

Boyd and the Brut

Quoting Robin Boyd's Words on Brutalism

Nugroho F Utomo

University of Canberra

Abstract

Robin Boyd's contribution to Modern architecture in Australia is well established. However, not enough has been said about his role in introducing Brutalism into Australia. Considering the topical status that Brutalism currently enjoys in both popular media and academia, it is perhaps timely to examine his position on this often-misinterpreted ethic and aesthetic. Broadly speaking, this paper aims to highlight Boyd's continuing relevance in current historiographies on post-war Modern architecture in Australia, of which Brutalism is part. Focusing primarily on his written work, the paper begins by discussing his role in the fifties and sixties as an active contributor to the English journal Architectural Review (AR), which at that time was an important source for Australian architects isolated from developments abroad. What is central to the paper's argument was his involvement with the AR during the period in which Brutalism was de rigueur. He authored numerous articles in the AR, from the time Reyner Banham wrote the arguably, most quoted article on Brutalism New Brutalism, up until Boyd himself authored the AR's Brutalist obituary The Sad End of New Brutalism. Contrary to other literature that contends that there was a delay in the reception of Brutalism in Australia, Boyd's involvement in effect suggests that he was privy to the debate at the time of its occurrence, which indeed becomes critical to the genealogy of Brutalism in Australia. The paper concludes that he is in fact a key figure in antipodean Brutalist discourse. He cemented the Brutalist legacy into the Australian context in his seminal literary work The Australian Ugliness, in which he promoted the Brutalist ethic as a potential antidote to the, so called, ugliness.¹

Boyd's Brutalist Legacy

At present, Robin Boyd's contribution has been largely ignored from the historical account of Brutalism in the Australian context. It is somewhat understandable, however, considering the complexity surrounding the usage of the term and the immense task of plotting its history domestically. Regardless, the relevance of his built and unbuilt projects on the subject should not be overlooked. Moreover, the role of his literature in shaping Australian interpretations of Brutalism should not be forgotten. This paper focuses on a selection of Boyd's writings that relate to New Brutalism and by association broader term of Brutalism, specifically articles published by the English journal the *Architectural Review (AR)* and of course his seminal literary work *The Australian Ugliness*, in which he made specific reference to New Brutalism. With the aim of underscoring Boyd's role in the reception of Brutalism in Australia, a series of quotations from key literary sources will be presented in the following paragraphs. It will be proposed that his large readership domestically should confirm his position as one of the main voices through which Brutalism entered Australia.²

Mainly dedicated to the topic of Brutalism in Australia, issue 2 of volume 25 of *Fabrications: The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians Australia and New Zealand* suggests the complexity involved in unpacking the issues, ultimately, standing out as one of, if not the most, comprehensive account of Brutalism in the Australian context.³ Philip Goad, in his article *Bringing It All Home* perhaps provides the clearest summary of the situation. Beginning with Jennifer Taylor's contributions on the subject, Goad highlights the inclusivity required when discussing Brutalism in the Australian context. He concisely explains that it is necessary to note a wide range of architects and buildings to, if anything, bring to attention "...the complexity of the task and emphasise the slippery nature of the term 'Brutalism' when considered within an Australia context".⁴ If one were to construct a continuation to his argument, it would have to agree on the fact that Australian architects, whether through travel and or first-hand experience abroad, witnessed the rise and fall of New Brutalism. In the case of Boyd, it would be fair to go further and argue that not only was he aware of the development, but that he was part of its history, contributing numerous writings on the subject including *The Sad End of New Brutalism*.⁵ This is significant because it presents New Brutalism as an historic anomaly that departs from Taylor's well referenced observation of the time lag or delay associated with the proliferation of Modern architecture in Australia.⁶ This paper seeks to clarify this position by highlighting Boyd's key role within the *Architectural Review (AR)* from the early fifties up until his premature death in 1971.⁷

During the fifties and sixties Boyd was conscious of the influence that architectural journals had in the proliferation of Modern architecture globally. In 1961, he explained how young architects practising in Australia absorbed "...the influences of Europe and America separately through the magazines and in travel ...".⁸ Further reinforcing the importance of his written work, it suggests that in contrast to today's era of digital mass media, at that time architects in Australia actually read printed publications and, to a degree, listened to authors such as Boyd who presented a particular view of Brutalism that was arguably shaped by the post-war English print media.⁹ But before delving further into Boyd's views on the subject and how they relate to his involvement with the *AR*, the current state of Brutalism in Australia must first be addressed.

Brut Eclecticism

The issues surrounding Brutalism in Australian architecture have become topical. Both the popular media and academics alike have brought to attention the recent demolition of some of its key examples, further suggesting that its historic legacy is under threat. If anything, however, the renewed interest in Brutalism has revealed the need for further inquiry into its complexities. Many issues remain muddled whilst some have not been addressed altogether. Even the definition of the term Brutalism in Australia is tentative. This hesitance toward clear definition is apparent in the relatively recent entry on 'Brutalism' in the *Encyclopaedia of Australian Architecture*.¹⁰ Consistent with Reyner Banham's original views, Geoffrey London's brief entry outlines the distinction between 'New

Brutalism' and 'Brutalism' and aptly explains that any definition in Australia depends on which canon is accepted. He accurately explains that if one leans toward the former, citable built examples become limited. The founding members Alison and Peter Smithson claimed that New Brutalism was 'an ethic not an aesthetic'. But instead of clarifying its message, this well cited aphorism confused its interpretation. As Reyner Banham would later observe in his 1966 full thesis on the subject, *The New Brutalism: Ethic or Aesthetic*,¹¹ the Smithsons' claim of an ethic would prove difficult to uphold when confronted with the reality of actual built work.¹² He claimed that as polemic it should have expanded the field of New Brutalism, but instead narrowed its influence because for many it was perhaps too esoteric.¹³ Simply 'Brutalism', on the other hand, came later. It flourished in the sixties and seventies, and as a consistent aesthetic style was more easily defined and as such more examples can be found in Australia and in general. Many historians agree that 'Brutalism' is characterised by bold massing, large amounts of exposed concrete, and is derived from Le Corbusier's *béton brut*.¹⁴ As mentioned previously, Issue 2 of volume 25 of *Fabrications* provided significantly more clarity on the subject, but at the same time highlighted the complexity involved in unpacking the issues.

Central to the broader discussion on the reception of Brutalism in Australian architecture, are the implications of its displacement from an originally English and European context into an Australian one.¹⁵ Arguably when Brutalism was introduced into the Australian architectural milieu post-war, a so-to-speak 'acculturation' occurred, whereby foreign attitudes were combined with consideration for the local context.¹⁶ In consequence, it cannot be interpreted as straightforward appropriation, and thus a definitive genealogy of Brutalism in Australia remains elusive. What is for sure, however, is that Brutalism in Australia departed from its originally English New Brutalist roots. Consistent with this interpretation were Boyd's views on Brutalism, which were echoed in a publication that described Brutalism in Australia as being 'wonderfully eclectic'.¹⁷ Extending beyond the pioneering English New Brutalism, it was claimed that local examples also display influences from: Scandinavia, particularly the work of Alvar Aalto; France, with Le Corbusier being the obvious reference point; Japan, especially the Metabolist movement; and North America, with emphasis on the work of (bizarrely enough) Frank Lloyd Wright and perhaps more appropriately Paul Rudolf.¹⁸ These international tendencies, however, were not merely copied or imported without modification. They were instead adapted to suit conditions specific to the Australian post-war context. Site specific factors such as climate, topography and the availability of materials and techniques, in fact played a key role in shaping a kind of Brutalism that is, arguably, characteristically Australian. As mentioned earlier, key examples embraced a wide range of influences – local and international. Overall it suggests a strong sense of inclusivity and openness amongst architects of that era. Boyd established this penchant as a kind of eclecticism that characterised Australian modern architecture in general. Writing for the *AR* in the early fifties, Boyd described, in a positive light, the attitude toward modern architecture in Australia as being safely 'centre of the road', further announcing it as a type of eclecticism.¹⁹

In an article published by the *AR* in 1951 entitled *The New Eclecticism*, Boyd confronted the reader with two polarised aesthetics presented in two houses by Roy Grounds and Harry Seidler. He argued that despite appearances the two houses share a common goal of achieving 'ultimate simplicity of means', which he argued as something that is at the heart of modern architecture's theoretical core. This view was consistent with the *AR*'s post-war pedagogy outlined in an essay entitled *The Second Half Century*.²⁰ By shifting attention away from 'style' in an aesthetic sense, Boyd's essay opened the field for modern architecture's continuing relevance post-war, further promoting the views and aspirations of the *AR*, and their quest toward a so-called 'modern vernacular'. Boyd advocated the *AR*'s position in numerous literary works. Beyond the overarching theme of architectural morality, *The New Eclecticism* for instance, suggests through its title, the influence of the *AR*'s post-war Trouville the New Empiricism, which itself was one of the main catalysts for the New Brutalism as a rebellious banner under which a younger generation of architects were able face up to the realities of post-war architecture.

The detailed origins of New Brutalism have been covered elsewhere.²¹ What is of interest here, is how the discourse on New Brutalism initially developed within the circles of the English print media, and how Boyd was involved with the *AR* during that time, publishing numerous articles from as early as 1951. The New Brutalist story publicly began in the early fifties within the pages of two rival English periodicals, *AR* and *Architectural Design (AD)*. During that period, the former represented the establishment, whilst the latter appealed to a younger audience via the promotion of more progressive ideas. It has been accepted that the term first appeared in print in *AD*, in an article by Alison and Peter Smithson, which described an unbuilt project for a house in Soho published in 1953. What is often forgotten, however, is the Smithsons' follow-up to the article, which was also published in *AD* as the editorial piece for the January 1955 issue. Ultimately, it amounted to the Smithsons' version of a New Brutalist manifesto. With the support of technical editor Theo Crosby, the Smithsons found in *AD* a channel from which they could promote their own ideas independent of Banham and the *AR* who had their own separate agendas. Nevertheless, despite the term first appearing in *AD*, articles published by the *AR* on the subject gained significantly more traction, at least from an historical perspective. Banham quickly responded to the Smithson's 1955 manifesto with his own definitive article *The New Brutalism*, which was published in the *AR* only eleven months later. Without a doubt, Banham's 1955 article is referenced more today in all matters relating to New Brutalism. On a broader level, even discussions on Brutalism as mere style, which relate more to Banham's 1966 full thesis on the subject, cannot evade Banham's original tripartite definition published by the *AR* in 1955.²² Amongst other things, it attests to the significant influence of the *AR* and by association its relevant contributors, such as Robin Boyd, in the theorisation of Brutalism in general, 'new' or not.

The Australian Brut Context

After the Second World War, Australia gradually realigned its identity away from England toward America. What ensued was, as John Maxwell Freeland puts it, the 'Americanization' of Australian tastes and ideals.²³ By the sixties, Boyd had observed and criticised the turning of Australia into what he called 'Austerica'.²⁴ Aware of the dangers associated with misguided appropriation of foreign attitudes, Boyd warned in *New Buildings of the Commonwealth* that if a locally sensitive attitude toward the built environment did not take hold, architecture in Australia could become overwhelmed with mass-produced ideas.²⁵ Initially published by the *AR* in 1957 as an article, Boyd's chapter reinforced what the magazine had been promoting since the late forties, that being a spirit of internationalism that is balanced with consideration for geographic specificities. Boyd agreed that consideration of local climatic features combined with locally produced materials in 'unselfconscious construction', could potentially nurture a level of adopted ingenuity.²⁶ What is particularly relevant to this paper, was his subtle allusion to the theoretical role the *AR* played in the reception of Brutalism in Australia.

The younger architect still clings to the faith that there is rational justification for his modern eclecticism... His first trip takes him to Europe, concentrating on Italy, Scandinavia and Great Britain. His second tip is to the U.S.A. He is looking for practice rather than theory, and on returning home he finds the Forum more helpful than the Architectural Review, and both more rewarding than any of the local architectural journals... Then there are Australian versions of all the mid-century mannerisms from Brutalism to Edward Stone...²⁷

In the above quotation Boyd also observed, amongst other prevalent mannerisms, the existence of Australian versions of Brutalism. Unfortunately, he did not cite any specific examples. And despite him being seemingly supportive of Brutalism, he admitted that its authentic form had not yet appeared in Australia; noting that the "...coarse, crude Anti-Featurism of the Brutalists was too much even for architectural students in the land of the Featurists".²⁸

Boyd introduced New Brutalism to the broader Australian public in *The Australian Ugliness*. Its aesthetico-moral subtext – inherited from an earlier generation of Moderns debating style in nineteenth century Europe²⁹ – can indeed be compared to the New Brutalist claim of an ethic and, to a degree, is in line with the approach that was being championed by the *AR*.³⁰ At the start of the book, Boyd ultimately revealed the influence of the journal in his explication of the phenomenon he coined as the ‘Australian ugliness’. He noted, that in substance it is not dissimilar to what the *AR* called “...the mess that is man-made America”.³¹ Further, he goes on to elaborate that “...these are the words of the London magazine Architectural Review when it devoted an issue in December 1950 to a devastatingly illustrated attack on American urban and suburban culture”.³² In the second half of *The Australian Ugliness* Boyd explicitly introduced New Brutalism to Australia, which for all intents and purposes, was made up of Banham’s and more broadly the *AR*’s rhetoric.

The recent tendency in England towards a revival of early modern architectural morality is more significant. The leaders of this movement hopefully adopted a style-name, ‘The New Brutalism’... a new promise perhaps for the second half century... Reyner Banham examined it in the Architectural Review of December 1955... [and] it was a hot topic in English architectural circles.³³

In addition to citing Banham’s contentious tripartite definition of New Brutalism,³⁴ Boyd’s choice of words, whether conscious or not, are reminiscent of *AR*’s post-war pedagogy, which was laid out in 1947 in an editorial manifesto entitled *The Second Half Century*.³⁵ But what is particularly relevant, was Boyd’s introduction of New Brutalism as a ‘hot topic’ in England; therefore, establishing the perception of Brutalism domestically as, first and foremost, an English phenomenon. Boyd, however, did not simply relay Banham’s version of events. He no doubt cast his own views on the subject. He noticed how the heroism of the New Brutalists had been met with fierce criticism abroad, further relating its negative reception to the movement’s unfortunate nomenclature. Unlike Banham who proposed that the compound term ‘New Brutalism’ was more than a label – a slogan and banner,³⁶ Boyd considered the catchphrase ‘New Brutalism’ as ‘half-ironic conceit’.³⁷ In *The Australian Ugliness* Boyd further explained how New Brutalism was largely misunderstood in England, and dismissed in America as nothing more than ‘poor-man’s Mies’. In doing so, Boyd revealed again the influence of the *AR*’s version of New Brutalism on his own views, and in effect that of the Australian readership. Arguably his precise knowledge of its reception in America came from Philip Johnson’s account of the Smithson’s Hunstanton School (1954), which was published in the *AR* in the year of its completion.³⁸ Johnson famously dismissed Hunstanton as being nothing more than poor-man’s Mies, referring specifically to his IIT campus buildings.

In 1963, Boyd underscored again Banham and the *AR*’s version of New Brutalism to an Australian audience. In *The New Architecture*,³⁹ Boyd proposed a positive alternative for architects practising in featurist ‘Austerica’. He noted that,

... he may join the counter-reaction to such irrelevant visual effects: the predominantly European movement which sometimes calls itself rather proudly the New Brutalism... There is not much brutalism in Australia. Nevertheless, many serious architects must feel some sympathy for this approach. While they may reject the crudeness of some of the more self-consciously rebellious brutalism, still they often feel drawn – morally and logically – to a large part of the theory of stringent simplicity and honesty for which the early 20th century pioneers crusaded.⁴⁰

He observed that the so-called ‘New Architecture’ emerging in Australia during the sixties was in line with the *AR*’s measured position: safely in the middle.

Elegance or brutality... Which of the two extreme paths does the creative architect follow? The happy answer to this key question is: at present neither. The mood of the younger, more advanced and creative architect in Australia today is reassuringly balanced. It is not vacillating or wandering, but determinedly and clear-headedly in the centre of the road.⁴¹

Contrary to Banham who insisted that bloody-mindedness or *je-m'en-foutisme* was essential to New Brutalism, Boyd attributed Australia's 'centre of the road' position to its geographic isolation. According to Boyd, this meant that Australian architects worked outside the international realm of competition, and consequently felt no need to prove their cleverness. One could construe Boyd's, self admittedly brief, account of the work of a small group of young architects practising in Australia during the early sixties as being reminiscent of Banham's codification of New Brutalism half a decade earlier – as emerging through the work of a select group of young architects and artists. In referring to the plates presented in *The New Architecture*, Boyd noted that the "... objects are to indicate as concisely as possible the character of the style at this moment ...".⁴² Like Banham, Boyd's method described a type of tendency belonging to a specific moment in time, but nothing more. Unlike Banham, he did not try to construct a relative coherency amongst an emerging avant-garde. And without degrading the discussion to the level of 'national styles', Boyd continued to explain that the New Architecture is native to Australia; further describing it as a "... branch of international modern design that is characteristically Australian ...".⁴³ This is also comparable to Banham's 1955 article which heralded New Brutalism as England's first real contribution since New Art History, But again, Boyd does not go as far as Banham, in claiming that the New Architecture is anything more than an approach, in journalistic terms a label perhaps, and not, like Banham's New Brutalism, also a polemic that promised the possible emergence of a revolution – *une architecture autre*. In terms of the *AR*'s influence, however, the 'New' prefix says it all.

The Sad End of New Brutalism

Many of Boyd's writings point toward the role, and influence, of Banham and the *AR* in the reception of Brutalism in Australia. His overall involvement with the journal provided him access to England and Europe. One could argue that his continuous exposure to the *AR*'s rhetoric would have had some influence on his own views. More than a decade prior to *The New Architecture*, Boyd had already taken up the *AR*'s favourite noun. The 'New' in Boyd's *A New Eclecticism* had presupposed the 'centre of the road' stance discussed in *The New Architecture*. Ultimately, it demonstrates Boyd's awareness of the then current leading edge theoretical discussions on New Art History, New Empiricism and indeed New Brutalism.

In reviewing Reyner Banham's full thesis on the subject *The New Brutalism: Ethic or aesthetic*, Boyd effectively wrote the New Brutalist obituary. Published in the *AR* in 1967, Boyd's article *The Sad End of New Brutalism* echoed Banham's conclusion that New Brutalism, having started as a revolutionary ethic, turned into nothing more than a mere aesthetic when faced with the realities of construction.⁴⁴ Beyond reaffirming what Banham had established a year earlier, Boyd offered his own reading of New Brutalism as, essentially, a vernacular phenomenon, further suggesting that because of this, it could not be displaced from England intact. Nevertheless, without going into the under discussed vernacular aspect of New Brutalism, which itself deserves more room than that available in this paper, it would be safe to conclude that Robin Boyd made a significant contribution to the history of Brutalism in Australia and abroad. Further, his role within the *AR* suggests that he was actively involved in the debate at the time of its occurrence. The large audience that Boyd had reached, from academics, architects to the general public, indeed cements his position as one of the main figures of Brutalism in Australia. That is not to say, however, that he is a 'Brutalist', but instead a key voice that must be included in the story of Brutalism in Australia.

QUOTATION: What does history have in store for architecture today?

After Boyd announced the end of New Brutalism to the world, he was quoted saying that there is no 'real brutalism' in Australia.⁴⁵ Besides signalling his frustration with the featurist tendencies of the day, the quote projects an assumed level of authority when it came to the subject of Brutalism. One could say that it is a level of authority that has been earned through first hand involvement and witnessing of the rise of New Brutalism and the historical context from which it emerged. From his relationship with the AR, as the official site of the birth and death of New Brutalism, to his specific mention of it in his seminal literary work *The Australian Ugliness*, the importance of Boyd's literature in discussions on Brutalism in Australia cannot be stressed enough. Furthermore, when combined with elements of his built work, which can be described as being sympathetic to the New Brutalists cause, Robin Boyd's status as a central figure in the history of Brutalism in Australia is something that should truly be acknowledged.

Endnotes

¹ The idea for this paper came from an anonymous reviewer's comments on an unpublished essay by this author entitled *The Brut and the Review: on the role of the Architectural Review in the reception of New Brutalism in Australia*, submitted in late 2014 for *Fabrications: the Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*.

² Philip Goad, "Bringing it all home" *Fabrications: The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*: vol. 25, no.2 (2015): 176. Goad's significant contribution on Robin Boyd's role in shaping Australian interpretations of Brutalism and his advocacy for 'creative realism', must be acknowledged as the basis from which this paper attempts to build upon the scholarship on Boyd and Brutalism.

³ *Fabrications*: vol. 25, no.2 (2015):

⁴ Goad, "Bringing it all home", 180-181.

⁵ Robin Boyd, "The Sad End of New Brutalism", *Architectural Review* 142 (1967).

⁶ Jennifer Taylor, *Australian Architecture Since 1960* (Canberra: Royal Australian Institute of Architects, 1990), 62-63.

⁷ This is the focus of the paper, and is meant to compliment other key factors such as Boyd's trip to America and his work on Japanese architecture, which should be acknowledged and considered in the broader understanding of Boyd in the Brutalist context. See: Goad, op cit.

⁸ Robin Boyd, "Australia", in *New Buildings in the Commonwealth*, ed. James M. Richards (London: The Architectural Press, 1961), 19. Boyd's contribution to this volume, which was put together by the AR's publishing arm, communicated the state of Australian architecture back to an international audience. In it he reinforced the AR's support for the proliferation of modern architecture in relatively less developed countries.

⁹ For further reading on the role of the English print media in the reception of Brutalism within the Australian context, see: Nugroho Utomo, "New Journalism: on the role of the Architectural Review in the reception of New Brutalism in Australia", in *Critique 2013 Conference Proceedings*, ed. Chris Brisbin and Myra Thiessen (Adelaide: University of South Australia, 2013), 369-380.

¹⁰ Geoffrey London, 'Brutalism' entry, in *The Encyclopedia of Australian Architecture*, ed. Phillip Goad & Julie Willies (Cambridge: University Press, 2011), 110.

¹¹ Reyner Banham, *The New Brutalism: Ethic or Aesthetic?* (London: The Architectural Press, 1966)

¹² He was referring to the Smithsons' Economist Building cluster in London.

¹³ Boyd, *The Sad End of New Brutalism*, 11.

¹⁴ Reyner Banham, 'Brutalism', *Dictionary of Art* vol. 5 (London: Grove, 1996), 55-57.

¹⁵ Joseph Buch, "Beyond Brutalism: Another Imported Style vs. Team Ten Theoretical Ideas" in *Progress: The Proceedings of the XX Annual Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand, Sydney, 2-5 October 2003*, 38-43. Robin Boyd used the term displacement in the sixties to describe Modern architecture in Australia.

¹⁶ This paper assumes John W. Berry and David L. Sam's definition of 'acculturation' – originally discussed from a social psychology perspective – as the process by which migrants to a new culture (in this case New Brutalism) develop relationships with the new culture and maintain their original culture.

¹⁷ Glenn Harper, "Concrete Poetry" in *Brutalism: A Heritage Issue, Architecture Bulletin* (Sydney: Australian Institute of Architects, March-April 2012), 12.

¹⁸ Peter Mould, "New Brutalism" in *Brutalism: A Heritage Issue, Architecture Bulletin* (Sydney: Australian Institute of Architects, March-April 2012). 14. See also: Philip Goad, *Bringing It All Home*, p.180-181.

¹⁹ Robin Boyd, "A New Eclecticism", *Architectural Review* 657 (1951): 155-58. The title in itself highlights the influence of the AR and its nomenclature of styles and tendencies post-war.

²⁰ James Maude Richards; Nikolaus Pevsner; Osbert Lancaster; Hubert de Cronin Hastings, "The Second Half Century", *Architectural Review* 101, January (1947), p. 23-24.

²¹ For further reading on the origins of New Brutalism see: Andrew Higgott, *Mediating Modernism: Architectural Cultures in Britain* (Oxon: Routledge, 2007), 86-113. See also: Laurent Stalder, "New Brutalism, Topology, and Image: some remarks on the architectural debates in England around 1950", *The Journal of Architecture* 13, no. 3 (2008): 263-281; see also: Steve Parnell, "From Behind Enemy Lines" in *CLOG Brutalism* (2013), 22. See also: Nigel Whiteley, "Banham and Otherness: Reyner Banham (1922-1988) and his Quest for an Architecture Autre", *Architectural History* 33 (1990).

²² Reyner Banham, "The New Brutalism", *Architectural Review* 118 (1955), p. 360. Banham's definition reads: "1, Memorability as an Image; 2, Clear exhibition of Structure; and 3, Valuation of Materials 'as found'".

²³ John M. Freeland, *Architecture in Australia* (Victoria: Pelican Books, 1972), 264.

²⁴ Robin Boyd, *The Australian Ugliness* (Melbourne: Text Publishing Company, 2010).

²⁵ Boyd, "Australia", 19.

²⁶ Erdem Erten, *Shaping 'The Second Half Century': The Architectural Review 1947-1971* (unpublished doctoral thesis), 200.

²⁷ Boyd, "Australia".

²⁸ Boyd, *The Australian Ugliness*, 233.

²⁹ Nigel Whiteley, "Banham and Otherness: Reyner Banham (1922-1988) and his Quest for an Architecture Autre", *Architectural History* 33 (1990): 191.

³⁰ The notion of 'valuing materials for their inherent properties "as found"' is Banham's final index in his tripartite codification of New Brutalism (see above). The Smithsons claimed that this sense of materiality is in fact being driven by an ethic.

³¹ Boyd, *The Australian Ugliness*, 39.

³² Boyd, *The Australian Ugliness*.

³³ Boyd, *The Australian Ugliness*, 232.

³⁴ Banham, "The New Brutalism".

³⁵ Richards; Pevsner; Lancaster; Cronin Hastings, op. cit, 23-24.

³⁶ Banham further described it, in an over the top tone, as a 'call to arms' in the 1955 *AR* article.

³⁷ Boyd, *The Australian Ugliness*, 233.

³⁸ Johnson described the Smithson's Hunstanton School, the first built example of New Brutalism, as an Adolf Loos inspired 'anti-architecture' and a cheap imitation of Mies' IIT campus. See: Philip Johnson, "School at Hunstanton Norfolk", *Architectural Review* 116 (1954), p. 148-150.

³⁹ Robin Boyd, *The New Architecture* (Croydon: Longmans, 1963). Like his article *A New Eclecticism*, the title itself highlights the influence of the *AR*'s journalistic style.

⁴⁰ Boyd, *The New Architecture*, 6.

⁴¹ Boyd, *The New Architecture*, 7.

⁴² Boyd, *The New Architecture*, 8.

⁴³ Boyd, *The New Architecture*.

⁴⁴ It is worth noting again that Banham singled out the Smithsons' Economist Building to support his claim.

⁴⁵ Peter Raisbeck & Christine Phillips, "Contesting Brutalism in Australia: Robin Boyd's high-rises commissions" in *Contested Terrains: The Proceedings of the XXIII Annual Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand, Fremantle, September 29–October 2 2006*, 455. It is curious how Boyd used the terms 'real Brutalism'.

