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Tucked away in the wooded suburban area of North Dartmouth, Massachusetts, stands perhaps one of the most peculiar looking campuses in America—The University of Massachusetts Dartmouth. As visitors drive onto the only public access road, newcomers to the University may find themselves struck with conflicting emotions: some with awe, others with aversion. Nonetheless, they will be exceptionally engrossed with what they see before them.

In 1963, Modernist architect Paul Rudolph was commissioned to design the UMassD campus, then known as the Southeastern Massachusetts Technological Institute (SMTI). After the completion of his master plan, construction began on the Liberal Arts building (known at the time as Group I). However, it did not take long before severe financial complications forced Rudolph to leave the SMTI design team. Nevertheless, he remained a volunteer on the project and helped to oversee its development. Rudolph admits, “Yes, I was fired. But in a sense, my influence and efforts did not change that drastically—not at first anyway—because the other architects—and I have to emphasize that there were many architects involved—understood that there was a pervading idea, a series of ideas, wielding the campus into one, and that it needed to be an ongoing effort, so the other architects actually came to my rescue, otherwise, it would not have worked.” Rudolph’s expressionistic modernist style developed out of his concern to crack the glass curtain façade of international modernism. As Timothy Rohan notes, “Rudolph articulated the growing feeling in the profession that modern architecture was in danger of becoming alienating, dehumanizing, and an almost rote activity for architects.”

Even as early as 1953, architectural journals were decrying the planar glass wall’s ubiquitous presence: “The standard curtain wall—perhaps America’s single, most important building innovation in the past decade or so—is fast becoming, in the hands of less than sensitive architects and manufacturers, one of the most irritating eyesores on the U.S. scene.”
Rudolph sought to break the glass façade’s stranglehold by using a more plastic, textured form—concrete. Nevertheless, he did not reject the modernist idiom. To understand both the importance of concrete and the significance of the geometric form in the design of the school, we have to begin with Rudolph’s first drawings.

An avid fan and practitioner of the Beaux-Arts, and a student of Walter Gropius’s Bauhaus drafting methods, Rudolph made both beautiful illustrations and complex plans of buildings and spaces that he hoped he could realize as material structures. Rudolph envisioned a campus of timeless monumentality, a muscular architecture that would lift classrooms and offices into the air and allow pedestrian traffic to pass beneath. That is, he planned a bold looking and adventurous center in which students could acquire knowledge and thus cultural capital.

To grasp Rudolph’s intentions for UMassD, one must first understand the context in which the campus was built. The university was constructed during a revolutionary time: the 1960’s. This was a period of great economic and social change. Citizens questioned societal norms that had been established prior to WWII. That is, they rejected many previous traditions and embraced the future-oriented progressive ideals of modernism. To some extent, working class families rejected the traditions of the ethnic cultures in which they had been raised. This rejection brought about a radical change in American culture. After the war, families moved to the outskirts of the city and created the suburban lifestyle—one which celebrated the individual’s right to own a house and a plot of green space on which to raise a family. With interest in the future and access to new products (because of advances in technology), families looked towards the modern when designing and decorating their homes. They eventually even redefined the “modern.”

Paul Rudolph, the architect of the UMass Dartmouth campus, had his own particular definition of modern—one that was also future oriented but one that celebrated the collective rather than the individual. The University’s architecture was Paul Rudolph’s grand opportunity to create an ensemble of structures that reflected his design principles. More importantly, UMass Dartmouth embodied his notion of an “educational utopia.” From the grand optical illusions and a monumental appearance, to the geometric fields and gardens throughout, the exterior of the school became an ideal integrated city.
1962 The Massachusetts state legislature creates Southeastern Massachusetts Technological Institute (SMTI) by merging the New Bedford Technical Institute and Bradford Durfee Technical Institute. Dr. Joseph Leo Driscoll is named President.

1963 Desmond and Lord of Boston hire Paul Rudolph as lead architect for the new campus.

1964 Groundbreaking ceremony for the SMTI campus in North Dartmouth is held on June 14th. Construction on the Group I Academic Building begins.

1966 The Group I Academic Building dedicated on June 5th. Construction on the Group II Science and Engineering Building begins in June. Pressure from the state ends in the removal of Rudolph as lead architect. He was kept on as an advisor to the project. With the determination of Dr. Driscoll and Desmond and Lord, the project follows his original intentions.


1968 Construction on the Administration Building and the Campus Center begins in October.

1969 Group II Science and Engineering Building is completed in April, the Textile Technology Building in September, and the Research Building in October. SMTI becomes Southeastern Massachusetts University (SMU).

1970 The Administration Building is completed in September.

1971 The Campus Center is completed in the fall.

1972 The Administration Building is dedicated as the John E. Foster Administration Building on May 27th. Dr. Donald E. Walker becomes President of SMU.

1979 The Research Building is renamed Violette Building on June 3rd.

1985 The C. Norman Dion Science and Engineering Building groundbreaking is held on October 21st.

1987 Groundbreaking for the Cedar Dell Residence Halls is held on October 21st.
1988  Swain School in New Bedford merges with Southeastern Massachusetts University’s College of Visual and Performing Arts. The 1213 Purchase Street campus is leased from New Bedford by the University until 2001; all other Swain buildings are sold.

1991  A new University of Massachusetts structure combines the Amherst, Boston and Worcester campuses with the Southeastern Massachusetts University and the University of Lowell. SMU becomes UMass Dartmouth.

2001  The Star Store campus in New Bedford opens with visual arts studios, classrooms, and the University Art Gallery. The Advanced Technology and Manufacturing Center opens in Fall River, offering laboratory and incubator-space for start-up companies.

2004  A new building for the Charlton College of Business is opened on the Dartmouth campus. A second centrally located Center for Professional and Continuing Education opens in New Bedford. The university breaks ground for two more student residence buildings, to meet the increasing demand for on-campus housing.

2007  Research Building opens.

2009  Ferreira-Mendes Portuguese-American Archives opens.

2010  School of Law Established, Claire T. Carney Library renovations begin in September.

2013  Library renovations completed for the Spring semester.
Concept 1
Modernism & UMass
Dartmouth’s Design
Paul Rudolph’s visual and spatial designs reflect various aspects of post-war modernism. Rudolph transformed the modernist architectural aesthetic into an innovative, unique escape from reality that harmonizes with nature and offers shelter to visitors. He both “retreat[ed] to the safe haven of autonomous formal abstraction, [and ventured] into the free play of signs in a capitalist marketplace.” Rudolph created a tight-knit community by employing these modern principles, distinguished by his unique concrete style and purposeful blueprints.

Rudolph captured the ideal modernist utopia with his unique, expressionistic architecture. He employed a Brutalist style that showcased the raw materials of each structure. As a result, UMass Dartmouth’s dominant color is the concrete’s natural grey hue. However, Rudolph’s grey structures become multi-dimensional fields of color when light hits each rough surface. Direct sunlight casts shadows that simulate the textural, multi-hued surfaces. Rudolph also applied bright reds and purples in the interior to saturate the monochromatic atmosphere. Further color comes from the giant curtain-wall windows incorporated into his design. These windows capture the ever-changing sunlight and cast a golden glow over the campus. These characteristics make the UMass Dartmouth campus unique. The cohesive architecture helps students escape mundane reality and focus on learning without the distractions of ordinary life.

UMass Dartmouth’s enclosed community also incorporates modern architectural forms that address post-World War II fears about nuclear war. In the 1950’s, most people felt unsafe living in a world with the potential for an atomic bomb to be dropped on them. To allay these fears, Rudolph used his architectural designs to create a safe-haven for students, staff, and faculty. The exterior concrete overhangs offer protection to those walking across campus, shielding them from the sun, rain, or snow. Inside, each academic building contains seating areas that also have sheltering overhangs. Rudolph created these den-like places for students to gather and meet.
Even the overall campus plan demonstrates the architect’s interest in enclosed spaces. Ring Road surrounds the academic space, a protected place that fosters learning. Student housing and athletic facilities lie outside the ring, as they do not relate to the vital function of education. From inside the campus quad, there are no views beyond the campus boundaries. With this enclosure, Rudolph intended to keep the hustle and bustle of the outside world completely separate from his educational utopia.

Modern architects understand that site impacts their work, and they often built around the preexisting terrain. For example, consider Falling Water, a home built in southwest Pennsylvania by architect Frank Lloyd Wright (figure 2). This home is built into the side of a waterfall and offers its inhabitants and visitors incredible views of nature. Like Wright, Rudolph planned to harmonize the campus architecture with its natural surroundings. His original landscape plan included a vast number of trees so that students could feel in tune with their environment. He intended to build a reflection pool outside of the Dion building as an entrance to campus. Even though most of Rudolph’s landscape designs were never realized, it is important to note his consideration of the campus’s scenery.

Rudolph employed certain modernist principles to fulfill his vision for our campus. As is evident from his plans, Rudolph not only built a modernist utopia, but a functional learning community that shelters students and visitors from the distractions of daily life.
When building UMass Dartmouth, Paul Rudolph diverged from—what he perceived as—the constraining modern aesthetics his teachers and predecessors laid out. Traditional international modernists embraced simple functionality, new technology, and the idea of looking forward. Accordingly, modern architects sought to rationally solve the problem of space by building basic geometric structures—structures that rejected decoration and resembled rationalized glass boxes. At this time, in other words, there existed a dichotomy in modern architecture. Many modernists followed the rational square box design of Mies Van der Rohe, while others—such as Paul Rudolph—sought to employ more expressive forms. Followers of Mies, for the sake of simplicity, always built structures with a specific purpose in mind. All unnecessary ornament was left out.

Rudolph tackled the task of creating a new educational community in 1963. Unlike the International Style modernists, Rudolph approached architecture differently. His ornamented and expressionistic architecture clearly critiqued the tenets of modernism. He created visually striking structures with dramatic spatial effects, geometric three-dimensional forms that mask their interior function. Rudolph did not include any extraneous detail. Rather, the buildings themselves function as giant ornaments. From the dramatic cantilevered third floor projections to the expansive curtain wall windows, UMass Dartmouth has its fair share of beautiful and subtle ornamentation.

In addition to the academic buildings, Rudolph designed the entire UMass Dartmouth campus so that it could optimally—and rationally—function as a unified college campus. Ring Road surrounds the campus and facilitates ease of movement. He situated the academic buildings inside this circular road and the dormitories outside it. Thus, students could easily walk from building to building and from their dormitories to their classrooms.

The academic structures, in turn, surround a green “plaza.” This expansive mall in the interior of this protected space encourages social
interactions between students, pedestrians and visitors while they walk on the walkways or congregate in the sheltered areas or open spaces. Pedestrians, at the same time, can’t help but notice the tall structure at the center of this green open space; the UMass Dartmouth bell-tower or campanile.

Rudolph’s campanile metaphorically defines the campus as a modernized version of a traditional community. It is essential to the campus architecture because it unites the surrounding structures with one central core. As UMass Dartmouth’s designated communications tower, it emits time-keeping chimes at regular intervals heard across campus. In Medieval and Renaissance Europe, bell towers were a traditional symbol of unity and were an important part of town planning. Rudolph continued the use of this structure, but reinterpreted its appearance in order to fit into a twentieth century modernist aesthetic.

UMass Dartmouth’s design clearly does not resemble a typical Northeastern college. The campus challenges notions about the college experience as much as it defies typical modern aesthetics. Rudolph crafted our campus based on what he thought academia should be—one that celebrated the collective rather than the individual. Everyone is equal and should have equal opportunities; this campus is a campus for everyone. UMass Dartmouth’s abstract forms flowed from Rudolph’s mind, through his arm, and onto paper in his architectural drawings. Most importantly, Rudolph’s designs were original, which appropriately fits the modernist idea of looking forward to the future.
Concept 2
Modernism and Futurism
In the 1950’s, ideas about new space technologies emerged in illustrator Arthur Radebaugh’s “Closer Than We Think” comics and later, popular television series Star Trek and The Jetsons. The creators of these series depicted a future of flying cars, and solar powered cars and houses. The architecture seemed ahead of its time with large windows and flat, perpendicular roofs. Such futurist visions would appear to have affected Paul Rudolph’s designs for UMass Dartmouth.

Radebaugh’s futuristic visions repeat throughout UMass Dartmouth. Ring Road compares to Radebaugh’s “drive-up hotel” driveway. In both, the driveway spirals around the academic core and drivers can easily access their classroom or suite. These winding shapes repeat in the staircases, which protrude from the building and wind with each flight of stairs up to a flat roof. These futurist fantasies clearly influenced other mass media and the actual architecture of the time.

Such designs originated with Le Corbusier’s architecture from the late 1920s. Le Corbusier and other modern architects influenced Paul Rudolph as he began designing his own buildings in the 1950s. Rudolph wanted to make a campus that functioned as a “single structural-mechanical system.” His designs employ ideas from Le Corbusier’s Villa Savoye, combined with technological ideas that were becoming increasingly popular (figure 4).

Le Corbusier’s idea that the home was a “machine for living [in]” inspired Rudolph’s united student community. Similarly, Rudolph wanted to create a campus that could act as a machine for learning. He does this by using concrete for every building as a unifying vehicle. Ring Road and numerous parking lots encircle the entire academic campus, which makes every building easily accessible to commuters.

New technology and futuristic ideas sparked by mass media strongly influenced Rudolph’s designs for UMass Dartmouth. New technologies allowed the modernist architects’ to look forward and build a sleek and functional educational unit—the campus of the future.
Technology Will Imprison Us!

In the 1940’s and 1950’s, those who celebrated technology thought these advancements would provide them with more time to enjoy life. Indeed, it seemed likely that flying cars and landing on the moon were just around the corner. For some however, this optimistic outlook gave way to a more cynical perspective as the Cold War developed. That is, could technology actually imprison us?

This socio-political tension strongly influenced Paul Rudolph’s design for the UMass Dartmouth campus. In Rudolph’s time, nuclear war with the Soviet Union ignited anxiety and hysteria in many Americans. The “red scare” eventually influenced the design world, inspiring apocalyptic architecture. Architects of that time were interested in constructing Cold War bunkers and fallout shelters, as seen in the Fallout Preparation poster (figure 5). The United States government launched propaganda campaigns urging frightened Americans to burrow underground and take cover. Funding for a widespread public shelter program seemed impossible with the financial demands caused by the race to fill various performance gaps in the Soviet Union. As a result, American families took control and began building backyard fallout shelters. An article in the July 1961 issue of Newsweek noted that American families had built around 2,000 shelters. The New York Times, however, estimated the total number of bomb shelters in the U.S. to be around 60,000.

This shift towards the individual’s privacy, protection, and shelter coincides with a similar movement in architecture. Oddly, this movement contradicts modernism’s typical dedication to open space and the modernist architect’s numerous, large expansive windows. In terms of Paul Rudolph’s campus architecture, we can observe connections to shelter architecture. For example, both UMass Dartmouth and bomb shelters were built using concrete. Shelters were concrete cubes that were immovable and covered by mounds of earth. Rudolph said UMass Dartmouth “juxtaposes a pedestrian campus defined by earth mounds... A spiraling mall created by buildings organizes the heart of the complex. The campus is intended
to be a single building utilizing a single structural-mechanical system, to be constructed of one material.” Rudolph carefully designed protected spaces inside and outside his buildings. Sheltered spaces shield individuals from the elements outdoors, while indoor cavities protect one’s privacy. If built underground, UMass Dartmouth could indeed function as a fallout shelter, due to its sturdy construction.

Embracing the future inevitably led to the dark side of technological advances. Constructing fall-out shelters brought comfort to those who feared technology. Eventually, the Cold War ended along with the construction of fallout shelters. Nevertheless, the remnants of that anxiety still linger in the protective design of architectural marvels like UMass Dartmouth.
YOU CAN PROTECT YOUR FAMILY AGAINST FALLOUT!

KELSEY-HAYES CO. • FALLOUT SHELTERS
NOW AVAILABLE FROM HENRICH LUMBER, INC. • 465 CORNWALL AVE. • BUFFALO, N.Y.

figure 5
Concept 3
Good Modern Design & American Consumerism
Around the time UMass Dartmouth was built in the 1960s, modern designers and architects established the principles of “good design.” They also attempted to educate the general public about these standards which they believed reflected a “Universal Style.” The so-called cultural elite feared that good design practices might fall by the wayside because of the post-war economic boom and the rise in consumerism associated with it. Therefore, it was up to the culturally educated to establish trends, effectively becoming “tastemakers.” As tastemakers, the upper class touted “good design” as a way to reform American over-consumption. By exposing the new middle class to high-class design standards, the hope was that “working-class consumers would be uplifted by their new prosperity and would simultaneously be compelled by qualities of simplicity to accept designers’ upper-middle class standards.” Therefore, collecting items with good design could improve one’s class status and simultaneously preserve modern styling.

To educate the public, the Museum of Modern Art in New York held a series of five exhibitions appropriately titled “What is Good Design?” Opening in 1950, these shows highlighted modern, everyday objects in a gallery setting. The Museum’s mission was to shape “consumer taste by presenting objects that people might want and could afford.” MoMA exhibited items ranging from furniture, to lamps, fabrics, decorative pottery, glassware, and metal pieces. (figure 6) shows an example of a room furnished with “good design” pieces. Items were chosen based on their appearance, functionality, and also their price. According to the exhibition’s organizer, Edgar Kauffman, Jr., “a good design should never pretend to be more than one thing at a time.” Therefore, good design is highly influenced by its functionality. Designers value the simple over the ornate.

In other words, “good” modern architecture observes the “form follows function” criteria defined by MoMA’s Good Design Exhibit. As a movement,
“Modernism symbolized a break with the past and seemed to stand for a shiny new age of peace and prosperity... the visual character of the modernist style seemed to sum up their own self-images: rational, efficient, and confident possessors of immense power and wealth and yet not flashy or desirous of individual expression.”

Miesian Modernism, named after creator Mies van der Rohe, applauds simple forms that highlight architectural fundamentals. Miesian buildings consist of a structural cage, which is clad with a glass curtain wall. Although UMass Dartmouth isn’t Miesian in form, it adheres to modernist principles because it was designed to function as a unified college campus—as a campus with simple, geometric, functional structures. Yet, within the campus’s expressionistic architecture, we find references to traditional ornament. For example, the concrete walls are incised with repeating patterns. Such embellishments also appear in the campus’ exterior in the smaller geometric shapes that complement the gigantic, masculine forms. These conflicting details symbolize the unsettled culture of the 1960s. Even today, with the renovation and addition to the Claire T. Carney Library, the campus continues to illustrate the ever-changing state of society.

UMass Dartmouth’s architecture is considered “good design” because it fulfills multiple functions. As a college it serves as a learning establishment: as a campus it ignites friendship among peers, and as a space, it inspires visitors to observe their environment and be more in tune with the present moment. Rudolph designed our campus to be an educational utopia that effectively serves as a learning community. Along with this social function, our campus also elicits a visceral, affective response from the visitor. In an interview with The Art Institute of Chicago, Rudolph said, “I happen to be very interested in what things mean to people and the symbolism involved... I want buildings to move people.” The bulky structures and protective overhangs suggest safety. Rudolph also integrates secret seating areas that enhance the notion of “dwelling” and promote human interaction. It is clear that Rudolph highly valued a space’s psychological impact as part of its function.

Modernist architecture which demonstrated “good design” principles effectively equated form with function. Its aesthetics are defined by its purpose. The same applies to the UMass Dartmouth campus: Rudolph’s forms were designed to create the ideal teaching community while simultaneously enhancing social relationships.
After World War II, definitions of social class and taste began to change—as did the distinctions between the “white collar” and “blue collar” classes. The average family income rose 30% in the 1960’s and purchasing power was strongest among the working “blue collar” class. Families flooded the suburbs and furnished their new homes with goods that represented their traditional working class values. The motto that best described the working class in the 1950’s was, “more is better.” For them, this meant rosebuds on silverware and brightly colored chrome on appliances and automobiles. Purchases of such types of “working-class” items rose 240% in the five years following WWII. This created a huge demand for manufacturers. They had to meet the needs of a new and very large market: the working class with newly acquired wealth. This new demographic equated worth with large size, bulk, embellishment, visual flash, and color. Such characteristics are also often associated with the term “kitsch”. Kitsch means products that appeal to the masses. It is often associated with poor quality goods that reflect lowbrow taste. Well-designed “upper-class” objects had a minimalist, “less is more” style and were quite different from the over embellished acquisitions of the rapidly expanding working class. Despite the efforts of the “cultural elite” to educate the masses, they were not all that successful. Manufacturers could barely keep up with the growing demand for the big, shiny, new over-embellished object. They produced standardized goods in large quantities—but in so-called “individual” colors with “selective” hardware. Many middle/working-class households contained flashy chrome appliances and cars, brightly colored cabinets, floral-patterned couches, and oddly shaped chairs—the types of furniture and appliances the working-class customer associated with their new-found wealth (figure 7) shows an example of kitsch everyday objects, embellished not for function, but for visual interest.

Ultimately, this popular style (or kitsch) influenced all design work. Nevertheless, not all Americans could buy the new “kitsch” objects. This included many of the residents of communities near UMass Dartmouth. Not
far from the campus is the city of New Bedford. During the 19th century, this was one of the most important whaling cities in the world. Despite its prosperity a century earlier, during the 1960's New Bedford suffered from high unemployment. Moreover, it also suffered from a housing crisis and could only shelter 16% of its population—which, not surprisingly, equaled the unemployment rate.

Within eight years, the city received $100 million in federal funds to help with its fiscal and social problems. Most of this went towards anti-poverty and renewal programs. At the time, Dartmouth and New Bedford did not have the industry or infrastructure (like other American cities) to offer employment to those who wished to purchase consumer goods and adopt the new working/middle-class lifestyle.

UMass Dartmouth students also were not interested in the new consumption-oriented lifestyle (whether kitsch or “high-culture”). Student publications from 1963 to 1970 clearly show that they were unconcerned with the mass culture that preoccupied those outside this educational utopia. In the student paper, The Torch, only one section, entitled “Fashion and Fads on Campus,” included short student interviews describing fashions that students were wearing. One quote from a female student in 1966 reveals students’ views toward fashion: “In general I dislike them –everyone seems so stereotypical. Thank goodness for the few who have minds of their own.” Students weren’t preoccupied with consumer culture. Another article from The Torch claimed, “There can be derived considerably more aesthetic pleasure from examining Paul Rudolph’s architectural techniques than from pondering the ingredients of a Howdy Beefburger or determining the make of the trailer standing between you and your next class.”

The students and residents of the Dartmouth and New Bedford area were not typical consumers like those found elsewhere. Therefore, it is only fitting that our architecture, which has lasted through the decades, matches our unique campus and unique student body.
The UMass Dartmouth buildings are masterpieces of the Brutalist style of modern architecture. Paul Rudolph called his designs “an act of bravery,” which is certainly a fitting statement, as Rudolph’s buildings were often a source of controversy in the public and architectural realms. What were responses to the UMass Dartmouth campus when it was newly constructed in 1966? Through consumer research, architectural journals and articles, local newspapers, and campus publications, the varied sentiments expressed were similar to today’s diverse opinions.

In June of 1966, Group I, or the Liberal Arts building, was dedicated and the reception was open to the public. An article published in the New Bedford Standard Times reported that those in attendance favorably received the building. One section of the article states that from women in particular, there were many positive comments about the colors Rudolph employed to contrast to the natural grey of the concrete.

This occurrence interestingly parallels an essay by Shelley Nickels entitled “More is Better: Mass Consumption, Gender, and Class Identity in Postwar America.” As many 1960’s families experienced significant increases in spending ability and upward class movement, middle class women became the fastest growing consumer population. The author of the article explains how designers had to compromise their strictly minimalist, modernist ideals in order to sell to this group. The middle class was not willing to pay more for simple refrigerators and sofas that, to them, seemed sparse and lacked ornamentation. They wanted fancy fins on their Cadillacs and shiny chrome on their refrigerators (figure 8). Rudolph created something that felt expansive, solid, and commanding, and was subtly ornamented with the textures embossed upon the concrete surfaces. Perhaps Group I was the architectural Cadillac to the South Coast residents.

Students and faculty favorably received their new campus. Many were excited at the prospect of an architecturally unified campus; this was relatively rare in historic New England. Modern architecture at large was seen as revolutionary, as a style that pointed to the future and represented
progress. Who wouldn’t want to have a campus that engendered such feelings? Surely, the university community was inspired by this break in the visual norms of antiquated South Coast campus buildings.

In December of 1966, an open letter to the editor of the student publication The Talker, expressed a student’s concerns over the littering epidemic unfolding inside Group I. The writer saw this as incredibly disrespectful to “our beautiful new campus”, and urged students and faculty alike to make an effort to keep the new building clean. In November 1966, after Rudolph was relegated to architectural consultant, a New Bedford Standard Times article quotes Rudolph was “pleased with the watch-dogging” of students and faculty to ensure the rest of the planned buildings would follow his original intentions.

National reviews of the campus were also positive. Architectural Record featured group one as “Campus Building of the Month” in a 1966 edition, and Ada Louise Huxtable, a Pulitzer Prize winning architectural critic, wrote an enthusiastic piece for the New York Times in 1967. Both reviews praise Rudolph for creating a space that encourages social interaction, educational progress, and employs the modernist ideals of embracing materiality. They appreciated that Rudolph created a space that was both intimate and open.

However, not all opinions were positive. In 1969, in the first off-campus publication The Cynic, a poem appearing on the first page entitled “Ode to Concrete” reads, “I hate concrete, I hate glass, I hate with steel, An apparition of our modern age...”. As the United States became involved in the Vietnam conflict, strong opposition to all forms of governance grew among many young people. Our campus body itself was at that time embroiled in conflict with Dr. Driscoll, the President of the University. Perhaps the author of this poem saw the heavy, steadfast concrete forms as a symbol of crass authoritarianism, and felt as though they represented the oppression of the socio-administrative climate on campus, and in our country.

Like any project erected in the public sphere, critics abound on both sides. Our campus, and Brutalist buildings at large, continue to have supporters and critics, and always will. Through historical contextualization, we are able to understand the intentions behind the concrete here on our campus, and hopefully generate a better appreciation for it.
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Concept 4
Modernism & Social Revolution
After World War II, the world was still divided. Although the Nazi domination of most of Europe may have been eliminated, a new reign of terror began with the start of the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union and their allies (the Communist and non-Communist worlds). Each bloc strove to see which would come out on top—that is, which cultural ideology would win. Although this war stoked fear and paranoia in all individuals (and resulted in numerous proxy wars between the U.S. and the Soviet Union), it also helped to spark many movements for change. Many hoped for change by joining peaceful protests associated with Feminism and Civil Rights—and especially with the anti-Vietnam war movement.

Students at UMass Dartmouth were not so different in their pursuit of a politics of change. A group on campus contributed to the yearbook in an effort to support global peaceful protests (figure 10). Like students at other college campuses at the time, many did not support the Vietnam War—especially after some students were shot at Kent State while protesting the administration’s Cambodian campaign. Although war tore the nation apart, students at UMass Dartmouth stood united with their fellow students. They wanted peace and attempted to convince others to join them by illustrating the horrors associated with the Vietnam War. The Graffiti image included here showcases the students who were victims of the continuing, bloody war (figure 11). As one can see in this image, students clearly showed their displeasure with the foreign policy of the American government. This displeasure was apparent to everyone in the UMass Dartmouth community.

Inhabitants of the Southcoast were united on other fronts as well. As advertised in The Torch on March 15, 1968, residents of the nearby communities were becoming increasingly impatient with how long it was taking to finish building UMass Dartmouth. The slow progress perplexed community residents; they wondered if the school would be constructed in time for their young children to apply. Everyone in the community united
and peacefully demonstrated at the campus in order for their concerns to be heard. This peaceful, organized protest forced the construction team to be aware that this project was not just affecting a small area of North Dartmouth, but the greater New Bedford community as well.

As the community of UMass Dartmouth banded together for change, so did other groups within eastern Massachusetts. Inmates from Deer Island Prison, which was predominately populated by African Americans, went on a hunger strike to demand more humane living conditions. They wanted better treatment, better food, and visitation rights regardless of race or ethnicity. By banding together, whites, Puerto Ricans, and African-Americans, believed that their voices would be heard. And they were right. The hunger strike was a success. Through non-violent actions, the united prisoners asked for—and received—better conditions and treatment for all.

This new political climate also affected women. During the 1960s and 1970s, they began to strive for economic equality with men in the workplace and social equality in everyday life. The UMass Dartmouth community experienced a significant increase in its female student population, which gave impetus to the Women’s Rights Movement in Southcoast Massachusetts. Emma Jones explained her situation in an article in *The Old Mole*, a student paper. She joined the women’s movement and through it, found strength, companionship and courage. At work, Emma began to stand up for herself when male co-workers made sexist remarks. Sadly, for many women of the time, it was the social norm to be publicly harassed. Although initially the women were complete strangers, shared experiences brought them together—both female students and members of the community joined to encourage each other to tear down the walls that gendered norms had erected.

In sum: negative events can inspire positive actions. During the 1960s and 1970s, the Cold War, the Vietnam War, racism and sexism empowered individuals to come together to effect change. Through the student yearbook, students on the UMass Dartmouth campus spoke out about current social and political situations. By protesting and being heard, they had an impact on the outcome of local and global events, from the construction of the UMass Dartmouth campus to the Vietnam War. By becoming a unified community, their impassioned protests inspired change.
The 1960’s and 1970’s were a time of great unrest across the country. Student protests often led to violence. There were over 100 University protests that ended in riots, from the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) riot on May 13, 1960, where students protested the HUAC hearings, to the Greensboro Massacre, in North Carolina on November 3, 1979. UMass Dartmouth students held numerous protests, however, they were always peaceful; police action was never required and there were no incidences of violence. Local protests were in response to what was perceived as the administration’s attempts to dictate what was being taught on campus.

It was widely believed that the university weeded out professors that held opinions or had ideas outside the mainstream. Young adults were trying to break away from the cookie cutter, middle class lifestyle and from their parents’ principles. They were rebelling against being forced to think a certain way.

Trouble started when Professor Donald Kruger, a second year Assistant Professor of Visual Design, was not recommended for contract renewal. Professor Kruger went against the administration to defend his students’ expressive freedoms. There was also talk of Professor Kruger counseling students with regard to the draft. It was believed he was being let go for not fitting the administration’s notions of how a professor should behave.

Professor Kruger appealed to the Faculty Committee and to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Seventy-five students came to the meeting with a petition signed by 150 students. However, the faculty committee still allowed his contract to lapse. The students staged a two-night sleep in. Nine administrators, nine faculty members, and nine students formed a committee to work towards a resolution. The peaceful protest eventually led to policies to avoid similar situations in the future.
The following year, Dr. Joseph Driscoll, the Dean of Faculty, and Dr. Vincent P. Wright proposed that six faculty members should be demoted with their salaries reduced. These six professors had supported Professor Kruger and it was believed they were being punished. The students feared their education was going to be dictated by people complying with the administration’s standards rather than academic ideals. Dean Wright submitted his recommendation without notifying the appropriate College Dean or Department Chair. The six professors never received an explanation as to why their contracts were not being renewed. However, the students believed they were entitled to this information.

The students staged a three-day strike. There is no mention of the striking students trying to intimidate students who wanted to attend classes. There were no complaints of violence. Unlike many student protests across the nation, the administration did not interfere and the students remained non-violent.

A march was organized. Forty members of the faculty and 350 students traveled to Boston to rally in front of the State House. The Governor met with them. The students and faculty expressed their concerns for the academic freedoms at the university, and the Governor expressed his desire to help maintain those freedoms.

Dr. Driscoll then informed Professor Charles White, a fourth year mathematics instructor who was respected by faculty and students alike, that he would not be recommended for tenure. The Student Senate held an open meeting to which Professor White and President Driscoll were invited. President Driscoll was allowed to speak about his decision regarding Professor White’s tenure. The Student Senate demanded President Driscoll’s resignation in a vote of 13-0 with one abstention.

The students stood behind Professor White because they believed in the same principles he stood for, and that he was denied tenure for political reasons. The demand for President Driscoll’s resignation came about because the students “believed his leadership represented the idea that the university must not become a forum for political debate.” Universities should be places where more than one opinion can exist. It was widely believed that President Driscoll was eliminating all faculty positions of those who held opinions contrary to his own. Students feared the idea of having one upper-middle class man dictate their educational exposure.

Across the country, student protests led to violence, including police and military action. However, UMass Dartmouth remained relatively peaceful. Credit should be given to the student body for remaining calm while maintaining a strong stance on issues they believed in. Recognition should also be given to the administration for never trying to break up the
student rallies. When faced with perceived injustice, the students at UMass Dartmouth stood up to their oppressors. They held peaceful protests, and worked with willing faculty and administrators to dispel any threat to their academic freedoms.
R. George Fallon, Administrative Assistant to President Driscoll, listens to Student Representative Steve DeCollibus, as Paula Robinson and James Chas look on.

Dean Donald Howard, acting as moderator during Student-Administration confrontation, explains the situation to both.
Concept 5
Modernism & the Landscape
The New Bedford we know today is a product of multiple reincarnations. The city’s economy, for example, has experienced many ups and downs. New Bedford’s first textile mill opened in 1846. From that point on, the city’s economy gradually transitioned from one based on whaling to one dependent on the textile industry. At the turn of the twentieth century, textile factories supported the city’s 120,000 inhabitants. During World War I, the demand for manufactured cotton goods increased and New Bedford prospered. By the war’s end in 1918, there were 32 cotton mills employing 30,000 people, which was about 90% of the manufacturing workforce. But the end of the War meant the end of this hyper-demand for cotton goods—and thus, an end to New Bedford’s economic boom. In 1920, the cloth market collapsed and production in the mills slowed or stopped completely. By 1921, workers’ wages had fallen one third and hard times truly began. This continued throughout the 1920’s and reached a climax with the 1928 textile mill strike. Twenty thousand workers walked out of the mills because of concerns with their pay. Although the strike was fought for noble reasons, it caused some mills to close permanently, which added to the already high unemployment figures.

In 1929 when the Great Depression began, the country started to understand what New Bedford had been experiencing for a decade. The national depression only exacerbated the financial struggles of the once prosperous city. The mills collectively employed 26,000 in 1929. By 1932, the workforce was halved and pay decreased by two-thirds. In 1934, only half of the original mills were still in operation; and by 1938 employment had dwindled to a measly 8,000. New Bedford was unable to regain the economic stability it once had and fell victim to deindustrialization, depopulation, economic restructuring, and high unemployment. Forever changed by the decline of the textile industry, the city suffered a steep decline. Today, however, New Bedford—home to the UMass Dartmouth’s College of Visual and Performing Arts and other creative enterprises—is attempting to move from decay to renewal.
“Out with the old and in with the new” was the idea behind post World-War II Urban Renewal projects. These were a series of government-funded attempts to repair decaying urban areas so that cities could get a “facelift”—a new, modern, fresh start. In the spring 1972 issue of *Warp and Filling*, the editors stated: “It has taken years, but it is happening. Plans have been made, land has been acquired, reclaimed and our New Bedford, is taking shape.” In other words, plans had been made for New Bedford’s renewal. What is Urban Renewal? According to the New Bedford Redevelopment Authority:

“Better housing for all, industrial development, downtown modernization, better public facilities, imaginative architecture, [the] breaking up [of] ghetto barriers, strengthened social services, increased employment, expanded business opportunities, historic preservation, citizen action, parks and plazas, new schools and better living for all.”

Urban renewal projects were those that cleared or transformed city slums (figure 14). Planners wished to restructure and repurpose the space and better serve the community. “Urban Renewal began as a noble idea. Federal money was made available to cities to help rebuild central areas and improve infrastructure.” But as ideal as urban renewal seemed, the development came at a cost to those who lived in the restructured communities. The transformation and rebuilding of a city often endangered the historic integrity of the area. New Bedford was one of the fortunate communities where organizations such as The Waterfront Historic Area League (WHALE) were formed to protect and restore historic landmarks from the destruction associated with urban renewal.

Due to the dramatic increase in student population after World War II, urban renewal efforts also included attempts to improve university architecture. Campus environments were considered as “utopias” dedicated to learning and community development:
“Modernist design and planning became the primary tools for those seeking to create the physical spaces for this utopia. Eighteen professional bodies and research groups such as the Educational Facilities Laboratories (EFL) and the Society for College and University Planning (SCUP) were founded and dedicated to campus planning.”

The University campus became a tool for shaping the future of modern civilization.

UMass Dartmouth provided the Southcoast with a source of positive, forward thinking as the development continued into the 1970’s. When founded, the University was a dedicated investment in the community. Planners hoped that the University—along with the renewal of the area—would help economic and cultural development. Urban renewal shaped the fast paced modern world, but not without casualties. A little piece of history was sacrificed in order to pave the road to the future.
Urban planners attempted to develop strategic plans that impose order on urban development. In the 1950’s and 1960’s, incentive plans associated with urban renewal had a large influence on urban planning. Such plans included special tax breaks for the development of new transportation networks—highways in particular—that connected cities with outlying areas.

Cities were once desirable places to live, but with the introduction of the interstate highway system in the 1950’s and 1960’s, workers on the Southcoast of Massachusetts moved from the city to the suburbs. In the past, city workers lived where they worked. With the building of the interstate highway system, workers could now commute. This resulted in a new lifestyle. The highway system also transformed the way our cities looked. In the gridded, organized layout of suburbia, residents hoped to have personal garages, white picket fences, and emerald green lawns. This, in fact, became part of the “American dream.”

In Southeastern Massachusetts, urban planning did not stop at the suburbs; it expanded to the design of universities. Paul Rudolph’s campus is also based on a rational framing of space. In his design, he combined open spaces with intricate geometric sheltered spaces. The walking paths on campus are an excellent example of controlled space, where the land is designated for a specific use.

Placing campus in the town of Dartmouth, Massachusetts was also intentional. Lying between the city of New Bedford and the small farming towns of Westport and Dartmouth, Paul Rudolph intended the University to be both city and suburb. Students could conveniently travel to school via two major roadways (the Cape Cod Motorway, now Interstate 195 and MA Route 6). The urban planner’s rationalized grid (as evident in the aerial photograph of Levittown, Pennsylvania, ca. 1959, figure 13) and new highway systems completely revolutionized the modern lifestyle—textile mill workers could now become commuting students.
Concept 6
UMass Dartmouth
Today
Part of Paul Rudolph’s complex designs for UMass Dartmouth are two vast academic buildings, each more than 300 feet long, bracketing an expansive college green. At the end of one of the long buildings is the five-story Claire T. Carney Library, with large boxes projecting from its upper floors. Like the rest of the campus, the building was constructed of board-formed concrete, with Rudolph’s trademark “corduroy concrete” bricks for non-structural walls.

“A link consisting of an enclosed hallway raised on bulbous concrete piers connected the library to the rest of the campus. This space was almost entirely windowless and grim but at least it provided shelter. The open spaces below, according to library director Catherine A. Fortier-Barnes, were useful only to skateboarders and students playing the live-action game Humans Versus Zombies.”

After decades of study, the university decided to make the library and the hallway link more usable. Within the library, designLAB undertook a series of renovations from smaller, oddly proportioned spaces to create large, glass-enclosed reading and meeting rooms. That strategy necessitated removing old corduroy bricks in some places and adding new ones elsewhere, made from Rudolph’s original molds. The changes are visible from the exterior (figure 15), with some rooms extending beyond the old building line, their new windows larger and more conventionally gridded than those used by Rudolph. There is one other large change to the exterior: modern heating and cooling equipment have been installed on the roof, replacing the 53 individual fan-coil units that Rudolph secreted secretly enclosed in closets around the building. This move essentially added a sixth floor hidden behind stainless-steel screens.

“Inside the library, spaces have been reconfigured to provide ramps that allow universal access. New lighting relieves the building’s former gloominess and allows all to appreciate the richly textured concrete of ceilings and upper walls. The library renovations showcase Rudolph’s artistry and that of the carpenters who built his form-work.”
Most of Rudolph’s key features were retained, but the more visible part of the $34.5 million renovation project involves enclosing the link in a 24,000-square-foot atrium between a pair of 120-foot-long, sheer glass walls, which was completed in January, 2013.

On the ground level, the new link serves as a large reading room and café, complete with two fireplaces. Upstairs, through the new 30-foot-high window wall, the hallway, having had much of its corduroy-concrete enclosure removed, is now a kind of bridge overlooking the space below and the entire campus. The new atrium brings students into close proximity with Rudolph’s béton brut and gives sweeping views of the rest of campus. With this recent renovation, Rudolph’s architecture will be seen more clearly and more comprehensively than at any time in the last half century.

A large part of Rudolph’s concrete palisade has been preempted by glass walls, which, in a wan echo of the original buildings, are shaded by vertical fins of stainless-steel mesh. Fortunately, the plain new surfaces bring Rudolph’s architecture into high relief—in that sense, giving Brutalism a boost. Moreover, Rudolph designed the campus as a city, and a city can contrast on a repetitive streetscape.

Using Aurasma, a free app available for mobile devices on iOS and android platforms, viewers will be able to compare extra digital content and contrast the past condition of the library, slideshows of floor plans, the library’s transition, and interviews with library staff, architects, historians, designers, and students. The Aurasma app is an augmented reality platform that serves as educational and interactive tool. Aurasma’s advanced image recognition technology use the camera of a smartphone or tablet to recognize real world images and then overlay rich media on top of them in the form of animations, videos, 3D models, and more. The platform enables both businesses and consumers to seamlessly enhance print with digital mobile content. Individuals use Aurasma to create and to share their own augmented reality experiences as well as to discover hidden digital content around them.
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figure 1 An Architectural Drawing by Paul Rudolph from The UMass Dartmouth Library Archives and Special Collections

figure 3 The Stanford Torus was proposed during the 1975 NASA Summer Study

figure 9 An example of a protest

figure 12 These photos depict Administration and students meet and calmly listen to both sides point of view. From the SMTI Torch May 13, 1968 at the UMass Dartmouth Library Archives and Special Collections