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The effects fighting on the battlefields of the First World War had on soldier-artists and their works have often been analyzed. Missing from many such accounts, however, are architects and architecture; a lacuna that becomes somewhat understandable if one considers that battlefields as sites of destruction are the ultimate opposite to architecture and building, two of humanity’s most constructive endeavors. As soldiers who actively participated in the war, architects and members of cognate disciplines like town planning experienced the same battlefields as writers, poets, painters, musicians, and indeed any other soldier. Accordingly, the question remains after architect's experiences of fighting in the war and the possible consequences of their experiences on their architectural work, on the ways they saw their discipline and profession.

This paper presents three case studies of how architecture and the First World War intersected, each offering an aspect of a possible comprehensive answer to the above question which this essay, however, does not attempt. The first case study discusses a summer school entitled The War: Its Social Tasks & Problems, which the Scotsman, Patrick Geddes, a biologist who had meandered via sociology into city design, co-organized in London. Held in July 1915, the event debated the larger cultural meaning of the war and was attended by various architects and soldier-architects from Britain and Belgium.

The following two examples illuminate how the experience of actively fighting in the war influenced individual architects. The second case study looks at an example from the western front where the English architect Adrian Berrington was shell-shocked in Flanders in July 1917. Subsequently treated at Craiglockhart War Hospital
near Edinburgh, Berrington was a patient of Captain Dr. Arthur Brock, a Scottish medical doctor who had developed a shell-shock therapy that relied on Geddesian ideas about the interaction of human beings with their environment.

The final case study turns to the Austrian architect Richard Neutra for whom fighting in and experiencing the First World War contributed to an understanding of modern architecture as a means to position man in a hostile environment; a perception that many years later resulted in a radical new way of organizing architectural space.

Reconstruction

The summer meeting ‘The War: Its Social Tasks & Problems’ was held at King’s College in London from July 12-31, 1915. The event offered a “sociological interpretation of the war” to which end the lectures of the first week focused on geographical and educational fundamentals of the warring nations, those of the second on historical aspects of the war, and of the third on civic, or socio-cultural, and constructive rebuilding of the destroyed nations and their cities. During the second week, a half-day conference on the “Reconstruction in Belgium and Northern France” was hosted by Émile Vandervelde, the Belgian Secretary of State, and the Belgian architect Victor Horta. Another speaker was Herbert C. Hoover, the Chairman of the American Committee for Relief in Belgium and future President of the United States of America.

In attendance at the summer school were many representatives of architecture, urban planning, and housing, among them the architects Henry Vaughan Lanchester, Frank Mears, Geddes’s son-in-law, Alfred Portielje (Société Royal des Architectes d’Anvers), and Raymond Unwin. Also attending were Lawrence Weaver, the editor of Country Life, and representatives of the Garden City and Town Planning Association, the National Housing and Town Planning Council, the Rural Housing Organization Society, and the Outlook Tower Edinburgh. In the audience was the architect Charles Rennie Mackintosh.

Geddes and his co-organizer, the economist Gilbert Slater, principal of Ruskin College in Oxford, argued that among the pressing problems was “real reconstruction [which] is … essentially … a renewal of social life”. The rebuilding of Belgium (and northern France) required that architects should aim “at no mere restoration, nor merely more efficient re-planning, roads, railways and all; but nobler and grander designs also”.

The German invasion of Belgium had attacked a nation and her citizens, and a century-old, spatial-geographic, and socio-economic order. On a large scale, this order had historically found visible expression in a network of villages, towns, and cities that existed harmoniously with and within their natural surroundings. On the
scale of individual towns, Geddes often resorted to images of town squares when he wanted to symbolically represent the social order underpinning the physical fabric of individual cities. The churches and cathedrals that rose on these squares were for Geddes complementary symbols of the spiritual order these communities enjoyed.

To reconstruct a historically grown socio-spatial order required, according to Geddes, two distinct though closely intertwined stages. First, a survey from high above would offer a synthesizing view of a larger territory. Second, on the ground, local, detailed surveys had to be conducted in order to familiarize oneself with the specific urban environments, individual communities, and their cities. Geddes had propagated this two-pronged approach ever since he installed the Outlook Tower in Edinburgh which offered far-reaching, surveying outlooks from the top floor complemented by ever more inward-directed looks at the history of Edinburgh and Scotland on the lower levels, ending with a meditation cell on the ground floor for final reflection before exiting.

In addition to the fighting on the ground, the modern battlefield necessitated reconnaissance from above, as the military service of Geddes’s oldest son, Alasdair, a geographer, illustrates. The size of the battlefields of the First World War had expanded almost indefinitely in comparison to those of earlier European history. For example, the terrain of the battle of the Somme that was fought from July to November 1916 “was ten times more spread out than Waterloo”, the site of Napoleon’s defeat. Before Major Alasdair Geddes was killed in France in May 1917 he had surveyed the frontline from a balloon that floated high above the battlefield while being anchored to the ground. Geddes’s wartime duty transformed into a military task his father’s idea of surveying from above vast territories as a basis for a regional or urban masterplan.

Coincidentally, the architect Frank Mears, Patrick Geddes’s son-in-law, also surveyed enemy territory from above with the same unit as Alasdair Geddes.

Other architects immediately saw the potential of the aerial view for reconstruction proposals. In October 1917, for example, the Belgian architect Lucien Coppé (1892-1975) drew up a scheme to rebuild both the city and port of Zeebrugge. His English colleague, Stephen Rowland Pierce (1896-1966), visualized the scheme with an aerial view depicting the new city and port as they would be seen through the fuselage of a biplane (Fig. 1).

The smaller, local scale of Geddes’s two-pronged approach was addressed by war memorials which the circle of architects around Geddes conceived following the summer meeting. Sometime in 1915 or 1916 Mackintosh designed a war memorial for soldiers fallen in France and a design for a memorial fountain. If built, both would have inserted into the urban fabric and the civic realm spaces for personal commemoration, reflection, and memory. After the war, Frank Mears conceived a comparable commemorative space for an entire community when he drew up plans for a Via Sacra for his home town of Edinburgh. To be located just below Edinburgh
Castle, the unrealized design envisioned a ceremonial street leading up the lower slopes of Castle Rock and ending in a neo-Gothic memorial chapel.

Recovery

The two protagonists of the second case study, the English architect Adrian Berrington (1886-1923) and Captain Dr. Arthur John Brock (1879-1947), were both acquainted with Geddes. Berrington had been in contact with Geddes from approximately the mid-1900s onward. Brock had studied medicine at the University of Edinburgh and also practiced in the city where he moved in Geddesian circles.8

Adrian Berrington was born in Birkenhead, near Liverpool, in 1886. From 1903 to 1905, he studied at the Liverpool School of Architecture. In 1907, Berrington moved to London where he worked for architect R. Frank Atkinson, who that year collaborated with Daniel H. Burnham on the Selfridge's department store in London's Oxford Street,9 enrolled in evening classes at the Royal Academy of Arts, and rendered designs conceived by Geddes, for example a temple of the Greek gods and a garden for the nine muses.10 While transforming lofty ideas into perspectival drawings, Berrington met in London the Scottish poetess, Rachel Annand Taylor (1876-1960), an acquaintance of Geddes from Aberdeen and knowledgeable on both mythology and classical antiquity. Berrington deeply admired Annand Taylor, and the two began a lasting correspondence by letter.

Berrington enlisted in January 1915. As a member of signaling units of the Royal Engineering Corps, one of his duties was to establish and maintain communication lines on the battlefields. Three letters to Taylor illustrate how Berrington tried to make sense of the spatial and environmental settings of his military service. On September 8, 1916, Berrington described how he had reached St. Ouen, France, by train on a journey that had taken him through a “slowly – very slowly – unfolding panorama of harvest fields & streams which run [through] this meadow … The machine sustains one however & the train keeps to its rails”. He adds that “standing about in a camp or a station whilst one might be seeing a cathedral or the church of St. Ouen almost makes a conscientious objector”.11

Clearly, Berrington did not want to be where he found himself to be, yet when recapitulating his travels, they transformed into an image of Geddes’s valley section, following the course of a river through a landscape until it reached a city, that is a human community huddled around a cathedral or church, a Geddesian symbol as explained earlier.

On October 22, 1916, Berrington was in an unidentified and undistinguished location: “A hard bitten little place of stone & cobbled streets. No ‘place’ with cafes
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& so on. A big village really”. He continues: “I know smaller places which are towns – by virtue of that place & perhaps a boulevard”.12 Relying again on Geddesian concepts to describe and analyze his surroundings, Berrington conveyed once more his alienation from the landscape of war. This example, however, focused on the social interactions between human beings as symbolized by a square or place, French for square, of a town rather than a spiritual community as represented by a cathedral.

Finally, on October 25, 1916, Berrington was occupied with the “gratuitous labour to make cosmos in chaos”,13 a phrase that summed up his efforts to arrange a livable space in a dugout. Already three days earlier, Berrington had reported that he was working on “quite a decent dugout” located below the cellar of a house:

By the time I have finished it, it will be a jolly good dugout. White & warm with wires in neat rows & so on.14

He continued explaining his motivation for spending much time and energy on this abode:

[I] Hate disorder like the Devil – a good big chunk of the devil is just pure disorder. […] Even if we move out next week it is a good work to make a white[,] clean[,] well[-]lit[,] orderly dugout in place of a [illegible word] confusion.15

Life in the trenches was bearable only by creating a space that through its orderly arrangements could perhaps resemble a home.

Berrington’s attempts to root himself in an environment rendered hostile through the war came to naught near Nieuwpoort (Nieuport), Flanders, on July 14, 1917. Nearby to the south-west is the town of Veurne (Furnes), even further to the south Ypres is located. Early in July 1917, just before the Third Battle of Ypres or the Battle of Passchendaele began, this part of Flanders was the site of the German army’s first deployment of Blue Cross and Yellow Cross (or mustard gas), two new chemical weapons.16

The German attacks began on July 10, the same day on which Berrington’s unit was exposed near Nieuwpoort to heavy fire with High Explosives and gas shells as minutes from a medical board meeting in December 1917 retrospectively report. A few days later, on July 14, Berrington “was startled by what appeared to be the quick sound of a high velocity shell, and he tripped and fell. Subsequently his mind became blank as regards practically the whole of his war experiences”.17

The notes were most likely written by Dr. Brock, Berrington’s medical doctor, who elsewhere described his understanding of shell-shock (or neurasthenia) as “a privation or relative absence of life”. A shell-shocked human being’s life is “broken
up and dispersed into its constituent elements” because “its unity in space and time both gone”. With the usually harmonious integration of a human being (or any other living organism) into the environment violently interrupted, a soldier is rendered incapable of “utilizing and profiting by his environment, his circumstances” because he can no longer adapt to or even shape his surroundings.18

This environmentally oriented definition of shell-shock called, accordingly, for a treatment that focused on the re-synthesis of the disparate experiences and reactions to the environment, though not on the large scale of the surveying gaze from high above but on the small scale of being eye-to-eye with one’s everyday surroundings. In short, Brock wanted to nudge his patients to re-engage through work and other physical activities with their daily, man-made and natural environment and thereby regain the capacity to synthesize again what the violence of the battlefield had torn apart.

Berrington came to Craiglockhart War Hospital in August 1917; shortly before him the poet Wilfred Owen, another of Brock’s patients, had been admitted.19 At the time of Berrington’s arrival, Owen had taken on as part of his therapy the editorship of The Hydra: The Magazine of Craiglockhart War Hospital. Responding to an editorial call “for an attractive cover design – a promising futuristic thing”,20 Berrington depicted the (possibly autobiographic) moment when a blast suspends a soldier in mid-air above a barren battlefield in the foreground. (Fig. 2) The soldier’s, and also the viewer’s, gaze goes into the distance where the silhouette of the Pentland Hills to the south-west of Edinburgh again recalls a Geddesian Valley Section. Between the hills and the human body a multi-headed hydra entangles the soldier and obscures the edifice of the war hospital. Even if not a futuristic design, the drawing was selected as the title cover for the new series of The Hydra from November 1917 to August 1918, when the magazine folded.21

Berrington’s other contribution to the new series of The Hydra was small line drawings illustrating regular columns on activities of various clubs and societies the patients could join. The clubs were more than social opportunities, for participation was part of the treatment regime, especially but not only of Brock’s patients. Viewing Berrington’s small vignettes, the drawings illustrate parts of the treatment that Brock hoped would stimulate the recovery of the lost unity between patient and environment. Patients arrive in a reception area of what could almost be a country club, they participate in indoor activities such as the debating society or writing for and producing the magazine. Outdoor activities comprise sports, nature walks and study, photography, but also surveying of the surrounding territory and exploring the nearby city of Edinburgh.

Brock himself published in The Hydra on the history of Edinburgh and prescribed participation in activities of Geddes’s Outlook Tower.22 He coined for his shell-shock therapy the term ergotherapy – ergo being the Greek word for work. In the context of
his and Berrington's involvement with Geddes and his circle, the term “occupational” also refers to Geddes's notion of natural occupation which underpinned the valley section and indicated environmentally well-integrated ways for humans to exist in different areas of a valley region.\textsuperscript{23}
Berrington embarked on ergotherapeutical activities such as hiking on the hill behind the hospital. Surveying from high up the surrounding countryside and city elated his mind while also bringing up painful memories of Alasdair Geddes. Berrington traveled to Edinburgh, visited local artists such as Charles Mackie, another acquaintance of Geddes, and explored the countryside. During the latter, he painted watercolors of regional architecture emphasizing the geometric solids underneath all architectural and ornamental dressings. Berrington also drafted imaginary buildings such as a Duke’s house for a hill in the Scottish countryside; the whereabouts of the design is presently not known.\textsuperscript{24}

A final vignette for \textit{The Hydra} shows departing patients passing the ticket booth of a train station upon leaving Craiglockhart War Hospital. Brock’s goal was that patients would regain their ability of “synoptic[ally] seeing” the environment which, if attained, indicated the recovery of an “Organism's constant active Interplay with Environment”, as Brock paraphrased Geddes's triad of Place-Work-Folk.\textsuperscript{25} The ultimate tragedy for Brock (and his fellow doctors) was the death on the battlefield of patients who had been discharged after successful treatment. Wilfred Owen was killed a week before Armistice Day. Berrington also went back to military service, though not to active fighting. After the war he was appointed professor for Urban Design and Planning at the University of Toronto on October 1, 1920. He took medical leave a year later and died suddenly in London in 1923.

\textbf{Reconceptualization}

The third and final case study deals with the Balkans, far away from Belgium and the United Kingdom. However, Richard Neutra, the Austrian, later American, architect and protagonist of this section, shared with Berrington an experience of the battlefield and fighting in the war that was determined by the relationship between the soldier-architect and his environment. In Neutra’s case, this gaze was initiated by the architect’s early interest in the physio-psychology of, for example, Wilhelm Wundt; Neutra read selected works of the Leipzig psychologists while studying architecture in Vienna from 1910.

Four phases of active military service can be reconstructed for Neutra. From the beginning of the First World War to the end of 1915 Neutra was stationed mainly in forts and defense installations, often in isolated locations, along the southern and on the Adriatic borders of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. In January 1916, Neutra participated in the offensive against Montenegro, and until the end of April 1916 he was a member of the forces occupying the mountainous country. From then on, a
malaria infection repeatedly enforced prolonged hospital stays and Neutra essentially ceased to serve actively in the military.

The Balkans posed a unique set of military challenges and dangers. Contemporary sources point out that the war in the mountainous regions of the Alps and the Western Mountain Barrier of the Balkans was second only to the Western Front. War in a mountainous terrain spatially expanded the battlefield even more than on flat land, as the topography often separated positions by distance and height, and required foremost trenches that were sometimes just short, unconnected segments. According to the German general lieutenant, William Balck, mountain war was harder because it was a struggle with the enemy and a “fight against nature”. The latter was a consequence of the addition of height to distance and the unpredictable swings of the weather. In addition, “troops had to learn a different way of … breathing” as the circumstances forced them to interact more intensely on a physio-psychological level with the environment.

Neutra’s war diary and autobiographical writings record the specific dangers and fear the war theater triggered. For example, the imbalance between modern weaponry and more traditional techniques of warfare and weaponry was a worrisome potential threat. The commanding, but exposed, mountain-top position of Fort Kravica, for example, faced “a savage guerilla-trained enemy”, who, in the night, burned down farm buildings and “frontier hamlets”. When wired dynamite charges supplemented barbed wire entanglements around his company’s position, Neutra wondered about their effectiveness against enemies who were “mountaineers of Montenegro, who had knives with which to cut our throats, pistols, guns, and matches”; in short, much simpler weapons that allowed the enemy to get as close as possible to Neutra and his fellow soldiers. Accordingly, Neutra’s gaze remained fixed on the landscape that crept right up to this outpost as it was the immediate danger zone from which partisans might attack.

The ways soldiers perceived the surroundings also determined their experience of the landscape of war. Comparing the war diary with diaries Neutra had written before the war, an important difference concerning the architect’s view of the landscape becomes apparent. As I have analyzed elsewhere, Neutra’s pre-war landscape observations differ little from those of a painter who studies a landscape by looking at a scene with a canvas or sketch pad between him and the scenery. Neutra’s war diary complements such directed gaze with one that perceives the landscape as surrounding space, a totality into which the soldier-architect is immersed and of which he takes measure primarily with regard to any physical characteristics that may hinder or help in traversing the terrain in pursuit of a military mission or survival.

Other soldiers recorded comparable experience; for example, the gestalt psychologist Kurt Lewin. Recuperating from wounds received on the western front, Lewin wrote *The Landscape of War*. The essay reflects on the space of a battlefield,
most notably the fundamental changes in the perception of both general landscape characteristics and details as seen through the eyes of an individual soldier. To the latter, the modern, extended battlefield appears as a relative, surrounding space that changes constantly depending on where the soldier is located or moving to, and never fully comprehensible.33

Militarily speaking, the phenomenon Lewin analyzed and which echoed through Neutra’s war diary was the open order of the modern battlefield that had emerged in the late nineteenth century.34 Advances in technology, reach, and accuracy of modern weapons spatially expanded the battlefield and revolutionized the position of individual soldiers within it. Modern weapons increasingly rendered obsolete traditional shoulder-to-shoulder formation because tight groups of soldiers were obvious and easy targets for machine guns, for example. Instead, soldiers on the battlefield were now “farther apart from one another than had been custom for most of recorded history”.35 Consequently, soldiers learned to fight differently, maneuvering more and individually, scanning the terrain for the slightest cover offered by topography and nature, crawling and hugging the ground while moving forward or backward; in short they engaged in activities that imposed close and persistent physical contact with nature.36

The German architectural and cultural critic, Karl Scheffler, pointed out already in 1915 that any likely effect of the First World War on art and architecture would be felt only “in a certain temporal and spatial distance, when the disgust of the moment, the efforts, in short the All-too-Human have been overcome”.37 While this conclusion is arguable for some art forms, it holds for literature. Soldier-authors such as, for example, Edmund Blunden and Erich-Maria Remarque published their ground-breaking works about the war only towards the end of the 1920s.38 Neutra’s architectural response to his experience of the landscape of the First World War happened even later, in the 1940s, when the immersive perception of battlefield space developed into one source of Neutra’s novel approach to architecture.

Survival Through Design, Neutra’s lengthy, quasi-philosophical statement of his approach to design and architecture, was published in 1954 but compiled after the United States had entered the Second World War at the end of 1941. It contains a remarkable passage that discusses four stages of a process of perpetual exchange between sensory stimulations and corresponding reactions or design decisions. The stages are “Orientation Response”, “Defense Response”, “Control Response”, and, finally, “Precision Response”.39 The passage can be read as an architect envisioning a well laid-out, functionally arranged modern house, for example, when Neutra refers to conveniences and other practical items being within reach. But it also describes how Neutra tried to control nearby dangers and, when that effort failed, to deal with their possible consequences, for example when checking whether he could still control his limbs, gather his tools, and flee, and was not confined because not entrapped.
The second perspective sheds an interesting light on Neutra’s architectural projects from the 1940s; a time when, as the late Esther McCoy once remarked, Neutra’s California œuvre entered a distinct new period as exemplified in the Nesbitt house (Los Angeles, 1941-42) – which Neutra called the “war house” – and the Kaufmann Desert House (Palm Springs, CA, 1946-47). Both houses are characterized by a dissolution of the building and its constituent elements. Enclosed rooms, fixed walls, and defined interior spaces spill over into and merge with the surroundings. Individual rooms form almost stand-alone pavilions, linked by views through generous and often moveable floor-to-ceiling glass walls and doors, outdoor terraces, and walkways, partially covered with projecting roofs and pergolas.

Almost everywhere within the environment of the Kaufmann House an occupant is placed into the open plan of modernist space without, however, being exposed to the dangers of the open order of the modern battlefield as Neutra had experienced them first-hand. Instead, Neutra allowed the inhabitant to constantly survey, for example, the immediate space around the house with the help of direct, indirect, and mirrored views. (Fig. 3) Situating his clients in an exposed, but now safe spatial position suggests that Neutra was re-enacting his precarious positions in the dangerous landscapes of the First World War, and the consequent need for prospect and refuge. The design of the house is less an ingenious response to an intriguing local landscape. Instead, it is inextricably linked to the malevolent nature that Neutra had experienced during the First World War; an experience the Second World War reawakened and for which California’s desert landscape offered the perfect laboratory to come to terms with architecturally, if not psychologically.

Fig. 3. Richard Neutra, *Kaufmann House*, Palm Springs, California, 1946-47. The photograph by Julius Shulman shows in the foreground to the right the wall-mounted mirror in the bathroom of the master bedroom. In the middle ground the sliding glass walls of the adjacent living room can be seen through the bathroom window. © J. Paul Getty Trust. Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles (2004.R.10).
Conclusion

Reflecting on the possible consequences of the Great War on contemporary art, Scheffler distinguished three responses which are helpful to classify the three case studies presented. Scheffler claims that artists who did not or could not actively participate in the war responded symbolically.\textsuperscript{41} Thoughts about the war by Geddes and memorials designs like Mackintosh’s fall into this group, tough comparable designs by Mears indicate that symbolic responses were not restricted to non-participants in the war.

Scheffler’s second group refers to young artists who actively fought in the war, were impressed and formed by the events, and subsequently often rejected established art forms. Berrington and, by extension of his dealing with shell-shocked soldiers, Brock come to mind. Trying to make sense of the experiences of the battlefield and treating the traumatic consequences of those experiences, both men resorted to Geddesian thought. This move, however, placed their responses into a long tradition of cultural critique of modern society. The effects the experience of the war may have had on a soldier-architect’s post-war work are difficult to decide in the case of Berrington because of his sudden death. That after the war Brock gradually broadened his environmentally based shell-shock therapy into a general critique of the ills of modern life\textsuperscript{42} suggests that, perhaps, the traumatic experiences of the First World War did not inevitably result in a \textit{revolutionary} rejection of established understandings of one’s art or environment.

Finally, Scheffler hints at artists who initially appeared rather untouched by their experiences of the war. Scheffler expected new forms of art to emerge over time, yet he also suspected that they would draw less on obvious war motives but more on new moral sentiment (\textit{sittliche Gesinnung}) and a contemplative world view (\textit{grosse Anschauung}). As Neutra’s case illustrates, even two or three decades later soldier-architects’s experiences of the First World War could be resolved in new concepts of modernist architecture. At first sight, Neutra’s new architecture proclaims to revolutionize man’s relationship with benevolent nature, but as it turns out it was deeply rooted in the architect’s experience of nature as a malevolent, man-made environment.
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