THE PARADOX OF GORDON CULLEN: BETWEEN INTERNATIONAL CELEBRITY AND A LIMITED CAREER ABROAD

Clément Orillard
Ecole d'Urbanisme de Paris, Lab'Urba (UPEC/UPEM)

The British draughtsman, journalist and “townscape consultant” Gordon Cullen had a paradoxical position in the post-war international planning scene. He acquired early international celebrity thanks to his editorial work at The Architectural Review and the publication of his book Townscape. However, he never managed to establish a broad international professional practice even if he was at first recruited for consultancy abroad by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations.
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INTRODUCTION

Thomas Gordon Cullen became well known after publishing articles in the professional journal *The Architectural Review* (AR) between 1947 and 1959. A vast majority of these articles actually belonged to the famous “Townscape” editorial campaign officially launched in December 1949. The co-owner and shadow editor in chief of the review, Hubert de Cronin Hastings, was behind it but he let other members of the editorial board develop the campaign. Indeed, Cullen, personally recruited by Hastings in 1946, became the main voice, and draughtsman, of the campaign for a decade. Before his recruitment, Cullen was educated as an architect at the London Polytechnic. He became known at first in the architectural milieu through his graphic work for key modern architects like Raymond McGrath and then Tecton. Even if he worked as a draughtsman, his role was not subaltern and he helped these firms in theorising their practice. He developed also an urban critical position in 1940-41 close to the future “Townscape” campaign.

In keeping with Hastings’ thinking, Cullen developed his ideas in the campaign, which significantly evolved during its first decade. It went from the debate on the post-WWII rebuilding policy to a harsher criticism of the national new towns policy in 1952. Then in 1954, after the arrival in the editorial board of the “young angry man” Ian Nairn, Cullen and Nairn collaborated on a global attack of the deterioration of the English townscape and landscape. Cullen officially left the AR editorial board in 1959 and the campaign continued without him. His main articles from the campaign were republished with a theoretical first part in the form of a book simply entitled *Townscape* in 1961.

The campaign and Cullen’s articles quickly attracted a broad interest at first in the UK and the Anglophone world at large and then in other cultural spheres. Some famous newspapers published articles about the campaign diffusing it to a general British audience. Beyond the campaign, the renown of the AR itself reached beyond the British architectural milieu. Indeed, since the thirties, a club of brilliant authors formed the editorial board and at least one of them, the poet John Betjeman, was celebrated well beyond architectural criticism circles. During the war, the AR also developed a very special visual identity through experimental layout. So through these features, which greatly exceeded what is expected from the professional press, the AR became the most famous architectural journal in the post-war Anglophone world and surely one of the most famous in other cultural spheres.

So, it is not surprising that the book *Townscape* achieved a broad international success. Published at the same time in the UK and in the US, it apparently quickly became popular in the Anglophone world, and really took off after a reduced, paperback version, *The Concise Townscape*, was published in 1971. After a failed attempt to translate it into French, the first series of translations were published in the seventies before a more recent second series making it available in eight languages today. The name of Gordon Cullen, mainly attached to this sole book, became renowned. Moreover, the publication of the book is closely linked with the development of a consultant carrier abroad; he left the editorial board after being involved in the planning of New Delhi and wrote the introduction while there, in 1959.

Beyond the international fame acquired through the “townscape campaign,” Cullen already had overseas experience before entering the AR editorial board. At the beginning of WWII, he reported for military service but was rejected because of a medical problem. He went on to participate in the war effort by working on some exhibitions with Misha Black for the Ministry of Information. In 1944, the architect Robert Gardner-Medvin, who assembled a team in charge of a “development and welfare” programme in Barbados, recruited him for civil service. This team focused in particular on “building research” in order to develop housing and public facilities according to local materials and climate. Arriving by boat, Cullen didn’t work on the planning issues but rather, in collaboration with Leslie Creed, on “construction systems” for the schools, producing a step-by-step self-construction guide intended to enable the islanders to develop their own buildings.
Thus, by the end of the fifties and the beginning of the sixties, Cullen has achieved international celebrity and had already worked abroad. So it is not surprising that he developed an international career after leaving the AR editorial board in order to become “townscape consultant.” However this international career was uneven. The first years, between 1958 and 1962, were spectacular; he worked in India and in the US for the two biggest US foundations of the time, the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, in collaboration with two key persons, the planner Albert Mayer and the landscape architect Ian McHarg. In India he participated in big planning teams working alongside the best experts in their fields on the two main Indian metropolises, New Delhi and Calcutta. In the US he was invited by the University of Pennsylvania, which was one of the most advanced in planning at the time and also worked in six of the main cities of the Northeast and the Midwest.

However, his international career abruptly ended by the beginning of the sixties and during the following decade Cullen devoted his consultancy to domestic commissions. It was only in the early seventies that he was again commissioned for studies abroad including a touristic study in Northwest Argentina for the Organisation of the American States and an early study for the Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines new town near Paris, France. Nevertheless, these few commissions were limited in terms of scale and issues, in particular regarding the early ones. In the eighties, he also developed some teaching activity, which in particular led to an international summer school held in his family summer house in the village of Biot on the French Riviera. Again, it was limited in scope given his international celebrity at the time. A careful analysis of his international activity during these two periods reveals the reasons for this contrast. It also sheds light on the larger questions linked to transnational consultancy during the second half of the 20th century: the relation between theory and consultancy, the role of planning cultures, etc.

A SPECTACULAR INTERNATIONAL DEBUT IN CONSULTANCY BETWEEN INDIA AND THE US

Cullen launched his consultanting career in 1958 with a series of three international commissions from two major US foundations, the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. During this period, they were involved in planning as this topic became a key post war issue. These commissions more or less originated in the same first commission that made a link between Cullen’s work as a journalist at the AR and this new career. In April 1958, Cullen and Nairn published a portfolio entitled “Scale of the City” in Fortune magazine used as illustrations for the article “Downtown is for People” by the young journalist Jane Jacobs. This article was included in the series “The Exploding Metropolis” edited by William “Holly” Whyte in 1957-58. The origins of that commission remain unclear; Cullen had already illustrated a first article for Fortune published in June 1957 and there were relationships between the AR and Fortune’s sister professional magazine The Architectural Forum. The portfolio was a short analysis of the spatial qualities of some American cities’ downtowns. Nairn come to the US but Cullen didn’t; Nairn took pictures and Cullen made the drawings in England. However, the portfolio played an important role in developing the celebrity of Cullen in the US.

The real involvement of Cullen abroad originated in 1957 when the Ford Foundation asked the US planner Albert Mayer to assemble a team of consultants to help the Indian Town Planning Organisation (TPO). Among the team coordinated by the sociologist Gerald Breese and then the planner Edward Echeverria, Mayer organised a “civic architect” position and asked Gordon Cullen to take it. For Mayer, “civic architecture” corresponded to “one of the most important and significant elements in the whole complex content of a plan. It is the physical and spiritual working out in the third dimension of the thinking and research which go into the plan.” He clearly stated that it didn’t include “detailed architecture building by building” but rather “the square, the vista, the complex of elements.” It seems Mayer secured this position for Cullen early on; Mayer stated with enthusiasm that “he has combined provocative verbal criticism with equally suggestive and evocative sketches of existing architecture and of ideas of his own.” Clearly the work for Fortune, described with admiration as a commission “to search out, discuss and illustrate good and bad civic architectural conditions,” played a key role even if he didn’t know that
Cullen actually didn’t come to the US for this. He also appreciated Cullen’s work with Tecton, a firm he “knew well and favourably,” and cited his work in Barbados in a letter to the Ford Foundation.\footnote{12}

Cullen was recruited for three months, travelling in December 1958-January 1959 from England to Mumbai by boat before reaching Delhi and returning to England in April 1959\footnote{13}. It seems he mostly stayed in Delhi, only travelling only once, going 254km to the North to visit Chandigarh, which was in construction. While he rejected “Corb” planning as it was “absolutely anti-urb,” it seems he was fascinated by the architecture of his Secretariat building in the Capitol Complex.\footnote{14} He also participated in a “Seminar on Architecture” at the then young Lalit Kala Akademi along with Mayer, his collaborator Edward Echeverria, the French architect Eugène Beaudouin invited by the Ford Foundation, and Catherine Bauer Wurster who was visiting India.\footnote{15}

Despite the initial enthusiasm of Mayer, it seems the position of Cullen in the team was not so comfortable in particular regarding his relationship with the planners including Mayer. In his diary, he complained for instance that he was “absolutely fed up” with not being respected “by planners” and that “Albert did the double talk denigrating but opening.”\footnote{16} The issue of densification, a central point in the discourse of the “Townscape” editorial policy appears to have been a main point of discussion between Cullen and Mayer.

After publishing a short version in the AR issue of January 1960, he eventually produced a separated report for the Ford Foundation published in February 1961 and entitled “The Ninth Delhi.” In its introduction, the chairman of the TPO clearly stated that the report did “not represent the views of the Town Planning Organisation” even if he hoped that the reader would “find these striking sketches and statements thought-provoking.” The first pages were devoted to a synthesis of the “Townscape” discourse that was reused as the introduction of the book Townscape. Then Cullen dealt with Delhi through a historical and geographical analysis of its articulation with its region, warning about sprawl and asking for a separation between town and countryside, and a pictorial inventory. His proposals focused mainly on several specific sites more or less along a North South axis. For the Central Vista from the Rashtrapati Bhavan to the War Memorial, the Parliament neighbourhood (Figure 1), and Connaught Place he discussed how to reinforce their characteristics through densification. He also discussed the possibility of creating a new civic centre between Old and New Delhi along the Ram lila, how to rehabilitate the Old Delhi, and the valorisation of the site of the Jama Masjid. All these proposals were detailed through sketches and illustrated by striking drawings showing a contemporary Delhi associating colonial architecture and modern buildings, sometimes high-rises.

![Figure 1](image1.png)  
**Figure 1** Design proposal for the outskirts of the Indian Parliament, New Delhi, 1960.
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**Figure 2** The reorganisation of the public space in front of the Betsy Ross House, “Independent Town Study,” Philadelphia, 1960.
Following this first experience, Cullen again became associated with the Ford Foundation when the Indian government requested help in 1961 for the planning of Calcutta. In 1959, under the hospice of the World Health Organisation, the Indian government decided, because of the pressure of the quick changes in the whole metropolitan area, the necessity of a master plan for the improvement of the water supply, sewerage and drainage. The Ford Foundation played a key role by offering advice and assistance in setting up the Calcutta Metropolitan Planning Organisation (CMPO).\(^{17}\) echeverria lead the new team.\(^{18}\) Cullen appears to have been listed since its origins as the consultant in charge of “civic design” for a longer period of six months between August 1961 and January 1962.\(^{19}\)

For this commission, he sailed to India traveling this time with his family: his wife, Jacqueline, and his daughters.\(^{20}\) The position not only of Cullen but also of the whole Ford Foundation team was apparently less comfortable than in Delhi as they looked at a complete planning work while the CMPO was in charge at first with a master plan dealing with a sole topic. Cullen produced a report before leaving, which was not published despite an article that came out in the 1964-65 issue of the Indian Annual of Architecture, Structure and Town Planning.\(^{21}\) Again, he focused on discussing several sites facing densification – Dalhousie Square, the New Market Area, the Maidan, etc. He explicitly articulated these elements at a larger scale along a 10 miles circuit with governmental, professional and commercial precincts, as illustrated by the title, “Calcutta: The Linear City.” However, the article showed also a work that was more fragmented than the Delhi study. It associated this proposal with general reflexions about climate and city life and less elaborated sketches or drawings.

Between these two studies in India, Cullen sailed to another country, the US, to work for another foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation. Nonetheless, this commission, undertaken jointly with Nairn, was much more hazardous showing the limits of his work as an international consultant. The difference with the Indian commissions was that his name was not the first considered, Ian McHarg, a Scottish landscape architect trained at Harvard’s Graduate School of Design during the Joseph Hudnut-Walter Gropius years, was rebuilding the Department of Landscape Architecture at the School of Fine Arts at the University of Pennsylvania with the help of the Rockefeller Foundation since 1954. In 1957, he decided to expand the two-year programme into a four-year program organised around several themes including “townscape”. However, despite having worked in Britain during four of the years of the “Townscape” campaign, he proposed to recruit the landscape architect Peter Shepheard who was close to the AR but didn’t participate in the campaign\(^{22}\). Then he proposed two members of the AR editorial board who, again, were not the main authors of the campaign and it is finally the AR editor who urged the Rockefeller Foundation to recruit Cullen and Nairn.\(^{23}\) This constrained commission was erratic.

Nairn and Cullen were supposed to work together on a book provisionally entitled Townscape USA but they came separately.\(^{24}\) Nairn embarked for a car tour of the suburbs and the countryside across the US from November 1959 to January 1960 while Cullen visited several downtowns and key persons from April to June 1960: New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Pittsburgh, Chicago, and Boston. Cullen was also a visiting professor at the University of Pennsylvania’s School of Fine Arts, participating in juries and apparently working on a proposal for the valorisation of Philadelphia’s heritage. This “Independence Town” proposed a redevelopment of the city core west of Independence Mall. It included a global scheme organised around a transformation of this section of Market Street as a new central square and details on the reorganisation of the outskirts of specific historic landmarks: Independence Hall, Christ Church and its Burial Ground, Friends Meeting House, and Betsy Ross House (Figure 2).\(^{25}\) However, his work in the US seems to have gone nowhere. There were no echoes to his “Independence Town” proposal. The project of the book was split into two manuscripts and only Nairn’s was published despite the fact that Cullen completely laid out his manuscript entitled “Urgent West.”\(^{26}\)
AN UNEVEN FOLLOWING ABROAD: SOME SMALL COMMISSIONS AND A SUMMER SCHOOL

At the same time Cullen launched an international consulting career he also pursued a more fruitful career of consulting in Britain, with more long lasting results. Even before going to Calcutta, Cullen was recruited by Graeme Shankland to join a team involved in planning Liverpool. Then, he worked in the sixties and in the seventies on urban proposals for several public authorities such as the Camden Borough Council, the Cities of Bolton, Northampton and Peterborough, the Kent County Planning Council, the Buckinghamshire Departments of Architecture and Planning, etc. before ending his career with commissions for the London Docklands Development Corporation and the Scottish Development Agency.

If, sometimes, he worked alone as an independent consultant, he worked mainly within teams. These teams built upon his own professional network, which went back to his studies at the London Polytechnic, his collaboration with McGrath and Tecton, the professional milieu around the AR and the Festival of Britain in which he participated, etc. Beyond his work as “townscape consultant” he also worked as an illustrator for British firms or architects.

Cullen also directly received some small international commissions in the sixties. They were connected with the diffusion of his publications but only one led to work. In August 1966, for instance, the architect Francisco Javier Blanco, president of the new Governor’s Committee on Aesthetics and Natural Resources from Puerto Rico, invited Cullen to help the committee to prepare a first report about the environmental problems of the island. In this letter he made explicit reference not only to the book Townscape but also to the AR and the New Delhi work. After studying the travel options, Cullen quickly renounced sailing. Instead, he proposed, like for the Fortune portfolio, to form a team with Nairn, who could travel to the island by plane. Despite the acceptance of Blanco, it seems this commission went nowhere.

One of the only similar commissions, which succeeded, was a study for the touristic development of Northwest Argentina. It was a part of a larger national effort to develop a first Plan Nacional de Desarrollo Turistico de la Argentina developed by the Direccion Nacional de Turismo with the technical assistance of the Universidad de Buenos Aires and was finally funded and published by the Division of Tourism Development of the Organisation of American States. It focused on planning control proposals for the preservation of scenic and folkloric small towns and villages. In 1968, Eduardo Ellis, a young architect and professor at the Universidad de Buenos Aires began an exchange with Cullen after knowing him through his publications.

Ellis, who was yet a key actor in the modernisation of architecture, had just received a grant from the Consejo Nacional de Investigacion Cientificas and Tecnicas (CONICET) for a study trip looking at “perception of the urban scale”. He eventually met Cullen a first time at his home after spending one year at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and then Paris’ Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes. He quickly became a friend of the family and ended his study trip in Biot, the village where the family had a summer house.

In his earliest letters, Ellis invited Cullen to Argentina to join the touristic study and, at first, Cullen accepted since Graeme Shankland was associated with this project. However, in 1972 Cullen was forced to give up travel and he proposed instead again the configuration experimented more than ten years ago with the Fortune portfolio; Nairn, who was supposed to fly to Latin America for the Sunday Times would go to Argentina to be “his eyes” there. Finally, Nairn didn’t go and Cullen was seconded by Antony Meats, an associate from Shankland & Cox. Meats went to Argentina in April and May 1973 and, when back in Britain, worked on the “townscape proposals” with Cullen. Thus, the report published in 1974 is a mix between the analysis of the general region and some specific sites drawn up by Meats and the proposals for three sites, the town of Cafayate (Figure 3) and the villages of Humahuaca and Tafi del Valle designed by Cullen and Meats dealing with preservation districts, control of the residential sprawl, valorisation and extension of the public spaces and some programs. All the illustrations of the report, including the first part, were drawn by Cullen.
The other commissions abroad usually came through other consultants in his personal network. For instance, one of his first commissions abroad during the seventies was a study in 1971-1973 for one of the new towns of Paris Region, St Quentin en Yvelines, which harkens back to his pre-war network. Jock Kinneir, the famous graphic designer, invited Cullen, along with a French sociologist, to work with his firm Kinneir Calvert Tuhill (KCT) for a study for the new town contracted in late 1971. Cullen probably knew Kinneir from the Festival of Britain and they seem close in their correspondence.

The scope of commission from the Etablissement public d’aménagement [public corporation] seemed confused from the beginning. After a meeting with Kinneir, Cullen proposed to divide the job between the members of the team, with Kenneir working on the physical orientation, the sociologist working on social hierarchy or ferment and then Cullen dealing with the concept of “the communicating town” through a “practical ‘phrase-book’ of the environment and the analysis of an English new town and a French existing town.”

Apart from that, Cullen worked also on the Centre des 7 Mares, which was already programmed by the public corporation and designed by the French architect Philippe Deslandes in a functionalist style with mono-functional buildings resting on an artificial concrete ground separated from a park. Upon the basis of Deslandes’ plans, Cullen made proposals for some changes trying to give the character of enclosed square to the public space on the artificial ground in articulation with the park. However, a meeting in October 1972 made clear the programme and the design could not be changed and Cullen’s work became limited to theoretical issues.

FIGURE 3 Townscape proposals for the city centre of Cafayate, Argentina, 1974.
In the final bilingual report entitled “La signalétique urbaine” [urban signage] in French and “Aspects of Communications in the Urban Context” in English, his work appears relatively limited and strange. Not only does it seem limited to only one chapter entitled “Identity Kit for a City,” but, in contrast with his usual work, this general text discussing general features is illustrated by very basic kid-like sketches from a notebook (Figure 4). The reason for this choice is not clear but can be seen as an ironic answer to the Etablissement Public. Nevertheless, the entire KTC work about this new town apparently did not go very far although some limited element in terms of signage were finally used.

Cullen also participated in other international studies linked to his British network. For instance, he worked a second time on the Barbados with the Church Village redevelopment study in Bridgetown published in 1978. This commission was linked not with his pre-war work but with a member of his post-war network, the architect and planner David Gosling who was commissioned and assembled the team after working there in 1964 and in 1970. Gosling corresponded with Cullen as of 1968, but it is only after a first collaboration in 1974 on the study of the British private new town of Marycutter and another for a competition bid for the planning of Porto Santo in the Portuguese archipelago of Madeira that he asked Cullen to join a commission in Barbados. In this work, it seems Cullen limited his participation to a “townscapist” analysis of the proposed redevelopment.

In the eighties, his commissions abroad seem to come to an end, as he became heavily involved with big public urban renewal agencies of the Thatcher administration. However, his international action didn’t vanish but changed from consultancy to teaching. Indeed, since middle of the seventies, the education milieu opened its doors to Cullen, beginning with contact from Oxford Polytechnic’s Joint Centre for Urban Design. However, his main teaching activity went into the opening of a summer school on the French Riviera where the parents of his wife lived, in the small village of Biot where the family had a summer house. The first session was organised in 1980 and the school ran at least until 1986.

As the 1981 flyer explained, it was a one-week seminar running two times in June alternating courses in the basement of the Cullen family house and exercises in the village:
“Studio work involves slide talks on the origins of a visual vocabulary through Townscape, Conservation and Regeneration. Its applications are illustrated by planning studies and case histories taken from professional practise. There are also simple specific studio exercises in urban design. It is intended that the course should be flexible so that a person may concentrate on one part whilst becoming aware of the general subject.

The real classroom starts just outside the studio door in the town itself. Drawing exercises and planning problems are posed in a living world where you walk through the shadows you are studying to buy a loaf of bread.”

This school was international from the beginning as it was mainly supported by two foreign architects, one American and one Dutch, who where teaching in schools of architecture. The first key person was the American architect Dennis Grebner, professor at the University of Minnesota, who organised the school through Townscape Ltd., the company he created with Cullen to represent him in the US. The other one was Rudi Kegel, professor at the then Technische Hogeschool Delft now Delft University of Technology (Figure 5). Nevertheless, the 1981 session announcement attracted interest beyond these two countries, in UK of course but also in Sweden and Belgium. This international teaching activity was not limited to the Biot school. Through a participant in the Biot school, the department of city planning of the Acadamie van Bouwkunst in Amsterdam invited Cullen for a one week design workshop in March 1983 that dealt with the interaction between the central station and the river IJ.

CONCLUSION

The uneven international career of Cullen, which associated small commissions during more than two decades after a four year spectacular debut, is clearly linked to his personality and personal life. First he was shy, which was a problem for developing consultancy. He was also unable to fly, which explains why he had to sail for a work overseas, thus increasing the delays for each commission. His family also grew by the beginning of the sixties. He was not happy far from them and despite the fact that they went in Calcutta, it was the only time they travelled with him.

Moreover, the professional context itself explained these limitations. He never sought to have and international career. Albert Mayer presented him with what seems to be the first of consultancy proposals in 1958, when he was still a member of the AR editorial board. Graeme Shankland’s asking him to join his Liverpool planning team in 1961, probably changed the situation in a major way.

Add to this his probable disappointment with the first big international commissions he received, even if he had a clear position in the Ford Foundation teams. Despite Mayer’s personal involvement in his recruitment for the Delhi team, Cullen was frustrated by what seemed to him to be a lack of confidence and his position was not firm. Clearly, the civic design issues were not as important as more pragmatic ones, such as sanitisation, in particular in Calcutta. The work done for the Rockefeller Foundation probably also frustrated him because the working relationship between himself and McHarg didn’t pan out and because his manuscript was never published. After 1962, he went back abroad but only working with teams of close colleagues or friends. He tried to transform two commissions to include Nairn, who could fly, and he also worked with colleagues with whom he collaborated first at home. Even in running the summer school, he was seconded by two admirers.

However, there was a more important explanation: there were not that many overseas proposals. Indeed, one apparently finds traces of no other proposals in the archives, and this despite Cullen’s increasing celebrity after the publication of Townscape in 1961 and its first translations in the seventies. Being a internationally renowned author didn’t parlay into international commissions. He was not alone. During the same period, other key theorists whose publications became international successes never developed a career abroad. It was the case of the American Kevin Lynch who authored The Image of the City, which was translated into several languages faster than Townscape and who developed both a career as an academic and an urban designer.
On the contrary, several designers without theoretical activities succeeded in establishing international careers. This scenario raises the question about the post-war relationship between theory and practice at a transnational level. Some pioneers in planning theory such as Patrick Geddes and Joseph Stubben transformed their international celebrity into commissions abroad. Maybe Cullen and Lynch exemplified that international celebrity in theory didn’t mean an international professional career in the post-war years.

However, the theoretical discourse they produced was for a great part idiosyncratic; the “Townscape” editorial policy of the AR was rooted in a very English architectural context while the research done by Lynch at MIT was attached to the field of urban design, which remained exclusive to the US universities during a decade. The success of their discourse abroad was much more based upon a local appropriation that often fed into a different kind of practice. Here is maybe the point that changed after WWII; publishing in planning and architecture greatly increased and made possible the diffusion of discourse at an international scale, but the practices were increasingly developed at a national scale with the creation of strong national policies, administrations, professional organisations, and education in planning.
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