its positioning in relation to temporal categories. Material surface on later brutalist work is not, for the most part, an index of the actions of making and labour on the building site. Whilst surfaces bare the traces of use and abuse and of weathering over time, the materials of Renaudie and Gailhoustet do not register the past tense in this way. Concrete surfaces are of a serviceable smoothness, with no particular level of attention to precision in the finish (being neither especially precise nor loose). A concrete render protects facade and structural members at street level and also facilitates the use of colour in the later phases of Ivry. Large, bespoke, precast panelling defines much of the housing facade and exhibits an equally pragmatic materiality – a robust agent of spatial tronxics in service of the speculations of the plan. As a speculative space, anticipatory of an as yet unknown future of social relations, the material traces of the past as an ‘as found’ aesthetic and an ideological implication of labour, have no place. The present temporal immediacy of the material and spatial system is thus made ‘neutral’ in support of the project’s programmatic futurity.
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Jean Renaudie presents a dynamic, fragmented cliff face to its main urban interface with rue Rateau, whilst to the rear the scheme cascades down from 7th to ground floor in the overlapping and constantly shifting orientations of the terracing characteristic of Ivry. The street frontage is deeply incised and hollowed, a space of transitional access to the apartments at ground floor and successive deck levels, with staircases visible as their own volumetric expressions behind the frame of the outer facade panelling. The volumes of the apartments break beyond this framework at higher level in a stepped rhythm descending to meet the more diminutive housing around it, and anticipating the more complex volumetric arrangements behind.

The ground floor of this façade yields a surprising complexity as one journeys through it and extends in places to the depths of something more like an under-croft. The material palette is more variegated than that of the earlier Ivry, with brick and seemingly more provisional breeze-block sections appearing amid the cast concrete, concrete paneling and render. A mid-grey paint occurs intermittently, picking out a sequence of surfaces as if there had been an attempt, not to colour code the surfaces according to architectonic performance, but to lead the eye through complex recessional plains, to tempt engagement in a scopic exploration. (It is likely, of course, that this spatial play of grey is not original, but a later effort of maintenance.)

Hier structure morphs into screen and ‘decoration’ with columns diversely shaped – splattered and spread as if they were assembled from something like the splintered fragments of the façade panelling system. Staircases and horizontal first floor connecting walkways further fragment the visual field and are, in turn, supported by a smaller, seemingly ad hoc structural system of columns, like concrete props or scaffolding. Despite Renaudie and Gailhoustet’s incredible capacities of spatial imagination and draughtsmanship, one cannot help but think that this is a space beyond drawing, beyond specification, and perhaps in part given over to the contractor to provide improvised solutions based on practical knowledge.

Only one figure traversed this space during our visit – a lone female seemingly unsure of her destination. Post boxes in one section of what was apparently conceived originally as an open foyer, seem to have been long abandoned. Almost all of the fenestration at the ground level was closed with an industrial grade metal shuttering, and it was unclear what type of space, or combination of spaces, was behind it: domestic, storage, commercial or studio.

This complex space of circulation, screen, shelter and structure would seem to provide myriad opportunities for appropriation: for concealment, for storage; for the chance encounter or the ambush; the improvised event and activity, industrious or celebratory and social. Yet, the space seems hollowed and left latent. Although suggestive in equal measure of a space of urban deviancy and of architectural festivity, it plays host to neither. The materials of the architecture of ‘difference’ have the appearance of being merely scenographic, the vacated shell of the propositional thesis. Less the connecting tissue of the ‘combinatory’ system to the surrounding city, such spaces now appear like the uncertain buffer zones between Renaudie and Gailhoustet’s utopianism and the spaces of the everyday.
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