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The ocean liner appearance of the Real Club Náutico de San Sebastián (RCNSS), after the refurbishment and extension carried out by the architects José Manuel Aizpurúa and Joaquin Labayen in 1929, was soon associated with Le Corbusier’s ideas, especially after his visit to the building at the end of the summer of 1930.

Under the title “Haus oder Schiff? Segelklunhaus in San Sebastian, Spanien” [House or Ship? Yacht Club in San Sebastian], the German magazine Wasmuth Monatshefte für Baukunst und Stadtebau, was one of the first to publicly express this idea in 1932, opening the article with the following quote from Le Corbusier: “A serious architect, who is able to see things like an architect (a creator of organisms), will find in the ocean liner the redemption of centuries of abhorrent servitude”.

Nueva Forma dedicated an issue to the architect, and although it used the name and conveyed the image of the “Spanish Terragni”, as Carlos Sambricio rightly points out, its continually referred to Le Corbusier, fuelling the notion that he was one of his disciples. The anecdote told by Luis Moya, a fellow student of Aizpurúa, in the inside pages of the magazine, suggest that this inspiration began when he was a student:

“The great moment came in November 1925, when our class received the second edition of Vers une architecture, the introduction to which Le Corbusier had signed a year earlier, in November 1924. He was enthusiastic about it, like everyone else, but he put Le Corbusier’s ideas into practice on the spot. The project he was working on, whose normal, symmetrical ground plan had already been drawn, was given a completely asymmetrical reinforced concrete structure. Naturally it turned out very well, as befitted Aizpurúa [...]”

Be that as it may, the work carried out subsequently, first by Carlos Sambricio, and then more fully by José Angel Sanz Esquivel and José Ángel Medina Murúa, revealed a more complex picture of Aizpurúa’s personality, broadening the architectural influences to which he was linked:

“Aizpurúa did not limit himself to being an architect, let alone a Lecorbuserian architect. [...] In other words, why not be several architects at the same time, not in succession or alternation, but sometimes in a single project?

Medina Murúa went further, and openly stated that Aizpurúa distanced himself from Le Corbusier’s ideas after the appearance of the Real Club Náutico. Despite the progressive distancing these studies revealed, no author questioned the Lecorbuserian origin of Club, which had been considered “a rite of initiation by which the architect, more than anything else, projects his obsessions in order to get rid of them”.

There are only two references that still link the architects of the Real Club Náutico building to Le Corbusier, in addition to their own creation: the quote by Luis Moya, and the letter that Aizpurúa wrote to Giedion stating that “the project was accepted because it was similar to a boat”. The other connections were generated over time and raised in various studies and articles, a process by which the influences on the Náutico building were practically delimited to Le Corbusier, as well as obscure comparisons with elements of other projects, never in a holistic way. In other words, it seems the RCNSS project was an intense but one-off professional experiment with Le Corbusier’s ideas. So, would it be correct to say that there was a Lecorbuserian influence?

1896–1905: From a real to a figurative ship

Let us take a look at the history and analyze the various buildings that made up the RCNSS. The first Club was located in a large barge anchored in the bay of La Concha, which basically served as a warehouse for boats. The growth of the club and the lack of space for meetings and social activities led them to move premises located on La Concha promenade, the aquarium in Alderdi Eder Park. It was swiftly renovated and converted into the club’s new headquarters, inaugurated on 19 July of the same year.

Elements characteristic of marine vessels were added during the refurbishment: a mainmast, flag telegraph, life floats, two portholes that illuminated the main saloon as the mainmast and the portholes, with only as obscure comparisons with elements of other projects, never in a holistic way. In other words, it seems the RCNSS project was an intense but one-off professional experiment with Le Corbusier’s ideas. So, would it be correct to say that there was a Lecorbuserian influence?

Those years celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the RCNSS, the club undertook renovations to its headquarters to increase its capacity and accommodate new activities, both leisure and sporting. The Club’s management entrusted the project to one of the most prestigious local architects of the time, Francisco Urcola, from San Sebastian:

“This year the club celebrates the twentieth anniversary of its foundation. The best celebration that could be offered was the improvement and refurbishment of its premises. The idea was proposed; the members responded well, as the subscription of interest-free bonds, issued to pay for Don Francisco Urcola's project, has reached 30,000 pesetas, and more are still subscribing”.

The new construction on the terrace, as detailed in the article, was a new deckhouse, of larger dimensions than the first superstructure, for a new social space—the famoir, or smoking room—as well as other minor alterations on the ground floor. Urcola’s intervention respected all the pre-existing elements, such as the mainmast and the portholes, with only the hatches disappearing from the front area, a space that had been taken up by the new superstructure.

Another characteristic feature of the new headquarters was the installation of awnings similar to those that ships at the time used to protect themselves from the sun on deck.

1916 and 1919 extensions

In 1916, to coincide with the 20th anniversary of the founding of the RCNSS, the club undertook renovations to its headquarters to increase its capacity and accommodate new activities, both leisure and sporting. The Club’s management entrusted the project to one of the most prestigious local architects of the time, Francisco Urcola, from San Sebastian:

“This year the club celebrates the twentieth anniversary of its foundation. The best celebration that could be offered was the improvement and refurbishment of its premises. The idea was proposed; the members responded well, as the subscription of interest-free bonds, issued to pay for Don Francisco Urcola's project, has reached 30,000 pesetas, and more are still subscribing”.

The new construction on the terrace, as detailed in the article, was a new deckhouse, of larger dimensions than the first superstructure, for a new social space—the famoir, or smoking room—as well as other minor alterations on the ground floor. Urcola’s intervention respected all the pre-existing elements, such as the mainmast and the portholes, with only the hatches disappearing from the front area, a space that had been taken up by the new superstructure. [Fig. 02]
The refurbishment maintained the image of a ship, as the press of the time reported. “Standing over the very sea that laps against its foundations, the Club Náutico is a ship at anchor with its awning, its masts, its magnificent and elegant deck salon”51.

In 1919, a new extension of the Real Club Náutico was built at the rear (stem), for which the management of the Real Club Náutico requested, in June 1919, the passage of wagons with materials52. 

**Labayen and Aizpurúa’s 1929 project**

The evolution of the RCNSS building is described in great detail in the book by Sanz Esquide, and later completed with the details provided by Medina Murúa [Fig. 03]. To avoid redundancies, this article has copied what these authors have described, highlighting only the points considered necessary to support the arguments presented here.

One of them is the notes made by Medina Murúa concerning the low height of the bar-restaurant, of only 2.20 meters: “[...] on the first floor, on the other hand, the recessed area is filled with thermal insulation and covered with a false ceiling to compress the space of the restaurant; the free height is 2.20 meters in the centre and 2.70 at the ends. The resulting effect greatly enhances the slanting presence of the window”53.

The low height of the floor, rather than being a project decision, as it was often interpreted, was actually a conditioning factor. The height was low for the same reason the mayor’s office stopped the work in December 1927, it blocked the views of the “neighbors on Igentea street”, a formality which in fact referred to the Casino54. This problem, as well as being the origin of the ribbon window described by Sanz Esquide, was the reason for limiting the height of the ridge to the height of the Casino balconies: [Fig. 04]

“The mayor had suspended the agreement adopted in his absence by the Permanent Committee, allowing two floors of the club to be raised to the height of the balconies of the Grand Casino. As a compromise solution, the mayor allowed only one floor to be raised. When the work began, the mayor saw that the intention was to raise the floors over a significant length, which would block the view of the bay from the terrace of the Casino. He called this meeting for that reason, and the works would not be carried out over such an extension, but over the extension that the mayor had originally authorized”55.

**The “boat” that always was a “boat”**

Although in abbreviated form, it has been pointed out that the Club’s management intended from the outset that the building should resemble a ship. Press articles alluding to this resemblance can be found in specialized and general newspapers, such as Vida Marítima, Gran Vida, Nuestro Tiempo, Heraldo Deportivo, or El Imparcial, to name but a few. They were published from 1905 to 1928, the year prior to the refurbishment undertaken by Labayen and Aizpurúa.

The intention of the buildings prior to the 1929 works, although known, was considered to be a simple marine decoration, an “exercise in interior design”, on a common building. Both Sanz Esquide and Medina Murúa, authors who described the decorative elements prior to the 1929 extension, also presented it in this way, but without defining the previous constructions as representing boats, a view that clashes with the social perception of the different versions of the building in its historical context. It is precisely this failure to consider the historical moment of each version of the building that has led to them to be interpreted in this limited way.

Ocean liners were very expensive ships, only profitable for large movements of people such as the UK–US emigration route that gave them their name. Before the ocean liner appeared as a ship in its own right in the mid-nineteenth century, passengers were transported alongside goods in sailing ships called clippers56, which were characterized by their lightness and speed and were the first ships to be referred to as ‘transatlantic’. A variant called the schooner, a similar but smaller vessel, was used for short distances and smaller volumes of goods and people. Like its bigger brother, the schooner was fast and light, and was the vessel chosen for the first America’s Cup sailing race57. In that sense, the vessel is directly linked to the origin of sailing clubs. [Fig. 05]

It was the lack of this context and characterization that led to mistakenly considering Aizpurúa and Labayen’s work being a precursor in the concept of a “boat building”. If we compare the first Club Náutico with a schooner, both in terms of size and design, we can see that, as reported by the press at the time, the building included a detailed reproduction of the deck seen on this type of vessel.

Nor was the configuration or development of the small 1905 building, some 35 meters long, comparable with the more than 56 meters it had after the 1929 extension. This was an important leap that changed how the ship’s typology was perceived, as reported by the press at the time: “They were, as always, from Madrid and Zaragoza, and the first thing they did, as soon as they left their luggage at home, was to go and see the work being carried out to extend and raise the Club Náutico, which used to have the modest and friendly appearance of a small gunboat but will now be the size of a battleship”58.

The newspaper El Liberal was more explicit, devoting an extensive article to the inauguration of the extension designed by Labayen and Aizpurúa under the title “De yate a paquebote”:

“This year the inauguration took place in the middle of La Concha Bay. The Nautical Club, the ship anchored in front of the Gran Casino, has been expanded and polished to the point of taking on the air of an ocean liner [...] And on the night of the 15th, the yacht, its status elevated to that of an ocean liner, began a new stage in its life”59.

**Le Corbusier in the Club Náutico?**

José Angel Medina Murúa did not identify Aizpurúa’s early work as being close to the ideas of Le Corbusier, but rather as drawing inspiration from the neoplasticism of Mallet-Stevens60. He placed the end of this influence at around 1931, that is, after the construction of the Club Náutico, and from then onwards the Donostia-born architect moved towards a model of German rationalism. In the course of this development, the Club Náutico would have appeared as a ‘Lecorbuserian’ influence, exultant but anecdotal in its short trajectory61; an inflection that the authors identified as indicating his inexperience and desire for experimentation: “El Club Náutico is also a stage where one glimpses doubt, improvisation, insecurity, and even impurity, tinged with an apparent arrogance” according to Sanz Esquide62; or in the words of Medina Murúa, “a youthful madness”63.

Luis Moya did not question the principles of the Club Náutico, stating that it “complied to the letter with Le Corbusier’s five points”64, but he argued that, after its construction, Aizpurúa broke with Le Corbusier’s ideas:

“So, we find ourselves faced with events and a memory that, on the one hand, defends the Mediterranean conception of the building and, on the other, conceals its Lecorbuserian origin. The true dimension of this conflict is difficult to reveal. Yet there is one event that suggests that Le Corbusier’s precepts could indeed have been called into question”65.

Both his supposed experimentation with the ideas of the Swiss master and his subsequent repudiation, would have occurred so quickly in the moments before and after the construction of the Náutico, as if they were incomprehensible. The hackneyed quote by Luis Moya turns out to be the only testimony we have that could link Aizpurúa with Le Corbusier, given that the latter never confirmed such an influence. Other comparisons made between the Club Náutico and Le Corbusier’s ideas should be assessed more critically. For example, the use of reinforced concrete is another argument used by Sanz Esquide to place Aizpurúa within the orbit of Le Corbusier, given that “reinforced concrete [...] did not begin to be used at the Madrid School of Architecture until 1926”66.

Although it is true that the use of concrete was a problem67, they were by no means pioneers in its use. Due to industrialization, concrete had been used in the Basque Country since the end of the nineteenth century68. It had been used in San Sebastián in industrial constructions since at least 190269, and it quickly spread to the field of architecture. Examples include the Mª Cristina Bridge (1904), the Victoria Eugenia Theatre (1912), and the Kursaal (1921). Francisco de Urcola, who oversaw the construction of the Victoria Eugenia Theatre together with Ramón Cortázár Urruzola, had already used
reinforced concrete to brace the roof of the Real Club Náutico in the refurbishment he led in 1929. Thereafter, to suggest a link with Le Corbusier simply because this material was used seems quite far-fetched.

This research led to the discovery of a new version of the plans, and this allowed some of the statements made by Sanz Esquide to be qualified. For example, the interpretation of some elements that appeared on the terrace of some versions of the project as “pergolas” or “running visors”, whereas they were awning protectors, as pointed out in the construction report that accompanied the plans found. Or the authorship of the construction of a “free column” located in the lobby-hall, which was in fact the nest inherited from the 1905 construction, embedded in the building after the extension by Labayen and Aizpurúa.

The most important revision of Sanz Esquide’s study relates to the statement that Labayen and Aizpurúa eliminated la bombonera, Urcola’s superstructure, and to the interpretation of a possible reconstruction maintaining the design of the original construction “with a mahogany and walnut veneer”. In fact, this space was—and still is, given that it is preserved to this day—the construction carried out by Francisco de Urcola in 1916 [Fig. 06]. An error in Sanz Esquide’s interpretation of the plans led him to think that it had been eliminated, but a careful study of the plans, as well as of other documents consulted for this research, has led to the deduction, with a high degree of certainty, that it is indeed Urcola’s original work [Fig. 07].

This clarification is important because many of the explanations justifying the ‘lecorbusieranism’ of the Club Náutico have been based on the hypothesis that the chosen solutions were project decisions when, in reality, they are due to conditioning factors of the project. The preservation of this space and maintaining the functionality of the ground floor of the building—spaces that housed the boatmen’s-quarters—would have prevented the construction of an intermediate structure [8]. The solution adopted by the architects, and probably requested by the Club’s management, was to respect la bombonera designed by Francisco de Urcola by surrounding it with the new construction and building the upper floor on top of it. For the formwork of the beams, its roof was cut away, integrating these [Fig. 08] cuts into the final design of the project [9]. These conditioning factors no doubt gave rise to the piloto and the free plan on the main floor of the Club Náutico, the solution adopted formally coinciding with Le Corbusier’s principles. On the first floor there were no such limitations, and so there is no such clarity of these precepts, as Sanz Esquide himself recognized when he compared the two floors, maintaining that “the aforementioned idea is partially called into question” [10].

The analysis of the most obvious aspect, the building’s resemblance to a ship, an intention confirmed by Aizpurúa himself in his letter to Giedion [11], has historically overlooked the fact that this concept was the ‘leitmotiv’ of all the projects developed from the construction of the first version in 1905. The extension made in 1929 was seen by the local media, onlookers of the Club’s history, as a continuity of this tradition, as was reflected in the aforementioned notes. It was the press, national and foreign, and the critics, alien to the history of the club, who linked the streamline modern design unequivocally with the theories of Le Corbusier.

Finally, the study of Aizpurúa the architect conceived Aizpurúa the sailor, an analysis that is extremely important [12]. His family ran a shipping company and his uncle, Ángel Azqueta, was one of the founding members of the Club in 1896, that is, one of the participants in the decision to make the building look like a ship. The ground-floor plan was designed by the architects not only in the envelope, but also in the layout of the main floor. As occurs on ships, they placed the living room to the right of the hall. And across from that, the exit to the main terrace, widened to allow space for hammocks. To the left and centered in the design of the floor plan, a fireplace with a projecting chimney on the deck [13], just as the machinery of the steamers was located on ships at the time.

These decisions have a formal immediacy, and hence seem to aim simply at creating the figurative representation of a ship, and not so much at Le Corbusier’s own serious symbolic pretensions or meanings.

The administrative ups and downs and the project’s own conditioning factors, well explained by Sanz Esquide, were compounded by the fact that the ground floor was kept in use during the works, thus requiring the use of a perimeter structure; all this altered the design until the final image was constructed.

For all these reasons, the symbolic and significant reading of the Club as a ‘lecorbuserian’ ship, with all the pretensions that this implies, must be reconsidered. Some of the aesthetic similarities may have been inspired by Le Corbusier, as well as by many of the explanations justifying the construction. For all these reasons, the symbolic and significant reading of the Club as a ‘lecorbuserian’ ship, with all the pretensions that this implies, must be reconsidered. Some of the aesthetic similarities may have been inspired by Le Corbusier, as well as by many of the explanations justifying the construction.
28. One could include, as a step prior to the neoplasticism development at the end of Aizpurúa's studies, the only reference that could link him to a supposed influence from Le Corbusier: the quote by Luis Moya published in the magazine Nueva Forma.
34. Aizpurúa told Giedion that they had “quite a few difficulties during the construction, as in Spain these things are still not very well resolved”. Medina Murua, Op. cit., 38.
39. During the research, plans for a new version of the Real Club Náutico were found in the Municipal Archives of San Sebastian, in addition to those provided by Sanz Esquide. This version, situated between the second and third indicated by the author, maintained the execution budget. The “pergolas” or “running sunshades” were in fact “protection from the sun and rain and to collect the deck awnings”. This protective function of the awnings explains why they appear in the different versions of the project in such diverse forms, parallel or perpendicular to the sea, not to provide protection from the sun, but to offer different distribution options for organizing the roof awnings, which also had to circumvent the mast, preserved from the 1905 project. It is very likely that this report is the same one Sanz Esquide himself referred to, but which he did not analyze. Sanz Esquide, Op. cit., 17.
43. The plans preserved in the Municipal Archives of San Sebastian are photocopies of the originals, which have been lost. The plans published by Sanz Esquide, lacking references to the documentary sources, would indicate that they are also photocopies on which the red line separating the pre-existences from the volumes proposed in Labayen and Aizpurúa’s extension was subsequently drawn. A more precise analysis of these plans seems to indicate that the original red line enveloped the superstructure, which was respected in Labayen and Aizpurúa’s project.
44. As can be easily found in the press at the time, regatta competitions were held during the works, at least in the months of June and July. This makes it very likely that the ground floor, where the yachtsmen’s quarters were located, was in use during the works. Take, for example, the competitions held during the Great Basque Week, organized under the patronage of the Centro de Atracción y Turismo, from 13 to 21 July 1929. Heraldo de Madrid. Year XXXIX. No. 13559 (13 July 1929): 4.