

The double issue 9/10 of the journal *O* includes Luuk Boelens' article *Naar een onverkorte stedenbouw* (Towards an Uncompromised Urbanism) and marks the end of the pioneer phase. *O* 9/10, published in spring 1985, was the final issue I was involved with as a member of the editorial team. The magazine then changed its name and from issue 11 onwards continued as *OASE*.

The editorial in *O* 9/10 notes: 'Recent years have seen a widespread interest in the work of the "generation of young architects". . . . Dissatisfaction with the architectural output from the past few decades is boosting the demand for "young designers with fresh ideas".' With hindsight, this is an understatement: the architecture from that period was indeed the most dismal since the introduction of the housing act in 1901. The reaction against modernism led to an uninspiring architecture and an impoverished vocabulary of forms. A new generation of young architects began practising, exploring new ways and receiving (international) recognition. The architectural output in the Netherlands has since become much more varied and attractive. The double issue *O* 9/10 presented, whether or not coincidentally, this rich diversity, thus reflecting the work of the pioneer phase: different contours and categories, seemingly unconnected yet also complementing each other.

Luuk Boelens' article contributed to the discussion about urbanism and thus formed part of the debate on the relationship between urbanism and architectural design – two completely distinct disciplines at that time. Back in 1979 Carel Weeber, in his article 'Formele objectiviteit in stedenbouw en architectuur als onderdeel van rationele planning' (Formal objectivity in urbanism and architecture as an element of rational planning), had tried to remove the discussion about urbanism and architecture from its ideological context and to regard it more objectively. In Italy and France especially, earlier attempts had been made to objectify the professional dimension.

Boelens restricts his outline of autonomy and synthesis to the development of urbanism by the avant-garde in the twentieth century. Via the Deutsche Werkbund (1907-1914) and the Bauhaus (1919-1927) we end up at the Weissenhofsiedlung (1927) and via the CIAM we arrive at the Hansa Viertel (1953). After that, the development lost its consistency: the jump to postmodernism and the current debate on urbanism, of which the IBA Berlin (1987) is an example, simply proved too big. At the same time, the article demonstrates the degree to which the debate on urbanism and architecture was, at that time, unable to free itself from the shackles of the legacy of the Modern Movement of the twentieth century.

Henk Döll
Member of the editorial board
from *OASE* 1 to 9/10

Translated by Laura Vroomen