

Journal of the Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada
Le Journal de la Société pour l'étude de l'architecture au Canada



“Les Girls en voyage”
Gender and Architecture in the Travels of Mary Imrie and Jean Wallbridge

Ipek Mehmetoğlu

Volume 44, Number 1, 2019

Women and Architecture

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1066279ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1066279ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

SSAC-SEAC

ISSN

2563-8696 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Mehmetoğlu, I. (2019). “Les Girls en voyage”: Gender and Architecture in the Travels of Mary Imrie and Jean Wallbridge. *Journal of the Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada / Le Journal de la Société pour l'étude de l'architecture au Canada*, 44(1), 7–20. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1066279ar>

Copyright © SSAC-SEAC, 2019

This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/>

Érudit

This article is disseminated and preserved by Érudit.

Érudit is a non-profit inter-university consortium of the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Its mission is to promote and disseminate research.

<https://www.erudit.org/en/>

“LES GIRLS EN VOYAGE”

Gender and Architecture in the Travels of Mary Imrie and Jean Wallbridge¹

> IPEK MEHMETOĞLU

IPEK MEHMETOĞLU is a Ph.D. candidate in Peter Guo-hua Fu School of Architecture, McGill University. She holds a Master of Arts in the History of Architecture and a Bachelor of Architecture from the Middle East Technical University, Department of Architecture, in Ankara, Turkey. Her Ph.D. research investigates the relationship between architecture, gender, and travel in the postwar period.

A Persian cat is all very well, I said; but a Persian cat is not enough. I must have a motor car. And it was thus that I became a novelist—for it is a very strange thing that people will give you a motor car if you will tell them a story. It is a still stranger thing that there is nothing so delightful in the world as telling stories.

—Virginia Woolf, “Professions for Women.”²

Have never been so dirty. What with exhaust from engine in our lungs—dust from road in air, clothes and faces and general grime of dirty smoky industrial city permeated throughout. Washed outside with soap and cold water, cleaned hair with enervous brushing and rinsed inside with Vodka . . .

—Jean Wallbridge’s diary.³



FIG. 1. JEAN LOUISE EMBERLY WALLBRIDGE (LEFT) AND MARY LOUISE IMRIE (RIGHT), AT A TRAIN STATION IN EUROPE, 1947. | PROVINCIAL ARCHIVES OF ALBERTA, PR1988.0290.0853.

The 1991 *SSAC Bulletin* titled “Women and Architecture” opened with guest editor Dorothy Field’s trusting view on the increase in the number of women professionals within the field and of scholarly work on women’s roles in Canadian architectural history.⁴ It is true that since the early 1990s, the systematic marginalization of women as architects, builders, clients, users, patrons, partners, critics, and historians of the built environment and architectural knowledge has received extensive critique. And much has been achieved in terms of women’s visibility and “recovery” by the feminist struggles pursued in the physical spaces of architectural offices and classrooms, and in the intellectual spaces of academia. Yet, the still-existing gender gap in the literature and the profession denotes an ongoing need to deepen our understanding of women’s contributions

to architectural and intellectual production, including works written by and about women.

This study explores two pioneering Canadian women architects, Mary Imrie and Jean Wallbridge—“the girls,” as they were called.⁵ They had a significant impact on the urban landscape of Alberta with the 224 projects that they built together between the 1950s and the late 1970s, including Queen Mary Apartments and Greenfield Elementary School in Edmonton. They were also pioneers within the architectural field because they established the very first professional female partnership in the country in 1950, Wallbridge & Imrie Architects, at 9 Merrick Building, downtown Edmonton. This research, however, focuses on the contributions Imrie and Wallbridge made to architectural knowledge in Canada through their writing.

They wrote five articles for the influential *Journal of the Royal Architecture Institute of Canada* (referred to as the *RAIC Journal* hereafter) between 1949 and 1958. That their position can be more readily traced through their intellectual production related to their travels, despite the substantial number of their built projects, is a sign of the barriers many professional and non-professional women faced in the field in the postwar period. This paper forms part of a larger research project that attempts to understand women’s roles as designers *and* critics of the built environment in postwar North America: two identities that overlap. Their experiences as designers positioned them to become critics, but it was through their criticism that their architecture has been made accessible to wider publics.

This research uses feminist theory as a framework to open up alternative ways to see how stereotypes framed women’s

contributions and practices, and how women transgressed the barriers formed by these stereotypes by travelling. It investigates Imrie and Wallbridge’s architectural and personal agencies as queer women struggling to find a place in the profession through their travels from 1947 to the mid-1950s. Specifically, through themes of networks, encounters, representations, and technologies of travel, three instances are analyzed: their first trip to Europe with the World Study Tours grant from Columbia University in 1947; their second trip to South America with their car Hector in 1949; and their grand trip to Asia and the Middle East in 1957. The couple’s travel diaries and the home movies they took during their travels, held in the Provincial Archives of Alberta, form the primary sources of this study. In addition to these, the articles of the architects reporting on these trips, published in the *RAIC Journal* and *Peruvian Times* (1950), are examined.

More broadly, this paper questions how women, who travelled for professional, exploratory, educational, or leisure purposes, negotiated their personal and architectural identities. It seeks to understand how, by using mobility, they challenged both the sites that they encountered, and the professional assumptions established in their homeland. Can female travellers change our ways of seeing architecture and its experiences? What did it mean for women to travel and record in “other” lands? How did women, by travelling to different geographies, exploring modern architectures and representing their experiences, transcend simple binaries, such as feminine and masculine, private and public, north and south, east and west? An analysis of Imrie and Wallbridge’s journeys can help shed some light on this ambivalent and often ignored crossroads of gender, travel, and architecture.

WOMEN ARCHITECTS AND PROFESSIONAL JOURNEYS

Mary Imrie [1918-1988] and Jean Wallbridge [1912-1979] were among the first women to graduate from schools of architecture in Canada prior to the Second World War. Imrie graduated from the University of Toronto in 1944, and Wallbridge from the University of Alberta in 1939, the third woman to graduate from the architectural program there. After a couple of years working in different offices, they established their own office in Edmonton in 1950, the first architectural partnership of women in the country.⁶ They were professional and life partners, and they soon designed and built their own modernist home and office, “Six Acres.”

Throughout their careers, Imrie and Wallbridge constructed many buildings, but a majority of their designs were residential, as was the case for many women architects in that period.⁷ Indeed, by the mid-twentieth century, architectural education and the profession in North America were still highly male-dominated. In the 1950s, only 37 out of 1011 architecture school graduates in Canada were women, and there were only 43 women registrants among 1783 in provincial architectural associations.⁸ Monica Contreras, Luigi Ferrara, and Daniel Karpinski, writing about the first four female architects in Canada, refer to women’s entry into the profession as a “journey,” likening Marjorie Hill, the second woman to receive a Canadian architectural degree,⁹ to “an immigrant entering a foreign country.”¹⁰ Moreover, the common belief was that women were more suitable for the so-called feminine aspects of architectural design, like interior decoration, furniture design, historic preservation, or domestic architecture, as discussed by feminist architectural

historians such as Gwendolyn Wright.¹¹ Jennifer R. Joynes wrote in 1959 in the *RAIC Journal*: “the architectural profession is not an easy road to travel for a woman.”¹² The metaphorical mobility—for immigration or travel—for women was used as a synonym for struggle.

The attribution of women to the “ghetto” of domestic architecture was no coincidence.¹³ Modernity saw the house and its “illusory” private realm as barriers holding men back from accessing the more profound and “real” world of public outside. In order to reach the freedom public offered, one had to break the barrier, escape, move.¹⁴ This masculine mobility, then, was the only option for one who wanted to progress and develop. To do this, one had to forget his ties and give up his roots. Consequently, various practices and representations of mobility, evoking freedom, growth, and advancement, were tied to masculinity. As Janet Wolff notes, travel or mobility was central to “constructed masculine identity.”¹⁵

It is thus no accident that displacement, motion, and dislocation have been themes in discussions of Western masculine modern subjectivities, such as the urban figures—the *blasé*, the *flâneur*, or German sociologist Georg Simmel’s “stranger.”¹⁶ Taking their power from their ability to move between urban places or identities, they all represent existences in-between and in-motion. What twentieth-century modernity added to these was, as sociologist John Urry describes, the “train-passenger, car driver, and jet plane passenger,” and the mobility not within, but “between” urban places.¹⁷

The popular Grand Tour in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, where elite British men and women, in different ways and experiences, explored Italy

to unearth ideas of antiquity, was soon replaced by the Tour d’Orient; and by the nineteenth century, travelling was a well-established industry through mass tourism with the help of Thomas Cook and the advancement of travel guidebooks, such as Baedeker or Marshall guides.¹⁸ Indeed, travel and tourism were tied to colonialism and Orientalism. Architectural historian Hilde Heynen talks about modernity’s explicit tie to colonization.¹⁹ According to her, the modern man’s abandonment of home was related to the idea of questing and conquering the “other.” Architectural scholar Jilly Traganou argues that “the mythology of the lone traveler . . . lies at the heart of the modern man; similarly, the figure of the colonizer is inseparable from the project of modernity, and in many cases its precursor.”²⁰

Architects, of course, were part of the cultural currents around mobility. Within the profession, mobility has been historically tied to the production, representation, and reception of the built environment; and it has been an important aspect in the educational and professional lives of architects. Travelling allowed the architect to shift points of view, to transform one’s self and to mediate between different selves and identities. Davide Deriu, Edoardo Piccoli, and Belgin Turan Özkaya suggest that it was seen as “fundamental for aspiring architects to visit historically significant places to gain a firsthand experience of architecture.”²¹ That tradition continued in the twentieth century among pioneer male architects, Le Corbusier, Frank Lloyd Wright, Alvar Aalto, Louis Kahn, Richard Neutra, Jørn Utzon, among others. Travel accounts of these architects have been the subject of scholarly works that analyze the meaning of mobility in these architects’ architectural identities and the role of architecture in their travels.²²

However women were *on the move* in different ways, they have often been ignored in modernist discourses, which were typically gendered as masculine with the male traveller at the centre. Indeed, analyses of the gendered experiences of travelling women architects constitute a large gap within the literature.²³ The architects’ mobilities and architectures of travel have always been gendered, and ideas of colonialism were embedded in them. Traganou infers that “architects’ travels are not immune to broader imperialist frameworks: the wish to dominate is often implicit in the will to travel as well as to build.”²⁴ Political scientist Roxanne Leslie Euben, for her part, emphasizes the effects of the gendering of mobility as a category and the colonializing dynamics within it.²⁵ According to her, as travel was associated with “imagination and knowledge,” immobility came to be related to “narrowness and complacency,” implying that those who did not travel—women—were “incurious, unphilosophical and unreflective.”²⁶ Moreover, the gendering of travel has not only put women who travelled under suspicion, but also ignored their mobility. Nevertheless, a deeper look into the history of architecture and the lives of women architects proves otherwise. The life experiences of Imrie and Wallbridge suggest that women travelled avidly and with the support of professional and academic institutions, their colleagues, and friends; and they used their mobility to resist the patriarchal limitations and normative structures within the architectural profession.

TRAINS AND NETWORKS IN EUROPE

Imrie and Wallbridge’s extended trips started in 1947 when they were awarded the World Study Tours grant by Columbia University, while working in Edmonton City’s Architects Department under



FIG. 2. IMRIE AND WALLBRIDGE ATTENDED SEVERAL LECTURES DURING THEIR EUROPEAN TOUR. A GROUP PHOTOGRAPH IN ENGLAND. | PROVINCIAL ARCHIVES OF ALBERTA, PR1988.0290.0853.

Two photographs taken during that trip show how Imrie and Wallbridge carried themselves when they travelled and how this was different to how they (were expected to) behave in professional environments (figs. 1-2). In the casual setting of a train station, in a relaxed but seemingly fatigued manner, the two women are waiting for the train, sitting on their luggage, all of which are scattered on the floor.³¹ The first image suggests their ease, which was actually a requirement of their tight-scheduled mobility, as Wallbridge's diary notes in the epigraph suggest. It is this relaxed, mobile freedom and casualness—for which they signed up—that enabled them to be part of the all-male group standing around a model in the second photograph, listening to one of the many lectures they attended in England. The difference of manners in the two photographs displays the ease with which they moved from one occasion to the other.

architect Max Dewar.²⁷ This grant allowed the couple (who incidentally were the only two Canadians to receive the grant that year) to visit England, France, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Sweden to investigate postwar town planning and reconstruction from August 2 to September 13, 1947.

The Tours offered twenty-four programs with different subjects, such as art and archaeology, including town planning and reconstruction that Imrie and Wallbridge attended. As described in the *Columbia Daily Spectator*, the student newspaper, the tours were “for the purposes of increasing individual friendships between students of this country and abroad, and to contribute to a fuller understanding between the peoples of the world.”²⁸

Imrie and Wallbridge's departure also had an apparent impact on their social and professional circles in their hometown, as it was written in the *Edmonton Journal*

on July 26, 1947, with a clear hope that the architects would venture abroad and return, “bringing back” ideas from their travels:

Later, when they return, [the architects] want to make use of all they have seen and done, using it in their work in developing a greater understanding of problems that are being met all over the world, and putting into play the ever-new and progressive ideas which are being formed in the re-building of countries in the wake of the Nazi terror.²⁹

Imrie and Wallbridge's own response to their acceptance to the tour was more humble, as they noted they saw “a small announcement of a tour through Europe” in the newsletter of the American Society of Planning Officials: “Curiosity prompted us to make inquiries from the instigator and leader, Mr. Hermann Field, New York Architect. We became more intrigued, applied, and were very surprised to find ourselves registered for the tour.”³⁰

The trip was an undertaking to open new perspectives for the two women; and it was also a significant first attempt for them to broaden their professional networks. Each year, recipients of the grant were accompanied by guides experienced in the selected field of study. Imrie and Wallbridge attended tour number 18, “European Reconstruction and Community Planning,” and were guided by several prominent planners, professors, and authorities. One of their guides was British urban planner Jaqueline Tyrwhitt, who was later a professor at the University of Toronto and Harvard University, a central figure in the transnational circles of postwar modern town planning.

This trip also afforded the couple access to publish their impressions in the *RAIC Journal*. As Annmarie Adams and Peta Tancred suggest, the publication of their articles in the journal was probably related to Mary Imrie's position on the journal's

editorial board.³² Their first article, entitled “Planning in Europe,” was published in October 1948, where they informed their readers about various town planning offices and buildings they had visited along with key figures they had met, with a significant focus on Tyrwhitt.³³ Their diaries, giving a day-to-day description of whom they met, reveal a number of lectures and tours guided by different scholars and planners, such as architect and town planner Gordon Stephenson, or Frederic James Osborn, a leading figure of the garden city movement in the United Kingdom. Yet, even though in the program’s itinerary the tour leader is noted as architect Herman H. Field,³⁴ it is Tyrwhitt who occupies the most space in the article compared to other lecturers or guides:

[U]nder the guidance of Miss Jacqueline Tyrwhitt, an English town planning authority known to many Canadians, we conferred with prominent English architects to discuss town planning problems. Our days in Stevenage consisted of lectures, discussions, long leisurely meals at which the discussions continued, afternoon teas in the garden, and walks around this beautiful small English town.³⁵

The overall emphasis throughout the text gives the impression that Tyrwhitt, as a woman, was their sole guide, implying the impact she left on the two young women architects at the outset of their careers. This was the first of many occasions where a feminine network left a mark on their professional experiences.

Imrie and Wallbridge also produced hand-drawn maps in many of their travels, starting with the trip to Europe (fig. 3). These maps, some of which were published alongside their articles, show their exact routes, the cities and towns at which they stopped, and their modes of travel.³⁶ The lines of their paths originate from their




FIG. 3. HAND-DRAWN MAP OF IMRIE AND WALLBRIDGE’S TRIP IN EUROPE FROM AUGUST 2 TO SEPTEMBER 13, 1947. | PROVINCIAL ARCHIVES OF ALBERTA, PR1988.0290.0853.

departure points (whether it is visible or not depends on the size of the map), implying both the distance travelled and the (will to) return. In addition to their descriptions of the places in their articles, they drew their route, inscribing their personal history on the two-dimensional surface of the re-created map. These descriptions and inscriptions—through the use of arrows, lines, dashes, and dots—represent the perception of places in motion.³⁷ It is the power of understanding a place through movement that Imrie and Wallbridge used so distinctively, as their coming trips uncovered alike.

DRIVING SOUTH IN A “GENDERED MOBILE”

Imrie and Wallbridge’s second trip, this time across the American continents, is important for its implications of networks and technologies of travel. Moreover, the material evidence related to this trip allows to see the couple’s

focus on modern architectures. After resigning from their jobs in Edmonton City’s Architects Department, they left on September 28, 1949, with their car, a 1949 Plymouth Suburban nicknamed Hector, for Buenos Aires, Argentina, and back. Their personal correspondence from that period reveals that the purpose of the road trip was both architectural and educational; their aim was to meet South American architects, visit their offices and see their built projects, attend conferences or courses in order to “broaden their knowledge of international trends in architecture.”³⁸ Then news column of the *RAIC Journal’s* December 1949 issue marked their trip as “temporary private researches in South America.”³⁹

They were travelling south through the United States and Mexico with an automobile at a time when writers Jack Kerouac and Neal Cassady were carrying out their famous motorized trip across the States to Mexico: two iconic and masculine figures



FIG. 4. THE PLATE INDICATING THE OFFICE DOWNSTAIRS. IT IS THE FIRST THING ONE SEES UPON ENTERING THE HOUSE. THE PHOTOGRAPH IS TAKEN FROM THE ENTRANCE DOOR; TO THE LEFT IS THE LIVING ROOM. | IPEK MEHMETOĞLU.

that defined the American “road trip.”⁴⁰ The trip and the book that came after, *On the Road*, have since been viewed as characterizing a postwar American mobility to escape tradition and society in a completely masculine fashion.⁴¹

Indeed, cars and roads have been gendered throughout history, and women have adopted automobility in different ways. For example, in the early twentieth century, automotive manufacturers addressed women with electric cars, as opposed to masculine gasoline cars.⁴² In the postwar period, the advertising industry was targeting women through a gendered form of mobility, emphasizing the car as an essential vehicle of home-making, even encouraging middle-class suburban families to purchase a second car for housewives.⁴³

Moreover, women have narrated automobilities from early on and in various ways too: a good example is feminist writer Simone de Beauvoir and Nathalie Sorokine Moffatt’s road trip with

Moffatt’s family car from California to Nevada in 1947, described in detail by de Beauvoir in the journal-turned-book, *America Day by Day*.⁴⁴ The alternative histories of cars used by women challenge masculine and escapist automobilities. They show how a closer inspection unsettles a simple gender division of cars and consequently, of public and private notions around them.

In *Moving Lives*, Sidonie Smith discusses the role of automobility in the construction of gender identities in the mid-twentieth century, and searches for the link between “gendered mobility and mobile gender.”⁴⁵ She asserts that the automobile served both as a vehicle of middle-class consumer culture (for women) and escape (for men). By carrying people away from routines and schedules linked to other modes of travel, such as the train, the interior of the automobile granted drivers and passengers agency.⁴⁶ “To get an auto is to get an (auto)biography. To have an auto is to have an identity.”⁴⁷

The escapist freedom attached to automobility was marked as masculine, and women’s engagement was deemed “out of place.”⁴⁸ Thus, the meanings embedded in Imrie and Wallbridge’s nine-month road trip are different than those of Kerouac and Cassady. In *Driving Women*, Deborah Clarke asserts that when women drive, they do not run free of attachments, responsibility, or domesticity: “They do, however, significantly revise the old associations of women as home, women as place.”⁴⁹ Virginia Scharff extends: “motoring women, employing the multiple possibilities of the automobile, gave new meanings to the notion of ‘woman’s place.’”⁵⁰

Imrie and Wallbridge note in a five-page, unpublished article, written through the eyes of their car, Hector, that when they could not find accommodation, they slept in the car, putting curtains on windows for privacy:

They [“the girls”] admired the way my back seat came and went at will, leaving a space long enough for them to sleep . . . It was just like women to put curtains on my windows. They said it would give privacy when sleeping in me, but I have always felt it rather infradigue [sic] for me to be trapesing through countries with these skirts flopping at my windows.⁵¹

The car is treated as a family member or as a companion (rather than as a lover, as in men’s narratives) and its interior acts as a space between domestic and mobile, enabling the couple privacy as well as freedom.⁵² As Clarke reports, “neither fully contained nor fully mobile, women in cars call into question both domesticity and movement as empowering female tropes and, more particularly, as mutually exclusive spheres.”⁵³

Imrie and Wallbridge also used the connections and detachments that the car and the road trip allowed for their own

personal, financial, and professional reasons. What the professional image of the road trip gave them was a mask—camouflage hiding the fact that two queer women were travelling alone across multiple countries. This agency and resistance differed substantially from that of Kerouac and Cassady, who were breaking free, even “running away,” simply because they could do it.

THE CAR AND THE HOUSE

This masking of the domestic partnership—of the “personal” through the propulsion of the “professional”—is also visible in the modernist house, Six Acres, that the couple designed and built as their home office in Edmonton, between 1954 and 1957. The house plan suggests that they used the ground floor as their living quarters and the basement as their architectural office. Today, upon entering the house, one is faced first and directly with a sign, “Imrie-Wallbridge Office,” obscuring any other functional attribution to the space (fig. 4). As Annmarie Adams notes with reference to Henry Urbach’s article entitled “Peeking at Gay Interiors,” this disguise or “double-sidedness” was a common feature in “purpose-built, queer, domestic architecture, designed by famous architects,” as was the case in the house Julia Morgan designed for physicians Clara Williams and Elsie Mitchell in California in 1915.⁵⁴ Six Acres functioned in a similar way: as a professional mask, it acted as a “double-sided” space hiding the gay relationship from the eyes of the public, this time deliberately arranged and constructed as such by the owners. Like Hector, Six Acres was both domestic and professional in nature. The house and the car did not confine these women; rather, they offered Imrie and Wallbridge new domestic subjectivities, and helped them to access the larger professional architectural circles.⁵⁵

In addition to an article entitled “South American Architects” published in the *RAIC Journal* in February 1952, Imrie and Wallbridge published four articles in the *Peruvian Times* journal describing the part of their road trip from Lima to Santiago. They also sent articles to *American Motorist Magazine of Travel, Recreation and Adventure*, published by the American Automobile Association, and to *Travel Magazine*, but these were rejected for reasons of unsuitability or limited space.⁵⁶ The diverse choice of magazines and consistent efforts were mostly due to financial need, since journal publications and hotel references that they included in their articles constituted a source of income for them during their travels throughout the decade.⁵⁷ However, apart from financial motivations, these attempts suggest that they wanted to justify their road trip by “writing” about it, reminding us of the Virginia Woolf epigraph above. It is through writing that one can have access to a car and one can substantiate the movement to which it relates; nonetheless it is nice to tell stories. By the professional act of writing, they constructed themselves as two women architects from Canada, there for a purpose—to learn, and to teach; and not as a gay couple moving at will.

Their enthusiasm with different technologies of travel is evident in looking at their travel films from South America, and in those from their trips to Asia and the Middle East in the following years. Avid modern-day travellers, they filmed and photographed planes, trains, or boats; and they embraced different modes of travelling, such as camels in Egypt. In various countries and throughout the years, ships, airplanes, cars, highways, and railways continuously formed part of their visual representations and verbal narratives of their travels, as evident in all four of the

articles they wrote for *Peruvian Times*. For instance, in “Arequipa to Santiago by Car,” they wrote: “Our trip varied from the above schedule as would that of any normal motorist, but we will try to give the distances and travelling times between points as a guide to anyone desiring to make the trip.”⁵⁸

Smith argues that “vehicles of motion are vehicles of perception and meaning, precisely because they affect the temporal, spatial, and interrelational dynamics of travel.”⁵⁹ This excitement of architects with vehicles and machines of mobility in the twentieth century was not new; from early on, architects like Le Corbusier engaged in designing houses with references to automobiles and perceived of airplanes as homes; and he, as well as Buckminster Fuller, even designed automobiles themselves.⁶⁰ However, just as driving or riding, the machinery, speed, and aesthetics related to mobility were attributed to the domain of masculinity: as objects of mobility, their industries and spaces were intertwined with “technologies of gender.”⁶¹ Imrie and Wallbridge’s focus on the visibility of these vehicles in transit in the home movies challenges the masculinization of machine technology. The narrative generated by the moving images and texts creates alternative feminine identities.

The article and diary notes reveal that the two women were aware of the gender assumptions of roads, machines, and automobility. In one instance, they explained how they had met two Ecuadoreans in Chala, Peru, motoring also to Buenos Aires via Santiago. In a humble and even naïve tone, they wrote: “They seemed surprised that two girls would dare to travel the highway alone, called us ‘muy valiente,’ a compliment ill-deserved in a country where we have found everyone willing and eager to help the motorist in trouble.”⁶² In another

one, they described how they had to stop because of a flat tire and a truck driver pulled and took over to help them: “We wondered if he stopped because of the two females in distress, of [*sic*] if Peruvian truck-drivers are always helpful to motorists in trouble.”⁶³

The physical movement of the couple echoed their social encounters and networking. Their correspondence from that period shows that the couple wrote to numerous architects and professors working in Canada and the United States before they left Edmonton, hoping to get reference letters as well as names of prominent South American architects to meet while travelling. These documents prove another aspect of their mobility: anticipation, the journeys that commence prior to departure—what Deriu, Piccoli, and Turan Özkaya call “pre-posterous travel,” and José Pozo and José Ángel Medina, “paper travels,” alternatively.⁶⁴ Jilly Traganou for her part says that the anticipation for travel creates an architecture that is “conceived, produced, reproduced, consumed or imagined.”⁶⁵

Imrie and Wallbridge’s “paper travels”—their letters—reveal the network that they developed in one month, from the end of July to September, just before leaving. They are also material evidence of the limitations they faced as women architects from Canada when communicating with renowned architects, such as Richard Neutra and Pietro Belluschi, whom they met on their trips to the United States in the summer of 1946; or John Bland, the director of the School of Architecture at McGill University at the time. All of them provided introduction letters for the couple along with some brief suggestions on what to see and whom to meet in South America. Yet, it is notable that it was Dione Neutra, Richard Neutra’s wife, who wrote back

to Imrie and Wallbridge in both instances of their correspondence—apologizing for a late reply due to the busy schedule of her husband, delivering his “cordial good wishes.”⁶⁶ Similarly, as they mention in the very first paragraph of their article “South American Architects,” in the first architectural office that they visited in Peru, it was the architect’s wife, fluent in English, who helped her husband explain his projects to the two young women architects.⁶⁷ This interesting pattern of networks raises the question of what would have been the nature of Dione Neutra’s reply, for instance, if the visiting young architects had been men. One wonders if she replied in empathy with “the two females in distress,” or if famous architects and their partners “are always helpful” to fellow architects in need, whether men or women.

The clues and references from the North American male architects must have done the job, since Imrie and Wallbridge spent most of their time meeting several South American architects, visiting their offices and buildings while travelling.⁶⁸ In their article they noted: “[the South American architects] went to no end of trouble getting literature for us. These were busy men: we were unknown North American visitors.”⁶⁹

In another instance, in Argentina, they met Amancio Williams, who collaborated with Le Corbusier on La Maison Curutchet; in Brazil, they visited Oscar Niemeyer, who, they explained, “appeared shy” and

was diffident about showing us anything, almost as if it might bore us . . . Again, as with Amancio Williams, we knew we were with a man who was far beyond our comprehension . . . He walked with us to the elevator. We felt we were leaving a lonely man, who is undoubtedly one of the great architects of the world.⁷⁰

There are different tensions at play in these accounts. Two women with limited references: they were unknown to local architects. Yet they were from the North, there to discover, and also to report what they learned from men, to men. They were experiencing and documenting modern architecture as travellers, as women, and as outsiders. And by their journalistic approach, the two mobile women acted as conduit of networks, bridging men and architectures across continents.

Another important aspect of the couple’s trips was their bold focus on modern architectures. It is evident from their personal writings, their articles in the *RAIC Journal*, and their home movies that their interest was in modern sites and buildings, such as apartment projects and hotels, in the countries they visited. Their articles were obviously aimed at potential Canadian architect-tourists. Yet, the couple’s focus on the international scene differed from the prevalent concern in that period for an image of a national Canadian architecture.⁷¹ The two women were challenging stereotypes in several ways, and this included their gaze turned outside, driven by discovery, exchange, and interaction.

It is noteworthy, though, to see how they were simultaneously trying to find traces of architectural influences from North America or Europe in their search. In Chile, they noted: “To the tourist Santiago would appear as a clean, modern, progressive city, but the architect would notice a lack of what we applaud as modern buildings,”⁷² and by “we,” they refer to North American and European architects.

SAILING ON THE BOSPHORUS AND THE MOVING IMAGE

In the subsequent decade, they made another big trip, departing on October 24,



FIG. 5. IN MOST CASES "THE GIRLS" WERE ACCOMPANIED BY A GROUP OF FEMALE TRAVELLERS, AND USUALLY A MALE GUIDE. MARY IMRIE AND ANOTHER WOMAN TRAVELLER LISTENING TO THE GUIDE IN JORDAN. STILL FROM HOME MOVIE. | PROVINCIAL ARCHIVES OF ALBERTA, PR1988.0290.0925.



FIG. 6. FROM THE BOAT TRIP ON THE BOSPHORUS, TOWARD ORTAKÖY MOSQUE. STILL FROM HOME MOVIE. | PROVINCIAL ARCHIVES OF ALBERTA, PR1988.0290.0925.

1957, to Asia and the Middle East, accompanied by a female friend, Margaret Dinning. They started from Japan and went westward, visiting twenty countries in six months. They saw the reconstruction of Hiroshima carried out by Kenzo Tange, and the construction sites in Chandigarh by Le Corbusier, of which they were fairly critical in architectural terms.⁷³ They continued to Kabul, Beirut, Damascus, Istanbul, and many other cities, before leaving from Rome for Canada. From that trip, they produced three more articles for the *RAIC Journal*.⁷⁴

Their itinerary was rare for Canadians or Americans at the time.⁷⁵ Indeed, Eric Arthur, editor of the *RAIC Journal*, introducing them in the first of their articles from this trip, "Les Girls en voyage," affirmed:

Readers of the journal will remember how, a few years ago, two lady architects in Edmonton circumnavigated the coast of South America by jeep. The same pair, Mary Imrie and Jean Wallbridge, along with a friend, Margaret Dinning, have gone off again. This time, on a slow boat to China,

Les Girls are not following in the very footsteps of Marco Polo, but, at times, it seems certain that they will not be far off. The route includes Hong Kong, Tokyo, Bangkok, New Delhi and camel train routes in Afghanistan where once a mere man dared not raise his head above the boulders on the trail.⁷⁶

The couple was compared to Marco Polo in their venture to Asia; yet, it was also implied that this geography was now safe even for women architects. This comparison was not very pertinent, though, since they were not alone in their travel. The home movies reveal that in many of their destinations, the architects were accompanied by a group of female travellers and, usually, a male guide (fig. 5). Moreover, in their own writings, their concern seems to be more on progress and modernity rather than safety. This is also legible in their language, especially in "Khyber Pass to Canada" that outlines their trip from Afghanistan to Italy.⁷⁷ Words like "primitive," "hectic," "modern," "more modern," "most modern" are dispersed throughout the text. We can trace the concern with modernity in their focus

on issues, such as irrigation of land, urban planning, or architecture. Their touristic amazement with various historical sites on the one hand was combined with an attention to International Style architecture on the other.

The moving images shot while moving are revealing in this context. Just like the hand-drawn maps and the written texts of articles, they act as tools in familiarizing the foreign, uncovering the spaces and architectures in motion. They are important primary materials also because they allow to see the contradictions and tensions modern architecture brought within local environments in that period, as viewed by two Canadian women. A fruitful example in that context is from their visit to Istanbul. They arrived in the city on March 27, 1958, and stayed five days before continuing to Athens. The diaries and movies reveal that the couple visited various sites in Istanbul. The narratives and movies include a boat trip on the Bosphorus—the boat and the coastline (fig. 6); historical monuments, such as the Ortaköy Mosque, the Sultanahmet



FIG. 7. THE ISTANBUL METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY BUILDING, DESIGNED BY NEVZAT EROL IN 1953. STILL FROM HOME MOVIE. | PROVINCIAL ARCHIVES OF ALBERTA, PR1988.0290.0925.



FIGS. 8 A-B. ISTANBUL HILTON HOTEL, DESIGNED BY SOM IN 1955. THE HOTEL AND THE MUNICIPALITY BUILDING ARE CONSIDERED THE FIRST TWO EXAMPLES OF INTERNATIONAL STYLE MODERN ARCHITECTURE IN TURKEY. STILLS FROM HOME MOVIE. | PROVINCIAL ARCHIVES OF ALBERTA, PR1988.0290.0925.

Square, or the Grand Bazaar; city streets with people and cars fleeing by; as well as modern architectural examples, such as the Metropolitan Municipality building designed by architect Nevzat Erol in 1953 (fig. 7). They spent most of their spare time in different modern hotels in the city, like the Divan Hotel and the Hilton Hotel. Interestingly, the only buildings that they mention in their article are Hagia Sophia, Blue Mosque—both culturally significant historical buildings, noteworthy to visitors regardless of their points of origins—and the Hilton Hotel: “an American spectacle abroad” as it was promoted.⁷⁸

This was the first Hilton Hotel to be built outside of the United States, famous for its owner Conrad Hilton’s urge to create each hotel “as a little America.”⁷⁹ The hotel was designed by the renowned architectural office SOM, in collaboration with Turkish architect Sedad Hakkı Eldem, and its chief designer was, remarkably, another woman, Natalie de Blois from the firm’s Chicago office. It is unlikely that Imrie and Wallbridge knew this, considering de Blois’s unrecognized position in the firm and within the field until recently. They were, however, appreciative of the building; in their article, they noted: “The Istanbul

Hilton commands a marvelous view over the Bosphorus [*sic*], as well as the attention of every tourist in Turkey. If it is typically foreign Hilton, more power to them”⁸⁰ (figs. 8 a and b). This “modern spectacle abroad” was both a site of encounter, of temporality, and a symbol of “foreign” modernism. Their emphasis on it signals the importance they gave to modern architecture within “less” modern cities; but also it is a sign of their association of modern architectural and visual characteristics with progress and development. Moreover, their focus accentuates the transience of the hotel as an urban typology. The hotel, similar to Meaghan Morris’s analysis of the motel, is a temporal transition place, offering “a fixed address for temporary lodgement [*sic*].”⁸¹ It implies a “transcendental homelessness,” a “home-away-from-home,” a transit zone.⁸² And for women, such a transitory effect conveyed it as a liberating, safe space. For Imrie and Wallbridge, this transient nature of the hotel was intertwined with the architectural modernity it signified; as they did in other geographies and for other hotels, they perceived the Hilton in motion and filmed it in their moving images, while entering through the gates of the hotel or spotting it while sailing over the Bosphorus (fig. 9).

CONCLUSION

Mary Imrie and Jean Wallbridge’s travels help us trace meanings embedded in displacements and discourses around modern architectures, in order to find alternative relationships between gender, movement, and cultural negotiations. A reading of their diaries, articles, drawings, photographs, and home movies from three of their transnational trips—to Europe with the World Study Tours grant to study postwar reconstruction in 1947; to South America with their car Hector in 1949; and to Asia and the Middle East in 1957—show that “Les Girls” not only crossed borders, but they also claimed their spatial and professional agency. With the support of their personal and feminine networks and professional institutions, they created room for themselves in the places to which they travelled, as well as in the architectural circles at home. As active agents, they used mobility to trespass boundaries drawn by social and professional hierarchies. And by writing and drawing, they constructed themselves as professionals rather than two queer women travelling simply for leisure, thereby bending the normative structures of the profession. As professional architects, they used their travel narratives to shape public perception regarding modernism in domestic and



FIG. 9. HILTON HOTEL SEEN FROM THE BOAT. STILL FROM HOME MOVIE. | PROVINCIAL ARCHIVES OF ALBERTA, PR1988.0290.0925.

international architecture. Their focus on modern architecture in different contexts displays their optimistic identification of it with growth and progress; and is evidence of their desire to align themselves with modernity. It also shows their simultaneous acceptance and rejection of their own femininity as they navigated their identities within masculine architectural modernisms. Similarly, their enthusiasm with different modes of travel complicated the masculinization of the technologies of mobility. Through their travels, they blurred social binaries and shifted identity roles; whereas at home, these trips allowed them to contribute to architectural discourse particularly around the issue of architectural modernisms. The written and visual materials they produced during and after their trips indicate that mobility allowed the two queer women to *travel* between architectural, geographical, and gender-based categories, resisting professional, social, and cultural norms. Mobility and modernism offered new potentials for Imrie and Wallbridge to participate uniquely in the discourse of postwar Canadian architecture.

NOTES

1. I would like to thank Tanya Southcott, Michael Windover, Jessica Mace, and the two anonymous reviewers for their comments on this article. I gratefully acknowledge the help of Tom Anderson, Tom Bernier, Sarah Eggert, and Robin Wallace from the Provincial Archives of Alberta. Special thanks to Annmarie Adams, Dana Arnold and Nik Luka for their helpful remarks, also to Cheryl Mahaffy for her help with my research on Imrie and Wallbridge and for introducing me to Cecil Stollings, an engineer and a former employee at Imrie & Wallbridge Architects. Meltem Al, Atagün Mert Kejanlioğlu, Magdalena Miłosz, and Laura O'Brien read earlier versions and gave insightful suggestions. This research forms part of my doctoral dissertation, which is funded by the Fonds de recherche du Québec – Société et culture (FRQSC); my archival research was supported by a Graduate Mobility Award from McGill University. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada Conference in St. John's, NL, in May 2018.
2. Woolf, Virginia, 1942, "Professions for Women," in *The Death of the Moth*, London, Hogarth Press, p. 149-154, at p. 151-152.
3. The World Study Tour group, driving a truck toward the village Giszowiec in Poland. Jean Wallbridge's diary entry, September 3, 1947, Provincial Archives of Alberta, PR1988.0290.0810.
4. Field, Dorothy, 1991, "A Note from the Editor," *SSAC Bulletin SEAC*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 3.
5. According to Contreras and her colleagues, it was Eric Arthur who first referred to Imrie and Wallbridge as "the girls." The couple used this nickname as the title of one of their articles in the *RAIC Journal*. Contreras, Monica, Luigi Ferrara, and Daniel Karpinski, 1993, "Breaking in: Four Early Female Architects," *The Canadian Architect*, vol. 38, no. 11, p. 18-23, at p. 22. For biographical information on Imrie and Wallbridge, also see Dominey, Erna, 1991, "Wallbridge and Imrie: The Architectural Practice of Two Edmonton Women, 1950-1979," *SSAC Bulletin SEAC*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 12-18; Mahaffy, Cheryl and Emily van Driesum, "Jean Louise Emberly Wallbridge & Mary Louise Imrie, n.d.," *Women Building Alberta: The Early Female Architects of Alberta*, n.p., [https://womenbuildingalberta.wordpress.com/jean-louise-emberly-wallbridge-mary-louise-imrie/], accessed October 1, 2018, supporting the exhibition "Women Building Alberta" display at *Voices for the Vote*, Borealis Gallery, Edmonton, AB, June 6 through August 14, 2016.
6. Upon graduating, Wallbridge worked in Rule, Wynn and Rule architectural office that was established by a classmate, Peter Rule. During the Second World War, she worked at the Town Planning Commission in Saint John, New Brunswick; and between 1946 and 1949, back in Edmonton, she worked at the Department of the City Architect and Inspection of Buildings. Imrie also worked at Rule, Wynn and Rule during the summers of 1941 and 1942, while still a student at the University of Toronto. After 1944, she worked with Harold Smith in Toronto, and Charles B.K. Van Norman in Vancouver. She returned to Edmonton in 1945, working at Rule, Wynn and Rule for a year, and then started at the City's Architects Department as well. They both worked there under Max Dewar until 1950. When they returned from their trip to South America, Dewar had quit, and they were left without jobs. Dominey, "Wallbridge and Imrie," p. 14-15.
7. On the attribution of women to domestic and residential architecture, see Adams, Annmarie, 1994, "Building Barriers: Images of Women in Canada's Architectural Press, 1924-73," *Resources for Feminist Research*, vol. 23, no. 3, p. 11-23.
8. Adams, Annmarie and Peta Tancred, 2000, *"Designing Women": Gender and the Architectural Profession*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, p. 17-18; Grierson, Joan, and For the Record Committee (eds.), 2008, *For the Record: The First Women in Canadian Architecture*, Toronto, Dundurn Press, p. 39 and 61. Also see Lemco van Ginkel, Blanche, 1991, "Slowly and Surely (and Somewhat Painfully): More or Less the History of Women in Architecture in Canada," *SSAC Bulletin SEAC*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 5-11, at p. 10.
9. Hill was mistakenly referred to as the first Canadian woman architect until very recently. It is now known that the first Canadian woman to graduate from an architecture school in Canada was Alice Charlotte Malhiot. Hill, Robert G., n.d., "Malhiot, Alice Charlotte," *Biographical Dictionary of Architects in Canada 1800-1950*, n.p., [http://dictionaryof-architectsincanada.org/node/2364], accessed January 5, 2019.
10. Contreras et al., "Breaking in: Four Early Female Architects," p. 20.

11. Wright, Gwendolyn, 1977, "On the Fringe of the Profession: Women in American Architecture," in Spiro Kostof (ed.), *The Architect: Chapters in the History of the Profession*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 280-308, at p. 281-283. Also see Torre, Susana (ed.), 1977, *Women in American Architecture: A Historic and Contemporary Perspective*, New York, Whitney Library of Design.
12. Joynes, Jennifer R., 1959, "Women in the Architectural Profession," *Journal, Royal Architectural Institute of Canada*, vol. 36, no. 9, p. 320-321, at p. 321. Joynes was the assistant to the national director of the Community Planning Association of Canada.
13. Adams ("Building Barriers," p. 2) argues that by attributing women to these "ghettos," "the perceived threat that they would replace men was diminished."
14. Heynen refers to this escape from home and its correlation to modernity. To be able to be modern, one had to leave the house. Heynen, Hilde, 2005, "Modernity and Domesticity: Tensions and Contradictions," in Hilde Heynen and Gülsüm Baydar (eds.), *Negotiating Domesticity: Spatial Productions of Gender in Modern Architecture*, London, Routledge, p. 1-29, at p. 2.
15. Wolff, Janet, 1993, "On the Road Again: Metaphors of Travel in Cultural Criticism," *Cultural Studies*, vol. 7, no. 2, p. 224-239, at p. 230.
16. Feminist thinkers deconstructed these masculine figures; see Wolff, Janet, 1985, "The Invisible Flâneuse: Women and the Literature of Modernity," *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 37-46; Wilson, Elizabeth, 1992, "The Invisible Flâneur," *New Left Review*, vol. 1, no. 91, p. 90-110; Rendell, Jane, 2000, "'Serpentine Allurements': Disorderly Bodies / Disorderly Spaces," in Iain Borden and Jane Rendell (eds.), *InterSections: Architectural Histories and Critical Theories*, London, Routledge, p. 247-268.
17. Urry, John, 1995, *Consuming Places*, London, Routledge, p. 141.
18. Deriu, Davide, Edoardo Piccoli, and Belgin Turan Özkaya, 2016, "Travels in Architectural History," *Architectural Histories*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 1-7, at p. 3-5.
19. Heynen, "Modernity and Domesticity," p. 9.
20. Traganou, Jilly, 2009, "For a Theory of Travel in Architectural Studies," in Jilly Traganou and Miodrag Mitrašini (eds.), *Travel, Space, Architecture*, Burlington, Ashgate, p. 4-26, at p. 26.
21. Deriu et al., "Travels in Architectural History," p. 2.
22. Some examples include: Johnson, Eugene J. and Michael J. Lewis, 1996, *Drawn from the Source: The Travel Sketches of Louis I. Kahn*, Williamstown, MA, Williams College Museum of Art; Bacon, Mardges, 2001, *Le Corbusier in America: Travels in the Land of the Timid*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press; Alcolea, Rubén A. and Jorge Tárrago, 2011, "Spectra: Architecture in Transit," in Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation (GSAPP) (ed.), *Architects' Journeys: Building, Traveling, Thinking*, New York, GSAPP Books, p. 6-19; Wigley, Mark, 2011, "The Myth of the Local," in *Architects' Journeys: Building, Traveling, Thinking*, id., p. 208-252; Nash, Joshua, 2015, "Ideas in Motion: Architectural Pilgrimage," *Transfers*, vol. 5, no. 2, p. 121-128; Chiu, Chen-Yu, 2016, "China Receives Utzon: The Role of Jørn Utzon's 1958 Study Trip to China in His Architectural Maturity," *Architectural Histories*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 12; Lloyd Jones, Gwyn, 2017, *Travels with Frank Lloyd Wright*, London, Lund Humphries; Potié, Philippe, 2018, *Le voyage de l'architecte*, Marseille, Parenthèses.
23. An exception is Tiven's article, in which he recounts architect Erica Mann's experiences of travelling to Nairobi. However, Tiven briefly mentions Mann's significance and only within a larger discussion of Ernst May's architectural contributions to East Africa. Tiven, Benjamin, 2013, "The Delight of the Yearner: Ernst May and Erica Mann in Nairobi 1933-1953," *Journal of Contemporary African Art*, vol. 2013, no. 32, p. 80-89.
24. Traganou, "For a Theory of Travel in Architectural Studies," p. 13.
25. Euben, Roxanne Leslie, 2008, *Journeys to the Other Shore: Muslim and Western Travelers in Search of Knowledge*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, p. 137.
26. *Id.*, p. 143.
27. Dominey ("Wallbridge and Imrie," p. 15) notes that Dewar asked the City Commissioners for the couple to be given the time off for this trip, implying Dewar's support of them.
28. "USNSA [United States National Student Association], Barnard, TC Offer Foreign Study Opportunities," *Columbia Daily Spectator*, vol. LXXI, no. 83, February 17, 1949, p. 1. Imrie and Wallbridge were graduates and not students at the time.
29. "Women Architects Leave Friday for Tour of European Countries," *Edmonton Journal*, July 26, 1947, p. 13, Provincial Archives of Alberta, PR1988.0290.0853.
30. Imrie, Mary L. and Jean Wallbridge, 1948, "Planning in Europe," *Journal, Royal Architectural Institute of Canada*, vol. 25, no. 10, p. 388-390, at p. 388.
31. The location where the photograph was taken is unidentified; however, a similar instance is found in Wallbridge's diary entry on September 6, 1947: "Wakened at 4.15. Walked to station, errie [sic] feeling in street lights. Found station full of sleeping bodies. Train 2 hours late. Sat on suitcases—went for walks etc., finally went up to trains." Provincial Archives of Alberta, PR1988.0290.0810.
32. Adams and Tancred, *Designing Women*, p. 55.
33. Imrie and Wallbridge, "Planning in Europe," p. 388.
34. "European Reconstruction and Community Planning Study Tour no. 18," Provincial Archives of Alberta, PR1988.0290.0853.
35. Imrie and Wallbridge, "Planning in Europe," p. 388.
36. Two other maps from their South American trip are published in Imrie, Mary L. and Jean Wallbridge, 1952, "South American Architects," *Journal, Royal Architectural Institute of Canada*, vol. 29, no. 2, p. 29-31, at p. 29. See also Imrie, Mary L. and Jean Wallbridge, 1950, "Motoring from Lima to Arequipa," *Peruvian Times*, March 17, p. 7-8, at p. 7, Provincial Archives of Alberta, PR1988.0290.0815.
37. Hultzsich refers to Nikolaus Pevsner and argues that architectural recording was accomplished through moving across space, through a "mobile" perception that is frozen in time to reveal "fleeting experience in front of the reader's eyes and intellect." Hultzsich, Anne, 2014, *Architecture, Travellers and Writers: Constructing Histories of Perception, 1640-1950*, London, Legenda, Modern Humanities Research Association and Maney Publishing, p. 47.

38. Letters to and from Pietro Belluschi, July 22, 1949, and July 28, 1949; John Bland and Richard Neutra, July 20, 1949, Provincial Archives of Alberta, PR1988.0290.0814.
39. Burgess, Cecil S., 1949, "News from the Institute," *Journal, Royal Architectural Institute of Canada*, vol. 26, no. 12, p. 448. Dominey, "Wallbridge and Imrie," p. 15.
40. Kerouac, Jack, 1957, *On the Road*, Harmandsworth, Penguin Books.
41. Cresswell, Tim, 1993, "Mobility as Resistance: A Geographical Reading of Kerouac's 'On the Road,'" *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, vol. 18, no. 2, p. 249-262, at p. 258.
42. Scharff, Virginia, 1991, *Taking the Wheel: Women and the Coming of the Motor Age*, New York, Free Press, p. 125. On the division between gasoline and electric cars, see Singer, Bayla, 1993, "Automobiles and Femininity," *Research in Philosophy and Technology*, vol. 13, "Technology and Feminism," p. 31-42, at p. 32-33.
43. Clarke writes: "despite the sophistication of marketing cars to women, then, cultural assumptions about women and cars still linked women's cars to domesticity, as an extension of the home." Clarke, Deborah, 2007, *Driving Women: Fiction and Automobile Culture in Twentieth-century America*, Baltimore, MD, John Hopkins University Press, p. 115. On the advertisement industry of automobiles and gender, see Walsh, Margaret, 2011, "Gender and Automobility: Selling Cars to American Women after the Second World War," *Journal of Macromarketing*, vol. 31, no. 1, p. 57-72.
44. de Beauvoir, Simone, [1948] 1999, *America Day by Day* [Carol Cosman, trans.], New York, Grove Press, p. 129-167.
45. Smith, Sidonie, 2001, *Moving Lives: Twentieth-century Women's Travel Writing*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, p. xiii.
46. *Id.*, p. 170.
47. *Id.*, p. 185.
48. Wolff, "On the Road Again," p. 234.
49. Clarke, *Driving Women*, p. 117.
50. Scharff, *Taking the Wheel*, p. 164.
51. Provincial Archives of Alberta, PR1988.0290.0815.
52. Marling argues that the twentieth-century modernism's obsession with the automobile was a masculine one: the love was between "man and machine," the car was his wife or mistress. In the case of Imrie and Wallbridge, as for many other women drivers, however, the car was treated more like a companion, a family member, rather than a lover. Marling, Karal Ann, [1989] 2002, "America's Love Affair with the Automobile in the Television Age," in Peter Wollen and Joe Kerr (eds.), *Autopia: Cars and Culture*, London, Reaktion Books, p. 354-362, at p. 355.
53. Clarke, *Driving Women*, p. 112.
54. Adams, Annmarie, 2010, "Sex and the Single Building: The Weston Havens House, 1941-2001," *Buildings & Landscapes: Journal of the Vernacular Architecture Forum*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 82-97, at p. 90; Urbach, Henry, 1992, "Peeking at Gay Interiors," *Design Book Review*, vol. 25, p. 38-40, at p. 39.
55. Clarke, *Driving Women*, p. 138.
56. The editor of the *American Motorist* thanked them "for sending along [their] little story," in a quite demeaning way. Provincial Archives of Alberta, PR1988.0290.0815.
57. In a letter dated April 4, 1950, they note that they sold an advertisement to the Compania Hotelera Andes in Santiago, and in another, that they received a 50% discount from Hotel Sucre in La Paz for including reference to it in their article. Provincial Archives of Alberta, PR1988.0290.0815.
58. Imrie, Mary L. and Jean Wallbridge, 1950, "Arequipa to Santiago by Car," *Peruvian Times*, April 21, p. 15-17, at p. 15, Provincial Archives of Alberta, PR1988.290.0815.
59. Smith, *Moving Lives*, p. 22.
60. Le Corbusier's Maison Citrohan from 1920 was a deliberate pun to the Citroën automobile company. Fuller designed a three-wheeled Dymaxion car, intended as an "Auto-Airplane." Fraser, Murray and Joe Kerr, 2002, "Motopia: Cities, Car and Architecture," in Wollen and Kerr (eds.), *Autopia: Cars and Culture*, op. cit., p. 315-326, at p. 316-317; Martin Pawley, 2002, "The Downfall of the Dymaxion Car," in Wollen and Kerr (eds.), *Autopia: Cars and Culture*, id., p. 371-378, at p. 373.
61. Smith, *Moving Lives*, p. 24.
62. Imrie and Wallbridge, "Motoring from Lima to Arequipa," p. 8.
63. *Ibid.*
64. Deriu et al., "Travels in Architectural History," p. 3; Manuel Pozo, José and José Ángel Medina, 2011, "Paper Taken on Trips, Trips Taken on Paper," in Columbia University (ed.), *Architects' Journeys: Building, Traveling, Thinking*, op. cit., p. 188-207, at p. 189.
65. Traganou, "For a Theory of Travel in Architectural Studies," p. 25.
66. Dione Neutra to Mary Imrie and Jean Wallbridge, August 21, 1950, Provincial Archives of Alberta, PR1988.0290.0814.
67. Imrie and Wallbridge, "South American Architects," p. 29.
68. But they also mention that in Peru, for instance, they knew nobody and they had no introduction letters, so they looked in telephone books and called unknown architects hoping they would answer. Imrie and Wallbridge, *ibid.*
69. Imrie and Wallbridge, *ibid.*
70. *Id.*, p. 31. Again, the "wife of the architect" appears in the text: They write, "His wife is also an architect, but is now busy raising their young family."
71. The concern with a Canadian image and architectural identity at the time can be traced in the country's architectural press. An example is the journal *Canadian Architect* that was established in 1955, with a title boldly expressing its range and target.
72. Imrie and Wallbridge, "South American Architects," p. 30.
73. Imrie, Mary L., 1958, "Hong Kong to Chandigarh," *Journal, Royal Architectural Institute in Canada*, vol. 35, no. 5, p. 160-163, at p. 162.
74. See, from Imrie, Mary L., 1958: "Les Girls en voyage," *Journal, Royal Architectural Institute of Canada*, vol. 35, no. 2, p. 44-46; "Hong Kong to Chandigarh"; and "Khyber Pass to Canada," *Journal, Royal Architectural Institute of Canada*, vol. 35, no. 7, p. 278-279.

75. In 1950, 99.5% of all journeys made by Canadian tourists were to the United States. And in 1949, Canada was the primary destination for American tourists, constituting 73% of all trips outside the States, followed by Mexico (9%), Cuba (5%), and Western European countries (totaling 6%). There is no mention of the Middle East or Asia in most of the tourist accounts from that period, let alone those by women travellers. Statistics Canada, "International Travel Statistics Section, 1971," *Travel Between Canada and Other Countries*, Catalogue 66-201 Annual, Ottawa, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, p. 108; Jakle, John A., 1985, *The Tourist: Travel in Twentieth-century North America*, Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, p. 188.
76. Imrie, "Les Girls en voyage," p. 44.
77. Imrie, "Khyber Pass to Canada," p. 278.
78. Wharton, Annabel Jane, 2001, *Building the Cold War: Hilton International Hotels and Modern Architecture*, Chicago, University of Chicago, p. 9.
79. Hilton, Conrad N., 1957, *Be My Guest*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, p. 265, cited in Wharton, *id.*, p. 1.
80. Imrie, "Khyber Pass to Canada," p. 279.
81. Morris, Meaghan, 1988, "At Henry Parkes Motel," *Cultural Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1, p. 1-47, at p. 6.
82. *Id.*, p. 2.