
“AT LEAST THE PIGS CAN’T STOP YOU READING AD AT HOME”
AD’s Cosmorama and the reinvention of cataloguing (1965 – 1973)

by Lydia Kallipoliti

Wham! Zoom! Rave! - and it’s not *Ready Steady Go*, even if it sometimes looks like it. The sound effects are produced by the erupting of underground architectural protest magazines. Architecture, staid queen-mother of the arts, is no longer courted by plush glossies and cool scientific journals alone, but is having her skirts blown up and her bodice unzipped by irregular newcomers, which are –typically-rhetorical, with-it moralistic, mis-spelled, improvisatory, anti-smooth, funny-format, cliquey, art-oriented but stoned out of their minds with science-fiction images of an alternative architecture that would be perfectly possible tomorrow, if only the universe were differently organized.¹

The quote appears in Reyner Banham’s article “Zoom Wave Hits Architecture,” and speaks mainly of *Clip Kit*, an improvisational journal that sprang up in 1966 from the Architectural Association in London, through the initiative of Peter Murray and Geoffrey Smythe. Next to *Clip Kit*, Banham includes in his list of nonconformist publications, the magazine *Architectural Design (AD)*, which in a very short time turned from a credible professional resource to a volatile publication instrument. By the late 1960s, *AD* no longer illustrated polished building products, but unelaborated habitation experiments with a proactive stance that sought to redefine the household, on a small scale, and the earth at large as its synecdoche. Banham’s choice of the term “zoom” was not accidental. On the one hand, it addressed the actual visual and imaginarily acoustical effects of a new luscious publication equation. On the other hand, “zooming-in” signaled a spatial strategy, where all imaginable materials and objects on a micro-scale—pneumatics, domes, carpets, pills, spray cans, pistons, capsules, and so on—were mobilized in a scheme for global change, in a reflection of the intense socio-political conflicts of the time and the collective fantasies about new technologies. As a platform for this new experimental mindset, in which vanguard architects and architectural groups passionately immersed themselves, *AD* functioned as a major showcase of subversive architectural currents and situated itself directly opposite to

standard mainstream practices. As Banham pointedly stated, student activists would piously declaim: "AT LEAST THE PIGS CAN'T STOP YOU READING *AD* AT HOME."² *AD*, in return, not only consented to a sentiment that arrayed the magazine within the marginal realm of an "opposition," but also celebrated Banham's remark, including it in a group of similar statements by Peter Cook, *The Whole Earth Catalog*, Yona Friedman, Cedric Price, Keith Critchlow, and others; their irreverent lines became advertisements for *Architectural Design* in September 1970.³

Arguably, *AD*'s swift transition was due largely to the operation of its growing innovative section, "Cosmorama," introduced in the magazine in 1965 to replace its previous preliminary section, "World News." Orchestrated by technical editor Robin Middleton, the original substitution was not intended as a change of content; however, re-titling forecast a tactical relocation: from an international publishing division that featured cathedrals and airport extensions as grand displays of civic achievement to a "cosmorama," a peep show of the world, or in other words, a series of selective perspectives that reconstructed the globe out of little pieces. Cosmorama was in effect a copying device; its pages were modeled by selecting, copying and pasting together excerpts from other magazines. Thus, in 1969, when Peter Murray joined the magazine as art editor, he saw in Cosmorama the same type of polemical "clip-on" tactics he had previously deployed in his own student journal, *Clip Kit*.

Murray and Middleton, both creditworthy of Cosmorama, worked well together. Admittedly they saved all their energy to put into Cosmorama, picking up any sort of information on new lifestyles that they could find. As attested in an apocalyptic testimonial delivered during an interview, Murray acknowledged: "If I could, I would turn the entire magazine into Cosmorama."⁴ In a different interview, Middleton added: "Cosmorama was the reason people were buying and reading the magazine. It was the main part of *AD*. Nobody was interested in pictures of new buildings. It is Cosmorama that kept the magazine going."⁵

Although already underway, Murray also injected into Cosmorama a further personal sensibility in materials not currently in use by the building industry. He firmly believed that architecture had much to learn from the other industries' technology and, as a result, production processes involved in the making of cars, ships, spaceships, ventilation ducts, spacesuits and other types of "vessels" appeared recurrently in Cosmorama's pages. With Murray scanning through the introductory section of *Time* magazine for new NASA-based or otherwise interesting materials, Cosmorama was flooded by bizarre material experiments between the years of 1967 to 1974. A series of proposals—"Snow Moulding,"⁶ "Soft Future,"⁷ "Vacuumatics,"⁸ "Foam House,"⁹ "Giant Flexible Tubes,"¹⁰ "Parachute House,"¹¹ etc.—exemplified a novel material genealogy that became an underlying theme in *AD's* Cosmorama. Such materials resisted standardization or cataloguing, they avoided the framework of repeatable pieces of knowledge that could be selected and applied indifferently within a variety of predetermined building parts and conditions. Rather than absolute objects, as indexed in a catalog, they were the offsprings of a local inventory, an inventory by which the material selection and the technique of its deployment fused semantically to produce the effect of unique and variable solutions. We may call such experiments "materials off the catalogue," not exclusively referring to the selection of peculiar materials not otherwise used for the purpose of construction. Rather, it is the inseparable merging of a material, such as snow, and its particular tactic of deployment, such as molding, that positions them within an alternative lineage of building processes. For "materials off the catalogue," molding in many ways signaled an open construction process, one that allowed the shelter under formation to be affected by environmental parameters, such as local winds, temperatures, and other meteorological phenomena. For example, in the case of the "parachute house," air acted as an invisible mold onto which a polymer would set; the parachute took its shape under air pressure.¹² In this sense, a more

expanded definition of molding was suggested, one in which the 'mold' would become an *accumulator* of physiological contingencies, like environmental elements, that played an active role in the construction process. This simple fact implied a new course of thinking, with molding methods setting up a speedy and almost *automatic* mode of spatial production that could provide shelter in seconds. Therefore, parallel to participating in vanguard agendas of the time—that is, embodying chance by such procedures as dropping or dripping a shelter onto a site¹³—the instantaneous production of habitats responded to real world problems very much in line with the social imperatives of the housing crisis.

Essentially, these methods suggested an alternate model for urbanism that “presupposed a new form of description that could no longer be satisfied with formal explanations, but had to integrate the parameters of an environment that is constantly changing.”¹⁴ Although the improvisatory techniques of “materials off the catalogue” only provided rudimentary shelters, they suggested a new method of approach, in contrast to prior geometric configurations, allowing for the integration of constantly changing environmental parameters within the design and construction process. This germinal connection between the macro-urban scale and the micro-material scale was vigorously registered in *Cosmorama*'s pages. In effect, what was gradually left out of the equation was “building.” Middleton confessed in August 2007 that this was an intentional oversight. “We did not like architecture,”¹⁵ he mentioned. The interdisciplinary outlook of *Cosmorama* was the main part of the magazine.¹⁶ In 1975 Peter Cook also recalled how, at the end of the 60s, “it was fashionable to introduce a project as ‘anti-building,’ or a conglomeration of environmental elements.”¹⁷

*

The overall flourish of *AD*'s "Cosmorama," with its emphasis on "materials off the catalogue," appears as doubly unorthodox once we introduce into the discussion the fact that the Standard Catalogue Company owned *AD* since its very first issue. The Standard Catalogue Co. Ltd. was a corporation that published detailed lists of information on how to set up and maintain an average architectural practice in the world of construction and building. The same company owned publications such as the *Architects' Standard Catalogues*, the *Builders' Standard Catalogue*, the *Builders' Merchants' Standard Catalogue*, the *Municipal & Public Works Catalogue*, the *Ironmongers' Standard Catalogue*, and the *British Export Catalogues*, all of which had wide distribution in the building industry, yet differed vitally from *AD*. The *Architects' Standard Catalogues* consisted of thoroughly indexed technical volumes, including British building standards, aiming at an audience eager to sustain a modest practice. Things literally started from zero, that is, from "where to buy a drafting table" and "how to equip your own office."

Despite their antithetical line of thinking, the Standard Catalogue Company made sure that each of its publications repeatedly advertised each other in their respective pages, and up to a certain extent the company acknowledged the critical viewpoint of *AD*. Nevertheless, *AD*'s increasing openness to alternative material enterprises with indefinite implications for building applications entails a remarkable paradox. *AD* ended up directly resisting what its own publisher represented: the organized indexing of materials and information that can be tamed, manipulated, and form cumulative knowledge for a standard architectural practice.

It is worth mentioning in this phenomenal conflict of contents that Cosmorama's subversive line of thinking was specifically informed by the cataloguing format of the *Standard Catalogues*. Despite the fact that both Murray and Middleton ardently deny any conceptual connection between *AD* and the Standard Catalog,¹⁸ they both agree that *AD*'s

transformation to a “little magazine” was steered by the methodic compilation of technical information. Murray pointed out that the “Recycling” and “Sector” sections, both highly technical in nature, were essentially Cosmorama’s “editorial clones” and were introduced in *AD* in order to organize streams of information that were already at play and overflowed Cosmorama.¹⁹

Cosmorama’s function of classifying provocative materials, ideas and constructs and transcribing them in short visually irruptive entries became fundamental to the course of the magazine. Rapidly exceeding its informative role, “Cosmorama,” by means of “copying and pasting,” became a synthetic device and evolved into the dazzling germinal function that it had in the early 1970s. “Copying” was evident not only in content, but also in graphic layout and visualization techniques, through the use of collage. In fact, collage embodied a polemical *modus operandi* of exquisitely intermingling contents and styles, that little magazines so often adopted. With the implication of protesting against the sweeping uniformity of mainstream magazines, collage signified the tectonic technique of a synchronous diversity in the publishing realm and was embraced by underground publications whose practice resonated with Marshall McLuhan’s description of collage elements as “extensions of situations else-where.”²⁰

However, clipping and pasting was more than a graphic methodology, it was by all means an architectural methodology. This is precisely the reason Banham became increasingly interested in the role of publications as architectural models, as his article “Zoom Wave Hits Architecture” explained. More specifically, Banham transferred his earlier claims about the emergence of “A Clip-On Architecture”²¹ to the organizational structure of little magazines. If Murray’s *Clip-Kit* stood for the paradigm of an expandable publication model, Banham spoke of the “kit” as a collective of “Goodies”—ideas, images, forms, documents, concepts raided from other disciplines—and “clip” as the know-how for putting these items

together to make physical or intellectual structures.²² For Banham, these parameters represented eccentric new models of architectural production.

AD's Cosmorama overtly manifested such aspirations as it functioned like a kit of diverse ideas without streamlining a specific orientation in architectural thinking. Laconic, yet incisive in presentation, as a prodigious child of its owner, the Standard Catalogue company, Cosmorama reinvented the role of cataloging, and became a “little catalogue of ideas” within *AD*. It was that editorial space of boundless experimentation, differentiated in its vitality and freshness from the main contents of the magazine, before the turn of the 1970s. Subsequently, in the years 1969 to 1971, Cosmorama gradually exceeded its role as an idea vessel and expanded to a “smart-advice” device. It not only increased in size,²³ progressively seizing more space, but also morphed into a methodological tool that invoked alternate lifestyles encompassing environmental practices, technology, and material culture.²⁴ In the summer issues of 1970, Cosmorama converted itself to an instruction manual of “dos and don'ts,” encompassing traveling advice,²⁵ information packs,²⁶ and recommendations on how to auto-grow your own garden.²⁷ In parallel with its style and contents, this shift was equally visually stimulating, advising *AD's* readers to cut out its pages and make them into a poster. Cosmorama then became an architectonic device with the instructions by which one could produce architectural elements and models, like posters.

In this reallocation of focus, we may observe a striking resemblance between the function that Cosmorama gradually acquired and that of the *Whole Earth Catalog*. Indeed, the connection is so overt, that one can hardly distinguish the difference between the content and graphic layout of the two publications. As a result of a co-spirited vision, *AD* was embraced by the *Whole Earth Catalog* as an exceptional journal, which could be pulled from the heap of other journals because of its distinctive, “non-architectonically” infused standpoint. The *Whole Earth Catalog* reported in its pages how,

AD is the only architectural magazine we've seen that consistently carries substantial new information, as distinct from the stylistic eyewash characteristic of most architecture journals... After a year of watching and using *AD*, it's clear that this is much more than an architectural magazine. It prints lots of news of American creative doings, months before any US publication. Its coverage of developments in cybernetics, structure systems, philosophy and use trends is extraordinary.²⁸

At the time of *Cosmorama*'s renovation, other new peripheral sections were introduced in *AD*, adopting *Cosmorama*'s concise and incisive cataloging style, its visually compelling features, and its cross-disciplinary outlook. Specifically, "Sector,"²⁹ covering cybernetics, was introduced in 1970, and "Recycling,"³⁰ devoted to ecological issues was included in 1971. These sections that would normally be valued as marginal became crucial to the operation of the magazine, which gradually gained strength from its periphery. In the early 1970s, *AD* developed into a conglomeration of different sections—catalogues, a collage of components, exhibiting nearly all of its contents in a "short idea format." As can be seen in the September issue of 1971, the main contents were almost equaled in size by the supposedly peripheral sections, a direct reflection of *Cosmorama*'s importance and the magazine's overall trajectory.³¹ Eventually, the complement of "Cosmorama," "Sector," and "Recycling" distilled *AD*'s recurrent emphasis on material experiments, cybernetics, and recycling into a very precise view of the world: one that rivaled the globe as a cybernetic machine and conjured technology in the face of global emergencies, while still promoting an bucolic agenda on organic products, farming and communal living in the United States Southwest. Because of this bipolar report, it would be partial to identify *Cosmorama* as an earnest and hopeful technophile account of the 1960s; yet, it harbored a sentiment that technology, as both a source of news products and as the application of scientific principles, could elicit social reform, if deployed imaginatively as a design tool.

Parallel to such contextual readings, we may consider that the course undertaken by *AD* not only reflected the spirit of the day, but also responded to pragmatic requirements and

technical changes, such as the use of different printing technologies. Between 1970 and 1971, *AD* faced incredible printing hardships and had to switch its production to less elaborate, cheap printers, due to the fact that the magazine was not making any money. With its endowment in alternative subversive design methods, building companies no longer deemed it a reliable periodical in which to advertise their wares. As recalled by Monica Pidgeon, *AD*'s lifetime editor from 1945 to 1975, reducing printing costs was part of what the owner saw as a trial period; *AD* was coerced to come up with new strategies in order to retain its status in the publication world. Collaged sections, cut-outs, and foldouts were the outcome of an attempt to compensate for the loss of quality in paper and printing. Both Murray and Pidgeon explained that the change in printing technology accounted for the radically informal style and avant-garde character of *AD*.³² "We didn't become a sort of second *Archigram* until we changed print, going to a very different format putting the things together,"³³ Murray recounted. In the September issue of 1971, the editors even apologized for the print quality of the magazine, in a prefatory editorial note that explained to readers that the drastic stylistic transitions of the two previous years were largely due to printing quandaries.³⁴ At the same time though, Murray and Pidgeon testified that it was precisely the knotted hardships that made *AD* come across as a "free thinking magazine."

The editors' declaration, however, came as an a posteriori rationalization rather than an inauguration of *AD*'s underground polemic discourse. The volcanic *Cosmorama* and the molding of *AD* into an avant-garde magazine were already on track, while the editors and staff were grasping at what was floating around in contemporary architectural undercurrents. As Peter Cook pointedly mentioned with regard to the impromptu character of little publications, "The sniff of the sniff happens before the articulation of the sniff. After the resolution point, the really interesting conversation has stopped."³⁵ In other words, the shift had occurred in the anticipation of *AD*'s transformation, a fact that delineates the different perspective of little magazines in comparison with the "pre-inaugural"

expectations of historic avant-garde magazines in the early twentieth century, where in many cases the announcement of intentions preceded the oeuvre and was put forward as a device to establish the movement itself.³⁶ As opposed to such straightforwardly revolutionary attitudes, *AD*, as an originally professional magazine, emerged as “little.” The manner in which this conversion occurred was gradual and procedural, as *AD*’s peripheral spinning sections infiltrated the journal’s internal structure.

Nevertheless, this historic moment of “littleness” is decisive to the explosion of an experimental discourse, which channeled new perspectives to materials and construction processes. In the spirit of experimentation and conjured through the prism of underground publications, Cosmorama’s embrace and promotion of ‘materials off the catalogue’ clearly comprised a polemic discourse at the end of the 1960s. Enmeshed within all the essential parameters of an oppositional thesis, the model of “direct action” stimulated major design debates, the echoes of which are still vibrant in contemporary practice. “Materials off the catalogue” positioned the experimental mindset of the chemical laboratory at the forefront of design debates, critically undermining the imperial significance of formalism as the distiller of value in architectural design. Above all, the emerging framework of thinking that favored procedural design experiments, motivated a faith that micro-material experiments would summon macro-global change. As an effect of this discourse, alternate means of production were recovered, disengaging design from the conventions and limitations of drawings, which for the most part governed design practice throughout the century. Latent in the punctuated lineage of this experimental trajectory is the disciplinary necessity for ongoing, unceasing production, a production so brutally engaging that it might “devour” the heroic architect, and remind the discipline of the fragility of conceptual rigor before one indulges in action.

ENDNOTES

¹ Reyner Banham, "Zoom Wave Hits Architecture" in *New Society* 3, March 1966, 21.

² Statement by Peter Reyner Banham (London). Published as an advertisement for *Architectural Design*. See *Architectural Design*, Vol.40, September 1970.

³ By 1970, *AD* no longer published advertisements related to the building industry. Historically, this was a major structural and organizational adjustment for the magazine that began as a supplement of the "Standard Catalog," a British catalog of building products. For Robin Middleton, technical editor of *Architectural Design* between 1965 and 1972, it is precisely the absence of advertisements that transformed *AD* into a little magazine. In particular, Middleton notes: "*AD* became a little magazine when its financial basis broke down and it had to survive out of 'selling magazines' and not advertisements. Once we had no money, we started operating like a 'little magazine'. The absence of advertisements is not an absolute rule, for example *Archigram* was a hand-made magazine and occasionally had advertisements. Yet, what differentiates a little magazine from a commercial publication is the dependence of the magazine on a steady monthly income, regularly coming from advertisements. The policy of *Architectural Design*, putting down most architecture, and its status as an international magazine and did not attract local advertising like *Architectural Review*. We did not like publishing new buildings and therefore the concrete and the pipe manufacturers did not want to advertise with us; we simply had a different audience." Robin Middleton in discussion with the author, New York, August 6th, 2007.

⁴ Peter Murray (*Architectural Design* magazine's art editor between 1969 and 1971 and technical editor between 1972-1973), in discussion with the author, 25th November 2005, London.

⁵ Robin Middleton in discussion with the author, New York, August 6th, 2007.

⁶ "Snow Moulding" in the 'Cosmorama' section of *Architectural Design*, Vol.43, December 1973, 751. "Snow Moulding" has first appeared in *D & E* winter 1972.

⁷ "Soft Future" in the 'Cosmorama' section of *Architectural Design*, Vol.43, October 1973, 617.

⁸ "Vacuumatics" in the 'Cosmorama' section of *Architectural Design*, Vol.41, April 1971, 198.

⁹ "Foam House" in the 'Cosmorama' section of *Architectural Design*, Vol.40, (November 1970), 545.

¹⁰ "Giant Flexible Tubes" in the 'Cosmorama' section of *Architectural Design*, Vol.43, (March 1972), 135.

¹¹ "Parachute House" in the 'Cosmorama' section of *Architectural Design*, Vol.43, (January 1972), 15.

¹² "Parachute House", *AD*, 15.

¹³ Although the term 'dripping' is for the most part drawn together with the work of Jackson Pollock and artistic practices of a similar nature in the early 50s, the term 'dropping' is related to an architectural paradigm launched by 'Drop City' in 1965. 'Drop City' was the first rural commune in America built entirely by geodesic dome frames, clad out of assorted found components or in other words, garbage. For its founders, dropping had a double significance. The first meaning is literal, referring to the droppers' socio-political discontent that urged them to abandon the cities and 'drop out'. The second meaning though, which correlated to the common understanding between droppers, adjoins a spatial narration to this previous action; something or someone being dropped from above, like a drip, a dribble or a splotch. The manner in which the droppers envisioned their relocation in abscond lands was similar to a 'drop' from the sky that lands and creates a thin-skinned membrane, an inhabitable environment that does nothing to disturb the ground and the milieu on which it was positioned.

¹⁴ Migayrou Frederic, "Extensions of the Oikos" in Marie-Ange Brayer & Beatrice Simonot (Eds), *Archilab's Earth Buildings. Radical Experiments in Earth Architecture* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2003), 20.

¹⁵ Robin Middleton in discussion with the author, New York, August 6th, 2007.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ Peter Cook, "The Electric Decade: An Atmosphere at the AA School 1963-73" in James Gowan (Ed), *A Continuing Experiment: Learning and Teaching at the Architectural Association* (London: Architectural Press, 1975), p.142. Quoted in Nigel Whiteley, *Reyner Banham: Historian of the Immediate Future* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002), 246.

¹⁸ Robin Middleton in discussion with the author, New York, August 6th, 2007. Middleton also insisted on eliminating connections between *AD* and the Standard Catalog, on a handwritten note, dated on August 18th 2007, mailed to the author as a commentary of her paper.

Peter Murray in discussion with the author, 25th November 2005, London.

¹⁹ Peter Murray in discussion with the author, 25th November 2005, London. In particular Murray mentioned:

"Lydia Kallipoliti: Could you talk about *AD*'s decision to expand Cosmorama at the beginning of the 1970s and at the same time introduce trans-disciplinary sections in the magazine of a similar format, such as "Recycling", "Sector", "Odds", "Catalogue" and "Exhibitions"? It seems that Cosmorama's expansion to sixteen pages per issue, along with the inauguration of new "Cosmorama-clone" divisions, was celebrated by *AD* as both events were featured in the cover of the January 1970 issue. What his structural shift a conscious editorial decision and if so what did it designate to reduce the pages of the contents and radically increase the "little sections" of a cataloguing format?

Peter Murray: This was a decision to clarify the various parts of the magazine that were already at play, using the same methodology and graphics as in Cosmorama. In other words, it was an attempt to make the contents more intelligible, since editorially, there was a particular "slot" – a reader's interest- for each of the subject matters that we wanted to cover."

²⁰ See Hadas Steiner's definition of "collage" in Hadas Steiner, "Off the Map" in Jonathan Hughes & Simon Sadler (Eds) *Non-Plan: Essays on Freedom Participation and Change in Modern Architecture & Urbanism* (UK: Architectural Press, 2000): 126-137.

²¹ Reyner Banham, "A Clip-On Architecture," *Architectural Design*, Vol. 35 (November 1965): 534,535.

²² See Banham, "Zoom Wave Hits Architecture," 21.

²³ In the *AD* issue of January 1970, Cosmorama expanded to sixteen pages and went full color.

²⁴ In the July, August and September issues of *Architectural Design* in 1970, "Cosmorama" converted exclusively to a catalogue of alternate lifestyles.

²⁵ Travel advice: "British Railways makes things easier. You used to have to take a holiday to see a friend, now you can fit it within a weekend. Weekend means between work periods. Work is a generative life support system, which is steadily being shown to be a myth by the drop-outs". See the 'Cosmorama' section of *Architectural Design*, Vol.40 (September 1970), 444.

²⁶ "Information pack; it handles things for you; you learn to select, play, make decisions and say things. Perhaps this should be called a re-birth pac'. In the 'Cosmorama' section of *Architectural Design*, Vol.40 (September 1970), 439.

²⁷ "For hardware lovers: a selection of available electric aids to natural growth to help the gardener in the world park. Also a diagram of a cross-section of a skinbot. The basic bot consists of a primary frame, a power module and an exchange unit. On to this are clipped combinations of modules for various performance requirements. Compatibility is assured by the exchange unit which rejects any mis-matched modules". See the 'Cosmorama' section of *Architectural Design*, Vol.40 (August 1970), 387.

²⁸ Stewart Brand (Ed), *Whole Earth Catalog 3* (Menlo Park, CA: Portola Institute, Inc., 1969), 29.

²⁹ In *AD*'s overview of important events that each issue has depicted, the editors stated: "A new section 'Sector' is introduced, in which architecture and planning will be considered as problem-solving activities possessing evolving structures and changing approaches". "Sector," mainly organized by Roy Landau, was introduced in *AD* at the same issue that Cosmorama expanded to 16 pages and went into full color. See *Architectural Design*, Vol.40, (January 1970), contents page.

³⁰ The "Recycling" section was introduced in *AD* in September 1971 and included survival information on how to manipulate waste streams, how to grow materials from organic matter and how to effectively utilize energy flows. "Recycling was mainly organized by Colin Moorcraft and was re-titled to "Eco-Tech" in October 1972.

³¹ In the September 1971 issue, thirty-nine pages were devoted to the main contents and twenty-three pages to the peripheral sections - "Cosmorama", "Sector", "Odds", "Recycling", "Exhibitions" and "Catalogue".

³² Monica Pidgeon characterized *AD* as an "avant-garde magazine." See Monica Pidgeon, "AD Remembered: 1941-1975," *Architectural Design*, Vol. 71, No. 2 (April 2001), 98.

³³ Peter Murray in discussion with the author, London, November 2005.

³⁴ In particular, this is what the editorial note announced:

"Dear Readers,

Over the past years, as you will no doubt have noticed, we have been rationalizing the production of *AD* in order to make it a viable proposition not dependent on advertising as a major source of revenue and therefore free in editorial content and orientation. We have had our problems, as in the disastrously printed issues of October and November last year; but now we feel we have at last reached a suitable solution and this month have started printing on a new heat-set offset machine –the first in Britain- allowing us to use coated paper again. This will give greater clarity and intensity to both the type and the illustrations. The Editors."

See *AD* Editorial Note, *Architectural Design*, Vol.41, (September 1971), contents page.

³⁵ Peter Cook, (Member of *Archigram*), in discussion Beatriz Colomina and architecture PhD students at Princeton University, November 16th 2004, Princeton, NJ.

³⁶ On the pre-inaugural announcements of avant-garde projects as means of production, see the work of Beatriz Colomina. In particular, she mentions:

"The artistic avant-gardes of the first decades of this century, saw in publishing, exhibitions, and public events another context of production. Their work in these media often preceded the artistic product itself. The Futurist manifesto published on the front page of as wide-reaching a newspaper as *LeFigaro*, before there was anything that had materialized as Futurist art, is only one of the most obvious examples."

See Beatriz Colomina, "On Architecture Production and Reproduction" in Beatriz Colomina (Ed), *ArchitectureProduction* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1988), 15.