

**'To Fend for Ourselves in Proud Isolation' –  
The AA School of Architecture in the Postwar Period (1945-1965)**

Patrick Zamarian

July 2017



## ABSTRACT

The immediate postwar years were a transitional period in architectural education, marked by an uneasy concurrence of lingering Beaux-Arts traditions and new, Bauhaus-inspired methods. The diversity of pedagogical approaches reflected the identity crisis of a profession which, faced with an expanded spectrum of tasks and growing state interference, struggled to redefine its role in the nascent welfare state.

The study puts the hypothesis that for approximately a decade after the end of the war the AA's unique setup as an independent school, run by a professional association and uninhibited by the structural constraints of a governing academic institution, enabled it to take full advantage of this fluid state of affairs. Yet the study also contends that by the late 1950s the AA's independence was beginning to look out of touch with the changing political and educational situation and threatened to leave the school marginalised within a tightening national framework of architectural education.

Filling a gap in existing scholarship about the AA school, the thesis spans the first two decades after the war and covers the terms of four principals. Gordon Brown (1945-48) oversaw a drastic increase of the student population, making the AA the largest and arguably most eminent school in the Commonwealth. Robert Furneaux Jordan (1949-51) introduced an unapologetically modernist and politically charged curriculum with a strong emphasis on group work. Michael Pattrick (1951-61), whose tenure was initially marred by discord with the student body, managed to attract the country's leading architects to the staff and sought to broaden the school's outlook through postgraduate schemes such as the Department of Tropical Architecture. The Oxford Conference of 1958 marked the occasion when the RIBA reasserted its prerogative to guide the fate of British architectural education and put an end to the relative liberalism of the previous years. The appointment of William Allen (1961-65), one of the instigators of the conference, was an ultimately unsuccessful attempt to conform the AA to a new pedagogical paradigm which prioritised science-based education over design training in a narrower traditional sense.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	v
Abbreviations	vii
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
Topic and Hypothesis	1
Existing Literature	7
Sources and Methods	15
Thesis Structure	19
<b>PROLOGUE: A Brief History of the Architectural Association (1847-1944)</b>	<b>23</b>
Inception and Early Proceedings	23
The AA, the RIBA and the Systematisation of Architectural Education	25
The Rise of the Beaux-Arts System in the Early Twentieth Century	27
The Question of Modernism: <i>Focus</i> and the Unit System	30
The Abolition of the Student Vote	36
Wartime Exile	39
<b>CHAPTER 1: After the War (1945-1949)</b>	<b>43</b>
New Beginning in Bedford Square	43
A Numbers' Game: The Financial Implications of a Growing Student Body	48
Teaching under Brown: The Stream System	53
'Draughtsmanship and the Technical Side' – The Postwar Curriculum	59
International Entanglements: The AA and the CIAM Summer School	63
A Tragic Person – Gordon Brown's Resignation and Subsequent Career	70
Conclusion	74

<b>CHAPTER 2: Architecture as Collaborative Practice (1949-1951)</b>	<b>77</b>
Life and Art Are One – Robert Furneaux Jordan’s Worldview	77
‘Continuity Being Thus Assured’ – Staff Changes under Jordan	82
Real Sites, Real Problems, Real Clients	89
Research and Collaboration – Training for Public Practice	93
Shades of Left – The AA in the Crossfire of Political Controversy	99
Unfinished Business after Jordan’s Departure	111
Conclusion	114
<b>CHAPTER 3: Chuzzlewit’s Heirs – The Postwar Student Body (1945-1951)</b>	<b>117</b>
Moth-Eaten Old Students and Noisy Little Schoolboys	118
Beyond the AA: The Architectural Students’ Association	123
The Wonder Years – The AA Students’ Committee in the Late 1940s	127
Cross-generational Links: From <i>Focus</i> to <i>PLAN</i>	131
Conclusion	138
<b>CHAPTER 4: Michael Pattrick’s Troubles with the Students (1951-1956)</b>	<b>141</b>
The Reluctant Principal	141
Unpopular Changes to the School Model	146
The Battle of the Principal	149
The Return of the Student Vote	157
Conclusion	163
<b>CHAPTER 5: The AA School under Michael Pattrick (1951-1961)</b>	<b>165</b>
New Curriculum	166
‘Liberal Education’ vs Unit System	169
Staff Changes under the Unit System	173
Pattrick’s Office Adoption Scheme	178
The Department of Tropical Architecture	181
The Brutalist Period at the AA	186
Smithsonian Curriculum	195
Conclusion	201

<b>CHAPTER 6: In Search of a New Policy (1951-1961)</b>	<b>203</b>
State of Crisis in the Early 1950s	203
The AA and ‘The Other Place’ – Patrick, the McMorran Committee and the Oxford Conference	208
Integrated Education: The Scheme for a College of Architecture and Building	218
Future Policy: The AA Working Party and the End of Patrick’s Reign	225
Conclusion	232
<b>CHAPTER 7: William Allen and the ‘Art/Science Tension’ (1961-1965)</b>	<b>235</b>
A New Order: The Appointment of William Allen and Edward Carter	235
Proposed Merger with the Imperial College of Science and Technology	239
‘Growth Points’ – Allen’s Vision for the AA School	246
Problems of Implementation	254
The System Boys vs The One-off Boys: Allen’s Isolation and Failure as AA Principal	260
Conclusion	270
<b>EPILOGUE: The AA in the Second Half of the 1960s (1965-1971)</b>	<b>273</b>
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>281</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>291</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>315</b>
Appendix 1: The Role of AA Graduates in British Postwar Architecture	317
Appendix 2.1: AA Council (1944-1966)	319
Appendix 2.2: AA Principals and Studio Staff (1945-1965)	323
Appendix 2.3: AA Students (1945-1965)	329
Appendix 3: AA Student Work (1945-1965)	337





## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It has taken me precisely four years to research and write this thesis, and it humbles me to think of the number of people who over this period of time have – each in their own way – helped me in my efforts.

I wish to convey my deep-felt gratitude to my two thesis advisors Mark Swenarton and Barnabas Calder, who have shared my enthusiasm and whose advice and criticism have been, and will continue to be, invaluable for my work. The University of Liverpool has provided me with an excellent research environment and I wish to extend my thanks to all academic and administrative staff and particularly to the successive heads of its School of Architecture Andy Brown, Andrew Crompton and Soumyen Bandyopadhyay. I am most grateful to my examiners Murray Fraser and Iain Jackson for scrutinising my thesis and sharing their thoughts and insights with me.

My research took me to a good number of libraries and archives, which as a general rule are always run by the most helpful people one can come across. I owe a tremendous debt to my friend Ed Bottoms, who opened the treasure trove that is the AA Archive and went out of his way to help me unearth any bit of information which could be useful for my study. I also wish to thank Valerie Bennett and Byron Blakeley of the AA Photo Library, Eleanor Gawne of the AA Library, Kurt Helfrich of the RIBA Drawings Collection, David Luck of the London Metropolitan Archives, Grant Buttars of the Centre for Research Collections at the University of Edinburgh as well as archivists and librarians at the National Archive in Kew, the Modern Records Centre in Coventry, the People's History Museum in Manchester, the British Library in London and its Boston Spa outpost, the RIBA, Lancaster University, Liverpool John Moores University, the University of Liverpool, and ETH Zurich.

Over the past four years I have had the pleasure to meet many former AA students and staff, some of whom welcomed me in their homes and allowed me access to their

private papers and student work. It was a great privilege to meet Jean and Stephen Macfarlane, Jenny and the late Martyn Haxworth, Alison and Bob Maguire, the late Geoff Spyer, Jean and Tim Sturgis, the late Chris Whittaker, and also Peter Ahrends, John Miller, Derek Montefiore, Bill Mullins, the late John Partridge, Michael Pearson, Simon Pepper, and Tim Tinker. I am equally grateful to those who took the time to talk to me on the phone or on skype, specifically the late Sir Andrew Derbyshire, Tony Eardley, Michael Glickman, Kenneth Grieb, Malcolm Higgs, Diana Lee-Smith, and Peter Rich, and to many more who communicated with me in writing, including Dargan Bullivant, Gabi Epstein, Bob Garratt, Bob Gatje, Allen Greenberg, Hans Heyerdahl Hallen, Elizabeth Hill-Smith, George Kasabov, Paffard Keatinge-Clay, Alec Livock, Bob Maxwell, Peter Phippen, Marius Reynolds, Stephen Rosenberg, Joseph Rykwert, Elizabeth Scott, Grahame Shane, Charmian Shenton, and David Wild. Nick Allen and Nicholas Boyarsky both gave me generous access to their fathers' papers, and countless others such as Rob Adams, Alistair Bevington, Judy Carter, Nick Coombe, Yvonne Glennie, Elain Harwood, Harry Hobin, Ben Johnson, Joshua Mardell, Jim McCann, Stephen Parnell, Alan Powers, Chris Rogers, Andrew Saint and Greg Smith provided useful information and leads for further investigations.

Having left my home country many years ago, I have come to treasure family and friendship ties which have remained unaffected by geographical irrelevancies like the English Channel. I am most grateful to my friends Dianne MacKinnon for proofreading the first couple of chapters of my thesis and Bobi Hajas for helping me with my final layout. My parents, my sister Katja and my nephew Remo have always been supportive of everything I do, including this thesis, and Banham and Sophie bring balance and joy to my life.

For all of the above and more I wish to thank my Julie, to whom I dedicate this thesis.

## ABBREVIATIONS

### Archives

AAA	Architectural Association Archives, London
ABA	Alvin Boyarsky Archive, London
BLSA	British Library Sound Archive, London
LMA	London Metropolitan Archives
MRC	Modern Records Centre, Warwick University, Coventry
PHM	People's History Museum, Manchester
TNA	The National Archives, Kew

### Periodicals

AAJ	Architectural Association Journal
ABN	Architect and Building News
AJ	Architects' Journal
RIBAJ	Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects

### Organisations and Institutions

AA	Architectural Association
AAD	Association of Architectural Draughtsmen
ABK	Ahrends, Burton and Koralek
ABT	Association of Building Technicians
ACP	Architects' Co-operative Partnership
AFP	Architectural Faculty Bureau, IUS
ArchSA	Architectural Students' Association
BAE	Board of Architectural Education, RIBA
BBPR	Banfi Belgiojoso Peressutti Rogers
BOE	Board of Education
BOT	Board of Trade
BRS	Building Research Station
CAT	College of Advanced Technology
CIAM	Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne – International Congresses of Modern Architecture
ComSoc	Communist Society, AA

CP	Communist Party
DBM	Department of Building Management, AA
DST	Department of Science and Technology, AA
DTA	Department of Tropical Architecture, AA
DTS	Department of Tropical Studies, AA
DURD	Department of Urban and Regional Design, AA
ETH	Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule – Swiss Federal Institute of Technology
FET	Further Education and Training
ICST	Imperial College of Science and Technology
IOB	Institute of Builders
IUS	International Union of Students
KNUST	Kwame Nkruma University of Science and Technology
LCC	London County Council
LEA	Local Education Authority
LMBA	London Master Builders' Association
MARS Group	Modern Architectural Research Group
MIT	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOW	Ministry of Works
NASA	Northern Architectural Students' Association
NUS	National Union of Students
RCA	Royal College of Art
RIBA	Royal Institute of British Architects
RWA	Royal West of England Academy
SCR	Society for Cultural Relations between the British Commonwealth and the USSR
SISTER	Special Institution for Scientific and Technological Education and Research
SPRND	School of Planning and Research for National Development
TPI	Town Planning Institute
TU Delft	Delft University of Technology
UGC	University Grants Committee
YRM	Yorke Rosenberg Mardall

# INTRODUCTION

## Topic and Hypothesis

In their introduction to *Anxious Modernisms* in 2000, Sarah Williams Goldhagen and Réjean Legault challenged a commonly held view amongst architectural historians whereby the decades following the Second World War represented an ‘interregnum between an expiring modernism and a dawning postmodernism’<sup>1</sup>, worthy of consideration only in so far as it allowed occasional glimpses of things to come. Though over the intervening years a more nuanced understanding of postwar architecture has developed, the historiography of the Architectural Association (AA) School of Architecture still echoes Goldhagen and Legault’s assessment. There has been tentative research into the period leading up to the Second World War, when the students staged a campaign against the school’s Beaux-Arts methods which would, as Elizabeth Darling writes, ‘ultimately [...] secure modernism’s domination over British spatial culture.’<sup>2</sup> Likewise, the so-called ‘Electric Decade’<sup>3</sup> from the mid-1960s onward, which reached its apex in the early 1970s, when Alvin Boyarsky reinvented the school as the vehicle for a ‘postmodern system of architectural education’<sup>4</sup>, has attracted considerable interest from historians such as Irene Sunwoo and Andrew Higgott. Bridging these two landmark events in the AA’s history, the two decades from the end of the war until the mid-1960s have received only perfunctory treatment and generated little more than anecdotal evidence. In a compellingly neat narrative the postwar years emerge as a transitional and largely inconsequential phase during which the pioneering spirit of the pre-war insurgents lay dormant until it eventually stimulated a new generation of staff and student activists, who salvaged the moribund AA from imminent closure and enabled

---

<sup>1</sup> Sarah Williams Goldhagen, Réjean Legault, ‘Introduction’, in: Sarah Williams Goldhagen, Réjean Legault (eds.), *Anxious Modernisms*, Cambridge MA 2000, p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Elizabeth Darling, *Re-forming Britain*, New York 2007, p. 179.

<sup>3</sup> Peter Cook, ‘The Electric Decade: An Atmosphere at the AA School 1963-73’, in: James Gowan (ed.), *A Continuing Experiment*, London 1975, pp. 137-146.

<sup>4</sup> Irene Sunwoo, ‘Between the “Well-Laid Table” and the “Marketplace”’: Alvin Boyarsky’s Experiments in Architectural Pedagogy’, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Princeton University, Nov 2013, p. 305.

Boyarsky to turn it into ‘the most talked-about architectural centre in the world’<sup>5</sup>. The present thesis sets out to challenge this narrative.

Why should the AA be the subject of such investigation? In the late 1950s there were 73 architectural schools in Britain, twenty of which (including the AA) offered a full-time five-year course which was recognised by the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) for exemption from its final examination.<sup>6</sup> Yet the AA could claim to have produced a quarter of all major competition winners in the postwar period,<sup>7</sup> and whilst the exact figure may be debatable, the overall success of the school in this respect is not. Beginning with the first significant competition after the war – the Pimlico housing scheme, won by Philip Powell and Jacko Moya in 1946 – AA graduates strung together a succession of similar accomplishments in the following years and decades. In 1951 the AA dominated both competitions organised in connection with the Festival of Britain, winning two first and two third prizes as well as one commendation and a special commendation for two current students of the school.<sup>8</sup> Two years later John Harris won the competition for a new state hospital in Doha, and in 1959 members of three of the four finalist teams for the Churchill College competition currently taught at the AA whilst the lead designer of the winning scheme – Bill Mullins for Sheppard Robson – was a recent graduate. In the following year Nigel Farrington and John Dennys (in collaboration with their former tutor Enrico de Pierro) submitted a successful entry for the new civic centre of Corby. In 1961 Paul Koralek won Trinity College in Dublin and founded a practice with his former fellow students Richard Burton and Peter Ahrends, whilst Eldred Evans took first prize in the Lincoln civic centre competition with a project based on her final thesis. Three years later Francis Pym won the contest for an extension of the Ulster Museum, and in 1971 Richard Rogers (with Renzo Piano) scored a surprise victory in the international competition for the Centre Pompidou in Paris.

---

<sup>5</sup> Andrew Higgott, *Mediating Modernism*, London 2007, p. 159.

<sup>6</sup> John Smith, ‘The Schools’, *Architecture and Building*, Feb 1958, p. 43.

<sup>7</sup> Edward Carter, ‘The Architectural Association – Imperial College Project’, 21 Nov 1966, AA Archives, London (hereafter cited as AAA), Box 2006:S16b.

<sup>8</sup> Restaurant: Leonard Manasseh (winner), Percy Davison (third prize), James Cubitt + Partners (commendation); ‘Vertical Feature’: Powell and Moya (winners), Peter Dickinson (third prize), A. K. Allen and G. J. Briggs (special commendation).

Of course not all distinguished architects came from the AA. Stirling studied at Liverpool, Gowan at Glasgow and Kingston, and the Smithsons in Newcastle. ‘We did not go to the AA – that’s why we’re good,’ Alison Smithson reportedly proclaimed,<sup>9</sup> but for many others the AA was high on the wish list and failure to be admitted a cause of regret.<sup>10</sup> Indeed, the list of AA graduates reads like a Who is Who of British postwar architecture and includes private practitioners such as Shankland + Cox, John Voelcker, Robert Maguire, Colquhoun + Miller, Edward Cullinan, Peter Cook, Quinlan Terry, Elias Zenghelis, Dixon + Jones, Michael Hopkins, Nicholas Grimshaw and three quarters of both HKPA (Howell, Killick and Amis) and DEGW (Duffy, Eley and Worthington) as well as many lesser-known, but equally influential architects who attained high positions in the public sector, including Ashley Barker, Patricia Tindale, Henry Swain, Thurston Williams, John Gammans, John Kay and Neave Brown. At a rough estimate the AA produced about half of the country’s leading postwar architects,<sup>11</sup> and in addition there were those who went on to illustrious careers abroad, including Peter Dickinson, Paffard Keatinge-Clay, John Godwin and Gillian Hopwood, John Belle, Donald Appleyard, Denise Scott Brown, Ram and Ada Karmi, Geoffrey Bawa, Thomas Leitersdorf and Mick Pearce.

The AA was for much of the postwar period the country’s largest and – if one accepts the subsequent careers of its graduates as a measure of its success – most eminent school of architecture. At its most basic, this thesis is driven by the question as to how the school managed to achieve this position. Such discussion cannot be isolated from the broader political and educational context within which the school operated, and the thesis therefore also aspires to contribute to a deeper understanding of British architectural education in the second half of the twentieth century.

---

<sup>9</sup> As quoted by Denise Scott Brown in: ‘Denise Scott Brown and Robert Venturi’, *Web of Stories*, n.d., <http://www.webofstories.com/play/robert.venturi.and.denise.scott.brown/29> [accessed 25 Nov 2016].

<sup>10</sup> Colin St John Wilson, for instance, tried in vain to get a place in the AA and settled for the Bartlett instead: ‘I was made aware, by Sam Scorer, who was down the road in the AA, that one was architecturally pretty much a peasant at the Bartlett.’ (‘Colin St John Wilson interviewed by Jill Lever’, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects’ Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 5/27 (24 Sep 1996), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 25 Nov 2016].)

<sup>11</sup> The estimate is based on the architects listed in the indices of five key publications on British postwar architecture. 46.5% of those mentioned in the majority of these books were AA graduates (see Appendix 1).

Historically, control over education, the setting of competition standards and the establishment of provincial societies formed the tripod on which the RIBA's efforts to spread professionalism rested.<sup>12</sup> In sharp contrast to the state-dominated educational systems in continental Europe, notably the French Beaux-Arts system and the German system of technical universities, architectural training in Britain was (and remained) tightly linked to and guided by the practical demands of the profession.<sup>13</sup> This raises the question as to the basic suitability of architectural education as a subject in its own right and, contingent on this, the potential validity of any study which centres upon the contribution of one particular school, no matter the significance of that school within its wider setting.

Andrew Saint, in his selective study of the profession, argues that 'the nature of architectural teaching at any given time proceeds from the state of the profession, rather than the other way round,' and he therefore omits any discussion of the subject altogether.<sup>14</sup> Yet the reality of architectural education in the postwar years paints a more complex picture than Saint suggests. In the mid-1950s there existed six different routes into the profession as intending architects could learn their trade by becoming articled pupils; taking a correspondence course; studying part-time at a so-called 'facilities school'; taking both RIBA examinations externally whilst attending a so-called 'listed school'; taking the final examination externally after completing the three-year course at a school exempt from the RIBA's intermediate examination; or studying at a fully recognised school (which in turn could be part of a university, an art school, a technical college or independent like the AA).<sup>15</sup> Moreover, even amongst the recognised full-time schools there was a marked discrepancy in methodology, ranging from the Beaux Arts-derived education at the Bartlett to the more vocational training offered by the London polytechnics. It seems that the setting of educational parameters was largely left to the schools, either because the profession had limited control over them or because it lacked the ability to agree a coherent policy.

---

<sup>12</sup> Barrington Kaye, *The Development of the Architectural Profession in Britain*, London 1960, p. 88.

<sup>13</sup> For a comparative analysis see: Garry Stevens, 'Angst in Academia: Universities, the Architecture Schools and the Profession', *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, vol. 15, no. 2 (Summer 1998), pp. 152-169.

<sup>14</sup> Andrew Saint, *The Image of the Architect*, New Haven 1983, p. x.

<sup>15</sup> Smith, 'Schools', op. cit.



Arguably, both were the case. The rise of full-time school training in the early twentieth century and the corresponding emergence of a sub-profession of architectural teachers, particularly in the universities, made the schools less susceptible to the pressures exerted upon them by the RIBA. More importantly, the diversity of pedagogical approaches in the postwar period reflected the identity crisis of a profession which, faced with an expanded spectrum of tasks and unprecedented government interference, struggled to redefine its role in the nascent welfare state. Broadly speaking, the architectural profession was divided into public and private practitioners, and for more than a decade following the end of the war their conflicting priorities frustrated any attempt at arriving at a unified policy within the RIBA. Significantly, throughout the period leading up to the controversial Oxford Conference of 1958, which finally crystallised the diverging views of its members into a unified and rigorously enforced policy centred upon higher entry standards and a preference for full-time university education, both factions saw educational policy as an instrument with which to mould the future trajectory of the profession. In other words, in the postwar period architectural education shed any passive role it may have had and turned into an active agent of change. In Crinson and Lubbock's view, it became 'one of the major forces shaping the built environment [...], perhaps the most important.'<sup>16</sup>

The interdependence between education and professional practice is of particular interest in our context since the AA school was the only architectural school, certainly in Britain, which was controlled and operated by a professional body.<sup>17</sup> The membership of the association consisted – on the basis of a closely observed formula – of at least 89 per cent architects, with the remaining 'non-architect' category divided into engineers (maximum 2 per cent of the total membership); artists (2 per cent); quantity surveyors (2 per cent); other surveyors (1 per cent); publishers and writers (1 per cent); teachers, educationists and clergy (1 per cent); directors and administrators connected with the profession and other persons (1 per cent); and

---

<sup>16</sup> Mark Crinson, Jules Lubbock, *Architecture – art or profession?*, Manchester 1994, p. 1.

<sup>17</sup> The thesis is primarily concerned with the AA school rather than the association itself, though it is impossible to draw a clear line between the two. The chief purpose of the association was the running of its school, and they shared the same premises, facilities and accounts – the latter to allow the association to retain its charity status, which exempted it from having to pay income tax.

industrial designers (1 per cent).<sup>18</sup> Throughout the postwar period the AA council as the governing body of both school and association was, with few exceptions, composed of practising architects, whilst almost all members of the studio staff served in a part-time capacity and were – in contrast to most other schools at the time – encouraged, and in effect required, to engage in architectural practice. In light of this, we should expect the AA to be particularly responsive to the changing demands and preferences of the profession.

Likewise, the gradual change from the loosely controlled educational framework of the postwar years to the tightly regulated setup of the late 1950s was bound to have implications for an independent school such as the AA. Without academic oversight through either a government agency or a university senate the AA had over the course of its history developed a highly adaptable educational system. The composition of the council changed annually and with the sole exception of the principal all members of the academic staff were appointed on short-term contracts (part-time tutors for an academic term, unit and year masters normally for an academic year), which enabled the school to effect changes to policy and curriculum almost instantly. Moreover, many of these changes originated in suggestions from the student body, which enjoyed unparalleled participatory privileges.

Unsurprisingly perhaps, AA graduates retained an unusual degree of loyalty to their alma mater, enabling the school to draw upon a virtually unlimited pool of practising architects to recruit to its part-time teaching staff. The sum total of these features had allowed the AA to pioneer a number of experimental pedagogical schemes and underpinned its self-conception as ‘the most imaginative and progressive radiating point of architectural ideas in Britain.’<sup>19</sup>

The AA was fiercely alert to external developments which in the postwar period jeopardised its autonomy and the educational benefits it derived from it. It is therefore not without irony that arguably the greatest threat to this autonomy was homemade and arose from the AA’s precarious financial position. Unlike the university schools, which received generous funding from the Treasury through the

---

<sup>18</sup> *Builder*, 18 Dec 1959, p. 899.

<sup>19</sup> [Edward Carter], ‘The Future of the AA’, memorandum att. to: Meeting of the Council, 17 July 1961, *Minutes of the AA Council 1955-1961*, AAA, Box 2007:66 (hereafter cited as CM 1955-61), p. 493.

University Grants Committee, and technical colleges such as the London polytechnics, which were under the charge of local education authorities (which were in turn subsidised by the Ministry of Education), the AA school was dependent on students' tuition fees to cover its running costs. Throughout its history the AA struggled to balance its books, and the state-funded expansion of higher technological education in the wake of the 1945 Percy Report inevitably put it at a competitive disadvantage. This is a matter which shall concern us throughout the thesis, as with the systemic shortage of money and the growing regulatory pressure from government agencies curtailing its room for manoeuvre, the advantages of the school's independence, and indeed the very idea of this independence, came into question.<sup>20</sup>

The overall picture which thus emerges of the postwar period is that of the government and the RIBA acting as dual forces pushing for greater conformity and control in architectural education. The study puts the hypothesis that for approximately a decade after the end of the war the advantages of the AA's independence outweighed any potential drawback arising from its scarce finances; yet by the late 1950s this independence had begun to look out of touch with the changing political and educational realities and threatened to leave the school marginalised within a tightening national framework of architectural education.

## Existing Literature

John Summerson's booklet *The Architectural Association 1847-1947* (1947) remains the standard work on the origins and early history of the AA up until the mid-1930s.<sup>21</sup> Apart from two papers by Alan Powers exploring the school's Arts and Crafts spell in Edwardian times, both outputs of his doctoral research into British architectural education (1982), nothing of substance has been added since.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> For a discussion of higher education funding see: Roy Lowe, *Education in the Post-War Years: a Social History*, London 1988, pp. 57-60.

<sup>21</sup> John Summerson, *The Architectural Association 1847-1947*, London 1947.

<sup>22</sup> Alan Powers, 'Architectural Education and the Arts and Crafts Movement in Britain', *Architectural Education*, no. 3 (1983), pp. 42-70; Alan Powers, 'Edwardian Architectural Education: A Study of Three

Summerson was understandably cautious about interpreting the, for him, recent past and dealt with the immediately preceding decade only in passing. It was Andrew Saint who, in *Towards a Social Architecture* (1987), first stressed the link between the school's pioneering unit system introduced by Principal E. A. A. Rowse in the late 1930s and postwar public practice.<sup>23</sup> John Gold, in *The Experience of Modernism* (1997), identified the pre-war AA as one of several supportive infrastructures for the formation of the modern movement in Britain,<sup>24</sup> and Elizabeth Darling fully developed this notion in *Re-forming Britain* (2007), pinpointing the turbulent events which followed Rowse's appointment as a defining moment in Britain's progression from modernity to modernism.<sup>25</sup> Written before the AA's archival records were fully accessible, these texts – and Darling's in particular – draw extensively on an account published by the student activists in their magazine *Focus* and embellished in retrospective testimonies.<sup>26</sup>

The international renown of the AA school from the early 1970s onward has likewise attracted considerable attention from researchers. David Dunster published a biographical essay on the school's charismatic chairman and reinventor Alvin Boyarsky (2005),<sup>27</sup> and Andrew Higgott, a former student and lecturer at the AA, analysed the unique and influential educational model which Boyarsky had put in place (2007).<sup>28</sup> This latter field has been explored in considerable detail in Irene Sunwoo's doctoral thesis (2013), which examines Boyarsky's pedagogical approach within its broader theoretical context.<sup>29</sup> Like Higgott, Sunwoo portrays Boyarsky as an autocratic ruler who succeeded in remodelling the AA's institutional framework to fit his pedagogical vision. Accordingly, whilst covering the immediate prehistory of Boyarsky's investiture, specifically his short teaching stint between 1963 and

---

Schools of Architecture', *AA Files*, no. 5 (1984), pp. 48-59; see also: Alan Powers, 'Architectural Education in Britain 1880-1914', unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cambridge University, 1982.

<sup>23</sup> Andrew Saint, *Towards a Social Architecture*, New Haven 1987, pp. 1-5.

<sup>24</sup> John R. Gold, *The Experience of Modernism: Modern Architects and the Future City, 1928-1953*, London 1997, pp. 88-93, 142-144.

<sup>25</sup> Darling, *Re-forming Britain*, pp. 179-208.

<sup>26</sup> 'The AA Story, 1936-1939', *Focus*, no. 3 (Spring 1939), pp. 79-111; for a more balanced view see: Alan Powers, 'Goodhart-Rendel: The Appropriateness of Style', *Architectural Design*, Oct/Nov 1979, pp. 50-51.

<sup>27</sup> David Dunster, 'Boyarsky and the Architectural Association', in: Paul Davies, Thorsten Schmiedeknecht (eds.), *An Architect's Guide to Fame*, Amsterdam/Oxford 2005, pp. 33-47.

<sup>28</sup> Higgott 2007, pp. 153-184.

<sup>29</sup> Sunwoo 2013, op. cit.; see also: Irene Sunwoo, 'From the "Well-Laid Table" to the "Market Place:" The Architectural Association Unit System', *Journal of Architectural Education*, March 2012, pp. 24-41.

1965 and the incumbency of his predecessor John Lloyd from 1966 onward, Sunwoo makes little attempt to anchor Boyarsky's chairmanship from 1971 within the broader institutional history of the AA.

The postwar historiography of the AA thus remains largely uncharted territory. A commemorative publication for the retiring Arthur Korn (1967) gives an inkling of the topics which preoccupied the school over the two decades he had been teaching there,<sup>30</sup> and the AA's 125<sup>th</sup> birthday in 1972 gave birth to four related publications, of which James Gowan's *AA Projects: 1946-1971* (1973), a critical survey of student work, contributes to our understanding of the postwar period.<sup>31</sup> Peter Cook had covered much the same ground in a piece for *Arena* (1966),<sup>32</sup> whilst Archie McNab summarised the developments of the postwar period for *Building* (1972).<sup>33</sup> To varying degrees all these accounts must be read in the context of the personal involvement of their authors in the events they recount.

The same inevitably applies to the various monographs and papers about former students or teachers which have been published in more recent years and which, even when they cover the formative years of their subjects, usually rely on oral history and are therefore not immune to inaccuracies. A number of authors identify tendencies of somewhat broader relevance by extending the discussion from individuals to their social and intellectual environment. Clive Fenton (2007) and Joshua Mardell (2012), for instance, reflect upon the motivations and influence of a group of students who published *PLAN* in the late 1940s.<sup>34</sup> Deyan Sudjic (2009) explores the reawakened interest in continental modernism amongst students such as John Miller, Neave Brown, Adrian Gale, Patrick Hodgkinson, Kenneth Frampton

---

<sup>30</sup> Dennis Sharp (ed.), *Planning and Architecture*, London 1967. Of particular interest is: Andrew Derbyshire, Hugh Morris, 'Arthur Korn: Man and Teacher', *ibid.*, pp. 125-126.

<sup>31</sup> James Gowan (ed.), *Projects: Architectural Association 1946-1971*, London 1973. The other three publications were: Dennis Sharp (ed.), *Architectural Association 125<sup>th</sup> Anniversary*, London 1973; James Gowan, 'AA 125: A Decade of AA Architecture', *AA quarterly*, vol. 5, no. 1 (1973), pp. 4-39; Gowan 1975, *op. cit.*

<sup>32</sup> Peter Cook, 'Responses', *Arena*, Dec 1966, vol. 82, no. 907, pp. 137-144.

<sup>33</sup> Archie McNab, 'The Architectural Association since the war', *Building*, 29 Oct 1972, pp. 71-78.

<sup>34</sup> Clive B. Fenton, 'PLAN: A student journal of ambition and anxiety', in: Iain Boyd Whyte (ed.), *Man-Made Future*, London 2007, pp. 174-190; Joshua Mardell, 'The CIAM Charter of Habitat: "Inter-relationships" and "scales of association" in the work of British architects, 1950-1970', unpublished master's thesis, Cambridge University, Nov 2012; see also Joshua Mardell, 'Far From the Madding Crowd', *AA Files*, no. 66 (2013), pp. 87-99. Saint covers the same period briefly in: *Saint* 1987, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-31.

and David Gray, who attended the AA in the early 1950s.<sup>35</sup> Denise Scott Brown (1990), a contemporary of theirs, relates her recollections of an emerging brutalist movement at the AA,<sup>36</sup> and Kenneth Powell (2012) registers a 'Prairie Style'-inspired counter-movement involving Ahrends, Burton and Koralek along with likeminded students such as John Donat and Edward Cullinan.<sup>37</sup> James Gowan (1994) provides fascinating insider information about the second half of the 1950s,<sup>38</sup> when the AA school witnessed a widespread reaction against entrenched modernist orthodoxies – a reaction exemplified by the work of the so-called 'Christian weirdies' Malcolm Higgs, Quinlan Terry and Andrew Anderson, discussed by Alan Powers in a paper for *AA Files* (2012),<sup>39</sup> as well as the nascent Archigram group, which is the subject of Simon Sadler's research (2005).<sup>40</sup>

Whilst there have thus been tentative forays into specific aspects of the AA's postwar history, only one has generated a substantive body of research. The AA's Department of Tropical Architecture (DTA), established in 1954, has engaged the interest of scholars researching the postcolonial exchange between British architects and their counterparts in the newly independent countries of Africa and Asia. Patrick Wakely (1983), a former student and tutor at the department, published a synopsis of its history, evidently the outcome of personal conversations with his former superior Otto Koenigsberger, who had been a driving force behind its foundation and headed it for most of its existence.<sup>41</sup> Mark Crinson (2003) traces the emergence of the DTA within a specifically British postwar, post-imperial discourse,<sup>42</sup> whilst Hannah Le Roux (2003) highlights its significance as a node in the networks

---

<sup>35</sup> Deyan Sudjic, 'John Miller: Biographical Notes', in: John Miller (ed.), *Custom and Innovation: John Miller + Partners*, London 2009, pp. 8-15; see also: Mark Swenarton, Thomas Weaver, 'In Conversation with John Miller', *AA Files*, no. 70 (2015), pp. 124-137.

<sup>36</sup> Denise Scott Brown, 'Learning from Brutalism', in: David Robbins (ed.), *The Independent Group: Postwar Britain and the Aesthetics of Plenty*, Cambridge MA 1990, pp. 203-206; Denise Scott Brown, *Having Words*, London 2009; pp. 24-27.

<sup>37</sup> Kenneth Powell, *Ahrends, Burton and Koralek*, London 2012, pp. 7-12; see also: Peter Blundell-Jones, *Ahrends, Burton and Koralek*, London 1991, pp. 7-8.

<sup>38</sup> James Gowan, *Style and Configuration*, London 1994, pp. 8-20; see also: Ellis Woodman, *Modernity and Reinvention: The Architecture of James Gowan*, London 2008, pp. 185-190.

<sup>39</sup> Alan Powers, 'Flying Angels and Solid Walls', *AA Files*, no. 64 (2012), pp. 48-58.

<sup>40</sup> Simon Sadler, *Archigram: Architecture without Architecture*, Cambridge MA 2005, pp. 20-24 et pass.; see also: Simon Sadler, 'The Brutal Birth of Archigram', in: Elaine Harwood, Alan Powers (eds.), *The Sixties*, London 2002, pp. 119-128; Simon Sadler, 'Archigram's invisible university', *Architectural Research Quarterly*, vol. 6, no. 3 (2002), pp. 247-255.

<sup>41</sup> Patrick Wakely, 'The Development of a School: An Account of the Department of Development and Tropical Studies of the Architectural Association', *Habitat International*, vol. 7, no. 5/6 (1983), pp. 337-346.

<sup>42</sup> Mark Crinson, *Modern Architecture and the End of Empire*, Aldershot 2003, pp. 132-137.

of tropical architecture.<sup>43</sup> Two doctoral theses touch on the same topic – the first, by Vandana Baweja (2008), a monograph on Koenigsberger;<sup>44</sup> the second, by Jiat-Hwee Chang (2009), a meticulous study into the genealogy of tropical architecture using Singapore as a case study.<sup>45</sup> Chang’s dissertation investigates the broader educational and political context from which the DTA originated as well as the course itself and must be considered the authoritative account on both. More recent contributions such as Iain Jackson and Jessica Holland’s monograph about Fry and Drew (2014) or Rachel Lee’s essay on education in her co-edited anthology about Koenigsberger’s work in India (2015) have further substantiated the reputation of the DTA.<sup>46</sup> The present thesis has no intention to challenge the findings of these papers as regards the profound international impact of the DTA, but it questions an underlying assumption, first made by Wakely and since perpetuated, of its inception as being more or less incidental to the AA.<sup>47</sup>

With the exception of the DTA, the postwar period at the AA has attracted little research from historians, and much the same can be said about British architectural education in general. The previous section has highlighted the role of education as an arena for the directional disputes within the profession. In spite of this, most of the key publications on postwar architecture deal with the topic only in passing or, indeed, not at all. Anthony Jackson’s *The Politics of Architecture* (1970) was arguably the first to put forward a comprehensive narrative of modern architecture in Britain from its beginnings in the 1920s,<sup>48</sup> whilst Lionel Esher’s rather personal

---

<sup>43</sup> Hannah Le Roux, ‘The networks of tropical architecture’, *Journal of Architecture*, vol. 8 (Autumn 2003), pp. 337-354.

<sup>44</sup> Vandana Baweja, ‘A Pre-history of Green Architecture: Otto Koenigsberger and Tropical Architecture, from Princely Mysore to Post-colonial London’, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, April 2008; see also: Vandana Baweja, ‘Otto Koenigsberger and Modernist Historiography’, *Fabrications*, vol. 26 (2016), no. 2, pp. 202-226.

<sup>45</sup> Jiat-Hwee Chang, ‘A Genealogy of Tropical Architecture: Singapore in the British (Post)Colonial Networks of Nature, Technoscience and Governmentality, 1830s to 1960s’, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, Spring 2009; see also: Jiat-Hwee Chang, ‘Building a Colonial Technoscientific Network: tropical architecture, building science and the politics of decolonization’, in: Duanfang Lu (ed.), *Third World Modernism: Architecture, Development and Identity*, Abingdon 2010, pp. 211-235; Jiat-Hwee Chang, ‘Thermal comfort and climatic design in the tropics: an historical critique’, *Journal of Architecture*, vol. 21, no. 8 (2016), pp. 1171-1202.

<sup>46</sup> Iain Jackson, Jessica Holland, *The Architecture of Edwin Maxwell Fry and Jane Drew*, Aldershot 2014; Rachel Lee, ‘Education’, in: Tile von Damm, Anne-Katrin Fenk, Rachel Lee (eds.), *Otto Koenigsberger: Architecture and Urban Visions in India*, Bengaluru/Berlin 2015, pp. 94-103.

<sup>47</sup> Wakely 1983, pp. 337-338; see also: David Toppin, ‘Koenigsberger: Early days abroad’, *AJ*, 7 July 1982, pp. 36-37.

<sup>48</sup> Anthony Jackson, *The Politics of Architecture*, London 1970.

survey *A Broken Wave* (1981) was the first to focus its attention solely on the postwar period.<sup>49</sup> Both studies investigate the political, economical and technological forces which shaped British postwar architecture, but neither includes education in its discussion. Nicholas Bullock's *Building the Post-War World* (2002) centres upon the country's reconstruction efforts between 1945 and 1955 and is divided into two parts, the first dealing with the debate on new architectural approaches, the second with the practical implementation of these approaches over the course of the decade.<sup>50</sup> As to the former, Bullock identifies the schools of architecture, and specifically the AA, as one of three venues where a 'search for new directions' took place (the other two being architectural publications and the MARS Group), but the analysis remains largely limited to the student magazine *PLAN*.<sup>51</sup> John Gold's *The Practice of Modernism* (2007), a sequel to *The Experience of Modernism*, covers roughly the same topic and time frame as Esher's *A Broken Wave*, albeit in a more scholarly fashion.<sup>52</sup> Singularly amongst the authors in this section, Gold examines the formative years of his protagonists and attaches considerable weight to their educational backgrounds, even though a detailed analysis was clearly outside his scope of inquiry.<sup>53</sup> Alan Powers's *Britain* (2007)<sup>54</sup> and Elain Harwood's *Space, Hope and Brutalism* (2014) complete our picture of British (or – in Harwood's case – English) postwar architecture. Powers dedicates two chapters of a book which spans the entire twentieth century to the postwar period; Harwood provides an authoritative account of the three decades following the end of the war, based on an in-depth analysis of its most prevalent building tasks. Neither author puts particular emphasis on architectural training as a potential source of architectural production.<sup>55</sup>

On the whole, education is thus not a topic which features prominently in the literature on British postwar architecture, and there exists at present only one survey

---

<sup>49</sup> Lionel Esher, *A Broken Wave: The Rebuilding of England 1940-1980*, London 1981.

<sup>50</sup> Nicholas Bullock, *Building the Post-War World: Modern Architecture and Reconstruction in Britain*, London 2002. Saint's *Towards a Social Architecture* (op. cit.), which centres upon the Hertfordshire schools programme, belongs in the same context.

<sup>51</sup> Bullock 2002, pp. 39-42; quote p. 39.

<sup>52</sup> John R. Gold, *The Practice of Modernism: Modern Architects and Urban Transformation, 1954-1972*, London 2007.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 24-30.

<sup>54</sup> Alan Powers, *Britain: Modern Architectures in History*, London 2007, pp. 88-161.

<sup>55</sup> Elain Harwood, *Space, Hope and Brutalism*, New Haven 2014.



which covers it monographically. Mark Crinson and Jules Lubbock's *Architecture: Art or Profession* (1994) summarises the history of British architectural education from its origins in the seventeenth century to the end of the twentieth and in its early sections draws upon a number of well-known studies by, amongst others, John Summerson (1947), Howard Colvin (1954), Barrington Kaye (1960) and Frank Jenkins (1961).<sup>56</sup> The particular value of their research lies in their continuing the story into, and beyond, the postwar years. The authors characterise these as a time of drastic change and uncertainty in architectural education. A growing number of schools abandoned their Beaux-Arts principles and adopted modernist, Bauhaus-inspired methods, and the initial lack of binding pedagogic standards allowed progressive schools such as the AA to become 'breeding grounds for new architectural imagery, experiments, styles, theories and fashions.'<sup>57</sup> This time of curricular experimentation and diversity came to a close with the Oxford Conference in 1958 and the subsequent implementation of the so-called 'Official System', i.e. the phasing out of pupillage in favour of a university-based educational system enforced and controlled by the RIBA. Crinson and Lubbock adopt the narrative of a 'new breed of younger, public authority modernists' such as William Allen, Stirrat Johnson-Marshall, Robert Matthew and Leslie Martin, who portrayed this process as the result of their conspiring to infiltrate the RIBA and aligning its Board of Architectural Education (BAE) with their objectives.<sup>58</sup> The schools emerge from this narrative as impotent bodies at the mercy of the BAE, on whose policy they had no influence whatsoever. The present thesis questions this account, at least in so far as the AA is concerned.

Crinson and Lubbock's survey, published more than twenty years ago, offered an excellent platform for further research, yet this has barely happened. Three universities have published histories of their schools of architecture but only one of these – on Cardiff (2009) – examines the postwar years in some detail.<sup>59</sup> Unlike for

---

<sup>56</sup> Crinson and Lubbock 1994, op. cit.; see also: Summerson 1947, op. cit.; Howard Colvin, *A Biographical Dictionary of British Architects 1600-1840*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London 1978 (first publ. 1954), pp. 18-41; Kaye 1960, op. cit.; Frank Jenkins, *Architect and Patron*, London 1961. Another important source for the history of the architectural profession is: A. M. Carr-Saunders, P. A. Wilson, *The Professions*, Oxford 1933, pp. 176-194.

<sup>57</sup> Crinson and Lubbock 1994, p. 1.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 131-134 et passim; quote p. 131.

<sup>59</sup> Christopher Powell, *The Welsh School of Architecture. 1920-2008: a History*, Cardiff 2009, pp. 29-38. The other two are: Peter Blundell Jones, *University of Sheffield School of Architecture 1908-2008*, Sheffield

instance the United States, where a substantial body of scholarship on postwar architectural education exists,<sup>60</sup> there has been surprisingly little such research in this country, and almost none into the period preceding the Oxford Conference. Robert Maxwell (2000) has written about the pedagogical approaches developed at the Bartlett and at Cambridge in the 1960s,<sup>61</sup> the latter also the subject of more recent papers by Peter Carolin (2012)<sup>62</sup> and Philip Steadman (2016)<sup>63</sup> as well as a doctoral dissertation by Sean Keller (2005).<sup>64</sup> At least four PhD theses – by Rachel Sara (2004)<sup>65</sup>, William Carpenter (2004)<sup>66</sup>, James Benedict Brown (2012)<sup>67</sup> and Harriet Harriss (2014)<sup>68</sup> – centre on ‘live projects’ and thus, to various extents, on Douglas Jones’s pioneering scheme at the Birmingham School of Architecture from 1951 onward. Looking at the AA’s educational setup in its entirety and over the space of two decades, the present thesis sits between these topical studies and the broader, more conventionally historical work of Crinson and Lubbock.

---

2008; Jack Dunne, Peter Richmond, *The World in One School. The History and Influence of the Liverpool School of Architecture 1894-2008*, Liverpool 2008. Incidentally, there are a number of studies on Liverpool’s earlier history, notably: Joseph Sharples, Alan Powers, Michael Shippbottom, *Charles Reilly & The Liverpool School of Architecture 1904-1933*, ex. cat., Liverpool 1996; Donald M. Peacock, ‘Charles Reilly and architectural education in Britain’, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Keele University, May 1999; Christopher Crouch, *Design Culture in Liverpool 1880-1914*, Liverpool 2002.

<sup>60</sup> E.g.: Alexander Caragone, *The Texas Rangers: notes from an architectural underground*, Cambridge MA 1995; Anthony Alofsin, *The Struggle for Modernism*, New York / London 2002, pp. 196-263; David Louis Sterrett Brook, ‘Henry Leveke Kampfhofner, The Modernist, Dean of the North Carolina State University School of Design 1948-1972’, unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, 2005; Jill Pearlman, *Inventing American Modernism: Joseph Hudnut, Walter Gropius, and the Bauhaus Legacy at Harvard*, Charlottesville 2007; Arindam Dutta (ed.), *A Second Modernism: MIT, Architecture and the ‘Techno-Social’ Moment*, Cambridge MA 2013.

<sup>61</sup> Robert Maxwell, ‘Education for the creative act’, *Architectural Research Quarterly*, vol. 4, no. 1 (March 2000), pp. 55-66.

<sup>62</sup> Peter Carolin, ‘An Outsider’s Reflections’, in: Ranald Lawrence, Daniel Godoy-Shimizu (eds.), *Prospect: 100 Years Research + Practice*, pp. 17-29, Cambridge 2012, <http://www.arct.cam.ac.uk/news/100years-research-practice> [accessed 1 Dec 2016].

<sup>63</sup> Philip Steadman, ‘Research in architecture and urban studies at Cambridge in the 1960s and 1970s: what really happened’, *Journal of Architecture*, vol. 21, no. 2 (2016), pp. 291-306.

<sup>64</sup> Sean Blair Keller, ‘Systems Aesthetics: Architectural Theory at the University of Cambridge, 1960–75’, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 2005; see also: Sean Keller, ‘Fenland Tech: Architectural Science in Postwar Cambridge’, *Grey Room*, no. 23 (Spring 2006), pp. 40-65.

<sup>65</sup> Rachel Sara, ‘Between studio and street: the role of the live project in architectural education’, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Sheffield, 2004.

<sup>66</sup> William J. Carpenter, ‘Design and Construction in Architectural Education 1963-2003’, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Central England in Birmingham, Dec 2004.

<sup>67</sup> James Benedict Brown, ‘A critique of the live project’, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Queen’s University Belfast, 2012, <https://learningarchitecture.wordpress.com/2013/01/10/download-the-full-text-of-my-phd-a-critique-of-the-live-project> [accessed 1 Dec 2016].

<sup>68</sup> Harriet E. Harriss, ‘Architecture Live Projects acquiring and applying missing practice-ready skills’, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oxford Brookes University, June 2014.

To sum up, this thesis seeks to fill an existing gap in scholarship on the AA. It covers the first two decades after the Second World War, linking up with a number of studies on the immediate pre-war period at one end, and Irene Sunwoo's doctoral research at the other. In doing so, the thesis hopes to provide the groundwork for future topical or monographic studies. Moreover, it aspires to complement – and in a sense mirror – Crinson and Lubbock's pioneering work on the historiography of British architectural education in the second half of the twentieth century. Whilst *Architecture: Art or Profession* puts its argument from the perspective of the RIBA, this thesis takes the opposite vantage point and examines the changes in architectural education through the lens of one of the country's major schools of architecture – one, incidentally, whose pedagogical approach differed profoundly from the RIBA mainstream.

## Sources and Methods

The AA's archive was opened to the public in 2010 and holds the administrative and educational records of the association, less than a quarter of which have as yet been formally catalogued. The most important amongst these are the minutes of the council<sup>69</sup> and its school committee<sup>70</sup>, which together form the backbone of this dissertation. The council as the governing body of the association set the parameters for educational policy and appointed the principal, who was given sole authority over the running of the school, including its curriculum design and staffing arrangements. The principal was an ex-officio member of the school committee, the council's largest and (along with the finance committee) most important sub-committee. Its role was effectively advisory since the council, as a matter of principle, chose not to interfere with the principal's actions unless they involved unbudgeted

---

<sup>69</sup> *Minutes of the AA Council 1927-1935*, AAA, Box C105 (hereafter cited as CM 1927-35); *Minutes of the AA Council 1935-1940*, *ibid.*, Box 2007:36 (hereafter cited as CM 1935-40); *Minutes of the AA Council 1940-1949*, *ibid.*, Box 2007:64 (hereafter cited as CM 1940-49); *Minutes of the AA Council 1949-1955*, *ibid.*, Box 2007:65 (hereafter cited as CM 1949-55); CM 1955-61; *Minutes of the AA Council 1961-1965*, AAA, Box 2007:67 (hereafter cited as CM 1961-65); *Minutes of the AA Council 1965-1970*, *ibid.*, Box 2007:68 (hereafter cited as CM 1965-70).

<sup>70</sup> *Minutes of the AA School Committee 1928-1937*, *ibid.*, Box C402b (hereafter cited as SCM 1928-37); *Minutes of the AA School Committee 1937-1944*, *ibid.*, Box C402a (hereafter cited as SCM 1937-44); *Minutes of the AA School Committee 1944-1951*, *ibid.*, Box C403 (hereafter cited as SCM 1944-51); *Minutes of the AA School Committee 1951-1963*, AAA, Box 2006:S13b (hereafter cited as SCM 1951-63).

expenditure. Generally speaking, the principal's reports to the school committee, attached to its minutes, offer a forthright account of the state of the school at any given time; the minutes themselves summarise the ensuing discussions, often in considerable detail. Verbatim minutes are rare but do exist, as in the case of the short-lived council/staff/students' committee of the early 1950s.<sup>71</sup> Apart from these and other catalogued holdings such as the school prospectuses and the archive's collection of student work the author has examined all archive folders which are, at present, presumed to contain material pertaining to the postwar decades.

Other archival sources have been consulted where appropriate. Most important are the records of the RIBA's Board of Architectural Education held at the Victoria and Albert Museum in London and of the Ministry of Education held at the National Archives in Kew, which have both been used throughout the thesis. In addition, the CIAM and Sigfried Giedion archives held at ETH Zurich have contributed to Chapter 1, the papers of the Association of Building Technicians held at the Modern Records Centre in Coventry and of the Communist Party held at the People's History Museum in Manchester to Chapter 2, and the records of the London County Council held at the London Metropolitan Archives to Chapter 6. The private papers of William Allen, the AA's principal between 1961 and 1965, and his nemesis Alvin Boyarsky – both in the possession of their respective families – have been indispensable in reconstructing the proceedings of the mid-1960s (Chapter 7), especially as the school committee minutes for the period from 1963 are seemingly absent in the AA Archives. Regrettably, the papers of Allen's predecessors are lost, and none of them has published any autobiographical works.

The findings derived from these archival sources are supplemented by testimonies of those who studied or taught at the AA in the postwar period. The pitfalls of oral history are well known: interviewees are naturally tempted and implicitly encouraged to overstate their role in the events they describe, and their present perspective inevitably informs their accounts, which, with the benefit of hindsight, are often

---

<sup>71</sup> *Minutes of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee 1952-1953*, *ibid.*, Box 2003:12D (hereafter cited as CSSCM 1952-53); see Chapter 4.

rationalised as being driven by a sense of historical necessity.<sup>72</sup> Witness testimonies are unreliable at the best of times and more so still when they concern events which happened over half a century ago. As Peter Smithson said: ‘You can disbelieve anything I remember about fifty years ago because it is over the edge of real memory.’<sup>73</sup>

The distinct nature of the AA adds its own particular question mark. A ‘self-propelling institution’<sup>74</sup> which habitually feeds its graduates back into staff and council positions, the AA provides fertile soil for the spread and entrenchment of rumours, half-truths and myths which often have little basis in reality. The thesis acknowledges the significance of such myths as a driving factor in the history of the AA but has, of course, no wish to perpetuate them. In fact, the lack of existing research into the postwar history of the AA appears itself to have become something of a myth amongst the members of that particular student generation, many of whom expressed their suspicions that, to quote one of them, ‘there was something of a conspiracy of silence during the Boyarsky years.’<sup>75</sup> The author has benefitted from this in so far as in the vast majority of cases his requests for interviews met with an enthusiastic response from former students. On the other hand, some of them clearly saw it as an opportunity to ‘set the record straight’, which may have coloured their statements and comments.

Notwithstanding such reservations, there are two particular reasons for employing oral history as part of this study. First, the nature of education in large measure depends on the personal interaction between teachers and students (and amongst students themselves) and is thus generally a topic which leaves comparably few written traces. The second and more important reason lies in the fact that AA students took an unusually active part in the affairs of the school. Though they never sat on the council or chose their own principal, as some of them would like to remember, they were represented on some of the council’s standing committees and

---

<sup>72</sup> For an excellent critique of oral history interviews, albeit in a somewhat different context, see: Robert Proctor, ‘The Architect’s Intention: Interpreting Post-War Modernism through the Architect Interview’, *Journal of Design History*, vol. 19, no. 4 (Winter 2006), pp. 295-307.

<sup>73</sup> Quoted in: Catherine Spellman, Karl Unglaub (eds.), *Peter Smithson: Conversations with Students*, New York 2005, p. 24.

<sup>74</sup> Gowan 1994, op. cit., p. 10.

<sup>75</sup> Robert Maguire, email to the author, 2 Sep 2013.

regularly invited to serve on its working parties. Moreover, through a variety of informal channels the students exercised a manifest influence on the educational direction of the school (see e.g. Chapter 4). Unfortunately, the AA does not (and probably never did) hold the minutes of the students' committee, which orchestrated such initiatives. Oral history interviews, no matter their flaws, offer the only available way to assess the students' vital contributions from a non-council point of view.<sup>76</sup>

The author has carried out and fully transcribed twenty interviews with former students and staff (and has otherwise communicated with many more). Interviews were of one to four hours' duration, conversational and largely unstructured, on the assumption that a more formalised approach might unduly confine the investigation to the topical boundaries set by the council minutes and held in any way little promise considering the large time gap between the interview and the events in question. Broadly speaking, oral testimonies have been used to complement and contextualise archival findings. In some cases they have indicated the need for additional research in previously unsuspected areas, a prime example being the political dimension of Principal Robert Furneaux Jordan's departure in 1951 (see Chapter 2). In addition to the interviews conducted by the author, the thesis makes ample use of conversations recorded for the 'Architects' Lives' collection of the British Library Sound Archive, including with long-deceased former members of the AA council such as Peter Shephard, John Brandon-Jones and Jim Cadbury-Brown. In general, discrepancies between archival and oral evidence have been remarkably rare, and the power of recollection of former AA students has been the source of some amazement to the author.

A third and final source of this thesis are contemporary periodicals. 'It is,' wrote Gowan, 'in the nature of the AA that it conducts its affairs in public, however embarrassing this might be.'<sup>77</sup> Indeed, the technical press – particularly the weeklies *Builder*, *Architects' Journal* and *Architect and Building News* – followed the proceedings at the AA with great interest, and their usually well-informed editorial comments form an integral part of the narrative of this thesis. A more obvious

---

<sup>76</sup> Incidentally, two interviewees – Stephen Macfarlane and the late Chris Whittaker – gave generous access to their private papers, which in both cases contained records of the students' committee.

<sup>77</sup> Gowan 1994, p. 12.

resource is the AA's in-house magazine *AA Journal*, published ten times a year to keep the membership up to date with association affairs. For much of the postwar period up until 1957 the *AA Journal* was little more than an informative, if slightly dull, mouthpiece of the AA council, produced by a salaried editor and supervised by the council's honorary editor.<sup>78</sup> Apart from the frequent display of student work, its most useful features as regards the present thesis were the reports of general meetings, the annual presidential addresses and, most notably, the principal's 'state-of-the-nation' speeches at the annual prize-giving ceremonies. In 1957 the journal's policy changed profoundly, as the council set up an editorial board and appointed John Killick as the editor-in-chief, both the outcome of sustained student agitation (see Chapter 4). Killick remodeled the *AA Journal* in both look and content, with each issue henceforth centred upon a particular topic and aimed at a wider readership. This policy, which was continued under Killick's successor Paul Oliver from October 1961 onward, implied a certain disengagement from the AA, which accordingly diminishes the journal's value for this study in that particular period. In this sense, the most fruitful phase in the *AA Journal's* history was the editorship of John Smith from April 1963 to May 1965. Unprecedentedly and much to the dismay of the council, Smith used his position and particularly his editorial column (itself a novelty) to fuel the controversies which preoccupied the AA in the mid-1960s (see Chapter 7).<sup>79</sup>

## Thesis Structure

The ultimate responsibility for the running of both the association and the school lay with the council, an annually elected body consisting largely, albeit not exclusively, of AA graduates. Some members of council play a major, and at times determining, role in the events recounted, particularly where they concern negotiations with outside bodies or the arbitration of internal disputes. For instance, Hugh Casson (council 1945-55; president 1953/54), freshly knighted for his work

---

<sup>78</sup> The editors in the postwar years were Eric Jarrett (Jan 1945 – Sep 1948), Philip Scholberg (Nov 1948 – Sep 1950) and Arthur Shannon (Sep 1950 – May 1957).

<sup>79</sup> Smith's successors were Clem Shephard (interim, May–Sep 1965) and Frank Duffy (from Sep 1965), who ran a less confrontational course.

on the Festival of Britain, emerges as a key figure in the turbulent events of the early 1950s; Peter Shephard (council 1946-56; president 1954/55) was chiefly responsible for obtaining the government's approval for a partial reinstatement of the students' voting rights in 1956; John Brandon-Jones (council 1951-59; president 1957/58) and Denis Clarke Hall (council 1950-60; president 1958/59) were, on opposing sides of the argument, instrumental in the AA's deliberations regarding an integrated college of architecture and building in the late 1950s; and in the first half of the following decade ACP members Leo De Syllas (council 1956-64) and Anthony Cox (council 1956-65; president 1962/63) masterminded a complete repositioning of the school centred upon a proposed merger with the Imperial College of Science and Technology.

However, more often than not the annual changeover of the council prevented members from exercising a sustained influence on the direction of the school, and even when they served for an extended period, as was the case with Bryan Westwood (council 1947-57; president 1955/56), John Michael Austin-Smith (council 1950-63; president 1961/62) or Gabriel Epstein (council 1956-65; president 1964/65), they usually did so with restraint – as was indeed the intention. The council was neither expected nor able to formulate and implement a policy for the school, which was – at least in theory – the principal's domain. Though in practice this setup proved flawed, not least because control over the school's finances gave the council a powerful tool to make its changing viewpoint felt, the degree of authority which rested with the AA principal was nonetheless considerable, and changes in school policy and outlook usually did correspond with changes in leadership. The basic structure of the thesis is therefore chronological and reflects the succession of principals. The chapters themselves, however, are topical, and issues which may take centre stage at a specific moment in the school's history often have their roots in previous years. In such instances, the discussion is not confined to a narrow time window.

Chapters 1, 2 and 3 address themselves to the immediate postwar years from 1945 to 1951. Chapter 1 describes how the school, under Gordon Brown (1912-62; principal 1945-49), sought to cope with a sudden increase in student numbers and



enhance its international reputation. Brown's successor Robert Furneaux Jordan (1905-78; principal 1949-51), whose term in office is the subject of Chapter 2, found the school in a rare state of affluence, which allowed him to operate within looser financial constraints. Driven by firm political convictions, Jordan implemented a teaching model which aimed at preparing his students for a professional future within the collaborative work environment of an all-embracing public sector. The postwar students themselves, many of them ex-service personnel, instigated an extraordinary range of activities within and beyond the AA. These are discussed in Chapter 3, which spans the same period as the previous two.

Chapters 4, 5 and 6 cover the decade-long tenure of Michael Pattrick (1913-80; principal 1951-61), each with a different theme. Chapter 4 continues the discussion of student activism, which led to great tensions within the school and culminated in the partial reinstatement of the students' voting rights in 1956. Chapter 5 examines Pattrick's changes to the educational model in the mid-1950s, which saw the foundation of the famous Department of Tropical Architecture as well as the introduction of a modified unit system and the appointment of a distinguished teaching staff around Peter Smithson and John Killick. Chapter 6 explores the school's difficulties in adapting its policy to the changing realities in British architectural education in the second half of the 1950s as the AA came under growing political and financial pressure.

Chapter 7 discusses the appointment of William Allen (1914-98; principal 1961-65) and the plan to merge the AA school with Imperial College, both driven by the intention to enhance the professional status of AA graduates and expand their sphere of influence. This technocratic vision manifested itself in a rebalancing between studio teaching and lecture courses, which met with fierce resistance from the staff and student body and left Allen – the only postwar principal who had not studied at the AA – increasingly isolated in the school.

The main chapters are framed by a prologue and an epilogue which locate the thesis in a broader continuum. The prologue gives a thumbnail history of the AA until the end of the Second World War. The period up until the mid-1930s is examined

through secondary sources, notably Summerson's book of 1947; the account of the immediate pre-war and war years, though not part of the main body of this thesis, presents new research based on archival records. The brief epilogue, which discusses the aftermath of Allen's departure, culminating in the failure of the Imperial College merger scheme and Boyarsky's election as chairman in 1971, is based on Sunwoo's doctoral thesis, supplemented by new archival research.

Three appendices supply additional information: Appendix 1 documents the importance of AA graduates in British postwar architecture. Appendix 2 provides chronological lists of council members (2.1), principals and studio staff (2.2), and students (2.3). Appendix 3 illustrates student work, including but not limited to the projects mentioned in the text, and aspires to give a comprehensive view of the course delivered at the AA in the postwar period.

## PROLOGUE:

### A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE ARCHITECTURAL ASSOCIATION (1847-1944)

In Victorian Britain young men (and rarely women) who wished to train as architects did so by attaching themselves to a practising master who, for a period of five or six years and in return for a fee, gave them instruction in drawing, measuring, site work and office organisation.<sup>80</sup> Pupillage offered a fluent passage from training to practice, but it had its drawbacks. Though articled pupils did not necessarily share the fate of Martin Chuzzlewit, who – in Charles Dickens’s eponymous novel of 1843 – endures exploitation at the hands of his hypocritical master, the lack of regulation left the pupillage system open to abuse and the quality of training varied considerably.<sup>81</sup> Moreover, pupillage was an inherently restrictive teaching method, which at best perpetuated a master’s craft but gave ambitious students little scope to expand their knowledge and develop their design faculties. The Royal Academy provided a limited range of supplementary facilities, including a library, drawing classes and lectures on architectural theory, and from the early 1840s both King’s College and University College arranged preparatory courses in architecture for intending pupils. However, none of these institutions offered design classes, nor did they provide a forum for debate on architectural matters.

#### Inception and Early Proceedings

The formation of the Architectural Association (AA) was a direct response to this state of affairs. In September 1842 James Wylson, the chief draughtsman in a leading London practice, formed the ‘Association of Architectural Draughtsmen’ (AAD), whose members sought to perfect their trade through self-improvement, build up a collection of architectural drawings and keep an employment register. Soon after, an articled pupil named Robert Kerr, using the pseudonym ‘R’, unleashed a ‘stream of vivacious and provocative copy’<sup>82</sup> against the vices of

---

<sup>80</sup> For architectural education in the mid-nineteenth century see: Crinson and Lubbock 1994, pp. 44-50.

<sup>81</sup> For *Martin Chuzzlewit* see e.g.: Saint 1983, pp. 51-54.

<sup>82</sup> Summerson 1947, p. 3.

pupillage in the correspondence columns of the *Builder*, and in September 1846 Charles Gray, another pupil, writing over the signature ‘An Architectural Student’, complained to the same paper about the impossibility of obtaining any substantive instruction in architectural design and suggested that, if the government was unable or unwilling to pit itself against the vested interests of their masters, the pupils themselves might take the initiative and organise their own school: ‘What is to prevent such if a number of us put our shoulders to the wheel and form it?’<sup>83</sup> By the end of the year Kerr had made contact with Gray, and together they persuaded the AAD to join forces by establishing an architectural society ‘for the benefit of those connected with the profession in the capacities of student and draughtsmen’<sup>84</sup>, i.e. with the objective of forming a school of architecture.

The AA, whose inaugural meeting took place on 8 October 1847, thus owed its existence to the initiative of youth – Kerr was 23, Gray only 18 – and though the average age of its members soon rose as many of them retained their membership after completing their training, the AA on principle remained receptive to the ideas of its youngest and most rebellious members. In other ways, too, the early activities of the AA set the tone for its future proceedings. Initially, these were a weekly affair taking place on Friday evenings, alternately in the form of general meetings or design classes. General meetings provided a forum for the uninhibited and often passionate discussion of papers read by members, which contrasted with the more august occasions at the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA). The real novelty, however, was the AA’s design class. In the absence of teachers, the learning process was based on mutual criticism: subjects were announced on a printed circular, and students brought their schemes to the following meeting for an informal discussion with their peers. Even when the AA eventually hired professional instructors, the relationship between tutors and students remained collegial and informal, and the same egalitarian spirit was to pervade the AA’s pioneering ‘juries’, which invited the participation of critics, students and observers alike and thus, despite their

---

<sup>83</sup> Cited *ibid.*

<sup>84</sup> Cited *ibid.*, p. 5.

nomenclature, differed profoundly from the closed and monologic Beaux-Arts juries.<sup>85</sup>

### **The AA, the RIBA and the Systematisation of Architectural Education**

The AA initially flourished and within four years managed to increase its membership from an initial two dozen to 166.<sup>86</sup> Yet the charm of novelty soon wore off: attendances at meetings declined, and by 1854 the AA, which depended on membership dues to cover its costs, was facing insolvency. ‘Curiously enough,’ wrote Summerson, ‘at this gloomy juncture, the Association set going a project which was to have the most important consequences not only on the future of the Association but on professional life as a whole.’<sup>87</sup> This ‘project’ aimed at the creation of an examination system as the basis for a qualifying diploma for architects – an idea first advanced by James Knowles in an AA prize essay of 1853 and endorsed by AA President Alfred Bailey in a paper two years later. RIBA President William Pite, who attended Bailey’s talk, adopted and promoted the idea, and in 1863 the RIBA staged its first voluntary examination.<sup>88</sup> In anticipation of this, the AA had, in the year before, launched a ‘voluntary examination class’, thus ‘crystallizing,’ as Summerson put it, ‘for the first time, the concept of organized study tested by examination, as the foundation of the architect’s training.’<sup>89</sup> The voluntary examination class (soon rechristened the ‘class of construction and practice’), the original design class and a ‘junior class’, started in 1869, were the three pillars on which the AA’s educational system in the 1860s and 1870s rested, with additional classes added if and when required.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> Open juries are considered amongst the AA’s major contributions to design teaching. Peter Smithson, who taught at the AA in the late 1950s, considered them ‘the method of teaching’ and refused to serve on RIBA prize juries due to the fact that they made no provisions for students to defend their work. (Smithson, letter to Everard Haynes, 5 Dec 1960, Meeting of the RIBA Board of Architectural Education, 18 Jan 1961, Enclosure H, in: *Board of Architectural Education Minutes, 1907-1967*, RIBA/ED 7.1.1, RIBA Archives, London (hereafter cited as RIBA/ED 7.1.1).) By the time the present study sets in after the Second World War open juries were an established feature of the AA’s pedagogical setup. Their precise origin, however, is unclear and would warrant further study.

<sup>86</sup> Summerson 1947, p. 6.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*; Crinson and Lubbock 1994, pp. 56-57.

<sup>89</sup> Summerson 1947, p. 19.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

Despite the AA's advocacy, the RIBA's examinations remained of marginal interest until, in 1882, they were made a mandatory requirement to attain associateship. Five years later, the RIBA divided its examination system into three distinct stages – preliminary, intermediate and final – and the AA responded at once by aligning its syllabus to this new tripartite structure and remodelling its own educational setup. The evening course now lasted four years, all classes were supervised by experienced tutors (so-called 'visitors'), and from the early 1890s the school engaged paid experts to deliver its extended lecture programme. At the same time, Leonard Stokes, the influential president from 1889 to 1892, instigated a substantial revision of the AA's administrative apparatus. After a temporary slump in the mid-1850s the membership had increased rapidly and by 1890 stood at 1,129.<sup>91</sup> In the following year the AA appointed its first paid official, assistant secretary R. S. Glover<sup>92</sup>, to take charge of the day-to-day running of the association and to oversee its vastly expanded activities, which included the publication of a monthly journal, custodianship of a fast-growing library collection as well as frequent visits to buildings in London and an annual summer excursion to other parts of the country or abroad.

Throughout its early history the AA acted in harmony with the RIBA. Even so, the relationship between the two bodies (which between 1859 and 1891 shared the same premises on Conduit Street) was – and remained – ambivalent. For one, there was, initially at least, a fundamental difference in class, or rather status. The RIBA was controlled by its 'fellows', members at least seven years in private practice (and thus usually in the charge of one or more pupils), whereas the AA was effectively a pressure group of their underlings. According to Summerson, the RIBA 'never felt entirely easy about this adolescent rival,'<sup>93</sup> and in 1856, when the AA was in financial straits, it launched a takeover bid and proposed 'amalgamation' of the two bodies. This threat to its independence provided just the impetus the AA needed to pull itself out of its lethargy. In 1860 the members of the association passed a resolution stipulating the annual changeover of officers on its governing body. It

---

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., p. 16.

<sup>92</sup> Glover left after a few months and was succeeded by D. G. Driver, who served the AA until 1911 (ibid., p. 31).

<sup>93</sup> Ibid., p. 12.

was a most momentous decision as it not only stimulated the inflow of new members and helped reverse the trend of the previous years but effectively enshrined the principle of perpetual change and the corresponding absence of any long-term policy in the AA's constitution.<sup>94</sup>

A second and equally, if not in fact more, important reason for the latent tensions between the AA and the RIBA was one of jurisdiction. The AA never questioned the RIBA's prerogative as examining and degree-awarding body, but it saw itself, with some justification, as the initiator of the examination system on which the RIBA based this prerogative and thus, effectively, of British architectural education itself. The AA inferred from this a sense of entitlement in educational matters: it expected to be consulted on major decisions and never felt entirely bound by the standards set by the RIBA and its Board of Architectural Education (BAE), established in 1904. Inevitably, the existence of two organisations, both with a tenable claim to setting the agenda in architectural education, would give cause for conflict for decades to come.

### **The Rise of the Beaux-Arts System in the Early Twentieth Century**

By the early 1890s, the AA had evolved from a 'happy-go-lucky club for self-improvement'<sup>95</sup> into a professionally organised educational establishment with paid lecturers and instructors. The following three decades were essentially a period of consolidation and elaboration. In 1901 the AA established complementary day classes, intended to replace articulated pupillage and therefore purposely put under the direction of practising architects. As anticipated, the full-time day school gradually superseded the evening school and eventually, in 1917, eradicated it altogether.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>95</sup> Nikolaus Pevsner, 'The AA', *Architectural Review*, March 1948, vol. 103, no. 615, p. 121.

<sup>96</sup> According to Frank Yerbury, who joined the AA staff as an office boy in 1901, the success of the new day classes owed much to the leadership of H. P. G. Maule, the AA's principal between 1903 and 1912: 'Maule was the embodiment of enthusiasm. His was a keen and sparkling personality, and nothing was dull when he was about, and he certainly did a lot towards killing the criticism of many who thought that the only way to become an architect was the hard way, which meant pupillage and evening school.' Apparently, working for Maule was even more rewarding than studying under him. A passionate gambler and generous to a fault, he reportedly won £10,000 (more than a million in today's money) in a Calcutta sweep and distributed half of it amongst his office staff. A junior typist who had joined the practice three weeks prior received £100, the equivalent of £10,000 today. (F. R. Yerbury, 'Some AA Reminiscences – 2', *Builder*, 2 Jan 1948, p. 6.)

This development was accompanied by changing attitudes in style and pedagogy. In the early 1890s the AA, which had upheld a fiercely neutral stance throughout the mid-nineteenth-century ‘battle of styles’, entered a distinct Arts and Crafts phase.<sup>97</sup> Headed by H. P. G. Maule and with a governing committee dominated by Arts and Crafts devotees, the AA set up a ‘School of Design and Handicraft’ and arranged workshop demonstrations for its students at Lethaby’s Central School.<sup>98</sup> Yet this was but a brief period. In the Edwardian era Arts and Crafts ideals lost traction, and the AA steered towards a neo-classical approach.<sup>99</sup> Maule retired in 1912, and under his successor Robert Atkinson the AA followed Liverpool’s example and embraced a ‘half-understood Beaux-Arts style’.<sup>100</sup>

The outbreak of the First World War in July 1914 put any further development on hold as within the space of a few months only twenty students (out of more than two hundred) were left in the school.<sup>101</sup> Cut off from its main source of income, the AA devised a number of measures to generate additional revenue – in 1917 it finally admitted women to the school (albeit not yet to the membership of the association); it launched an appeal for money (and received a generous donation from the RIBA); and it sold the lease for its headquarters on Tufton Street and took up a more favourable one on its present premises in Bedford Square, which for the first time allowed it to provide club amenities for its non-student members.<sup>102</sup> When the war ended in November 1918, the student population almost immediately returned to its pre-war size. The AA ran refresher courses, organised an employment bureau and rented additional properties in the area, complemented, in 1919, by a new studio block in Morwell Street designed by Atkinson.<sup>103</sup>

Institutionally, this marked the moment when the AA set itself up in the form in which it would operate for the next fifty years, and in some part beyond that. In March 1920 the AA was incorporated at the government’s behest (see page 37), and

---

<sup>97</sup> Other schools in Liverpool, Birmingham and London witnessed a similar development. (Crinson and Lubbock 1994, pp. 65-66.)

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 71; for a more detailed account see Powers 1984, *op. cit.*

<sup>99</sup> Crinson and Lubbock 1994, pp. 72, 84; Summerson 1947, p. 39.

<sup>100</sup> Powers 1984, p. 59.

<sup>101</sup> Summerson 1947, p. 40.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 41-42.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 43-44.



the articles of association for the first time made provisions for women to join the association. The governance of the AA was entrusted to a council composed of ten ordinary members elected annually by the subscribing members plus eight officers, who were returned unopposed, and organised into different committees transacting specific aspects of its business. By far the largest and most important of these was the school committee, which was chaired by the president of the council (or the more senior of his two vice-presidents) and advised the principal on broader educational policy, the actual running of the school being left entirely to his own devices. Meanwhile, the various student societies were reconstituted as sections of the 'students' club', which comprised the entire student body and was managed by the students' committee.<sup>104</sup> Staff and students were represented on the council's house, general purpose, and (from 1953) library committees, but not on the school committee. In addition, the council could draw on the expertise of an advisory committee consisting of its past-presidents and other eminent members of the profession, which existed since 1885 but, like the students' committee, had neither legal nor statutory standing.

Pedagogically, the school continued on Beaux-Arts principles derived from French and American models. In 1920 Atkinson instituted a five-year course, to which the RIBA granted exemption from its final examination, and later that year he retired to the less demanding position of 'director of education'. The council appointed as its new principal the AA- and Beaux-Arts-trained Howard Robertson, who, upon his return from the services, had briefly run a Beaux-Arts type 'atelier' at the school. By the early 1920s, the AA had completely aligned its course with the RIBA's examination syllabus and abandoned its evening classes, the last vestiges of the pupillage system. 'It may be said,' wrote Summerson, 'that [...] the final consummation had been reached of the great changes begun under Stokes's presidency of 1889-1891.'<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> Initially, the students' committee consisted of two elected representatives from each year plus three women representatives. The latter provision was subsequently dropped, reducing the students' committee to ten members. Under the unit system (see p. 33) each unit deployed one representative, and the students' committee consequently comprised fifteen members. When the year system was reintroduced after the war (see p. 54), each year nominated three representatives due to the large number of students. When this number dropped again in the early 1950s the number of students was reduced to two per year and the committee reverted to its previous size.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid., p. 45.

## The Question of Modernism: *Focus* and the Unit System

The rise of modernism in the early 1920s did not go unnoticed at the AA. The *AA Journal* reviewed Le Corbusier's *Vers une architecture* in 1924;<sup>106</sup> the AA organised several excursions to Holland, Sweden and Germany; and Robertson invited prominent European architects such as Hakon Ahlberg, Werner Hegemann and Erich Mendelsohn to lecture at the AA.<sup>107</sup> Indeed, it was chiefly through a series of 'travel reports' in the *Architect and Buildings News* written by Robertson in conjunction with Frank Yerbury, since 1912 the secretary of the association, that in the second half of the 1920s a broader British public woke up to the new phenomenon on the continent.<sup>108</sup> According to Summerson, the influence of modernism 'spread furiously'<sup>109</sup>, though perhaps not quite as furiously as he seemed to remember. In 1962 Robert Furneaux Jordan, who – unlike Summerson – had studied at the AA at the time, told a general meeting of the association:

Let us not in our loyalty to the Architectural Association imagine that it was always in the van of modern architecture. I was a student in the AA in the late 'twenties; I was here when *Vers Une Architecture* and the *Ville Radieuse* were being published. We were so busy popping over to Stockholm that we were unaware of them. Our attention was not drawn to them. In fact let us be honest; I think that many of my generation were not even aware of the Bauhaus until it was shut.<sup>110</sup>

Be that as it may, in the early 1930s modernist ideas began to infuse the training at the AA. Howard Robertson, despite his educational background and inclination, was broad-minded enough to create a permissive learning environment which allowed for a variety of formal expressions as long as they arose logically from the

---

<sup>106</sup> V. O. Rees, 'Vers une architecture', *AAJ*, vol. 40, no. 451, pp. 64-67.

<sup>107</sup> Mendelsohn subsequently recommended the school to his pupil Gabriel Epstein: 'If you must, go to the AA, go to London. It is probably the best school.' (Quoted in: 'Gabriel Epstein interviewed by Niamh Dillon', *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London (hereafter cited as BLSA/Epstein), Track 1/7 (24 Sep 2009).)

<sup>108</sup> The AA Photolibrary holds the 'F R Yerbury Collection', which consists of more than 3,000 images he took on these travels. For Robertson's role in disseminating modernism in England in general, and at the AA in particular, see: Reyner Banham, 'Howard Robertson', *Architectural Review*, Sep 1953, vol. 114, no. 681, pp. 162-163; see also Higgott 2007, pp. 20-30.

<sup>109</sup> Summerson 1947, p. 47.

<sup>110</sup> Quoted in: 'Annual General Meeting', *AAJ*, Dec 1962, vol. 78, no. 867, p. 198. James Richards, a near contemporary of Jordan's, concurred: 'Very little of what was going on on the continent reached us at the AA. [...] One or two members of staff, R. A. Duncan for instance, had an inkling that things were changing, but I can't say that the AA, in the 1920s, was linked up with what we now call the modern movement.' (Sherban Cantacuzino, 'Sir James Richards Interview', in: Gowan 1975, p. 45.)

problem in hand.<sup>111</sup> Thus, from about 1932 student work showed signs of a distinctively modernist vocabulary.<sup>112</sup> More importantly, the spirit of social idealism and scientific enquiry which had inspired the creation of this vocabulary infected a growing number of students and staff, challenging the ideological certainties of the ‘establishment’ as represented by the AA council. This generational conflict soon escalated, not least because it coincided with a constitutional crisis which seriously and permanently damaged the relations between students and school authorities.

Following the AA’s incorporation in 1920 the students’ club retained an important social function, but the sole responsibility for educational policy was henceforth delegated to the council. Significantly, this did not alter the status of students within the association as they remained equal members, entitled to vote and, indeed, stand for council.<sup>113</sup> Although this never actually occurred (maybe because, as John Brandon-Jones suggested, ‘no student was ever silly enough to put up another student for election’<sup>114</sup>), it did potentially undermine the authority of the school executive committee, which, in May 1933, prevailed upon the council to create a non-voting class of membership for students.<sup>115</sup> Having cleared all legal hurdles, the council on 26 February 1935 sought to get the necessary alterations of the bylaws approved by a special general meeting of members, yet the students spotted the item on the agenda and attended in force to oppose (and defeat) the ‘apparent attempt to slip disenfranchisement through unnoticed.’<sup>116</sup> Though outnumbered by a ratio of

---

<sup>111</sup> ‘The policy of the school in teaching architectural design is to encourage all original thought which is based on constructive logic and not on the uncertain basis of fashion or fantasy. Architectural knowledge and experience is today developing with extreme rapidity. New problems arise making demands on creative thought in design and structure. A new expression is therefore bound to arise, as a direct result of the problem. And in all cases, where such expression is justified, the student in the school is free to seek it.’ ([Howard Robertson], *The Architectural Association*, school prospectus, London 1931, AAA, p. 22.) For a critical discussion see: Darling, *Re-forming Britain*, pp. 182-183.

<sup>112</sup> According to Michael Patrick, the first who were ‘profoundly stirred by the new architecture’ were the future members of Tecton following a visit to Germany by Val Harding in 1930. (Michael Patrick, ‘Architectural Aspirations’, *AAJ*, Jan 1958, vol. 73, no. 818, p. 151.)

<sup>113</sup> This, of course, was only the case for male students. Between 1917 (when they first joined) and 1920 (when the AA was incorporated) female students were, as mentioned, *not* members of the association.

<sup>114</sup> Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students’ Committee, 18 June 1953, CSSCM 1952-53, p. 11. In fact, in 1924 a fourth-year student named Gatti ran for council but withdrew his nomination prior to the election. (Susan Cox, ‘Student Vote’, 1948, AAA, Box 1991:7.)

<sup>115</sup> Meeting of the Council, 1 May 1933, CM 1927-35, p. 356.

<sup>116</sup> Cox, ‘Student Vote’. It appears that Susan Cox is quoting from the minutes of the students’ committee, which are lost.

more than 6 to 1<sup>117</sup>, the students had managed to turn the vote in their favour, and the council seemed determined not to allow this to happen again. At another special general meeting a few months later, shrewdly scheduled during the summer vacation, when most students were absent, a majority of members supported the council's motion to introduce a postal ballot instead of a vote by show of hands, which effectively weakened the students' influence.<sup>118</sup>

The events of 1935 opened a gulf between the council and an increasingly distrustful student body. Unwilling to indiscriminately accept the council's school policy, the students' committee began to shift its priorities from social to educational issues – 'away from the world of nail-brushes and soap in the lavatories and into the world of conscious expression on the way they were being taught.'<sup>119</sup> This change of emphasis was further stimulated by the introduction, in spring 1936, of an entirely new teaching system at the school. Four years prior, Robertson had retired from the principalship and assumed the less demanding post of director, appointing E. A. A. Rowse as his assistant director.<sup>120</sup> Rowse soon displayed remarkable organisational acumen as he single-handedly devised the scheme for a new postgraduate department at the AA.<sup>121</sup> The pioneering 'School of Planning and Research for National Development' (SPRND), inaugurated in January 1935, was the first in this country to consider planning as a subject in its own right rather than merely an 'extension of architectural studies in scope and scale'<sup>122</sup> (as was the case with Liverpool's famous civic design department). The SPRND proved an immediate success, and when Robertson resigned at the end of the year, the council promoted Rowse to the principalship and appointed Harry Goodhart-Rendel, the Slade

---

<sup>117</sup> In 1937 the total membership of the association was over 2,000, 273 of whom were students. (Board of Education, 'Report of H. M. Inspectors on The Architectural Association's School of Architecture and School of Planning', May 1937, in: *Records created or inherited by the Department of Education and Science, and of related bodies*, The National Archives, Kew (hereafter cited as TNA: ED), TNA: ED 90/422, p. 4.

<sup>118</sup> Cox, 'Student Vote'.

<sup>119</sup> 'The AA Story', op. cit., p. 82.

<sup>120</sup> 44 applicants answered the job advertisement, amongst them Rowland Pierce, L. W. Thornton White, R. A. Duncan, Edward Playne, Brian O'Rorke and Verner O. Rees. The school committee invited Rowse, who was at the time second-in-charge and designated head of the Edinburgh College of Art, to an interview at the AA and offered him the position on the spot. (Meetings of the School Committee, 1, 12, 15 May 1933, SCM 1928-37, pp. 83, 85, 86.)

<sup>121</sup> Special Meeting of the School Committee, 16 March 1934, *ibid.*, p. 122.

<sup>122</sup> William Holford, 'The Department of Civic Design: A Note on Post-war Prospects', 7 Feb 1944, att. to: Meeting of the Board of Studies in Architecture and Civic Design, 15 Feb 1944, n.p., in: *Minute Book 'Vol VII'*, Special Collections & Archives, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool, Reference S3161.

Professor of Fine Arts at Oxford and a former president of the AA, to the largely ceremonial role of director.<sup>123</sup>

On 14 January 1936, at his first school committee meeting as principal, Rowse – with Goodhart-Rendel’s approval – presented his proposal for a fundamental reorganisation of the school.<sup>124</sup> Rowse considered the division of the school into five large year-groups fundamentally flawed in that it prevented a free adjustment of the curriculum to meet the changing demands of the profession, discouraged a close contact between staff and students (as well as amongst the students themselves), deterred staff from recommending relegation due to its relatively severe implications and led to over- or underused studios depending on the size of the year group. To address these issues, Rowse devised a new system – the so-called ‘unit system’ – which was based on a division of the school into fifteen term-based units, each under the charge of a different master. In other words, the cycle of studio tuition would be trimestrial rather than annual as each term a new group of students would enter Unit 1 and begin their fifteen-step progression through the school. This would allow the principal to relegate weak students by a single term rather than an entire year; talented students could be allowed to progress more rapidly through the course; and candidates could be admitted three times a year, which would likely increase the school’s revenue. The school committee passed Rowse’s report on to the council with a ‘strong recommendation that it be adopted’,<sup>125</sup> and the council, on 22 January, resolved ‘that the scheme be proceeded with immediately, in an experimental form.’<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup> Elizabeth Darling suggests that this position gave Goodhart-Rendel superiority over Rowse. (Darling, *Re-forming Britain*, p. 184.) Whilst constitutionally this was certainly the case, in actual fact the running of the school was entirely in Rowse’s hands. The fact that his was a full-time position, whereas Goodhart-Rendel was expected to give half a day once a fortnight may put things into perspective. (Meeting of the Council, 2 Dec 1935, CM 1935-40, p. 29.)

<sup>124</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 14 Jan 1936, SCM 1928-37, p. 180; for the report itself see: ‘Proposed Re-organisation of the School’, att. to: Meeting of the Council, 22 Jan 1936, CM 1935-40, pp. 46-52.

<sup>125</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 14 Jan 1936, op. cit.

<sup>126</sup> Meeting of the Council, 22 Jan 1936, op. cit., p. 42. The council had discussed the report with high-ranking RIBA officials, who had voiced no objections, although Everard Haynes, the secretary of the BAE, advised the council ‘not to draw any public attention to the scheme, but allow the changes to be made as quietly as possible.’ (Ibid.)

The students approved of the new system and put forward a number of suggestions to improve it, including the extension of group work arrangements, the abolition of marks (or the introduction of a simplified system of ‘Mention, Pass, Fail’) and the participation of students in the writing of programmes.<sup>127</sup> In light of the students’ interest in the parameters of their own training, the staff began to meet with the students’ committee on a regular basis to discuss the curriculum and, in January 1937, invited them to compile their ideas in the form of a report. The work of the sub-committee set up for this purpose coincided with a controversial speech on architectural education given by Goodhart-Rendel in February 1937.<sup>128</sup> In his first address to the school, after one year in office, the director rejected the changes which were taking place in the school, specifically the tendency to complicate design programmes and, as a consequence thereof, the prevalence of ‘research’ and ‘co-operation’, and he defended Beaux-Arts exercises such as the drawing of the Orders – not because he considered them to have any practical applicability to the contemporary architect, but because their abolition had left a normative void in the curriculum.<sup>129</sup> Yet to the authors of the ‘Report of Students’ Sub-committee on the School System’, issued in June 1937 and better known as the ‘Yellow Book’, these changes did not go nearly far enough as they called for higher entry standards to facilitate a more advanced lecture course, criticised the compartmentalisation of subjects and, in the concluding and most substantial sub-section, demanded a complete remodelling of the history course as a ‘history of social movements’ rather than a ‘history of architecture’, and with particular emphasis on the immediate past – an approach which was clearly inspired by their history lecturer Robert Furneaux Jordan (see page 78).<sup>130</sup>

The students envisaged the Yellow Book as ‘the first tentative step to clarify the basis on which a modern school should rest,’<sup>131</sup> but their intention to follow it up with a second report advancing definite proposals to improve the curriculum was soon confounded by events in the school. In February 1938 Goodhart-Rendel, who thus

---

<sup>127</sup> ‘The AA Story’, p. 84; for a possible political agenda of communist student leaders such as Richard Llewelyn Davies and Anthony Cox see: Darling, *Re-forming Britain*, pp. 185-186.

<sup>128</sup> H. S. Goodhart-Rendel, ‘Architectural Education’, *AAJ*, March 1937, vol. 52, no. 601, pp. 381-384.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 382.

<sup>130</sup> ‘Report of Students’ Sub-committee on the School System’, June 1937, rpt. in: *Focus*, no. 3 (1939), pp. 87-96; quotes p. 95.

<sup>131</sup> ‘The AA Story’, p. 86.

far had not commented on the Yellow Book, addressed a general meeting of the AA on 'The Training of an Architect'.<sup>132</sup> To the students' consternation, Goodhart-Rendel remained steadfast in his appreciation of the virtues of Beaux-Arts training and left no doubt about his desire to reverse the educational trends of the past couple of years – irrespective of the merits, or otherwise, of the unit system.<sup>133</sup> The council concurred with this view and felt that a new principal was needed to effect the desired change of direction.<sup>134</sup> On 3 May it relieved Rowse of his duties, and two months later it appointed French Beaux-Arts classicist Fernand Billerey, the former partner of Detmar Blow, as interim principal for the period until Christmas.<sup>135</sup> Rowse himself remained principal of the planning school, which – having been abandoned by the council for financial reasons – continued to operate as an independent institution.<sup>136</sup>

It was in this seemingly desperate situation that two students, Tim Bennett and Leo De Syllas, decided to stem the wave of defeatism and launch a magazine to rally the support of those who shared their desire for a reform of their training. With the financial backing of, amongst others, Maxwell Fry, and with Anthony Cox, a recent graduate of the school, as joint editor and main contributor, *Focus* was chiefly responsible for making the tumultuous events at the AA known to a broader audience and securing their place in the narrative of the so-called modern movement

---

<sup>132</sup> H. S. Goodhart-Rendel, 'The Training of an Architect', *AAJ*, March 1938, vol. 53, no. 613, pp. 403-416.

<sup>133</sup> Goodhart-Rendel's stance deserves further explanation as subsequent scholarship appears to have too readily accepted the narrative put forward by the authors of *Focus*, which cast the director as the villain of the piece, hostile towards Rowse and fundamentally opposed to the unit system. The archival records support neither of these claims. In a discussion with the council following his talk to the school Goodhart-Rendel defended Rowse against members of the council who lobbied for his dismissal, notably president Verner O. Rees (incidentally one of Rowse's competitors for the post of assistant director five years prior): 'I have had nothing but touching loyalty from him and sincere efforts to do what I ask. [...] He is a valuable servant of the AA if given more direction. I have a kindly respect for his qualities.' ('Notes on the Discussion with Mr. Goodhart-Rendel on the Work of the School and Its Organisation', att. to: Special Meeting of the Council, 1 March 1938, CM 1935-40, p. 249.) More importantly, with regard to the unit system Goodhart-Rendel is reported to have said that 'He himself had as yet no definite opinion. It was a complicated machine, but it had advantages, and it was an experiment well worth trying. He was conscious that it was not working well, but there were a number of small things which could be cleared up.' (Ibid.) In other words, whilst Goodhart-Rendel was out of sympathy with the direction in which the school was heading, he did not consider Beaux-Arts methods and the unit system to be mutually exclusive.

<sup>134</sup> Meeting of the Council, 29 March 1938, *ibid.*, pp. 261-262.

<sup>135</sup> Meeting of the Council, 3 May 1938, *ibid.*, pp. 265-266; Special Meeting of the Council, 4 July 1938, *ibid.*, p. 305.

<sup>136</sup> Special Meetings of the Council, 29 March 1938, 8 Aug 1938, *ibid.*, pp. 260, 335.

in Britain.<sup>137</sup> The inaugural issue of the magazine in summer 1938 featured a censorious letter from Anthony Cox to Goodhart-Rendel in reply to his talk at the AA and the second one, published half a year later, a brief justification of the students' conduct in their recent altercation with the school authorities.<sup>138</sup> Meanwhile, the latter's deliberations were taking an unexpected turn as Goodhart-Rendel, who was working with Billerey on a scheme for the reorganisation of the school in the form a modified unit system, urged the council to either extend the contract of the principal by another year or appoint another suitable person for the same period of time to get the new system running smoothly before a new principal took over.<sup>139</sup> The council rejected Goodhart-Rendel's suggestion of another short-term appointment and advertised the position despite the fact that there was one candidate – Maxwell Fry – who had the support of students, staff and indeed Goodhart-Rendel himself.<sup>140</sup> Dissatisfied with the council's decision, Goodhart-Rendel resigned in August 1938, and his plans were shelved pending the appointment of a new principal.<sup>141</sup>

### **The Abolition of the Student Vote**

The students appeared to have won their battle against the establishment, and the combined achievement of *Yellow Book* and *Focus* (two more issues of which were published) would be a source of inspiration for the succeeding generation of AA students. However, the more immediate outcome of the tumultuous years between 1935 and 1938 was the disenfranchisement of the students at the behest of the government's Board of Education. The BOE had approved the AA's application for recognition in July 1920 despite reservations regarding its status and curriculum,

---

<sup>137</sup> For a discussion see: Elizabeth Darling, 'Focus: a Little Magazine and Architectural Modernism in 1930s Britain', *Journal of Modern Periodical Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1 (2012), pp. 39-63.

<sup>138</sup> Anthony Cox, 'The Training of an Architect. An Open Letter to H. S. Goodhart-Rendel', *Focus*, no. 1 (1938), pp. 24-32; 'Editorial', *Focus*, no. 2 (1938), pp. 9-10.

<sup>139</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 13 July 1938, CM 1935-40, pp. 309-310.

<sup>140</sup> Special Meetings of the Council, 18 July 1938, 20 July 1938, *ibid.*, pp. 314, 318.

<sup>141</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 8 Aug 1938, *ibid.*, p. 333. The council urged Goodhart-Rendel to reconsider his decision and hoped, as president Rees told H. B. Wallis, the head of the technological department of the Board of Education, in a confidential conversation, 'to keep him on for say a year or two, partly for the sake of his name and partly because they did not wish it to be thought that his resignation had been forced by the criticism of the students.' (H. B. Wallis, 'Interview Memorandum', 9 Aug 1938, TNA: ED 90/422.)



and only on the provision that it would become an incorporated body and provide a building research laboratory (the latter because it had applied as a ‘technical institution’).<sup>142</sup> The AA had since received a substantial annual grant from the BOE, even though it failed to deliver on its promises regarding the facilities for technical training.<sup>143</sup> In light of this, it can be assumed that when the BOE carried out its first full inspection of the school in May 1937 it did not do so entirely without bias, particularly as the controversy surrounding the general meeting of the AA in February 1935 had not escaped its attention. In a preparatory meeting for the BOE’s visit in April 1937 the reporting inspector, Martin Briggs, told the council that ‘the Board was perturbed that students had voting powers on important affairs, and had heard of the attempt to alter this’, suggesting that ‘the Board might help the council in this matter.’<sup>144</sup> Accordingly, his report listed the ‘constitution of the governing body’ as one of twelve points requiring ‘immediate and serious consideration’<sup>145</sup> and, referring to the meeting of February 1935, stressed that ‘the present position, which makes it possible for students to control educational policy, remains highly unsatisfactory and calls for action which will put an end to such a system.’<sup>146</sup> The council addressed the inspectors’ objections in a letter to the BOE, stating with respect to the constitution of the governing body that new bylaws introducing postal ballots had been passed which would henceforth prevent students from exerting disproportional influence in elections and referenda (see page 31). The obvious attempt to gloss over the contentious issue of the student vote proved successful as the BOE advised the council that it ‘was very satisfied with the manner in which the AA had met the Board’s suggestions, and the matter was now closed.’<sup>147</sup>

---

<sup>142</sup> Board of Education 1937, op. cit., p. 3.

<sup>143</sup> The AA school incurred a deficit each year, and even the BAE grant of approximately £1,800 (between £70,000 and £110,000 in today’s money) ‘did not quite cover this.’ (Meeting of the Council, 7 June 1938, CM 1935-40, p. 288.)

<sup>144</sup> Quoted in: Cox, ‘Student Vote’. The minute of the meeting seems lost. The inspection itself was triggered by recent contacts between Briggs and the AA regarding the school’s financial returns and a request for recognition of the planning school, in the course of which he became ‘aware that the school’s nature and policy had substantially altered’, not least through the introduction of the unit system. (Board of Education, ‘Interview Memorandum’, 14 March 1938, TNA: ED 90/422.) Darling speculates that Rowse’s dismissal may have been a result of the Board’s inspection. However, the report, whilst critical of certain aspects of the course, questioned neither Rowse’s direction of the school nor indeed the unit system itself, which ‘must be given a fair trial before judgment is passed on its efficacy.’ (Board of Education 1937, p. 10; see also: Elizabeth Darling, ‘“Into the world of Conscious Expression”: Modernist revolutionaries at the Architectural Association, 1933–39’, in: Whyte 2007, p. 165.)

<sup>145</sup> Board of Education 1937, p. 23.

<sup>146</sup> Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>147</sup> Meeting of the Council, 22 March 1938, CM 1935-40, p. 250.

It would almost certainly have stayed closed had it not been for a spectacularly ill-timed editorial comment on the recent council elections in the 2 June 1938 issue of the *Architects' Journal*:

It seems that eight out of ten members nominated by the school [i.e. the students] were successful. Which means, presumably, that only the other two are anti-student-co-operation and all that goes with it. This goes to show what concerted action can do. And if the majority of senior members are too lazy to vote, it's fair enough the students should have their way.<sup>148</sup>

In the following week the editors retracted their insinuation that the students were able to dominate this (or any other) election, yet the damage was done.<sup>149</sup> On 13 June 1938 the council received a letter from the BOE deploring the fact 'that the students are in a position to exercise a material, if not a determining, influence on the direction of the school'<sup>150</sup> and announcing that unless the AA took steps to 'ensure that in future the management of the school and its educational policy are in no way subject to control by the students'<sup>151</sup> both financial support and recognition would be rescinded. Only ten days later the BOE suspended its grant, and the council felt compelled to initiate the process leading to the abolition of the student vote, which, in turn, prompted the students' committee to resign en bloc.<sup>152</sup> The council issued the ballot papers in November 1938, and when two months later the results were announced, the required two-thirds majority of members had voted in favour of the proposed changes to the bylaws, framed to include a probationary, non-voting class of student members.<sup>153</sup> Thus, on 31 January 1939 the association disenfranchised its own founding body – 'perhaps the only backward step in the AA's history', as the *Architectural Review* later reminisced.<sup>154</sup>

---

<sup>148</sup> *AJ*, 2 June 1938, p. 930.

<sup>149</sup> *AJ*, 9 June 1938, p. 972.

<sup>150</sup> Quoted in: Cox, 'Student Vote'. The original letter is lost.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>152</sup> The fact that the council agreed to this by unanimous decision left a sense of bitterness with John Brandon-Jones: 'I thought the council's decision back then was wrong, and I was one of a group of AA members who, along with some students such as Anthony Cox, fought against the abandonment of the student vote. But we lost that one. Jane Drew defected to the enemy. She was the students' representative on the council and we thought she fought for us, but she didn't. I never forgave her for that.' ('John Brandon-Jones interviewed by Jill Lever', *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Tape 5, Side A (May/June 1999) (hereafter cited as BLSA/Brandon-Jones).)

<sup>153</sup> Meeting of the Council, 29 Nov 1938, CM 1935-40, p. 357ff; 'New Bylaws', *AAJ*, Feb 1939, vol. 54, no. 624, p. 187.

<sup>154</sup> 'The Centenary of the AA', *Architectural Review*, Dec 1947, vol. 102, no. 612, p. 184.

## Wartime Exile

Goodhart-Rendel's resignation, though greeted with regret by the council, had presented it with an opportunity to abolish the post of director and thus address BOE criticism concerning the 'system of dual direction' operating at the AA.<sup>155</sup> The council briefly considered Arthur Kenyon, a representative of the old guard, as possible head of the school, but those who eventually emerged as the frontrunners in the race for the principalship – Maxwell Fry, R. A. Duncan, Robert Furneaux Jordan and Leslie Martin (who was backed by Edwin Lutyens, then a member of the council's advisory committee) – were all part of the early wave of British modernists.<sup>156</sup> Deeply polarised, the council was unable to give any of them its unanimous support and instead, in October 1938, agreed a last-ditch compromise in the person of landscape architect Geoffrey Jellicoe, a former member of the teaching staff and sufficiently detached from either of the warring factions.<sup>157</sup>

Jellicoe, who delivered his inaugural address on 15 February 1939, one month after taking office, struck a conciliatory note with his audience.<sup>158</sup> He announced that in compensation for the loss of their voting rights the students would be entitled to choose two members of council as their so-called 'liaison officers', to whom they could appeal directly to make their grievances heard.<sup>159</sup> Informal meetings between staff and students (which the council had disallowed seven months prior) would be reinstated,<sup>160</sup> and the present school system would be continued pending a review of the curriculum, for which he assembled an advisory panel comprising A. F. B.

---

<sup>155</sup> Board of Education 1937, pp. 5, 23.

<sup>156</sup> Whilst Lutyens 'had met and had a good opinion of Dr. Martin', Robertson's business partner J. Murray Easton felt that 'Dr. Martin may not have a definite enough personality.' Atkinson meanwhile advised that neither Duncan nor Jordan be chosen. (Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 27 Sep 1938, CM 1935-40, p. 341; see also: Special Meetings of the Council, 18 July 1938, 8 Aug 1938, *ibid.*, pp. 314, 334.

<sup>157</sup> Meeting of the Council, 6 Oct 1938, *ibid.*, p. 344. Jellicoe appears to have been put forward by Atkinson and Robertson, under whom he had trained. Incidentally, he was the first full-time student to become head of the AA school.

<sup>158</sup> Geoffrey Jellicoe, 'The Principal's Address to the School', *AAJ*, March 1939, vol. 54, no. 625, pp. 209-211.

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 209. The council introduced this mechanism, which had been suggested by the students, despite initial resistance from the BOE, which 'felt that the arrangement suggested might lead to situations which would be difficult to handle and would be prejudicial to the authority and prestige of the Principal.' (Meeting of the Council, 29 Nov 1938, CM 1935-40, p. 358.) It was a prescient assessment as the system of 'council liaison' would cause frictions between principal and council for decades to come.

<sup>160</sup> Jellicoe 1939, pp. 209-210; see also: Special Meeting of the Council, 4 July 1938, CM 1935-40, pp. 304-305.

Anderson (representing the council), Robert Furneaux Jordan (representing the staff), Anthony Cox (representing the students) and John Henry Forshaw, at the time chief architect to the Miners' Welfare Association (representing the 'outside world').<sup>161</sup> An early outcome of these consultations was, in March 1939, the modification of the marking system in favour of written reports and one of three grades (viz. 'fail', 'pass' or 'mention').<sup>162</sup>

These measures calmed the waters, and the outbreak of the Second World War rendered the quarrels of the past few years immaterial. Like other institutions in the capital, the AA – whilst retaining the ground-floor rooms in Bedford Square as its club facilities – bowed to government pressure and evacuated its school to safer quarters when the war broke out. It took refuge in Mount House, a Georgian residence in the leafy suburb of Barnet – 'a setting as lovely as a Gainsborough', as Summerson wrote.<sup>163</sup> As in the previous war, the sudden drop in numbers and the corresponding fall in revenue caused financial problems. Given that travel was almost impossible and vacations therefore of little value, the school in May 1940 announced the introduction of a four-term year, which raised the school's income by a third and allowed students to graduate in four instead of five years (and thus ideally before they were called up).<sup>164</sup> Two months later Jellicoe relayed the findings of his panel, the most significant of which was its condemnation of the unit system, which it deemed 'unsatisfactory' and 'undesirable' owing to the impracticality of harmonising the term-based cycle of the studio teaching with the annual cycle of the lecture course.<sup>165</sup> The panel proposed that 'in peace time the system of annual entry shall be re-established,'<sup>166</sup> with year groups divided into parallel units – apparently the core idea of Goodhart-Rendel and Billerey's scheme for the reorganisation of the school.<sup>167</sup> Due to the reduced numbers in the school Jellicoe did in fact combine the

---

<sup>161</sup> Jellicoe 1939, pp. 210-211.

<sup>162</sup> Meeting of the Council, 28 March 1939, CM 1935-40, p. 394. These categories were frequently modified in the coming decades, but throughout the postwar period there would be no return to the old marking system.

<sup>163</sup> Summerson 1947, p. 49.

<sup>164</sup> Meeting of the Officers of the Council, 15 May 1940, CM 1935-40, p. 6; Meeting of the Council, 28 May 1940, *ibid.*, p. 8.

<sup>165</sup> Geoffrey Jellicoe, 'Principal's Report to the Council of the Association', July 1940, AAA, Box 2006:S34.

<sup>166</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>167</sup> See e.g.: Meeting of the School Committee, 27 April 1939, SCM 1937-44, pp. 78-79.

fifteen units into five groups, but he retained termly entry as a suitable feature to cope with wartime conditions.<sup>168</sup>

Frustrated by the abundance of administrative work and a perceived lack of support from the council, Jellicoe left in September 1941. In his resignation letter to Kenyon, now the president of the AA, Jellicoe warned that with growing competition from other institutions, specifically Liverpool, which had largely adopted the ‘advanced thought and method’<sup>169</sup> pioneered by the AA but had the additional advantage of being adequately funded, equipped and staffed, the AA school might ‘face extinction’<sup>170</sup> unless it managed to reassert its leadership position, a task for which he, Jellicoe, considered himself unfit:

Our School has one advantage only over all others; it need not compromise. On this depends survival and leadership. My own appointment was a compromise. It gave stability in a time of clashing ideologies. But I must state that my aspirations lie beyond the world of associations and preconceptions, in which my generation and myself are contained. The youth of the country will desire a leader of their own who has already his own established convictions, rather than one like myself, who is engaged in establishing them afresh. [...] Certainly now is the moment for this change.<sup>171</sup>

Jellicoe recommended Frederick Gibberd, a member of the teaching staff, as his successor, and the council appointed him in November 1941.<sup>172</sup> Gibberd left Jellicoe’s course largely intact, though he strengthened certain aspects of it (notably the instruction in presentation techniques, for which he devised intensive study periods with first-year master Eric Jarrett).<sup>173</sup> As anticipated, the designer of Pullman Court inspired his students to follow his lead, and it is probably fair to say that it was under Gibberd that the AA fully embraced modernism as its guiding philosophy.<sup>174</sup> The RIBA’s visiting board, which on 16 October 1942 made its first

---

<sup>168</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 12 Oct 1939, *ibid.*, p. 94.

<sup>169</sup> Jellicoe, letter to Arthur Kenyon, in: Verner O. Rees, Henry Braddock, John Summerson, ‘Report to Architectural Association Council by School Exploratory Committee’, 30 Sep 1941, att. to: Meeting of the Council, 1 Oct 1941, CM 1940-49, p. 87.

<sup>170</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>171</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>172</sup> Meeting of the Council, 6 Nov 1941, CM 1940-49, p. 88 K.

<sup>173</sup> Frederick Gibberd, ‘Principal’s Report to the Council’, att. to: Meeting of the Council, 23 Feb 1943, *ibid.*, p. 167.

<sup>174</sup> ‘He was somebody who had a reputation of an early modernist and one that we somehow automatically accepted and admired.’ (‘Philip Powell interviewed by Louise Brody’, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects’ Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 10 Dec 2016], Track 8/20 (1997).)

inspection of the AA since 1934, commended the work of the school, though it noted that the students' designs had 'little or no traditional basis' and were 'perhaps too experimental'.<sup>175</sup> The board was also critical of the unit system and recommended that it should be 'reconsidered when normal conditions obtain'<sup>176</sup> – a view with which Gibberd himself concurred (see page 53).

The small cohort of students which found itself secluded to rural Barnet developed into a tight-knit community, whose social and artistic life centred on Mount House as well as 'Taliesin', a rented house where, to the council's embarrassment, students of both sexes lived together – 'in heathen disarray', as one of them jocularly recalled.<sup>177</sup> The diminutiveness of the school and the total lack of metropolitan peacetime distractions were conducive to the development of a distinguished group of students which included Leonard Manasseh, Geoffrey Robson, Geoffry Powell, Gerhard Kallmann and, perhaps most notably, Philip Powell and Jacko Moya, whose competition-winning scheme for Churchill Gardens built on their joint housing thesis.<sup>178</sup> According to the RIBA, it was 'evident that the school is vigorous' and the students appeared 'keen [and] genuinely interested in their work.'<sup>179</sup> Gibberd himself was convinced that the success of the school owed a great deal to the close affinity between students, staff and principal:

The AA is indeed fortunate in having got over its growing pains. After the war it will be at a great advantage over those schools which have yet to face the fact that you cannot teach students something in which they do not believe.<sup>180</sup>

---

<sup>175</sup> 'Report of the RIBA Visiting Board Report on the School of Architecture, The Architectural Association, Hadley Common, Hertfordshire', n.d. [March 1943], AAA, Box 2006:S34. Established in 1924, the visiting board was a standing committee of the RIBA's Board of Architectural Education and advised on the recognition, or otherwise, of architectural schools.

<sup>176</sup> Ibid.

<sup>177</sup> 'Neville Conder interviewed by Alan Powers', *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 10 Dec 2016], Track 3/13 (1999).

<sup>178</sup> The thesis, for which the LCC acted as a proxy-client, was completed in collaboration with Margaret Taylor, who went into practice with her husband, one Rutherford (possibly Ronald Rutherford, an AA graduate of slightly older vintage and tutor in the early 1950s). Manasseh, Robson and Kallmann graduated in 1941, Geoffry Powell in 1943, Philip Powell (no relation) and Moya in 1944. The latter three all worked for Gibberd after graduating. Many others who populate the pages of this thesis began their course at Mount House before being called up for war service.

<sup>179</sup> Visiting Board 1943, op. cit.

<sup>180</sup> Gibberd, Feb 1943, op. cit.

## CHAPTER 1

### AFTER THE WAR (1945-1949)

The first chapter of this thesis examines how the AA school addressed the unprecedented educational and organisational challenges of the immediate postwar years. The first section discusses the reasons for Frederick Gibberd's resignation, the appointment of Gordon Brown (1912-1962) as the new principal and the return of the school to Bedford Square. With its capital exhausted, the school was eager to maximise its revenue by admitting the greatest possible number of students and increasing their tuition fees. The second section shows how this led to confrontation with the Ministry of Education and the momentous decision to forfeit its annual subsidy. The rapid growth in student numbers necessitated fundamental changes to the teaching arrangements, and the third section explains Brown's so-called 'stream system' and the staffing policy he devised to support it. The fourth section centres upon the course itself, which was marked by a pragmatic mixture of revived Beaux-Arts drawing exercises and Lethabite ideas, specifically a practical training site, and allowed students far-reaching liberties in the interpretation and execution of their tasks. The fifth section assesses the success of Brown's school and highlights his contribution to the international debate on architectural education within CIAM. The final section explains the reasons for Brown's resignation and traces his subsequent career, cut short by his premature death at the age of fifty.

#### **New Beginning in Bedford Square**

If one were to pinpoint the moment at which the war's fortunes began to turn in Britain's favour the 22 June 1941 would probably be as good a guess as any. On that day the Third Reich launched a surprise offensive against its Soviet ally, thereby incurring a 2000-mile front line which was to absorb a fast-growing portion of its troops. This, in turn, rendered unlikely the continuance of the sustained air raids which had plagued the British Isles for almost a year and permitted the country to apply its thoughts to the aftermath of the war. By autumn 1943 Italy had

surrendered, and the allied forces were closing in on Germany. The end of the war within reach, the council in November 1943 invited its principal to formulate his ideas regarding the postwar school, which he submitted in the form of a detailed report four months later.<sup>181</sup>

Gibberd sought to address the perceived shortcomings of the school in its current setup by introducing a new teaching system (see page 53) and by incorporating an office training scheme as well as a separate building department, through which he hoped to overcome its artificiality and lack of connection with building practice. Gibberd left no doubt that he regarded his report as a non-negotiable condition of his reappointment and would not accept the post as principal of the postwar school if it were rejected.<sup>182</sup> Somewhat to his surprise, the council approved of his plan, in principle, although it argued that in view of the financial position of the AA the suggested changes would have to be implemented gradually.<sup>183</sup> Furthermore, for the time being it was only prepared to offer Gibberd an extension of his existing, temporary appointment (albeit at a considerably higher salary) rather than the permanent contract he asked for.<sup>184</sup> Unsatisfied with these conditions and the lack of assurance that his plans for the postwar school would receive the wholehearted backing of the council, Gibberd resigned on 14 July 1944, and the council shelved his proposal.<sup>185</sup>

The departure of its principal forced the AA council to find a replacement to tackle the challenges awaiting the school in the postwar period. With many potential candidates serving in the forces and cut off from British media a meagre response to the job posting was to be expected. Even so, the council was underwhelmed by both quality and quantity of the 22 applications it received and made abortive approaches to more suitable candidates.<sup>186</sup> For better or worse, the choice was between the five shortlisted candidates, two of whom – John Brandon-Jones and Joseph Stanley

---

<sup>181</sup> Frederick Gibberd, 'A Plan for the Architectural Association School of Architecture', March 1944, AAA, Box 1991:7.

<sup>182</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 6 March 1944, CM 1940-49, p. 213.

<sup>183</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 16 June 1944, *ibid.*, p. 241f.

<sup>184</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 8 May 1944, *ibid.*, p. 229.

<sup>185</sup> Meeting of the Council, 24 July 1944, *ibid.*, pp. 243-244.

<sup>186</sup> The council was particularly interested in William Holford, who, however, let it be known that he intended to return to Liverpool University after the war. (Special Meeting of the Council, 13 Nov 1944, CM 1940-49, p. 254.)



Allen – failed to make an impression at the interview, whilst a third one – Colin St. Clair Oakes – was stationed in Burma and therefore unable to attend.<sup>187</sup> To the indignation of councillor John Grey, who remembered Oakes as a ‘very useful’ member of staff before the war and felt it unsatisfactory that he had to be turned down solely for the fact that he could not come for an interview, the decision boiled down to the two remaining candidates, Anthony Chitty and Raymond Gordon Brown.<sup>188</sup> Chitty, formerly of Tecton and now in partnership with Robert Hening, had come out slightly ahead of Brown on the marking system employed by the council’s selection committee. However, he stated frankly that his ambitions resided in practice rather than teaching and that he was therefore not likely to make a long-term commitment. Brown on the other hand consented to devote ten years to the school and give it priority over his private work, which was the decisive factor in the council’s decision on 13 November 1944 to appoint him as the new principal of the school on a five-year contract.<sup>189</sup>

Born in South Africa, Gordon Brown had studied at Natal before completing his course at the AA in 1935. Following a short stint with Willem Dudok he worked as chief assistant for Michael Tapper, for Richardson & Gill, and in private practice. When the war broke out he volunteered for the army, serving in the Essex Regiment and the Commandos before joining the Parachute Regiment.<sup>190</sup> At the time of his application Brown was merely 32 years old, and whilst it was in the tradition of the AA to appoint a youthful man as the head of its school, there can be little doubt that Brown’s limited experience as a practitioner and the complete absence of a teaching background would under normal circumstances have disqualified him from being considered for this position. Brown’s appointment resulted from a lack of choice as the council considered neither him nor any of the other candidates to be ‘brilliant

---

<sup>187</sup> Ibid., pp. 254-255. The first candidate is listed as ‘R. Brandon Jones’, but it is assumed that this is a typing error. The RIBA membership register for 1944 features the names of John Brandon-Jones and his brother Noel Brandon-Jones, but not R. Brandon Jones. John Brandon-Jones was an AA graduate and present member of the teaching staff and therefore almost certainly the one who applied for the principalship. Joseph Stanley Allen was the current head of the Leeds School of Architecture and a vice-chairman of the RIBA’s Board of Architectural Education.

<sup>188</sup> Ibid., p. 255.

<sup>189</sup> Ibid. Considering that the negotiations with Gibberd had foundered on the council’s refusal to offer him a permanent appointment, one is inclined to share his suspicion that it was indeed not prepared to fully support as ambitious a scheme as he had in mind.

<sup>190</sup> Cecil St Clair Oakes, ‘Obituary: Mr. Gordon Brown’, *AAJ*, May 1962, vol. 77, no. 862, p. 279.

architects.<sup>191</sup> One member, A. S. Knott, remembered Brown as a student and, whilst liking him personally, ‘would not have thought that he was good enough as an architect for the post.’<sup>192</sup> Knott’s colleagues shared his doubts, agreeing that ‘as an architect he was not perhaps likely to become one of the first rank in the profession,’<sup>193</sup> but unlike Knott they felt that Brown’s abilities as an architect were less essential than his ‘capabilities, character and personality’, which had impressed the majority of them.<sup>194</sup>

The controversies of the late 1930s still reverberating at the AA, the council sought to avoid putting a principal in charge whose approach might polarise the members of the association. Similarly to Jellicoe, Brown was seen as someone who stood ‘against revolutionary changes, and was not wedded to any particular school of architecture, [yet] sufficiently progressive [...] to appreciate the general trend of architecture.’<sup>195</sup> More important than Brown’s nonpartisan outlook and moderate views, however, were the leadership qualities he had demonstrated through his ‘exceptional work in the army for the past four years.’<sup>196</sup> The new principal would have to cope with a drastically inflated and considerably older student body and a neglected infrastructure which was likely to remain deficient for years to come. At least initially, this would require organisational and improvisational skills rather than architectural or pedagogical ones. The council evidently felt that a young paratroop major who had led a successful airborne assault on a heavily defended artillery position in preparation for the D-Day landings was just the right man for the job.<sup>197</sup>

---

<sup>191</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 13 Nov 1944, CM 1940-49, p. 255.

<sup>192</sup> Ibid.

<sup>193</sup> Ibid.

<sup>194</sup> Ibid.

<sup>195</sup> Ibid.

<sup>196</sup> Ibid.

<sup>197</sup> ‘[Brown’s] battalion penetrated the minefields and outer wire defences of the battery in the face of heavy enemy fire, and finally assaulted and overran the position [...]. At the close of this action they had lost 65 killed, wounded or missing from the assaulting 150, and had captured 22 enemy prisoners.’ (T. B. H. Otway, *The Second World War 1939-1945. Army: Airborne Forces*, London 1990, p. 180.) Brown himself was wounded and missing but managed to fight his way back to his own lines. (AAJ, Sep/Oct 1944, vol. 59, no. 689, p. 102.) Bill Mullins, who was apprenticed to Robert Atkinson at the time, was present when Atkinson’s business partner and AA President A. F. B. Anderson interviewed Brown for the position: ‘Brown came to the office, young lad, to be interviewed by Anderson. He turned up in an army uniform – he was a major, quite a bullish bloke, his arm in a sling, with his war wound.’ (Bill Mullins, interview with the author, 16 March 2016.)

With the question of leadership settled, the council re-focused its efforts on planning the urgent relocation of the school back to London. Gibberd had stressed that at a time when schools of architecture increasingly depended on external experts to take part in their teaching an accessible location was crucially important – more important in fact than the premises themselves.<sup>198</sup> Moreover, the seclusion of the school undermined the relationship between students and ordinary members. Throughout the war the association had retained its ground-floor rooms in Bedford Square as a meeting place for members stationed in the Home Counties or on leave from the services. H. J. W. Alexander, Yerbury's successor as secretary of the AA, used his extensive contacts to place members and students in suitable branches, preferably the Royal Engineers (and in particular its camouflage units),<sup>199</sup> and gathered those who passed through London for Wednesday dart evenings or Saturday luncheons. The segregation of the school meant that the students were excluded from these activities of the association, and the AA was eager to reunite the two sooner rather than later.<sup>200</sup> At the time of Brown's appointment the relocation plans were at an advanced stage as the council had originally agreed to move the school after the end of the summer term, thus meeting Gibberd's precondition for his entering contract negotiations in the first place.<sup>201</sup> The onset of flying-bomb attacks on London confounded this plan, but at the beginning of December the council decided to proceed with the move during the Christmas vacation, and despite the tight time schedule the school reopened in Bedford Square on 8 January 1945.<sup>202</sup>

---

<sup>198</sup> Gibberd 1944, op. cit.

<sup>199</sup> See e.g.: Alexander, letter to K. J. Sandbrook, 18 Oct 1941, AAA, Box 1991:9: 'I have been able to find quite a number of AA men employment in Camouflage, and sent about a dozen to the Army School at Farnham Castle.'

<sup>200</sup> The AA first considered a move back to London in February 1942 but deemed it too perilous at the time. ('Special School Sub-Committee. Select Committee: War Time School', 18 Feb 1942, CM 1940-49, p. 138.) Incidentally, both London polytechnics remained in the capital throughout the war; the Bartlett was attached to St. Catherine's College at Cambridge.

<sup>201</sup> Special Meetings of the Council, 6 March 1944, 13 March 1944, *ibid.*, pp. 213, 217.

<sup>202</sup> [H. J. W. Alexander], letters to members, 27 July 1944, 11 Dec 1944, AAA, Box 1991:25. 'With a cheer we returned to Bedford Square exactly in time for the V2s.' (Alec Livock, letter to the author, 27 August 2015.)

## A Numbers' Game: The Financial Implications of a Growing Student Body

If the idea had been that a military man was required to get things up and running in London it failed as the War Office denied repeated requests for Brown's release. In anticipation of this – and in light of the fact that Gibberd was reluctant to stay on after the end of the term – the council had, one week after Brown had signed his contract, decided to appoint George Fairweather as interim principal.<sup>203</sup> Fairweather, who had joined the teaching staff in 1936 and was held in high esteem by Gibberd, ended up heading the school for two terms as Brown's demobilisation was further delayed by a general ban on releases.<sup>204</sup> It was not until May 1945 that Brown got transferred to England and was able to attend council meetings; he finally received his discharge in September, in time for the beginning of the new academic year.

The school to which he returned had suffered considerably from enemy action, and the combined shortage of money, material and labour had by the end of the war created a substantial maintenance backlog.<sup>205</sup> The fact that the council in 1946 instigated a three-year plan to 'bring the premises back into a reasonable state of repair'<sup>206</sup> conveys a sense of the scope of damage which still existed and the necessary timeframe anticipated to dispose of it. Simultaneously, preparations began for the forthcoming centenary celebrations of the AA in 1947, which acted as a catalyst for the repair work considering that members of the royal family alongside eminent guests from abroad were expected, for whom, of course, the premises needed to be 'in first class order'.<sup>207</sup>

---

<sup>203</sup> Meetings of the School Committee, 13 Nov 1944, 4 Dec 1944, SCM 1944-51, pp. 14, 16.

<sup>204</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 15 Jan 1945, *ibid.*, p. 17; see also: Gibberd, Feb 1943, *op. cit.*

<sup>205</sup> The AA filed a war damage claim in each month between September and December 1940 (AAA, Box 2006:S30). The most serious incidents concerned the impact of an H. E. bomb dropped on Tottenham Court Road in September, which 'rather severely damaged' the AA (H. J. W. Alexander, letter to Graham Laidler, 25 Sep 1940, AAA, Box 1991:9); partial damage through an explosive bomb in the night of 7 November; and a fire following an air raid in the night of 8 December, which burnt out the main lecture theatre.

<sup>206</sup> Meeting of the Council, 6 July 1948, CM 1940-49, p. 491.

<sup>207</sup> Meeting of the Council, 28 Jan 1946, *ibid.*, p. 318. The committee reports concerning the preparation of the celebrations remind us that this was a time of austerity. For instance, in October 1946 the house committee expressed its worries that the stock of wine and spirits was not increasing fast enough (Meeting of the Council, 28 Oct 1946, *ibid.*, p. 365), and in November it suggested that members be discreetly asked to give clothing coupons to buy table cloths and waitresses' uniforms (Meeting of the Council, 25 Nov 1946, *ibid.*, p. 368).

In the meantime there was need for additional studio space as large-scale demobilisation seemed imminent. The government's 'Further Education and Training' (FET) scheme, launched in early 1943, provided grants covering tuition fees and maintenance allowance to military personnel whose post-school education had been interrupted or suspended by the war.<sup>208</sup> FET grants thus removed the financial obstacles for a large number of ex-servicemen to take up or continue their academic training.<sup>209</sup> In late 1945 the AA actively supported the RIBA in its attempt to secure priority discharge for architecture students, which the government rejected on the grounds that, according to the current schedule, the majority of them were expected to be demobilised within a few months and the remaining few would not justify special consideration.<sup>210</sup>

In spite of this initial delay Bedford Square quickly filled with students. In July 1944, when there were still only 106 students at the school, the council estimated that this figure was likely to increase to 270 after the war – roughly the number in attendance a decade before.<sup>211</sup> After the return to London the student population grew gradually to approximately 150 in May 1945, when hostilities in Europe ended, whereupon they more than doubled (to 325) within only a few months.<sup>212</sup> In November 1944 the AA council, alongside the representatives of most other

---

<sup>208</sup> Some had the presence of mind to seize the opportunity. Chris Whittaker relates that – recalling a similar scheme following the First World War – his mother sold her diamond ring to raise enough money to cover the fees for the first two terms of his course at the AA. The speculation paid off: Whittaker was called up before the end of his second term and returned to the AA in 1947 on an FET grant (interview with the author, 11 Jan 2014).

<sup>209</sup> Between 1945 and 1950 a total of 83,000 FET awards were made, more than half of which were used at university level (Lowe 1988, p. 62). In autumn 1947 there were, according to a joint report by the MARS Group and the Architectural Students' Association, 12,000 architecture students in Britain (twice the number of the pre-war years), seventy per cent of them funded through an FET grant. (William Tatton-Brown, 'Architectural Education in Britain', report of the MARS Group to the Sixth CIAM Congress, Bridgwater 1947, in: *CIAM Archive*, gta Archives, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich (hereafter cited as gta/ETH/CIAM), 42-JLS-7-35; see also Chapter 3, p. 132ff)

<sup>210</sup> *RIBAJ*, Nov 1945, pp. 1-2; Meeting of the Council, 25 March 1946, CM 1940-49, p. 333; 'Release of Students', *AAJ*, April 1946, vol. 61, no. 702, p. 72. The government's demobilisation plan divided service personnel into two categories. Class B 'key men' had been in pre-war civilian occupations such as coal mining, building and civil engineering or teaching which were considered so vital to reconstruction that it was justifiable on grounds of national interest to discharge them ahead of the others. The remainder – nine out of ten – were in Class A. For them, the order in which they would be demobilised was calculated according to their date of birth and the month in which their war service began (two months of service being equivalent in value to one year of age) regardless of military rank or where they were stationed. Whilst this system was a feat of fairness and transparency, it explains why the return of students to their schools was delayed (see: Alan Allport, *Demobbed*, New Haven 2009, p. 23f).

<sup>211</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 7 July 1944, SCM 1944-51, p. 5.

<sup>212</sup> Meetings of the School Committee, 14 May 1945, 1 Oct 1945, *ibid.*, pp. 26, 33.

architecture schools in the country, had pledged to run a series of FET-funded refresher courses for qualified architects, preferably – but not exclusively – from the AA.<sup>213</sup> These were instituted in September 1945 and ran concurrently with a similar course for American architects and students stationed in England and awaiting repatriation or redeployment to a different war zone. Therefore, in addition to 261 regular students there were, in late 1945, 49 GIs and 16 participants in the refresher course at the school.<sup>214</sup> Their vacant spaces – the second American course ended at the end of the year, the refresher courses twelve months later – were continually filled with decommissioned service personnel on the waiting list.<sup>215</sup> In November 1945 a sub-committee of the council, formed to deal with school development from an educational viewpoint but at least initially solely concerned with questions of space, estimated that extra accommodation for a further two hundred students would be needed for the following three years.<sup>216</sup> Matters were exacerbated by the fact that Brown exercised his discretion in admitting applicants liberally, accepting both new entrants and ex-service personnel who had not previously been students of the AA. This aroused the indignation of AA President Graham Dawbarn, who feared that the school might find itself unable to honour its commitment to ‘take back all its ex-students as and when they were demobilised.’<sup>217</sup> In order to cope with the rapid influx of students the council in early 1946 commissioned the erection of a large Nissen hut on a bombed site on Morwell Street adjacent to the main studio block, which provided accommodation for an additional 120 students and was complemented by two standard MOW huts shortly after.<sup>218</sup> However, regardless of the creation of any additional studio space the school remained in a permanent state of overcrowding as student numbers kept rising. They eventually peaked at 532 in October 1948 – in excess of the presumed maximum capacity of five hundred

---

<sup>213</sup> Meeting of the Council, 30 Oct 1944, CM 1940-49, p. 252. It appears that, in the event, only the AA actually organised such courses (see: ‘Refresher Course’, *AAJ*, Feb/March 1947, vol. 62, no. 710, p. 105).

<sup>214</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 2 Nov 1945, SCM 1944-51, p. 35.

<sup>215</sup> The situation was, of course, no different in other RIBA-recognised schools, none of which had any vacancies at all. Consequently, in September 1946 there was, according to Brown, a list of 140 (non-AA) applicants who could not get into any school. (‘AA School Annual Prize Giving’, *AAJ*, Aug/Sep 1946, vol. 62, no. 705, p. 22.) This led to a short-time plan to set up a joint emergency school for ex-service personnel in cooperation with other London schools, which, however, was dropped when it transpired that the matter was in fact less urgent than at first thought. (Meetings of the Council, 15 July 1946, 28 Oct 1946, CM 1940-49, pp. 356, 364.)

<sup>216</sup> Meeting of the Council, 26 Nov 1945, *ibid.*, p. 306f.

<sup>217</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 307.

<sup>218</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 1 April 1946, SCM 1944-51, p. 55; Meeting of the Council, 29 April 1946, CM 1940-49, p. 335.

students – and remained at that level for two years before starting to drop again with the end of the FET scheme in 1951.<sup>219</sup>

Whilst the overall tendency in the late 1940s was steeply upward, there was considerable variance in the intake of students. Given the circumstances, one might expect that the AA would have welcomed any temporarily relief, but this was not the case. Unlike many universities, whose recurring grants from the University Grants Committee (UGC) had been maintained at pre-war levels in spite of lower staff expenditures and which had therefore been able to build up substantial reserves during the war,<sup>220</sup> the AA had only managed to keep its school operational by cutting down expenses and introducing the four-term year (see page 40). With fatigue affecting the quality of student work, Gibberd in March 1944 single-handedly abolished the four-term year, leaving the council no other option than to levy higher charges to avoid a financial deficit.<sup>221</sup>

The costs involved in moving back to Bedford Square aggravated the need for additional revenue, and in January 1946 the school felt compelled to raise its tuition fees once more.<sup>222</sup> This step met with strong disapproval from the Ministry of Education (MOE), which – embarrassed by the ‘suggestion that public funds were being used to subsidise a school which could only be attended by the children of the comparatively rich’<sup>223</sup> – threatened to withdraw its annual grant unless the school restored its fees to their former level. Assured that this would not affect the AA’s status as a recognised school and therefore the awards made to its students under the FET scheme, the council reluctantly decided to dispense with the grant, anticipating that the additional revenue through student fees would compensate for its loss, which indeed it did.<sup>224</sup> It was a momentous decision as it marked the moment when the AA effectively opted out of the state-system of higher education, becoming, for the first time since its incorporation in 1920, a truly independent institution.

---

<sup>219</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 4 Oct 1948; SCM 1944-51, p. 120.

<sup>220</sup> Michael Shattock, *Making Policy in British Higher Education 1945-2011*, Maidenhead 2012, p. 9.

<sup>221</sup> Meeting of the Council, 5 June 1944, CM 1940-49, p. 237; see also: Gibberd, letter to Arthur Kenyon, 20 May 1943, att. to: Meeting of the Council, 25 May 1943, *ibid.*, p. 181, 2520; Meeting of the Council, 13 March 1944, *ibid.*, p. 218.

<sup>222</sup> Meeting of the Council, 12 July 1945, *ibid.*, pp. 297-298.

<sup>223</sup> Frederick Bray, under-secretary for further education, quoted in: Ministry of Education, ‘Interview Memorandum’, 21 March 1946, TNA: ED 90/422.

<sup>224</sup> *Ibid.*; Meeting of the Council, 25 March 1946, CM 1940-49, p. 332.

As a result, the school now relied exclusively on student fees, and the finance committee insisted that the number of students in the school be kept to the maximum as any temporary drop would instantly put the school in financial jeopardy.<sup>225</sup> This explains why the council despite the lack of space and an already overstrained administration was hesitant to halt Brown's generously handled intake of students and allowed him to fill unexpected vacancies at once. Bearing in mind that the AA had committed itself to accepting ex-AA students without delay, and with admissions therefore an almost weekly occurrence, it stands to reason that the numbers were bound to spiral out of control and that, throughout the late 1940s, permanent overcrowding had to be accepted as an irrevocable fact of life.

A greater number of students necessitated a correspondingly greater number of staff, and their wages, accounting for half of the school's total expenditure, were key to balancing the books.<sup>226</sup> To the despair of the finance committee, the principal, who was repeatedly reminded to 'keep a careful check on the numbers,'<sup>227</sup> proved rather inept at doing so. Brown, like Gibberd, aimed at a student-staff ratio of 15 to 1, but unlike his predecessor he favoured a smaller staff of full-time teachers over a large workforce of part-time tutors. When therefore in January 1947 the council issued a number of full-time contracts at a higher salary for senior members of staff, it did so on the understanding that a number of part-time teachers would be dropped in order to avoid financial overstretch.<sup>228</sup> Rather characteristically, Brown re-engaged three of them, thus rendering the scheme obsolete.<sup>229</sup>

Rising costs for accommodation and staff were likely to sustain a continuous cycle of fee increases, and the absence of any financial support left the school precariously

---

<sup>225</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 20 Jan 1947, SCM 1944-51, p. 78. By comparison, in 1949/50 nearly two thirds of the average university income was supplied by recurring UGC grants, with fees accounting for less than a fifth. (Shattock 2012, p. 12.)

<sup>226</sup> See: Henry Braddock, 'Report of the Development Sub-Committee', July 1949; att. to: Meeting of the Council, 11 July 1949, CM 1949-55, p. 26.

<sup>227</sup> Meeting of the Council, 24 March 1947, *ibid.*, p. 394.

<sup>228</sup> Meeting of the Council, 24 Feb 1947, *ibid.*, p. 387f.

<sup>229</sup> Meeting of the Council, 24 March 1947, *ibid.*, p. 394. In fairness, the school committee had granted Brown a student-staff ratio of 20 to 1 (Meeting of the School Committee, 1 April 1946, SCM 1944-51, p. 56f); yet in January 1948 there were only thirty studio tutors (the equivalent of 17½ full-time staff) for 532 students, adding up to a ratio of 30 to 1 – twice as high as at Liverpool or the Bartlett but, according to Brown, not nearly high enough. (Meeting of the School Committee, 12 Jan 1948, *ibid.*, p. 103; Joint Meeting of the Officers of the Council, the Development Sub-Committee and the Advisory Council, 27 Jan 1948, CM 1940-49, p. 461.)



exposed to swings in student inflow. Indeed, the impact of a series of slumps in the number of applications due to momentary slowdowns in demobilisation during the 1946/1947 session could not be cushioned by budget cuts and led to a further increment in fees to £100 per year, making the AA by far the most expensive school of architecture in the United Kingdom.<sup>230</sup>

### Teaching under Brown: The Stream System

The swelling of the student population not only affected the school's finances but had direct consequences on its educational setup, specifically its teaching system and staffing arrangements. In 1944 the AA was still operating under the unit system, which divided the five-year course into fifteen terms and combined a termly cycle for studio work with an annual cycle for the lecture course. Gibberd shared Jellicoe's misgivings about a mechanism which led to the absurd situation that some students worked reversely through the lecture course: 'The complications that ensue must be experienced, they are beyond imagination.'<sup>231</sup> To combine the strengths of the year and unit systems, Gibberd in his plan for the postwar school revived the idea of a parallel unit system, first suggested by Goodhart-Rendel and Billerey and subsequently promoted by Jellicoe and his advisory panel, whereby year groups would be divided into autonomous sections of fifteen students, each under the charge of a unit master, and run as parallel streams through the year.<sup>232</sup> The major advantage of this so-called 'stream system' was the possibility of putting a different emphasis on each of the streams, allowing, for instance, students with difficulties in construction to be grouped together and fostered accordingly. Although a full implementation of this concept presupposed a return to annual entry Gibberd tested the division of large units into parallel streams in the spring term of 1945 and,

---

<sup>230</sup> Meeting of the Council, 26 Jan 1948, CM 1940-49, p. 458. In fact, the AA charged more than twice as much as any other school: annual tuition fees amounted to 45 guineas at Cambridge and the Bartlett, £35 at Liverpool and approximately £27 at the Regent Street Polytechnic ([Architectural Students' Association], 'Tuition Fees Payable at the Schools of Architecture Recognised for Exemption From the RIBA Examinations', 1947, private collection).

<sup>231</sup> Gibberd 1944.

<sup>232</sup> Ibid.

encouraged by the results, both he and Fairweather continued the experiment in the following terms.<sup>233</sup>

A year after Gibberd had submitted his plan the council, under pressure from the Ministry of Education, adopted his views and announced a reversion to annual entry for the beginning of the 1945/46 session except for those students entering upon their release from the service.<sup>234</sup> In addition, it was decided to introduce a new entrance examination for all applicants (including those holding a hitherto exempting school certificate) whose main purpose it was to determine whether a candidate 'showed promise of becoming a good architectural student' and whose results, taken in conjunction with the school record, helped to place the candidate in the right unit.<sup>235</sup>

Gordon Brown had not trained under the unit system and was evidently indifferent towards it. In June 1945, whilst awaiting demobilisation in England, he attended a council meeting and announced his plans for the coming session.<sup>236</sup> Brown demanded the abolition of the unit system and envisaged an intake of sixty students to be distributed into three groups and reshuffled after each term according to their respective qualities. His proposal was, in other words, a duplicate of Gibberd's plan. Given that the council had previously approved this plan and had effectively sealed the fate of the unit system when resolving upon the reintroduction of annual entry, it seems surprising that it was divided over Brown's agenda and only approved it after lengthy discussion.<sup>237</sup> Less surprising, perhaps, was the clamour of the students' committee, which, having had no prior knowledge of Gibberd's unpublished plan, resigned at once.<sup>238</sup>

---

<sup>233</sup> Meetings of the School Committee, 24 April 1944, 9 Oct 1944, SCM 1944-51, pp. 3, 9.

<sup>234</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 12 March 1945, *ibid.*, p. 21; Meeting of the Council, 26 March 1945, CM 1940-49, p. 276.

<sup>235</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 16 April 1945, SCM 1944-51, p. 23.

<sup>236</sup> Meeting of the Council, 11 June 1945, CM 1940-49, p. 289.

<sup>237</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 289-290. Susan Cox, the only member of the council who had studied under Rowse, protested in vain against the abolition of the unit system.

<sup>238</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 25 June 1945, SCM 1944-51, p. 30. The council had denied Gibberd the right to publish his plan or circulate it amongst staff and students so as not to prejudice the decisions of his successor. (Special Meeting of the Council, 13 Nov 1944, CM 1940-49, p. 256.)

The reversion to the year system freed tutors from administrative duties, but staff shortage remained a problem, impairing the quality of education to an even greater extent than the lack of space. To guarantee each student a specified period of personal tuition, Brown therefore implemented a more highly organised tutorial system. Whilst the mornings were reserved for informal studio teaching in the conventional way, the afternoons were devoted to tutorial sessions of twenty minutes per student, requiring teachers to work to a precise time plan and making their attendance throughout the day indispensable.<sup>239</sup> Brown was aware that this new system, though commonplace in other schools, meant a departure from the informal structures at the AA:

It is often said that the AA should be run on the lines of a university and that too strict a control of times of attendance leads to a secondary-school atmosphere. I agree with this provided it is realised that our problem is fundamentally different to most university studies. At the AA the student learns most of his architecture in the studio. It is not the type of work which he can carry on in his own room. He needs frequent help and advice. To give this help and advice to a large number of students the staff have to organise their time with great care.<sup>240</sup>

Unsurprisingly, the new regime was not to everyone's liking. George Fairweather, who shortly before had been appointed senior master in appreciation of his work as interim principal, resigned at once due to 'fundamental disagreements as to the teaching system now used in the school.'<sup>241</sup>

The system debased the working conditions at the AA, which, compared to other institutions of higher education, were not favourable to begin with. First, true to its origin as a self-help organisation of students, the AA had taken a long time to start paying competitive wages, and even when it finally did, the standard it adhered to was the so-called 'Burnham Scale', i.e. the pay grades of school teachers.<sup>242</sup> Secondly,

---

<sup>239</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 14 Jan 1946, SCM 1944-51, pp. 44-45; Gordon Brown, 'Procedure Note No. 4: Tutorial System', 2 Jan 1946, *ibid.*, p. 46 (att.).

<sup>240</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>241</sup> Meeting of the Council, 26 Feb 1946, CM 1940-49, p. 323.

<sup>242</sup> Gibberd was highly critical of the AA's salary structure: '[It] is not school teachers we should compare staff with, but university professors. [...] No matter how perfect we get the curriculum, we shall not have a leading school unless we get exceptional staff – I offer any polytechnic as an example. You will not get the staff, and you will not hold the staff you now have, if the attitude and the basis of their appointment is that of secondary school teachers.' (Gibberd, Feb 1943, *op. cit.*) Brown concurred: 'The most important thing is still the quality of the staff. [...] With good students and good teachers you can do good work in a barn. I would make a strong plea for a little more consideration of this very important fact. [...] Unless the junior staffs are paid better, there will not be any junior staffs. In the Burnham Scale it is laid down that a qualified teacher of architecture can be paid a minimum wage of £6 a week. In other words, his value is estimated as that of a

and more importantly, the AA could not offer long-term employment: full-time staff were engaged for one academic year, whilst part-time tutors were appointed on a term basis. Low wages and lack of job security meant that high staff turnover at the AA was – and always had been – inherent. On the other hand, the school's central London location and its unique link with a professional association gave it unrivalled access to a large pool of practising architects, many of whom had themselves trained at the AA or were otherwise sympathetic to the school. Conscious of the limited resources it had at its disposal, they were often prepared to take on temporary teaching duties for little or, in some cases, no money at all.<sup>243</sup> Moreover, precisely *because* teaching at the AA did not involve a long-term commitment and – crucially – the school not only allowed but actively encouraged members of its teaching staff to be practising architects, it was a welcome stop-gap for aspiring young architects in the course of setting up in private practice. This was particularly the case in the immediate postwar years, when building licensing made the resumption of professional work outside public offices all but impossible. Unlike Gibberd, who was often forced to employ staff regardless of their aptitude as teachers, Brown thus had the option (if not always the funds) to choose between candidates, not least because the accelerated pace of demobilisations, which otherwise put a strain on the running of the school, did have the benefit that potential tutors, too, became increasingly available.

Two general tendencies in Brown's staffing policy are discernable. First, he embraced the time-honoured policy of feeding young professionals – many of them recent AA graduates – back into the school. Some of them, including Jim Cadbury-Brown, Jacko Moya and Denys Lasdun, only taught for a limited period before their private work gained momentum; others such as Colin Penn and Andrew Carden, however, stayed on well into the mid- or late 1950s. Incidentally, it was also Brown (rather than his successor Robert Furneaux Jordan, as is sometimes claimed), who conceived the idea of engaging the members of the Architects' Co-operative

---

farm labourer.' (R. Gordon Brown, 'A New Form of Architectural Education', *AAJ*, Dec 1948, vol. 64, no. 727, p. 99.)

<sup>243</sup> For instance, both Goodhart-Rendel and Ove Arup offered their services entirely free when in January 1948 the AA faced an acute shortage of staff (Meeting of the School Committee, 12 Jan 1948, SCM 1944-51, p. 103).

Partnership (ACP) under a collective contract.<sup>244</sup> A second tendency lay in an increasingly internationalised personnel. During the war the AA had maintained a veto on the appointment of foreign teaching staff, and although the council gradually lifted this policy from 1944 onward, it urged its principal to ‘make every effort to employ British staff first.’<sup>245</sup> Accordingly, at the time of Brown’s inauguration German architect Walter Segal, who had been appointed the year before, was still the only non-British teacher at the school.<sup>246</sup> Ignoring the council’s recommendation, Brown employed a number of foreign tutors, two of whom would have a lasting impact on the school. Canadian Enrico de Pierro joined the AA after a brief teaching stint at McGill and stayed for almost a decade.<sup>247</sup> Brown’s key appointment, however, was Arthur Korn, the mastermind behind the 1942 MARS Plan for London, whom he enticed away from Oxford in August 1945 and who was to become a major influence on successive generations of AA students throughout the postwar period.<sup>248</sup> Korn, who had been affiliated with German avant-garde groups in the 1920s, was joined on the AA staff by a number of other émigré architects with links to continental modernism, including Egon Riss, Alexander Kurz and Jaromír Krejcar.<sup>249</sup>

Brown would have favoured a small staff of full-time teachers on long-term contracts, but he presumably realised that this was an unrealistic proposition under the circumstances. He never actively tried to hold part-time tutors to their contracts, even when they left during term time without giving the requisite period of notice

---

<sup>244</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 27 April 1948, *ibid.*, p. 112. Brown proposed a similar arrangement with the partners at Yorke Rosenberg and Mardall, which failed to materialise. (Meeting of the School Committee, 13 Dec 1948, *ibid.*, p. 125.)

<sup>245</sup> Meeting of the Council, 13 March 1944, CM 1940-49, p. 217; see also: Meeting of the Council, 19 Jan 1942, *ibid.*, p. 109.

<sup>246</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 9 Oct 1944, SCM 1944-51, p. 9.

<sup>247</sup> De Pierro was recommended by John Bland, the director at McGill, who had himself studied under Rowse.

<sup>248</sup> See e.g.: Sharp 1967, *op. cit.* Korn had been a full-time member of staff at Oxford since 1941. In early 1944 he had to relinquish his position to a former member of staff who returned from the services – much to the regret of Edwin Rice, the head of the school, who re-employed Korn in a part-time capacity. Korn applied for a part-time position at the AA to supplement his salary. Brown instead offered him a full-time position, which precluded him from carrying on his work at Oxford. (Edwin Rice, letter of reference for Korn, 20 Jan 1944, AAA, Box 2012:13; Korn, letter to H. J. W. Alexander, 23 Sep 1944, *ibid.*; Alexander, letter to Korn, 22 Aug 1945, *ibid.*)

<sup>249</sup> Riss had left Vienna in 1938 and was briefly employed as an assistant in Furneaux Jordan’s practice before moving to Scotland to work for the Scottish Coal Board. Fellow Austrian Kurz had been a partner of Ernst L. Freud in Berlin and later moved to the USA. Krejcar was the delegate of the Czechoslovak branch of CIAM; he fled the communist coup in 1948 and sought asylum in England, where he died in the same year.

(although he was clearly annoyed by it).<sup>250</sup> By contrast, he rallied a group of trusted year masters, to whom he delegated much of the conduct of the school. John Brandon-Jones remembered that ‘the organisation was really left to a committee of the five year masters, and as it happened we all got on well together, and we all ran the school quite happily, playing into each other’s hands and making an annual report to Gordon Brown, which he signed and pretended it was his own.’<sup>251</sup> Unsurprisingly given his military background, Brown adhered to a hierarchical chain of command: he conveyed a great deal of responsibility to his year masters and purposely chose not to interfere with their courses. However, unbeknownst to Brandon-Jones, Brown did not in fact take credit for the work of his year masters and regularly referred any praise he received from the council back to them.<sup>252</sup> Brown evidently chose his year masters for their teaching skills and suitability within the year masters’ collective rather than their architectural predilections. In comparison with the tutors they were therefore a more eclectic and, on the whole, considerably less progressive lot. Two of them were already at the AA when Brown arrived: Eric Jarrett, in charge of the first year, had been on the staff since 1919, and David Goddard had started his appointment under Fairweather. In addition, Brown engaged Colin St Clair Oakes and Brandon-Jones, two of his competitors for the principalship, as well as Michael Patrick, who became his second-in-command.<sup>253</sup> Although Brown reshuffled their assignments occasionally, he stuck to this small nucleus of year masters and went to great lengths to retain them.<sup>254</sup>

---

<sup>250</sup> See e.g.: Meeting of the School Committee, 30 Sep 1946, SCM 1944-51, p. 69.

<sup>251</sup> BLSA/Brandon-Jones.

<sup>252</sup> See e.g.: Meetings of the School Committee, 3 March 1947, 28 March 1947, SCM 1944-51, pp. 83, 86.

<sup>253</sup> Brown and Patrick likely knew each other as students as they both arrived at the AA in 1931, when Brown joined the second year and Patrick the first. In addition to this core group, Robert Furneaux Jordan, Elizabeth King, L. H. Bucknell (who was also in charge of the refresher courses) and Brown himself had spells as year masters.

<sup>254</sup> For instance, when Oakes was offered the post as principal architect to the Imperial War Graves Commission for South-East Asia, Brown over considerable objections coerced the council to alter his contract, allowing him two months’ leave of absence for each of the following five years. (Meetings of the Council, 14 April 1947, 27 May 1947, CM 1940-49, pp. 398f, p. 402f.)

## ‘Draughtsmanship and the Technical Side’ – The Postwar Curriculum

Rising numbers and the uncertainties caused by the delayed demobilisation of expected students on the one hand, and the call up of existing ones on the other, made it exceedingly difficult in the immediate postwar years to institute and maintain a structured curriculum. This was all the more worrying as, notable exceptions notwithstanding (see page 42), the overall quality of student work seemed to have suffered under wartime conditions. When in January 1945 Ralph Tubbs, a member of the council, visited the school alongside Fairweather, he delivered a damning indictment of the standard of education offered. According to Tubbs, there were omissions in the curriculum in so far as important subjects, in particular aesthetics and architectural practice, were barely touched.<sup>255</sup> Tubbs laid no blame on Fairweather but, somewhat vaguely, on the fact that things had been ‘allowed to drift during the war.’<sup>256</sup> Brown’s verdict was, if anything, even more scathing. Although he was sympathetic to the difficulties under which the students had to complete their course, he disapproved of much of their work and was particularly critical of the fifth year, the standard of which he considered in some cases too low for the respective students to obtain the AA diploma.<sup>257</sup> To address these issues, Brown defined the improvement of ‘draughtsmanship and the technical side’ as the two cornerstones of his pedagogical concept.<sup>258</sup> Indeed, although he instigated an array of design lectures, it is clear that, rather than introducing his students to particular design strategies, Brown’s curriculum aimed at equipping them with a sound technical expertise based on which such strategies could be developed and the necessary drawing skills to translate them appropriately and intelligibly into architectural schemes.

The students’ lack of drawing skills may come as a surprise given that prior to the introduction of universal entrance examinations at the beginning of the 1945/46 session most candidates were judged solely on the strength of their portfolios. However, these comprised mainly free-hand sketches, which were examined for

---

<sup>255</sup> Meeting of the Council, 29 Jan 1945, CM 1940-49, p. 266.

<sup>256</sup> Ibid.

<sup>257</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 2 Nov 1945, SCM 1944-51, p. 36.

<sup>258</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 3 March 1947, *ibid.*, p. 83.

‘evidence of creative ability rather than technical skill.’<sup>259</sup> Echoing Lethaby’s approach to ‘draughtsmanship’, Gibberd wrote:

As drawing to the architect is only a means to an end, the end being an actual building, it does not matter whether the student is naturally gifted at drawing or not. I will take students to the school who have absolutely no skill at drawing, providing they can show evidence of creative ability. [...] The school curriculum has been designed to teach automatically anyone to draw. Automatically, not consciously; in this respect it differs from most other schools where emphasis is attached to drawing as an end in itself.<sup>260</sup>

However, it appears that, perhaps as a result, many drawings were in fact deficient even as a means to an end. When Peter Shephard along with councillors Roderick Enthoven and Hugh Casson examined the work of third-year students at the end of the academic year 1945/46, they were ‘not at all happy’ with the standard in the school, faulting not so much the actual designs but the poor manner in which they were presented.<sup>261</sup> Brown continued and amplified Gibberd and Fairweather’s efforts to incorporate a variety of drawing exercises into the curriculum, particularly in the junior years. Stephen Macfarlane, who entered the AA in 1945, recalls that the ‘first year was really about making us competent draughtsmen, about getting people imbued in being able to express themselves with the end of a pencil or pen.’<sup>262</sup> Measured drawings and outdoor sketching figured prominently on the timetable, and students were encouraged to carry a sketchbook with them at all times.<sup>263</sup> Moreover, prompted by staff concerns regarding the level of draughtsmanship, Eric Jarrett developed a series of Beaux-Arts type exercises for first-year students, ranging from life drawing to Trojan lettering and studying the classical orders. Thus, contrary to the belief that the AA from the late 1930s gradually abandoned its Beaux-Arts traditions, many of them – including a succession of once-despised one-day sketches – were in fact revived after the Second World War.<sup>264</sup>

---

<sup>259</sup> *School of Architecture War-Time Prospectus*, London 1942, AAA, p. 14.

<sup>260</sup> Gibberd 1944. Likewise, Lethaby felt that students should ‘draw just in the way everyone was expected to learn to write’ and regarded drawing ‘not so much as a skill but as a means of seeing, recording and thinking [...]’ (Theresa Gronberg, ‘William Richard Lethaby and the Central School of Arts and Crafts’, in: Sylvia Backemeyer, Theresa Gronberg (eds.), *WR Lethaby*, London 1984, p. 18.)

<sup>261</sup> Meeting of the Council, 15 July 1946, CM 1940-49, p. 355.

<sup>262</sup> Stephen Macfarlane, interview with the author, 23 Aug 2013.

<sup>263</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>264</sup> Incidentally, former students interviewed for this thesis were unanimous in their appreciation of the value of these exercises for their professional development.



More important perhaps than these drawing exercises was the vastly extended lecture syllabus which Brown introduced to strengthen the technical competency of his students. Anticipating the demand for refresher courses and therefore additional lecturers, the AA council had, in December 1944, approached the Building Research Station (BRS) with a view to provisionally engaging its specialists before other schools could put them under contract.<sup>265</sup> Although William Allen, the head of its architectural division, did not (as was hoped) join the AA at the time, one of his colleagues, John Eastwick-Field, did, whilst another, Cecil Handyside, had been teaching at the AA since 1935 and was now released from studio duties to focus exclusively on his services lectures.<sup>266</sup>

Eastwick-Field took charge of the practical training site, which involved students in the junior years erecting life-size structures of small buildings in timber, brick or concrete in correlation with both studio subjects and lecture course.<sup>267</sup> According to the *AA Journal*, the method followed ‘the new wartime training methods of the British Army, in which demonstration and exercise play an important part’<sup>268</sup>, but it did in fact have a precursor at the AA itself. In 1938 unit master Douglas Jones had realised two ‘live projects’ with his students – an idea which was to be at the heart of his pedagogical approach as head of the Birmingham school from 1951 onward and had itself been anticipated by Lethaby’s School of Building in Brixton, founded in 1902.<sup>269</sup> Gibberd picked up the thread in his plan for the postwar school, which was to incorporate a ‘school of building’<sup>270</sup>, and Fairweather subsequently set it up on a temporary site before it was permanently installed alongside the MOW emergency

---

<sup>265</sup> Meetings of the Council, 27 Nov 1944, 18 Dec 1944, CM 1940-49, pp. 257, 263.

<sup>266</sup> Handyside, formerly in partnership with Fairweather and Furneaux Jordan, was a senior architect with the BRS. Eastwick-Field joined the BRS in 1945 and briefly worked in Handyside’s office. For Allen and the BRS see p. 238.

<sup>267</sup> Eastwick-Field took over the training site from Hugh Crallan, who had devised the original programme. He left the AA in January 1949 to form the Stillman and Eastwick-Field Partnership and was succeeded by R. A. Duncan and, shortly after, Denzil Nield.

<sup>268</sup> ‘Technical Training and New Scholarships at the AA School of Architecture’, *AAJ*, May 1945, vol. 60, no. 695, p. 156.

<sup>269</sup> For an authoritative account of Lethaby’s School of Building in Brixton see: Mark Swenarton, *Artisans and Architects*, Basingstoke 1989, pp. 118-124; for Douglas Jones’s live projects at the AA see: ‘Building Experience’, *Focus*, no. 4 (1939), pp. 85-86; for the live project programme at Birmingham see e.g.: Brown 2012, op. cit., pp. 25-31. Incidentally, Douglas Jones’s collaborator and successor at Birmingham was Denys Hinton, who had studied under Brown.

<sup>270</sup> Gibberd 1944.

hutments on Morwell Street.<sup>271</sup> Brown, who saw great value ‘not only in teaching building construction as such, but in showing students the problems they would face in carrying out their designs, especially whilst building restrictions prevented them from seeing many examples,<sup>272</sup> was thus the latest in a line of AA educators who sought to inject the course with Lethabite ideas.<sup>273</sup> The dominance of technical studies within the curriculum became such that Brown in July 1946 considered it necessary to appoint Sergei ‘George’ Kadleigh to the newly created post of ‘director of technical studies’, whose main task it was to coordinate the lecture syllabus with the practical training site.<sup>274</sup> Brown also restructured the course itself, which he divided into three distinct phases – the first year as an introductory and testing period (including practical training); the second and third years, in which students had the bulk of their lectures; and the fourth and fifth years, in which students were largely free from lectures and concentrated on design.<sup>275</sup>

Brown expected the quality of training provided by the AA to be of a considerably higher order than the standard set by the RIBA.<sup>276</sup> He took pride in the fact that the

---

<sup>271</sup> Material shortages delayed the scheme until June 1945 when W. E. Mullen, the head of the building firm Mullen & Lumsden, offered to supply material, equipment and the services of one of his foremen. Moreover, Mullen, who was also mayor of Holborn, provided a temporary site in his borough before the installation could be transferred to Morwell Street. (Meetings of the Council, 28 May 1945, 11 June 1945, CM 1940-49, pp. 286-287, 288.)

<sup>272</sup> Quoted in: Joint Meeting of the Officers of the Council, the Development Sub-Committee and the Advisory Council, 27 Jan 1948, *ibid.*, p. 461.

<sup>273</sup> Brown himself referred explicitly to the first RIBA syllabus of 1906, which bore the signatures of Reginald Blomfield and John Slater but was largely based on a draft by Lethaby: ‘In 1906 the Board of Education of the RIBA published a syllabus for schools in which they said that construction was the basis of architecture; architecture was the interpretation of forms into aesthetic value, and that students should be familiarised with the actual facts of building. [...] It was [sic] as true today as when it was written.’ (Brown, quoted in: ‘Prize Giving 1946’, *op. cit.*, p. 21; see also: John Brandon-Jones, ‘Architects and the Art Workers’ Guild’, *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, March 1973, vol. 121, no. 5200, p. 195.)

<sup>274</sup> Meeting of the Council, 15 July 1946, CM 1940-49, p. 355. Serge Kadloubovsky was White Russian by birth and changed his name to Kadleigh when he became a British citizen in 1935 whilst studying at the AA. At the time of his appointment he was in private practice with Michael Ryan, another AA tutor; subsequently he went into partnership with Fry and Drew before teaming up with Patrick Horsbrugh, one of his former students. Kadleigh was succeeded as director of technical studies by John Brandon-Jones in September 1948 and Michael Pattrick in April 1949.

<sup>275</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 30 Sep 1946, SCM 1944-51, pp. 68-69.

<sup>276</sup> In a report to the school committee Brown referred to ‘examination hysteria’ over technical subjects as many students had gaps in their knowledge due to the interruption of their training through the war. Rather than lowering the standard of the AA examinations, Brown considered introducing a two-tier system whereby weaker students could sit a standard examination equivalent to the RIBA Final while those who were more advanced would take the AA examination and gain an honours degree in construction. A student called V. H. R. Naidu appears to be the only one who was ever awarded such a degree. (Meeting of the School Committee, 28 March 1947, *ibid.*, pp. 85-86; Meeting of the Council, 22 Nov 1948, CM 1940-49, p. 508.)

course of technical lectures at the AA was ‘the best produced by any school’<sup>277</sup>; at the same time he was conscious that the extended lecture programme affected the time his students could afford to work on their design tasks, and he therefore reduced them in both scope and number.<sup>278</sup> Alan Colquhoun remembered the teaching as ‘unremarkable’<sup>279</sup> – indeed, to some degree it was non-existent, for given the sheer number of students even a weekly tuition time of twenty minutes per student proved impracticable and had to be cut to twelve.<sup>280</sup> With year groups regularly exceeding a hundred students, Brown’s original idea of splitting an intake of sixty students into three ‘streams’ soon became obsolete, and from session 1947/48 onward students were grouped in sections of about ten,<sup>281</sup> loosely supervised by often changing and rarely present staff. This setup suited the more mature students, who organised their education as a largely self-guided process, taking liberties in the interpretation of their tasks and – encouraged by the staff, notably fourth-year master David Goddard – often tackling them collectively (see also page 97).<sup>282</sup>

### **International Entanglements: The AA and the CIAM Summer School**

Brown was convinced that the school was ‘too large to train the best possible architect.’<sup>283</sup> Given the number of distinguished architects who emerged from his course, one may question this assessment, and his superiors at least wholly disagreed with it. Whether it was due to Brown’s leadership, his panel of year masters, the revised syllabus or the curricular permissiveness and the type of student to whom it was granted, the excellent outcome was generally recognised. In March 1947, Anthony Chitty, by then a member of the council, felt that ‘the conditions at the school have improved to an extent he had not thought possible so soon after the

---

<sup>277</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 3 March 1947, SCM 1944-51, p. 83. Brown repeated the claim in his centenary message: ‘The technical syllabus, which includes the practical training scheme, is probably the best in Europe.’ (‘The Centenary of the Architectural Association’, *AAJ*, Dec 1947, vol. 63, no. 717, p. 74.)

<sup>278</sup> Meetings of the School Committee, 8 July 1946, 25 June 1948, SCM 1944-51, pp. 62, 116.

<sup>279</sup> Quoted in: Sarah Menin, Stephen Kite, *An Architecture of Invitation: Colin St John Wilson*, Aldershot 2005, p. 23.

<sup>280</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 20 Jan 1947, SCM 1944-51, p. 78.

<sup>281</sup> Joint Meeting of the Officers of the Council, the Development Sub-Committee and the Advisory Council, 27 Jan 1948, CM 1940-49, p. 461.

<sup>282</sup> See e.g.: Michael Ventris (ed.), ‘Group Working’, *PLAN*, no. 2 (1948), pp. 6-22; Gowan 1973, op. cit., p. 10.

<sup>283</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 3 March 1947, SCM 1944-51, p. 83.

war<sup>284</sup>, and his president Howard Robertson, himself a former principal of the school, opined that the ‘teaching, in spite of congestion at the entry point, has never been at a higher level.’<sup>285</sup> The architectural press shared these sentiments. Both the *Architect and Building News* and the *Builder* praised the annual school display of 1947,<sup>286</sup> and the *Architects’ Journal* was in no doubt that the AA had ‘lost none of its pre-eminence’<sup>287</sup> and reasserted its position as ‘the unquestionable seat and centre of *avant-gardism* in architecture for the whole country.’<sup>288</sup>

Meanwhile the country’s standing was itself changing as Britain was on the turn from being a latecomer to international modernism to becoming one of its driving forces. Although the MARS Group had met only occasionally in the early 1940s, due to the virtual dissolution of most of its continental counterparts it almost by default emerged as the leading CIAM section after the war.<sup>289</sup> With roughly one hundred members it vastly outnumbered any other branch within the organisation and started to take a key role in shaping its agenda, hosting two of its three conferences in the immediate postwar period.<sup>290</sup> The AA was intimately involved with these developments, not least because at the time of CIAM 6 at Bridgwater in summer 1947 many MARS members were associated with the school. Three of them – Furneaux Jordan, David Goddard and John Broadbent – had been on the studio staff when Brown took over, and they were soon joined by Korn, Cadbury-Brown, Christopher Nicholson and the seven members of ACP. In addition, senior lecturers Kadleigh, Felix Samuely and Richard Sheppard belonged to the MARS Group, as did six out of eighteen members of council.<sup>291</sup>

---

<sup>284</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 28 March 1947, *ibid.*, p. 86.

<sup>285</sup> Quoted in: ‘Opening of the Centenary Exhibition’, *AAJ*, Jan 1948, vol. 63, no. 718, p. 102.

<sup>286</sup> *ABN*, 4 April 1947, p. 3; *Builder*, 25 July 1947, p. 87.

<sup>287</sup> *AJ*, 17 June 1948, p. 550.

<sup>288</sup> ‘The AA Centenary’, *AJ*, 11 Dec 1947, p. 512.

<sup>289</sup> See: John R. Gold, ‘“A Very Serious Responsibility”?: The MARS Group, Internationality and Relations with CIAM, 1933-39’, *Architectural History*, no. 56 (2013), p. 268; for a discussion of the CIAM context after the war see also: Eric Mumford, *The CIAM Discourse on Urbanism, 1928-1960*, 1<sup>st</sup> pb. ed., London / Cambridge MA 2002, pp. 168-173.

<sup>290</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 173, 201.

<sup>291</sup> MARS members remained a minority on the AA council, although they gradually increased their number from three at the end of the war (Susan Cox, Summerson, Tubbs) to five in 1946/47 (Tubbs, Chitty, Casson, Sheppard, Pott), six in 1947/48 (Susan Cox, Chitty, Casson, Sheppard, Pott, Samuel), and eight in 1948/49 (Susan Cox, Chitty, Casson, Pott, Nicholson/Sheppard, Samuel, Mardall, Richards).

In 1947, the AA celebrated its centenary, and the council intended to organise its festivities concurrently with CIAM 6, allowing visitors from abroad to attend both events and thus boosting the prestige of the occasion (not least because it was seen as a welcome opportunity to attract much-needed donations). To the same end, the AA invited King George to deliver the opening address and waived its usual election procedures to appoint as its president for the centenary year Howard Robertson, at the time Britain's representative on the UN Board of Design and as such 'in a sense the ambassador of our profession', as Henry Braddock put it.<sup>292</sup> By and large these plans failed as neither the King nor any other member of the royal family was inclined to attend and the celebration itself had to be deferred to cause less disturbance to the school. In fact, limited resources and austerity measures forced the AA to curtail the event to an extent that Robertson, in fear of embarrassment, suggested that for the time being it be cancelled altogether.<sup>293</sup>

The scaled-back festivities eventually took place shortly before Christmas and, despite travel difficulties caused by currency restrictions, were attended by seven hundred visitors from eleven different countries.<sup>294</sup> More telling for the international reputation of the AA, however, was the reaction of some who did not. Much to the indignation of the Swiss CIAM group, the AA had invited Hans Hofmann, the comparably traditionalist dean of ETH Zurich, but not Sigfried Giedion or any other of its members.<sup>295</sup> Effectively barred from influential teaching positions in their own country by Hofmann's 'closed-shop policy'<sup>296</sup>, the group expressed bemusement at the lack of support from what they publicly referred to as 'Europe's most advanced architecture school'.<sup>297</sup> Alarmed by his colleagues, Robertson sent a

---

<sup>292</sup> Quoted in: Howard Robertson, 'Quality in Architecture', presidential address, *AAJ*, Nov 1947, vol. 63, no. 716, p. 54.

<sup>293</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 16 Oct 1947, CM 1940-49, p. 428.

<sup>294</sup> Some of them had come from as far as South Africa, New Zealand and Burma; however, to the council's disappointment no delegate from the United States was able to attend the centenary – a fate it largely shared with the Bridgwater congress. (Mumford 2002, p. 168.)

<sup>295</sup> Alfred Roth, letter to Hartland Thomas, 9 Dec 1947, gta/ETH/CIAM, 42-SG-23-218/219; also: Giedion, letter to Percy Marshall, 8 Dec 1947, *ibid.*, 42-SG-23-220.

<sup>296</sup> Sigfried Giedion, telegraph to Howard Robertson, n.d. [Dec 1947], *ibid.*, 42-SG-19-53.

<sup>297</sup> *Ibid.* Alfred Roth used the same phrase in *Das Werk*, Switzerland's leading architecture magazine (A. R., '100 Jahre AA-School in London', *Das Werk*, Feb 1948, vol. 35, no. 2, p. 23).

last-minute invitation, but at this juncture Giedion was either unable or unwilling to attend.<sup>298</sup>

Whilst the centenary was primarily an association affair whose organisation lay in the hands of the council (which may explain the slip-up with Giedion), Brown on his own initiative set schemes in motion which aimed specifically at raising the school's international profile. According to Brandon-Jones, this was in fact his main pursuit: 'Gordon Brown [...] took very little interest in running the school. He rather took the Reilly line that his job was to advertise the school rather than to organise it.'<sup>299</sup> Indeed, there can be no doubt that Brown allocated a substantial part of his time to building up contacts with schools in other countries. Although the council was concerned about the repeated absences of its principal due to his frequent travels abroad, it welcomed the outcome and was delighted with the 'remarkable recrudescence of the association's foreign contacts, greater even than before the war.'<sup>300</sup>

Most of Brown's collaborations with foreign schools took the form of reciprocal student exchanges during the summer vacations. Reviving a pre-war tradition, plans for the first such 'summer school' were drawn up in July 1945 between Brown and the well-known Swedish architect Sven Ivar Lind on behalf of the Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm.<sup>301</sup> Simultaneously, Brown approached Steen Eiler Rasmussen, who had taught at the AA when Brown was a student and was now a professor at the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts. As a result, in late summer 1946 two dozen AA students embarked on an eight-week excursion to Sweden and another party took a shorter trip to Denmark.<sup>302</sup> In January 1946, whilst the

---

<sup>298</sup> Robertson, letter to Giedion, 10 Dec 1947, gta/ETH/CIAM, 42-SG-23-217. The fact that Robertson rather than AA secretary Alexander sent the invitation indicates that the council took the affair seriously.

<sup>299</sup> BLSA/Brandon-Jones. Charles Reilly was the influential head of the Liverpool school between 1904 and 1933. Brandon-Jones, who had worked at Liverpool, maintained that it was Reilly's second-in-command and successor Lionel Budden who 'made it work while Reilly was selling it', the implication being that Brandon-Jones and his fellow year masters were the ones who actually made the AA school work. ([Gavin Stamp], 'An interview with John Brandon-Jones: "Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive"', *Architectural Design*, Oct/Nov 1979, p. 101.)

<sup>300</sup> 'Council's Report for Session 1946-1947', *AAJ*, June/July 1947, vol. 63, no. 713, p. 9; see also: Meeting of the Council, 26 Feb 1946, CM 1940-49, p. 327.

<sup>301</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 2 Nov 1945, SCM 1944-51, p. 35f.

<sup>302</sup> The journey to Sweden under Kadleigh's guidance took place between 8 August and 19 September and was coupled with the annual members' excursion; the trip to Denmark was led by David Goddard and lasted

Scandinavian journeys were in preparation, Brown visited Paris to see the reconstruction plans for towns in Normandy and used the opportunity to line up an exchange with students of the *École des Beaux Arts*. The final draft for this venture was in hand in February,<sup>303</sup> though it was eventually cancelled, presumably because the travel planning for yet another group would have overstretched the capacities of AA secretary Alexander. Instead, the Scandinavian trips were followed by summer schools in Zurich in 1947 and Venice in 1948, both under the direction of Michael Patrick.

The series of exchange schemes provided the groundwork for Brown's major undertaking, which briefly positioned him, and thereby the AA, at the forefront of the international discourse on architectural education in the late 1940s. Concluding from his experiences with schools on the continent, Brown identified a 'reactionary tendency [...] in architectural education in all countries' and in spring 1947 approached Giedion with a proposal for a permanent 'CIAM International School' for postgraduate students in Zurich in order to give 'serious challenge' to this undesirable development.<sup>304</sup> Brown's plan was for a full-time course of one year's duration, modelled – unsurprisingly – on the AA school: Led by an independent director under the auspices of a CIAM-appointed council, the aims of the course would be to cultivate 'draughtsmanship' and 'building technique' (complete with a practical training site) as well as 'creative ability and aesthetic appreciation' and, somewhat vaguely, 'logic'.<sup>305</sup>

Giedion, who shared Brown's assessment of the state of architectural education, mistakenly assumed that Brown was acting in conjunction with the MARS Group and suggested that they discuss his ideas in plenum so that at the forthcoming congress in Bridgwater, 'the problem of educational reform could be brought forth

---

from 23 August to 8 September. In return, groups of Danish and Swedish students visited England in, respectively, June and September 1947.

<sup>303</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 4 Feb 1946, *ibid.*, p. 49.

<sup>304</sup> [Gordon Brown], 'CIAM International School', n. d., gta/ETH/CIAM, 42-SG-19-77/78/79 (both quotes from this document). Brown's proposal is undated but apparently reached Giedion shortly before the CIRPAC meeting in Zurich in May 1947. See also: Brown, letter to Giedion, 14 Oct 1947, *ibid.*, 42-SG-19-65.

<sup>305</sup> *Ibid.*

by the members of the English group.<sup>306</sup> The permanent commission on architectural education, which was inaugurated at the congress, included a number of MARS members, two of whom, George Kadleigh and Leo De Syllas, were on the AA teaching staff at the time.<sup>307</sup> However, in the absence of Brown, who had to cancel his appearance owing to an illness of his wife, and without the official support of the MARS Group, the item was dropped from the agenda.<sup>308</sup>

Nonetheless, the plan had clearly aroused Giedion's interest, as he – together with Maxwell Fry on behalf of MARS, but without Brown himself – initiated informal consultations with Julian Huxley, the director-general of UNESCO, putting forward Swiss architect Ernst Burckhardt as the prospective principal of the school.<sup>309</sup> Brown was understandably irritated at being sidelined and advised Giedion that he was anxious to proceed with the scheme as quickly as possible and was in a position to organise it, 'whether it is inside or outside CIAM'.<sup>310</sup> Trying to circumvent the MARS Group, who appeared to have appropriated his idea, Brown cunningly suggested that since the school was to be located in Zurich the affair should be placed in the hands of the Swiss group, which could co-opt him as a special member to assist Burckhardt in preparing a draft curriculum.<sup>311</sup>

Sceptical about Brown, whom he wrongly blamed for the AA's disregard toward the Swiss CIAM group ahead of the centenary celebrations, Giedion approached his two main English allies, Jane Drew and Jaqueline Tyrwhitt, to obtain their views.<sup>312</sup> Drew,

---

<sup>306</sup> Giedion, letter to Brown, 7 June 1947, *ibid.*, 42-SG-19-80. Brown had joined MARS in 1945 but appears to have been a marginal figure within the group.

<sup>307</sup> Chaired by Gropius, the commission had fifteen members including six of the MARS Group (Holford, Drew, De Syllas, Kadleigh, Marshall, Townsend). Jaromír Krejcar, who represented the Czechoslovak branch on the commission, joined the AA staff in 1948, Robert Townsend the year after. ('CIAM 6 - Tentative List for Commissions. Commission IV. Architectural Education', *gta/ETH/CIAM*, 42-JLS-7-19; see also: Mumford 2002, p. 172.)

<sup>308</sup> 'It was decided that in view of the more urgent and important problems before CIAM 6, and because as an English proposal it had not yet come before the MARS Group, it could not be considered by the Commission.' ('Commission IV. Architectural Education: Summary of Proceedings', *gta/ETH/CIAM*, 42-AR-1.)

<sup>309</sup> The idea for an 'International School of Modern Architecture' featured on Huxley's to-do list for the forthcoming UNESCO conference in Mexico City (Julian Huxley, 'UNESCO, General Conference, Second Session', 5 Oct 1947, *ibid.*, 42-SG-19-115.)

<sup>310</sup> Brown, letter to Giedion, 14 Oct 1947, *op. cit.*

<sup>311</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>312</sup> Giedion, letter to Jane Drew, 12 Nov 1947, *ibid.*, 42-SG-23-230 ('We would be delighted to work with him, but I want to know if he is really on our side. [...] [We] would like to know on which side stands G. B. '); see also: Alfred Roth, letter to Hartland Thomas, 9 Dec 1947, *ibid.*, 42-SG-23-218/219 ('The Swiss



who had studied with Brown, replied that Brown ‘does not seem to be producing a really good spirit of modern architecture in his school, and yet he has done certain good things, such as the summer school in Switzerland [...],’ concluding somewhat enigmatically: ‘I do not really think he is on the side of modern architecture as a cause though his feelings naturally lie that way.’<sup>313</sup> In sharp contrast, Tyrwhitt felt that Brown was ‘convinced of the value of international education’ and anxious to link his successful scheme of summer schools to CIAM: ‘The AA is probably the most CIAM minded of any European school.’<sup>314</sup> None the wiser, Giedion deferred his reply until January 1948, by which time Brown had managed to persuade the MARS Group to recognise him as their official representative in dealing with the proposed CIAM school.<sup>315</sup> The arrangement, however, was short-lived as within two months of submitting an official MARS proposal for a summer course at the AA, envisaged as a test-run for the permanent school and directed by Brown, he was once more replaced by Maxwell Fry.<sup>316</sup> In light of currency and travel difficulties the MARS Group ultimately cancelled the summer course, and Brown, having objected in vain, lost any interest in CIAM and sought to realise his scheme in collaboration with TU Delft.<sup>317</sup> Nothing came of it, but the CIAM Summer School did eventually take place in the following year, organised by Maxwell Fry and Jaqueline Tyrwhitt at the AA as a follow-up to the seventh CIAM congress at Bergamo,<sup>318</sup> and was to become a regular feature at Venice until the dissolution of CIAM in 1956.

---

CIAM members are very interested in Brown’s project of a CIAM school but will support it only if they, in turn, can count upon the help of their English friends.’)

<sup>313</sup> Drew, letter to Giedion, 18 Nov 1947, *ibid.*, 42-SG-23-228.

<sup>314</sup> Tyrwhitt, letter to Giedion, 13 Dec 1947, *ibid.*, 42-SG-19-57.

<sup>315</sup> Brown, letter to Giedion, 26 Nov 1947, *ibid.*, 42-SG-19-63.

<sup>316</sup> M. Hartland Thomas, letter to Giedion, 17 March 1948, *ibid.*, 42-SG-19-113; ‘MARS Group: 1947-8 Session – Report of the Executive Committee to the AGM’, 21 May 1948, *MARS Group File*, AA Library, London, 72.036(42) MARS [hereafter cited as AAL/MARS].

<sup>317</sup> Meeting of the Council, 22 Nov 1948, CM 1940-49, p. 504; Meeting of the School Committee, 13 Dec 1948, SCM 1944-51, p. 126.

<sup>318</sup> MARS Group, ‘CIAM Summer School – Information Sheet’, 26 April 1949, gta/ETH/CIAM, 42-JT-3-219. Notable participants included Christoph Bon, Paul Boissevain, Oliver Carey, Francesco Gnechi-Ruscione, Oscar Hansen and Anders William-Olsson (*ibid.*, 42-JT-3-352). Brown had left the AA by then.

## A Tragic Person – Gordon Brown’s Resignation and Subsequent Career

When the 1948/49 academic session began, the school’s infrastructural problems were under control, its leadership was firmly in place and its national and international reputation restored. Yet Brown was not content with the state of affairs and, in a paper read to the AA on 24 November 1948, proposed radical changes to its organisational and educational setup.<sup>319</sup> Brown’s bone of contention was the persistent lack of realism in student work, which he blamed on the enduring legacy of the school’s ‘digression’<sup>320</sup> to the Beaux-Arts system in the early decades of the century. The revision of the technical syllabus, specifically the practical training site, had been a first step toward resuscitating the Arts and Crafts-inspired methods employed in the school around the turn of the century and realigning it thus to what Brown considered to be the ‘main stream which the policy and development of the AA were [and should be] following.’<sup>321</sup>

Brown advanced two further schemes aimed at pulling students out of their academic isolation ‘by ensuring contact [...] with both the profession and other parallel studies.’<sup>322</sup> First, students were to be attached to an architectural practice from their first day at the school and give it a month’s unpaid vacation work each year, thus making office training an integral part of the basic course. Secondly, Brown proposed the integrated training of architects and artists, thereby reflecting the revived interest of the profession in questions of architectural expression, which, inspired by Giedion’s influential essay on ‘The Need for a New Monumentality’ of 1944, emerged as a key topic of the international – and particularly British – postwar discourse.<sup>323</sup> More prosaically, Brown saw the cooperation with art schools as a way to secure his students a foothold in the emerging field of industrial design. In the previous session AA fourth- and fifth-year students had collaborated with Royal College of Art (RCA) students on designs for a drama centre (see page 91), and Brown intended to forge a permanent liaison with the RCA, which under its

---

<sup>319</sup> Brown, ‘Architectural Education’, op. cit., pp. 94-107.

<sup>320</sup> Ibid., p. 96.

<sup>321</sup> Ibid.

<sup>322</sup> Ibid., p. 102.

<sup>323</sup> See: Mumford 2002, pp. 150-152. The ‘synthesis of the arts’ (Ibid., p. 192f) was one of the main themes discussed at CIAM 7 in Bergamo and at a follow-up joint meeting of the MARS Group and the Institute of Contemporary Art at the RIBA (*AJ*, 8 Sep 1949, p. 244; *Builder*, 23 Sep 1949, pp. 392-393).

new principal Robin Darwin was undergoing an ambitious and generously funded expansion programme.<sup>324</sup> After a first-year foundation course devoted to general education and design basics the two schools were to combine for an extended period of joint training in a new ‘country school’, reflecting Brown’s conviction that an architectural training in entirely urban surroundings lacked balance.<sup>325</sup> Students would then be given the choice between completing their architecture course in the fifth year or embarking upon a two-year course which would earn them an additional degree in either town planning or industrial design.<sup>326</sup>

The principal was, as the *Architects’ Journal* succinctly noted, ‘flying a pretty powerful kite’<sup>327</sup>, levelling criticism at the RIBA (for preserving Beaux-Arts traditions through its student prizes), the Ministry of Education (for underfunding students) and, above all, his own council, which due to its annually changing membership proved unable to agree upon a much-needed long-term policy for the school. As early as January 1946 A. F. B. Anderson had stressed the need for such a policy,<sup>328</sup> but it was not until June 1947 that the council eventually decided to set up a ‘development sub-committee’ to consider the future of the AA and discuss ways of safeguarding the school’s independence in light of scarce finances and increasing government intervention in technical education.<sup>329</sup> By the time of Brown’s address

---

<sup>324</sup> ‘We in England after the war have need of markets for our exports. Good industrial designers are vital to the whole country, and, hey presto, there is a new director at the Royal College of Art and a team of eminent designers. Money and machinery and priorities are provided, and there is our Bauhaus, or something better.’ (Brown, ‘Architectural Education’, p. 99; see also: Meetings of the School Committee, 1 March 1948, 27 April 1948, SCM 1944-51, pp. 108-109, 114.)

<sup>325</sup> Brown, ‘Architectural Education’, p. 98. The idea of an AA country school was popular in the immediate postwar years, partly as a result of the experience of Mount House. The AA’s woodland site at Hooke Park, acquired in 2002, is a modern-day incarnation of Brown’s idea.

<sup>326</sup> It is unclear whether and to which degree Brown had developed his ideas in consultation with Darwin. When the *Architects’ Journal* praised the original scheme for a collaboration between AA and RCA students (*AJ*, 15 April 1948, pp. 344-345), Darwin replied that ‘when certain plans for the reconstruction of the College have been carried out, it is hoped to develop this co-operation on a fully organized basis’; however, he also stressed that efforts to liaise with architecture schools were in no way limited to the AA and that ‘similar exchanges have been initiated with Professor Corfiato of the Bartlett School of Architecture in the University of London, who has shown himself equally interested and helpful.’ (*Ibid.*, 13 May 1948, p. 434.)

<sup>327</sup> *AJ*, 2 Dec 1948, p. 504.

<sup>328</sup> Meeting of the Council, 28 Jan 1946, CM 1940-49, p. 319.

<sup>329</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 30 June 1947, *ibid.*, pp. 412-414; ‘Development Sub-Committee’, att. to: Meeting of the Council, 24 Nov 1947, *ibid.*, p. 446. Simultaneously, the council launched the so-called ‘Centenary Endowment Fund’ to make financial provisions for the yet to be determined policy. The fund remained far below expectations. Anderson’s original estimate that the AA could receive about £5,000 p. a., mainly from outside sources, proved entirely illusory as the initial appeal in 1947 raised barely a third of this sum and a second one in 1951, targeted solely at AA members, even less. By May 1953 the fund had only grown to £4,000 (as opposed to the hoped-for £250,000), and it was eventually folded in July 1962.

the development sub-committee (of which he was a member) had been deliberating for one and a half years with no tangible outcome and no end in sight, and he was clearly annoyed that in the meantime pressing policy decisions had to be put on hold (see for instance page 157).

Nonetheless, tone and content of Brown's paper – euphemistically termed a 'personal expression of opinion'<sup>330</sup> but effectively a master plan – suggested that in his view the question was not 'if' but rather 'when' it would be put in motion. It seems surprising, therefore, that less than a week after delivering his paper Brown established contact with the University of Edinburgh, where a new chair in architecture had been instituted.<sup>331</sup> The council was unaware of this development and caught by surprise when Brown, shortly before the end of the year, informed it of his intention to resign.<sup>332</sup> Urged to reconsider his decision, Brown demanded a long-term contract and the right to attend council meetings. Most importantly, he 'wished to be able to consult the council from time to time, but not to be bound to adopt any of its suggestions as an order,'<sup>333</sup> thus effectively reducing it to an advisory body and assuming complete authority over the school. Testifying to the high regard in which Brown was held, the revised contractual terms he was offered not only met these demands but in fact exceeded them.<sup>334</sup> Brown would be allowed to attend council meetings as a non-voting member and required to report to it only once a year. A new 'principal's committee', chaired by the AA president, would deal with broader policy issues, while Brown himself would assume the responsibilities of the abolished school committee. In addition, the council offered Brown more favourable financial terms, viz. a considerable salary increase and inclusion in a pension scheme, as well as – perhaps most significantly – a fifteen-year contract breakable only on his part. In light of these generous terms, the council expected

---

<sup>330</sup> Brown, 'Architectural Education', p. 94.

<sup>331</sup> Brown had indicated his interest in the position to James Macgregor, the current head at Cambridge and former head at Edinburgh, who recommended him to the appointing committee. (Assistant Secretary, University of Edinburgh, letter to Gordon Brown, 29 Nov 1948, in: *Records of the University of Edinburgh*, Centre for Research Collections, University of Edinburgh, EUA IN1/ADS/SEC/1/7.)

<sup>332</sup> Meeting of the Council, 29 Dec 1948, CM 1940-49, p. 509.

<sup>333</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 510.

<sup>334</sup> Meeting of the Officers of the Council, 31 Dec 1948, *ibid.*, pp. 511-512.

Brown to withdraw his resignation and were accordingly bewildered when, on 3 January 1949, he reaffirmed his wish to be released from his contract.<sup>335</sup>

Brown may have reached the conclusion that his idea of synchronising the teaching between different schools, in which he saw the ‘nucleus of a University of the Arts’<sup>336</sup>, would be easier to put into practice within the departmental structure of an existing university rather than the skittish AA.<sup>337</sup> However, the course of events – particularly the short time gap between his lecture and the initial contact with Edinburgh – suggests that such considerations were not the decisive factor for Brown’s sudden departure. The public announcement cited ‘personal reasons’ for Brown’s resignation,<sup>338</sup> and John Brandon-Jones – only slightly less vaguely – recalled that ‘things started to get a bit hot for Gordon Brown, and he suddenly [...] disappeared from the London scene.’<sup>339</sup> Although there is no direct evidence, one can presume that Brown’s problems were of a financial nature. In 1946 he had misappropriated a grant provided by the Swedish Institute in London for the students’ summer excursion, which left the AA liable to reimburse the hosts.<sup>340</sup> James Richards stressed that Brown was ‘not dishonest; rather accident-prone where money was concerned,’<sup>341</sup> and his subsequent career seems to confirm this verdict. Brown relinquished his chair at Edinburgh after only eighteen months, having accumulated significant debts for which the university stood as guarantor.<sup>342</sup> He accepted an offer from the University of Hong Kong, where he set up a highly successful course modelled on the AA (including a country school on nearby Lantau Island) whilst virtually monopolising the building programme of the university, for which he designed a number of student hostels, staff flats and laboratories as well as two new

---

<sup>335</sup> Meeting of the Council, 3 Jan 1949, *ibid.*, p. 516.

<sup>336</sup> Brown, ‘Architectural Education’, p. 98.

<sup>337</sup> The Forbes Chair at the University of Edinburgh, which Brown took up on 1 February 1949, was a dual appointment which also saw him as head of the School of Architecture at Edinburgh College of Art. Brown thus found ideal conditions to teach architects in contact with sculptors and painters and, in summer 1949, organised a joint one-month summer school for them in Scandinavia. (*ABN*, 15 July 1949, p. 48.)

<sup>338</sup> *AAJ*, Jan 1949, vol. 64, no. 728, p. 115.

<sup>339</sup> BLSA/Brandon-Jones.

<sup>340</sup> Meetings of the Council, 25 Nov 1946, 6 Jan 1947, *CM* 1940-49, pp. 371, 373. It appears that Brown used the grant, which was meant to cover the students’ meals, for other student expenses.

<sup>341</sup> James Richards, *Memoirs of an Unjust Fella*, London 1980, p. 225.

<sup>342</sup> Grant Buttars (deputy university archivist, University of Edinburgh), email to the author, 17 Jan 2014.

colleges and a library.<sup>343</sup> In addition, he developed a vast harbour reclamation scheme in Hong Kong and, from October 1951, acted as planner to the government of British North Borneo, entrusted with the development of four new towns.<sup>344</sup> Yet despite his high salary and a thriving practice Brown's finances soon got out of hand again, due in part to his flamboyant lifestyle – he owned several cars, a sailboat and a motorised Chinese junk – but mainly because, as one student remembers, 'he was generous to a fault' and regularly covered the school fees of students in financial difficulties.<sup>345</sup> Increasingly frustrated by the RIBA's refusal to grant exemption to his school, Brown resigned his position in November 1957 when the university decreed that faculty would no longer be allowed to conduct private practice.<sup>346</sup> He subsequently lectured in the United States and acted as consulting architect to Miguel Ydígoras Fuentes, the president of Guatemala, before returning to England in 1960 to resume his private practice.<sup>347</sup> On 17 March 1962, the day before his fiftieth birthday, he shot himself – 'a tragic person whose undoubtedly great potential was never fulfilled.'<sup>348</sup>

## Conclusion

Gordon Brown disappeared from the British scene at just the moment when, according to the *Architect and Building News*, he was 'set to develop into a leading authority on architectural education.'<sup>349</sup> Instead, Brown's term in office is all but forgotten today, his reputation overshadowed by the popularity of his successor. This does not do him any justice. The AA emerged from the war with little more than its reputation intact. Its premises were in a state of disrepair and its desperate shortage of money put the school at a distinct disadvantage vis-à-vis its competitors, its dependence on tuition fees forcing it to admit students to and beyond its capacity. Brown navigated these circumstances with remarkable ease. Taking advantage of his

---

<sup>343</sup> James Richards, who inspected the school in 1951 on behalf of the Colonial Office, praised its 'commendably high standards' and recommended continuing financial support. (Richards 1980, p. 225 et pass.)

<sup>344</sup> *AJ*, 25 Oct 1951, p. 487.

<sup>345</sup> Quoted in: Christian Caryl, *Building the Dragon City*, Hong Kong 2012, pp. 27-28.

<sup>346</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 28, 30.

<sup>347</sup> Miguel Ydígoras, the president's son, had studied at the AA under Brown.

<sup>348</sup> Richards 1980, p. 225.

<sup>349</sup> *ABN*, 28 March 1962, p. 441.

discretionary powers and the AA's adaptable structure, he introduced an entirely new teaching system and delegated much of its day-to-day running to a trusted and well-functioning year masters' collective.

In purely pedagogical terms, Brown's headship was short of novelty, the practical training site as the one truly innovative scheme being the result of council initiative. Even so, his pragmatic decision not to impose rigid precepts on either his staff or his students whilst implementing an eclectic and perhaps somewhat incoherent mix of Beaux-Arts and Arts and Crafts methods allowed a considerable measure of experimentation, and key concepts of the postwar years such as group working were first tried under his watch. Brown's success in re-establishing the AA as one of the leading schools – if not *the* leading school – of architecture in the country was widely acknowledged at the time. His ambitions, however, reached beyond national confines, and through his various exchange schemes and especially his proposal for a CIAM-run postgraduate school Brown managed to raise the AA's international renown.

Inevitably perhaps, Brown's tremendous drive eventually clashed with the systemic inertia of the AA council. Though not the only reason for his resignation, Brown's impatience with the council's development sub-committee highlighted an inherent flaw in the AA's institutional setup, which laid the responsibility for long-term policy in the hands of a continually changing body. More immediately significant was the council's decision to forfeit its annual MOE grant, which allowed it to set its own tuition fee levels and turned it into a fully independent institution – a decision with far-reaching consequences, as the following chapters will show.





## CHAPTER 2

### ARCHITECTURE AS COLLABORATIVE PRACTICE (1949-1951)

When Gordon Brown resigned the most pressing problems of the immediate postwar years had been overcome: emergency hutments provided additional accommodation, and the school went through a period of relative prosperity due to high student numbers. This allowed Brown's successor Robert Furneaux Jordan (1905-1978) to implement his pedagogical vision with comparably few restrictions. The first section of this chapter outlines Jordan's background and historical worldview, which permeated every aspect of his course. Jordan sought to adapt the training at the AA to the changing realities of the postwar period, and his unambiguously modernist approach had profound consequences on both the staff makeup (section 2) and the curriculum itself (section 3). Jordan was driven by a firm belief in the rise of the public sector, and the fourth section illustrates the measures he took to emulate the group working methods of progressive public offices such as the Hertfordshire County Council. By the end of the decade the political mood changed, and the fifth section argues that – headed by a principal of the far-left persuasion – the AA became an easy target for anti-communist propaganda. Jordan's resignation in July 1951 was a direct outcome of this and came, as the final section shows, at a critical time when the school's relations to both the Ministry of Education and the RIBA were in the balance.

#### **Life and Art Are One – Robert Furneaux Jordan's Worldview**

Dispassionate though they are, the minutes of the council cannot conceal the strong sentiments which Gordon Brown's resignation evoked – oscillating between genuine regret about his departure and indignation as to the manner in which it had come to pass.<sup>350</sup> Indeed, many sympathised with Anthony Chitty's motion to hold Brown to his contractual period of notice, feeling that they were 'being forced into accepting the resignation at once, and that it would have been easier to treat Mr. Brown

---

<sup>350</sup> See e.g.: Meeting of the Council, 3 Jan 1949, CM 1940-49, pp. 516-519.

generously if he had come to council and stated frankly that he wished to leave for personal reasons.<sup>351</sup> However, the council ultimately agreed that it would be detrimental to continue for eighteen months under a principal who wished to leave and decided, as a show of confidence in the current staff, to promote the new principal from within their ranks rather than to advertise the position.<sup>352</sup> Brown himself recommended Cecil St. Clair Oakes as his successor, but the council appears not to have seriously considered him. Instead, an overwhelming majority favoured Robert Furneaux Jordan, who was appointed by unanimous decision less than a week after Brown had tendered his resignation.<sup>353</sup>

Jordan was a polymath who combined his architectural practice with an interest in historical scholarship and a commitment to teaching. Born in Birmingham in 1905, he studied for three years at the local school of architecture before transferring to the AA, where he was awarded the RIBA's coveted Henry Jarvis Scholarship and reached the finals of both the Tite and the Rome Prize. After qualifying in 1928 Jordan briefly practised in his hometown before returning to London in 1934. He joined the AA as assistant fourth-year master and from 1936 lectured in history and design as well. In the following year Jordan was promoted to senior design master – one of only three permanent teaching staff positions – but he resigned in March 1939 as a belated reaction to Rowse's dismissal.<sup>354</sup> Whilst at the AA, Jordan had set up in private practice with two fellow staff members, Cecil Charles Handisyde and George Fairweather, and after the war the firm (now without Handisyde) briefly flourished thanks to a number of school and housing commissions. Jordan rejoined the teaching staff as third-year master under Brown but resigned this position after only one term for health reasons.<sup>355</sup> One year later, in February 1947, he returned as senior lecturer and henceforth focused on his academic work, refining and disseminating an idiosyncratic interpretation of history which formed the philosophical foundation of his pedagogical approach as principal.<sup>356</sup>

---

<sup>351</sup> Ibid., p. 517.

<sup>352</sup> Ibid., p. 519.

<sup>353</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 5 Jan 1949, *ibid.*, p. 520.

<sup>354</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 14 March 1939, SCM 1937-44, p. 74. Jordan resigned when Rowse left but stayed on as a general adviser at Jellicoe's request. (Meeting of the School Committee, 13 Dec 1938, *ibid.*, p. 64.)

<sup>355</sup> Meeting of the Council, 28 Jan 1946, CM 1940-49, pp. 315-316.

<sup>356</sup> Meeting of the Council, 24 February 1947, *ibid.*, p. 387.

The rise of modernism with its ahistorical pretensions called into question the sense and purpose of teaching architectural history in its prevalent classical mode aimed at extracting eternal principles of design and composition from the study of ancient masterpieces.<sup>357</sup> Not surprisingly, in schools which from the mid-1930s aligned themselves with the modernist ethos history teaching, divorced from any immediate and practical applicability, suffered what could, as Lionel Budden wrote, ‘not unfairly be described as a partial eclipse.’<sup>358</sup> The Board of Education, which inspected the AA in 1937, noted with regret that the subject was unpopular with students, who regarded it ‘as an obstacle in the path towards their schemes of social regeneration’, and criticised the school, whose ‘concession to students’ preferences seems to have gone too far.’<sup>359</sup> Nonetheless, even at that time the syllabus included an average of twenty history lectures per year, and there was no intention to reduce this number any further. Hence, at the AA the rejection of history was considerably less pronounced than, for instance, at Harvard, which – in the absence of similarly progressive schools in Europe – was increasingly seen as a benchmark.<sup>360</sup> This was arguably due to the publication, in 1936, of Pevsner’s seminal *Pioneers of the Modern Movement*, which drew a genealogical line from William Morris to Walter Gropius and the early German modernists and thus legitimated English forays into modern architecture in terms of their historical continuity with a specifically English progenitor.<sup>361</sup> Tellingly, in the early 1940s, while there was still not ‘sufficient enthusiasm over the history of architecture lectures’<sup>362</sup>, AA students were required to pass a paper on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in addition to the ‘classical’ subjects stipulated as part of the RIBA’s intermediate examination.<sup>363</sup> Moreover, whilst in the United States the teaching of history lay in the hands of art historians

---

<sup>357</sup> For a discussion see: Mark Swenarton, ‘The Role of History in Architectural Education’, *Architectural History*, 1989, pp. 201-215.

<sup>358</sup> L. B. Budden, ‘The Future of Architectural Education’, *RIBA J*, July 1945, p. 255; see also: Gibberd 1944 (‘A student who knows that all his designs will be judged in terms of the aesthetics of Greece and Rome is more likely to be interested in the history of these periods, than one whose designs will be judged in terms of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.’)

<sup>359</sup> ‘Board of Education: Report of H. M. Inspectors on The Architectural Association’s School of Architecture and School of Planning, May 1937’, AAA, Box 2003:29c.

<sup>360</sup> For the role of architectural history at Harvard see: Alofsin 2002, op. cit., pp. 241-247.

<sup>361</sup> Nikolaus Pevsner, *Pioneers of the Modern Movement*, London 1936; for the adoption of Pevsner’s ideas in England see e.g.: James Richards, *An Introduction to Modern Architecture*, rev. ed., Harmondsworth 1956 (first publ. 1940), p. 61ff; Edward D. Mills, *The New Architecture in Great Britain, 1946–1953*, London 1953, p. 11.

<sup>362</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 15 Nov 1943, SCM 1937-44, p. 236.

<sup>363</sup> Gibberd 1944. The RIBA intermediate examination included test papers on Greek & Roman, Byzantine & Medieval, and Renaissance; papers on nineteenth-century architecture were introduced in 1950/51.

with little interest in architectural history in its own right, at the AA (as well as most other English schools) the subject was traditionally entrusted to architect members of the teaching staff.<sup>364</sup> Despite the growing influence of the more rigorous German art historiography through émigré scholars such as Wittkower, Gombrich and (to a lesser degree) Pevsner, all of whom lectured regularly at the AA, the general approach toward history teaching therefore remained essentially ‘architectural’ and thus presumably more accessible for students.<sup>365</sup>

Robert Furneaux Jordan’s synthesis of art and social history fitted neither category.<sup>366</sup> According to Saint, his lectures were ‘the first in a British school of architecture to bring social, economic and technological concepts to bear upon the understanding of style.’<sup>367</sup> Indeed, Jordan’s conception of history was based on the proposition that art forms were the inevitable result of the reciprocity between the philosophy and technology of an age: ‘Life and art are one. [...] The visual world and the world of thought have always been as two mirrors face to face, reflecting each other.’<sup>368</sup> Supreme art could only emerge from a ‘complete culture’<sup>369</sup> encompassing society, science and art as three facets of an indivisible whole, for it was this integrity which caused a civilisation’s ascension to greatness but also ultimately its demise – a key tenet of Jordan’s Marxist-Hegelian worldview, applicable to any period in history and repeated in memorable phraseology

---

<sup>364</sup> Notable examples include Harry Goodhart-Rendel on Victorian architecture (in the 1930s), Cecil Stewart on Byzantine architecture and John Brandon-Jones on Arts and Crafts (both in the 1940s); for the American context see e.g.: Stanford Anderson, ‘Architectural History in Schools of Architecture’, *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, Sep 1999, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 282-290.

<sup>365</sup> Neil Jackson argues that this was even the case with John Summerson, undoubtedly the most scholarly of the architect-historians and never actually a practising architect. (Neil Jackson, ‘John Summerson and the View From the Outside’, in: Frank Salmon (ed.), *Summerson and Hitchcock: Centenary Essays on Architectural Historiography*, London / New Haven 2006, p. 263 et pass. For a general discussion see: David Watkin, *The Rise of Architectural History*, London 1980, pp. 145, 156-160; Swenarton 1989, op. cit.

<sup>366</sup> The most instructive sources for Jordan’s philosophy are: ‘What Kind of Architecture Do We Want in Britain?’, paper read to a symposium of the SCR on 17 March 1949, *ABN*, 25 March 1949, pp. 264-266; Paper read to the CID Furniture Design Conference at the RIBA in July 1949, *AJ*, 4 Aug 1949, pp. 128-129; ‘The Teaching of Architectural History’, *PLAN*, no. 4 (1949), pp. 4-8; see also two books based on his lecture courses: *Victorian Architecture*, Harmondsworth 1966; *Western Architecture*, London 1969.

<sup>367</sup> Saint 1987, p. 30.

<sup>368</sup> Jordan, CID Conference, op. cit., p. 128.

<sup>369</sup> R. Furneaux Jordan, ‘General History’, lecture synopses, AAA, Box 2008:60. Jordan acknowledged the influence of Arnold Toynbee, Lisle March Phillipps and Lewis Mumford (whom he considered to be his ‘master’) on his historiographic approach (R. Furneaux Jordan, ‘The Significance of History’, *AAJ*, June 1963, vol. 79, no. 873, p. 369; see also e.g.: R. Furneaux Jordan, ‘Lisle March Phillipps’, *ibid.*, Oct 1949, vol. 65, no. 735, pp. 61-63). The wish for a ‘complete culture’ also recalls Giedion’s notion of a ‘split civilisation’ as the legacy of the nineteenth century (Sigfried Giedion, *Space, Time and Architecture*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., Cambridge MA 1962 (first publ. 1941), pp. 13-14).

throughout the lecture course.<sup>370</sup> Torn between dichotomous tendencies – industrialism and the rise of the engineer on the one hand; Victorian romanticism, ending with William Morris and the Arts and Crafts movement, on the other<sup>371</sup> – the nineteenth century emphatically lacked such integrity: ‘The fascination and tragedy of the Victorian era is that its quintessence was in itself a conflict.’<sup>372</sup> Yet Jordan believed that modern society was on the verge of resolving this dialectic, thus again becoming a complete culture united by a common system of thought and a common technology. It was the task, and indeed the historic mission, of the modern architect to find the expression of his age – ‘an age which is socialist, scientific and sophisticated’<sup>373</sup> – by acquiring a ‘complete understanding [...] of his own society and his own technical resources’<sup>374</sup>, as it was only through this understanding ‘that the great architecture of the past found its being.’<sup>375</sup> Thus, Jordan not only vindicated the active quest for a contemporary architectural expression in historic terms, he also provided a justification for history teaching itself:

First, if the relationship of building technique to life is once again to be a great art, then that relationship – in those times when architecture was a great art – must be studied. Second, if that relationship, between 1800 and 1950, was such that architecture ceased to be a great art, then a diagnosis of the disease must be made. It is the recognition of this twofold value of history – what was right with man when architecture was great and what was wrong with man when architecture was not great – that must form the basis of our history teaching.<sup>376</sup>

---

<sup>370</sup> ‘His famous phrase – and we almost used to chant it when we saw it coming up, you know, chant it with him – was: “But this contains ... the seeds of its own decay!”’ (‘Robert Maguire interviewed by Linda Sandino’, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects’ Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Tape 4, Side A (2004).) Jordan’s history syllabus consisted of three parts: the first (for first- and second-year students) dealt with the ‘sociological-historical basis of art forms through history’; the second (for third-year students) examined the ‘social-historical-aesthetical background of architecture and art in 1800-1950’; and the third (for senior students) delivered a ‘deeper study of certain periods’. Jordan himself took charge of the first two courses, whilst for the third one guest lecturers were invited. True to his claim for universality, the first-year course, covering the time before 1800, started with the prehistoric period of ‘Lower Savagery’ in 500,000 BC. (‘Lecture notes taken by Christopher Whittaker’, AAA, Box 2011:14; for subsequent amendments to the syllabus see: Meeting of the School Committee, 8 Dec 1950, SCM 1944-51, pp. 203-204.)

<sup>371</sup> ‘Lecture notes’, op. cit.

<sup>372</sup> R. Furneaux Jordan, ‘The Architectural Significance of 1851’, *RIBAJ*, July 1951, p. 340.

<sup>373</sup> Jordan, CID Conference, p. 129.

<sup>374</sup> Jordan, quoted in: ‘AA Students Exhibition’, *ABN*, 29 July 1949, p. 100.

<sup>375</sup> Ibid.

<sup>376</sup> Jordan, ‘The Teaching of Architectural History’, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

## ‘Continuity Being Thus Assured’ – Staff Changes under Jordan

Unlike his predecessor, Jordan had been actively involved in the controversies at the AA in the late 1930s – according to Saint, he had been ‘second only to Rowse as a catalyst.’<sup>377</sup> In spite of this, the council did not expect him to effect fundamental changes to Brown’s educational programme, which it hoped would be carried on and further developed by the new principal, ‘continuity being thus assured’<sup>378</sup>.

Indeed, Jordan had spoken in support of Brown’s ‘farewell’ paper (see page 70), and a comparative reading of his inaugural address, given only two months later, shows the proximity of their ideas.<sup>379</sup> According to the new principal, the immediate reality of postwar students was concerned with ‘the office, the site, the factory and the rural scene’.<sup>380</sup> Consequently, he seconded Brown’s proposal for a trainee scheme whereby each student would become ‘the adopted child of some office [...] making a general nuisance of himself every vacation, but really seeing for himself the full relationship between drawing board and job.’<sup>381</sup> In addition, he suggested that students should gain experience on a construction site or in a factory – an arrangement which would gradually replace the practical training site, whose lease was to expire in 1951.

Finally, Jordan also embraced Brown’s idea of a country school: ‘We are a shamefully urbanized profession – and nation. That is a reality we work under, but clearly Gordon Brown’s vision of a country school is attractive as well as an antidote to that excessive urbanization.’<sup>382</sup> Jordan’s key propositions were thus almost identical with the more practicable aspects of Brown’s paper, and he stressed ‘that all this is not a diplomatic foreshadowing of something dramatic or immediate in the way of a new curriculum, a new staff or a new house.’<sup>383</sup> Yet, while there were indeed no immediate changes to the ‘curriculum’ or the ‘house’, the ‘staff’ was an altogether different matter.

In June 1949 Jordan proposed the abolition of the year master system for the upcoming session and the creation of a tighter, more manageable administration by

---

<sup>377</sup> Saint 1987, p. 31.

<sup>378</sup> ‘AA School Appointment’, *AAJ*, Jan 1949, vol. 64, no. 728, p. 129; see also *ibid.* p. 115.

<sup>379</sup> R. Furneaux Jordan, ‘An Inaugural Address’, *AAJ*, Feb 1949, vol. 64, no. 729, pp. 136-146.

<sup>380</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 141.

<sup>381</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>382</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>383</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 137.

dividing the school into three administrative units, viz. the 'preliminary school' (first year), the 'intermediate school' (second and third years) and the 'final school' (fourth and fifth years).<sup>384</sup> The directors of these three schools, along with the principal, his administrative assistant Michael Colborne Brown and Michael Patrick as the director of technical studies, formed the new six-strong executive.<sup>385</sup> Jordan portrayed this as a purely organisational measure, which would not affect the educational programme; yet it had profound implications as it meant, in effect, the disempowerment of the existing year masters with the exception of Goddard, who was promoted to vice-principal and put in charge of the senior school, and Patrick (who was, however, relieved of teaching duties).<sup>386</sup>

Once again bypassed for the position of principal, fifth-year master Oakes had left the AA in April 1949 to become the chief architect for drugs manufacturer Boots. Rather more spectacular was the departure, in January 1950, of Eric Jarrett, who had been teaching at the school since the end of the First World War and expressed the wish to stay until 1951 in order to increase his pension. Jordan, however, insisted that Jarrett's contract be terminated at the end of the current session in July 1950, and he put him on leave after only one term – a seemingly ruthless act, which was not well received by some of the older AA members, particularly as Jarrett was dismissed before a replacement had been found.<sup>387</sup> Jordan considered the 'first and second years to be the most important'<sup>388</sup> and had, from the moment he took office, begun to interfere directly with Jarrett's course. In March 1949 the voluntary life drawing classes were transferred to the RCA,<sup>389</sup> and in July painter Olive Sullivan

---

<sup>384</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 27 June 1949, SCM 1944-51, p. 138; Meeting of the Council, 11 July 1949, CM 1949-55, p. 23.

<sup>385</sup> 'AA Information and Curriculum Notes 1949-50', AAA, Box 1991:31.

<sup>386</sup> Meeting of the Council, 11 July 1949, CM 1949-55, p. 21.

<sup>387</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 3 Oct 1949, SCM 1944-51, pp. 145, 147; Meeting of the Council, 2 Jan 1950, CM 1949-55, p. 54. In light of his long service, the AA was prepared to help Jarrett find a temporary position to supplement his income – preferably outside the AA but in any case somewhere 'where he could work without coming into contact with other members of staff.' (Meeting of the Council, 23 Jan 1950, CM 1949-55, p. 57.) This suggests that Jarrett had tried to set his colleagues against Jordan, which would explain the latter's precipitance. For reactions from AA members see e.g.: L. H. Bucknell, letter to the editor, *AAJ*, April 1950, vol. 65, no. 741, p. 195; D. H. Beaty-Pownall, 'Presentation to E. R. Jarrett', *ibid.*, Sep 1950, vol. 66, no. 744, p. 43; Hugh Crallan, letter to S. E. T. Cusdin, 5 March 1951, AAA, Box 2006:S30.

<sup>388</sup> 'Annual Prize-Giving', *AAJ*, Aug/Sep 1949, vol. 65, no. 734, p. 32.

<sup>389</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 7 March 1949, SCM 1944-51, p. 133. It appears that this arrangement was short-lived as in December 1950 the weekly classes were again transferred – this time to the St Martins

joined the staff as senior art lecturer, enticed away from the Manchester School of Art, where she had devised an experimental, Bauhaus-derived introductory course for art and architecture students.<sup>390</sup> Jarrett's old-fashioned exercises in draughtsmanship had clearly become an anachronism, highlighted by the fact that Jordan himself drafted the brief for the first-term design project in autumn 1949. The famous 'primitive hut' programme required the student to imagine himself [sic] as 'the hero of some Robinson Crusoe type of story'<sup>391</sup>, choosing one of three climates and using local resources to erect a simple shelter for himself and his wife ('respectability being the keynote of the AA school'<sup>392</sup>, as the *Architect and Building News* quipped). Originally conceived in the late 1930s by George Keck at Moholy-Nagy's 'New Bauhaus' in Chicago,<sup>393</sup> the primitive hut exercise was an object lesson in basic three-dimensional planning and – with its reference to Laugier – thinking in 'first principles'. Under Leonard Manasseh, who had briefly assisted Jarrett during the war and took charge of the preliminary school in July 1950, it was to become a signature programme of the AA in the first half of the decade.<sup>394</sup>

Jarrett's retirement came suddenly but not unexpectedly given his age. More surprising had been the dismissal of second-year master John Brandon-Jones in April 1949.<sup>395</sup> Jordan saw Arts and Crafts as concluding the 'Romantic' strand of the nineteenth century, which, together with the Victorian engineering tradition, formed the bedrock on which the 'Modern Movement' was built. In contrast,

---

School of Art, where they proved so popular that a special 'AA Class' was created. (Meeting of the School Committee, 8 Dec 1950, *ibid.*, p. 206.)

<sup>390</sup> Meeting of the Council, 11 July 1949, CM 1949-55, p. 22. Sullivan's work was well known at the AA. In 1943 she had visited the school for a fortnight to give criticisms and talks to students. (Meeting of the School Committee, 10 May 1943, SCM 1937-44, p. 219; 'Mount House Notes', *AAJ*, Aug 1943, vol. 59, no. 677, pp. 15-16.) From 1949 onward she delivered courses on 'Basic Form and Colour', 'Interior Design' and 'Finishes', whilst her assistant John Greene covered 'Draughtsmanship', in particular perspective drawing. (Lecture synopses, AAA, Box 2008:60.)

<sup>391</sup> Programme excerpt quoted in: 'The AA School: "Desert Island" Design', *Builder*, 4 Nov 1949, p. 575.

<sup>392</sup> *ABN*, 11 Nov 1949, p. 466.

<sup>393</sup> See: Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, *Vision in Motion*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed., Chicago 1965, p. 98; Paul Oliver, *Built to Meet Needs: Cultural Issues in Vernacular Architecture*, Oxford 2006, p. 414.

<sup>394</sup> Douglas Jones introduced the 'primitive hut' exercise at Birmingham shortly after (see: Martin Kenchington, 'Architectural Education in Britain', *Architects' Year Book*, no. 4 (1951), p. 87), and from the AA it spread to at least two other schools: the Royal West of England Academy through Stephen Macfarlane in 1956 (interview, *op. cit.*) and the University of Pennsylvania through Denise Scott Brown in 1960 ('Denise Scott Brown interviewed by Peter Reed', *Oral History Interviews*, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, 25 Oct 1990 – 9 Nov 1991, <http://www.aaa.si.edu/collections/interviews/oral-history-interview-denise-scott-brown-13059> [accessed 10 July 2014].) First-year master John Dennys dropped the 'primitive hut' programme in 1957, but art master Paul Oliver reintroduced it in 1963.

<sup>395</sup> Meeting of the Council, 11 April 1949 CM 1949-55, p. 5.



Brandon-Jones insisted on the continuing relevance of Arts and Crafts as an ongoing tradition and regarded modernism as a misguided deviation from it.<sup>396</sup> Evidently, the two positions were incompatible, and Brandon-Jones remembered Jordan telling him that ‘if I went on talking the way I was, I was going to destroy the students’ faith in the modern architecture; if I wasn’t prepared to toe the line and back the modern movement, I was going to have to look for another job.’<sup>397</sup> Brandon-Jones’s case highlights the intimate connection between history and studio teaching under Jordan since he was essentially dismissed from the latter for his ideas about the former. Assisted by Arthur Korn, Brandon-Jones had, in autumn 1947, developed a second-year programme which required groups of students to draw up a development plan for an existing village as the contextual framework for individually designed projects in subsequent terms, and Jordan retained this programme as an unaltered part of his curriculum, defending it against criticism from the RIBA’s visiting board (see page 167).<sup>398</sup>

Completing the triumvirate of directors, Kenneth Capon, one of the members of ACP, took charge of the intermediate school – a role he was, in light of his ‘exceptional capabilities’<sup>399</sup>, allowed to fulfil in a part-time capacity and in which he was assisted by Fello Atkinson, a recent graduate of the school and partner in James Cubitt’s up-and-coming practice. Whilst Brown had surrounded himself with an eclectic group of older and more experienced teachers, Jordan’s lead tutors were all younger than himself, and they were – with the exception of Goddard and his second-in-command Henry Elder – all former students of his with little or no teaching experience. Jordan’s personnel policy was driven by the desire to attract the vanguard of the profession to the AA – a strategy which proved increasingly difficult to pursue when in the late 1940s the building industry began to recover and

---

<sup>396</sup> A paper written for the Liverpool University Architectural Society illustrates Brandon-Jones’s resentment to modernism: ‘Now the essence of a NEW style is that it shall in no way resemble any previous style and that, of course, means that, instead of selecting the best precedent he can find and attempting an improvement upon it, the would be “modernist” is left with nothing to do except the things that no one has ever been such a fool as to do before!’ (John Brandon-Jones, ‘Architecture Without Prejudice’, *ABN*, 7 Oct 1949, pp. 358-359; quote p. 358.)

<sup>397</sup> BLSA/Brandon-Jones.

<sup>398</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 8 Dec 1950, SCM 1944-51, pp. 199, 209 (att.); see also: James Gowan, ‘Arthur Korn Interview’, in: Gowan 1975, p. 101. Brandon-Jones’s programme may have been inspired by Thomas Sharp’s seminal survey *The Anatomy of the Village*, published in the previous year (Thomas Sharp, *The Anatomy of the Village*, Harmondsworth 1946).

<sup>399</sup> Meeting of the Council, 10 July 1950, *ibid.*, p. 100.

employment opportunities for architects improved.<sup>400</sup> Jordan therefore resumed Brown's 'atelier system' whereby eminent architects who could not otherwise spare the time to teach mentored small groups of senior students whom they received in their own offices.<sup>401</sup> A successful new scheme involved the formation of a 'post-graduate group' as part of the intermediate school, which comprised Gabriel Epstein, Paul Boissevain and Francesco Gneccchi-Ruscone, all of whom had recently qualified with distinction and were retained past their initial trial period.<sup>402</sup>

The difficulties in recruiting British staff induced Jordan to broaden the intake of foreigners by inviting a number of visiting teachers to the AA. Gneccchi-Ruscone was thus not the only foreign postgraduate who tutored at the school as in the first term of the 1950/51 session Turkish architect Orhan Bozkurt and Argentine Eduardo Catalano, both sponsored by the British Council and selected from a worldwide list of applicants, were attached to the AA staff.<sup>403</sup> In the same academic year Charles Burchard, a young Harvard professor, taught at the AA in exchange for Fello Atkinson, and the latter's position as Capon's deputy was taken over by Swedish architect Alf Bydén, who had joined the school in the year before.<sup>404</sup> Moreover,

---

<sup>400</sup> Meeting of the Council, 11 April 1949, *ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>401</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 3 Oct 1949, SCM 1944-51, p. 145. Brown's original atelier staff comprised Denys Lasdun and Denis Clarke Hall. In the 1949/50 session the group included Lasdun, Clarke Hall and Judith Ledeboer, and in 1950/51 Ledeboer and Jim Cadbury-Brown. Jordan had also approached Richard Llewelyn Davies, the director of the Nuffield Foundation's division for architectural studies, who was eager to participate but did not obtain permission from his employer. (Jordan, letter to Llewelyn Davies, 9 May 1949, AAA, Box 2012:13; Llewelyn Davies, letter to Jordan, 19 May 1949, *ibid.*)

<sup>402</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 3 Oct 1949, *ibid.*, pp. 147-148. Epstein, who worked with Shepherd & Bridgwater, taught until his election to the council in 1956. Boissevain received a standard contract in 1951 but left the year after to focus on his private practice, which he ran with his wife Barbara Osmond. His place on the post-graduate group was given to Manasseh's future partner Ian Baker. Gneccchi-Ruscone left the AA staff in January 1951 for family reasons but returned for the 1959/60 session. Another recent graduate who taught under Capon and Atkinson in 1949/50 was Hugh Owen, who was, however, a full-time member of staff and not part of the actual 'post-graduate group'.

<sup>403</sup> Although essentially a favour to the British Council in return for its help with foreign visitors and students' travel awards, Jordan was reluctant to accept any fees for Bozkurt and Catalano 'since their record suggests that they may well prove their worth as teachers'. ('Principal's Report', Meeting of the School Committee, 16 May 1950, SCM 1944-51, p. 176.) Little is known about Bozkurt, who returned to his home country. Catalano, who had studied under Gropius at Harvard, was headhunted for a professorship at North Carolina State University in 1951; in 1956 he transferred to MIT, where he would teach for more than two decades.

<sup>404</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 6 Oct 1950, *ibid.*, p. 193. Brown had revived the pre-war tradition of always having one young Swedish architect on the teaching staff. Bydén, who had worked with Markelius on the UN Building, replaced Magnus Ahlgren in 1949 and was succeeded by one Ahlstrom in 1951. The report of the RIBA's visiting board, which inspected the school in June 1950, lists Bydén as the director of the preliminary school, which suggests that he served in this capacity between Jarrett's departure in January and Manasseh's start in July. ('Report of the RIBA Visiting Board on the School of Architecture, The Architectural Association', 17 Nov 1950, att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 8 Dec 1950, *ibid.*, p. 209.

Jordan persuaded Alvar Aalto to teach at the AA for four weeks<sup>405</sup> – a coup with great publicity value, especially as it coincided with a visit by Frank Lloyd Wright, who attended the annual award ceremony in July 1950.<sup>406</sup> Finally, Jordan negotiated a long-term arrangement with leading Italian practice BBPR: Ernesto Rogers taught between October and December 1949, and his partner Enrico Peressutti followed him in summer 1950 and spring 1951, respectively.<sup>407</sup> In addition, BBPR offered to keep one trainee position permanently open for AA students, and between January and December 1950 at least half a dozen of them spent three months each in Italy.<sup>408</sup>

The broadened inclusion of foreigners might suggest that Brown's 'internationalism' was seamlessly continued, yet the underlying thinking was altogether different.

Prominent visitors such as Aalto and Rogers were invited for their qualities as practising architects rather than teachers. With the exception of Burchard their presence, therefore, did not reflect an interest in the workings of foreign schools, let alone an attempt at making an institutional impact on international architectural education itself. Paradoxically then, despite the unprecedented number of international staff, the school itself had a rather more self-referential outlook.

Jordan, who, so far as can be ascertained, did not leave the country once during his tenure, certainly lacked Brown's missionary zeal and did not share his international ambitions. When the CIAM Summer School eventually took place in 1949 (see page 69) the AA played no significant part besides providing the infrastructure.<sup>409</sup>

Likewise, the series of international exchange schemes was temporarily discontinued

---

<sup>405</sup> Meeting of the Council, 12 June 1950, CM 1949-55, p. 95.

<sup>406</sup> Legend has it that Jordan lured the notoriously elusive master by sending him a telegram saying that 'five hundred students demanded that he should be here this afternoon' (Jordan, quoted in: 'Annual Prize-Giving', *AAJ*, Aug/Sep 1950, vol. 66, no. 744, p. 32); however, it appears that Peter Matthews, a second-year student who had previously trained at Taliesin, played a decisive part in facilitating Wright's first visit to England since 1939. (Robert Maguire, interview with the author, 10 Sep 2013.) True to form, the idiosyncratic 83-year old alternately shocked and delighted his audiences with his hard-hitting one-liners. Asked by a student whether he admired the work of contemporary architects, he reportedly replied: 'They have my sympathy.' (*AJ*, 20 July 1950, p. 51.)

<sup>407</sup> An intended visit by the third partner, Lodovico Barbiano di Belgiojoso, was cancelled after Jordan's resignation (Meeting of the School Committee, 2 March 1951, SCM 1944-51, pp. 213, 220).

<sup>408</sup> Meetings of the School Committee, 30 Jan 1950, 8 Dec 1950, SCM 1944-51, pp. 162, 208. Amongst those who took advantage of the scheme, which appears to have been continued into the mid-1950s, were Pat Crooke, John Voelcker, John Turner, Andrew Derbyshire and Mary Crittall, who met her future husband, the famous graphic designer Germano Facetti, in the office.

<sup>409</sup> Jordan did serve on the final jury and was particularly impressed with Rogers, one of his co-jurors, and Gnechi-Ruscione, one of the 35 postgraduates in attendance, which was the reason why he subsequently invited the two Italians to teach at the AA. (Meeting of the School Committee, 3 Oct 1949, SCM 1944-51, p. 148.)

as neither a Danish visit in summer 1949 nor a Swedish one in 1951 was reciprocated under Jordan. Instead, in summer 1950 he realised his pet project of a country school at Corsham Court, the stately home of painter Lord Methuen and headquarters of the Bath Academy of Art. Organised in conjunction with the latter's principal, Clifford Ellis, the three-week event brought together nearly one hundred students as a 'definite step towards restoring that universality of the arts that was once, long ago, acceptable to all men.'<sup>410</sup> More importantly, the school's location in the quintessential English countryside on the fringe of the Cotswolds offered at least some AA students the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the 'rural scene' – a process which Jordan, in complete agreement with Brown, considered to be of vital importance to counter the school's inherent metropolitan bias. In fact, to Jordan the English landscape constituted a vital part of the architect's inheritance, and in addition to his history lectures he gave a remarkable six-part course on 'Landscape and Garden', half of which consisted of a detailed account of the 'pre-architectural' features of the English scenery such as 'trackways, forest and river valley clearance, road patterns, [...] agriculture and enclosure'.<sup>411</sup>

In this sense, the country school at Corsham, though advertised as an 'International Summer School', epitomised the pronounced anglocentrism which infused Jordan's lectures on landscape and history.<sup>412</sup> His preoccupation with the 'rural scene' can be seen in the context of a wider national debate on the adaptability of modern architecture to local conditions, specifically the *Architectural Review's* Townscape campaign and its promotion of the Picturesque as a distinctively English visual

---

<sup>410</sup> 'Corsham Summer School', *AAJ*, March 1950, vol. 65, no. 740, p. 174. One tangible outcome of the summer school was a mural for the barrel-vault entrance hall of ACP's Brynmawr rubber factory, won in competition by AA students Robert Maguire and Michael Brawne in collaboration with Bath student Kate Nicholson, the daughter of Ben and Winifred Nicholson. (Meeting of the School Committee, 2 March 1951, SCM 1944-51, p. 222; Maguire, interview, 10 Sep 2013.)

<sup>411</sup> R. Furneaux Jordan, 'Landscape and Garden', lecture synopsis, AAA, Box 2008:60; see also: Jordan, Inaugural, p. 140.

<sup>412</sup> The school was widely advertised in the national press, but most participants were in the end drawn from the two organising schools. 45 students – or half of the total number – came from the AA, twenty from Bath and the rest mainly from other English schools, with a small contingent of students from France, Germany, Sweden and Norway (see: Michael Colborne-Brown, 'Corsham International Summer School', *AAJ*, Nov 1950, vol. 66, no. 746, p. 76). John Summerson challenged Jordan's anglocentrism, which was equally pronounced in his interpretation of history, by pointing out that his characterisation of the nineteenth century was not, for instance, applicable to developments in France. (Summerson, quoted in: Jordan, 'Architectural Significance', *op. cit.*, p. 348.) Jordan tacitly agreed and conceded that in many smaller democracies, particularly Denmark, the situation had also been markedly different. He was, however, unperturbed by such inconsistencies since they only arose because these were 'countries [...] that did not have a nineteenth century.' (Ibid.)

tradition, which in turn paralleled the advent of regionalist tendencies in other parts of the world during and after the war.<sup>413</sup> Even so, in the time of New Towns and out-county housing estates it carried an obvious practical connotation, and Jordan saw the country school, as one tutor wrote, ‘not as a form of escapism but as a solid contribution to education.’<sup>414</sup> However, the fact that a scheduled rerun in the following year failed to attract sufficient interest and had to be cancelled suggests that for his students it may have been the former rather than the latter.<sup>415</sup> Indeed, one can speculate that the momentary enthusiasm for a fellowship of like-minded artists in a secluded bucolic retreat owed much to Frank Lloyd Wright, whose forthcoming visit cast a spell over the school in the summer of 1950.

### Real Sites, Real Problems, Real Clients

The previous chapter showed how Brown responded to criticism regarding the practical shortcomings of his students by strengthening ‘draughtsmanship’ and ‘the technical side’. Jordan, too, was aware of the charge that the AA ‘had produced some brilliant and several sound architects, but that it was not producing good assistants,’<sup>416</sup> and he regarded this ‘weakness in the school [...] as a serious matter.’<sup>417</sup> In this context it is worth pointing out that despite the fact that the RIBA at the outbreak of war had suspended twelve months’ office experience as an eligibility requirement for associateship (and was not to reintroduce it until 1951), under both postwar principals such experience remained a stipulation for attaining the AA diploma (see also page 148).

---

<sup>413</sup> For a detailed discussion of Townscape see: Erdem Erten, ‘Shaping “The Second Half Century”’: *The Architectural Review* 1947-1971’, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2004, pp. 57-108.

<sup>414</sup> R. A. Duncan, ‘Summer School at Corsham’, *Official Architect*, Dec 1950, p. 691.

<sup>415</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 29 June 1951, SCM 1951-63, pp. 3, 5. Following the initial success of the school, the AA briefly considered building a permanent school on land offered by Lord Methuen and purchasing a nineteenth-century manor house as an interim solution (Meeting of the Officers of the Council, 12 Sep 1950, CM 1944-51, p. 121; Meetings of the Council, 19 March 1951, 23 April 1951, *ibid.*, pp. 165, 174).

<sup>416</sup> Jordan, quoted in: Meeting of the Ad-hoc Committee on Architectural Education, 9 Jan 1951, in: *Board of Architectural Education Committees Minutes, 1910-1962*, RIBA/ED 7.1.2, RIBA Archive, London (hereafter cited as: RIBA/ED 7.1.2).

<sup>417</sup> *Ibid.*

The resumption of building production in the late 1940s enabled Jordan to link his course in a more sustained manner to its realities than had previously been possible. First, he undertook the announced changes to the practical training scheme, i.e. its gradual replacement with site and factory work. Starting on an experimental basis in April 1949 with a dozen students working on ACP's Brynmawr factory, Jordan managed to secure the co-operation of a number of contractors and extend the (non-compulsory) scheme to all willing third- and fourth-year students.<sup>418</sup> In addition, Jordan introduced so-called 'job lectures', which involved architects presenting their drawings and job histories in talks at the AA and regular progress reports on site, in an attempt to 'strike a balance between theoretical lecture on structure and the purely practical site work.'<sup>419</sup> Trips to manufacturers such as Crittall, Pilkington or Fibreglass featured prominently on the school agenda, as did Saturday visits to new buildings, usually led by their respective designers, who often happened to be members of the teaching staff or recent graduates.<sup>420</sup> 'Starved of new buildings', the students were, according to Saint, 'avid in their pursuit wherever there was any real intimation of building activity.'<sup>421</sup> Indeed, excursions to ACP's factory and YRM's housing at Brynmawr, Powell and Moya's Pimlico scheme or schools in Essex, Kent and particularly Hertfordshire were regularly oversubscribed, and the London sites of the Festival of Britain were visited on at least eight different occasions.

With ample evidence of progressive architecture in Britain itself, there was less need for organised foreign travel, and it was probably not only for financial reasons that the traditional annual members' excursion was suspended in years 1949 and 1950, whilst one to Italy in 1951 attracted little interest. The latter was perhaps inevitable as it collided with the final preparations for the Festival of Britain, which was widely – and quite justifiably – seen as an AA enterprise since, as President Anthony Chitty proudly proclaimed, 'out of the twenty-six architects commissioned [...] for the

---

<sup>418</sup> Meetings of the School Committee, 31 Jan 1949, 3 Oct 1949, 8 Dec 1950, SCM 1944-51, pp. 129, 148, 202-203. To Jordan's delight, site labour had a sobering impact on his students: 'Generally speaking four weeks navvying swings the pendulum completely: the student starts with an idealised view of the architect's function, and ends with a very "tough" view that the architect is hopelessly impracticable.' ('Principal's Report', *ibid.*, p. 203.)

<sup>419</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 205. Leo De Syllas and Anthony Cox, who were amongst the participating architects, had proposed a similar scheme in *Focus* before the war (see: *Focus*, no. 3 (1939), pp. 7-9).

<sup>420</sup> 'AA Information and Curriculum Notes 1949-50', *op. cit.*, p. 16.

<sup>421</sup> Saint 1987, p. 30.

South Bank Exhibition, three-quarters were members of this association and more than half were trained here [...].<sup>422</sup> Indeed, Hugh Casson, the architectural director of the Festival, was a current member of the council, and several of his designers, including Jim Cadbury-Brown, Stefan Buzas, Paul Boissevain and the seven members of ACP, were members of staff. Moreover, AA graduates dominated the two architectural competitions for the Festival, winning two first and two third prizes as well as one of four commendations, whilst two current students received the only special honourable mention (see page 2).<sup>423</sup>

The quest for realism was not limited to extramural activities but permeated the curriculum itself. The basic approach – encapsulated in the formula ‘real sites, real problems, real clients’ – had been introduced by Robertson in the 1930s and subsequently remained a constant, if at times marginal, feature of the course.<sup>424</sup> When in July 1948 RIBA President Michael Waterhouse deplored the inevitable lack of realism in student work owing to the absence of real clients, Gordon Brown retorted that this was not in fact the case.<sup>425</sup> In the previous year students had planned houses for ‘inspired clients’ such as designer Jack Pritchard and publisher Eric Gregory, and groups of fourth-year students had developed a cluster of factory and office blocks for Penguin Books, based on a programme provided by the project architect Ralph Tubbs, who, along with the company’s founder-director Allen Lane, also served on the final jury.<sup>426</sup> Likewise, in the closing academic session fourth- and fifth-year students had designed a drama centre in conjunction with RCA students and in close consultation with specialist advisors for each of its three components (viz. cinema, theatre and opera).<sup>427</sup> However, under Brown’s aegis such programmes remained the exception and co-existed with more unworldly exercises, including day-sketches for Victorian mansions, Roman villas and an ‘Albert Memorial in the

---

<sup>422</sup> Quoted in: ‘Annual Prize Giving’, *AAJ*, July/Aug 1951, vol. 67, no. 754, p. 56.

<sup>423</sup> In fairness it should be mentioned that AA representatives also served on the prize panels, including, in the case of the restaurant competition (won by Manasseh), Jordan himself. Reviewing the annual exhibition of AA student work, the *Guardian* wrote: ‘It is no accident that so many of the drawings and models positively breathe South Bankism – for it is from the school, fully of its day, in thought and method, that a good deal of the South Bank has indirectly come.’ (*Guardian*, 13 July 1951, p. 6.)

<sup>424</sup> See: James Gowan, ‘Annual Exhibition of Schoolwork 1956-1961’, *AAJ*, Sep/Oct 1961, vol. 77, no. 855, p. 66.

<sup>425</sup> ‘AA School Annual Prize-Giving’, *AAJ*, Aug/Sep 1948, vol. 64, no. 724, pp. 31, 32.

<sup>426</sup> See: *ABN*, 25 July 1947, p. 63; Gowan 1973, p. 14.

<sup>427</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10. The ‘clients’ in this case were Roger Manvell (cinema), Michel St. Denis (theatre) and John Christie (opera).

Classical tradition'.<sup>428</sup> Jordan, who considered the 'real sites, real problems, real clients' approach 'one of the AA's best contributions to design teaching'<sup>429</sup>, made it the core of the curriculum, particularly in the senior years. Fourth-year programmes included the replacement of a joinery factory for John Sadd & Sons, which involved students visiting the company's existing plant in Essex to familiarise themselves with its work processes, or a theatre school developed in cooperation with students of the Old Vic, for which the latter's principal Michel St. Denis acted as 'make-belief client'.<sup>430</sup>

Jordan's lecture syllabus, the studio curriculum with its underlying sense of 'realism' and the various extramural activities were the pillars of a coherent pedagogical strategy which aimed at enabling students to pursue their profession with a grasp of 'the true nature and significance of the contemporary scene'.<sup>431</sup> This 'scene' was characterised by unprecedented building problems involving 'the design of shelter for entirely new activities ... education, entertainment and the health service'<sup>432</sup> as well as a shift of patronage from the individual client to collective bodies acting on behalf of the general public, adding, as Robert Matthew put it, the complication of 'finding out not just what the client wants but [...] who the client is'.<sup>433</sup> In other words, set within the changed realities of the welfare state, the 'contemporary scene' made the interpretation of the neat formula 'real sites, real problems, real clients' a rather intricate task.

---

<sup>428</sup> The sketch for a Victorian mansion was a first-year exercise under Jarrett (*AJ*, 24 July 1947, pp. 81-82); the sketch for a Roman villa was a second-year exercise under Brandon-Jones (Whittaker, interview, 11 Jan 2014); the sketch for a new Albert Memorial was a fifth-year exercise under Oakes (*Builder*, 25 July 1947, p. 87; *ABN*, 1 Aug 1947, p. 90; 'Students of Architecture', *Guardian*, 18 July 1947, p. 4).

<sup>429</sup> Jordan, *Inaugural*, p. 140.

<sup>430</sup> The student projects for the Old Vic were subsequently exhibited at the Building Centre and received a great deal of publicity; see e.g.: 'Designs for a Theatre', *Times*, 10 June 1949, p. 7; *AJ*, 16 June 1949, pp. 538-539; *ABN*, 17 June 1949, pp. 523-524; *Builder*, 1 July 1949, pp. 2-3; Edward Passmore, 'The Earnest Forties', *Builder*, 22 July 1949, p. 101. Brandon-Jones was critical of such attempts to link the school course to building practice and suggested that 'to carry this sort of reality to its logical conclusion under present-day conditions the year master should put up a notice half-way through the subject telling students that as it has now been ascertained that no licence would be granted for the type of building under consideration all work will be stopped [...]' (John Brandon-Jones, 'The Education of Architects II', *ABN*, 24 April 1952, p. 490.)

<sup>431</sup> Jordan, *CID Conference*, p. 128.

<sup>432</sup> Jordan, *Inaugural*, p. 138.

<sup>433</sup> Quoted in: 'Research and Development in Public Offices', *AAJ*, March 1951, vol. 66, no. 750, p. 167.



## Research and Collaboration – Training for Public Practice

Orchestrated by a coalition government, the country's wartime effort had demonstrated the potentials of state interventionism, and the election victory of the Labour Party in 1945 ensured that similar directive powers were now applied to the rebuilding of the country. Effectively turning architecture into a public service, the agencies of the welfare state assumed responsibility for the provision of housing and schools as the twin engine of the reconstruction drive and, through a plethora of building regulations, particularly the licensing of building materials, curtailed private practice to an extent that it 'might,' as Summerson wrote, 'with only slight exaggeration, be described as illegal.'<sup>434</sup>

The spectre of nationalisation looming, the future of private architectural practice was the prevailing concern within the profession in the immediate postwar period, dominating the editorials and correspondence columns of the technical press and prompting, in 1948, the formation of a special RIBA committee under Percy Thomas to report on the matter.<sup>435</sup> Within the AA these debates were infused by a sense of pragmatism, epitomised by Roderick Enthoven's remark that '[it] is not for us to be concerned whether architecture, like music, is produced by solo instrumentalists or by orchestras, provided it is in fact good.'<sup>436</sup> The rise of the public sector was accepted as a fact of life, and discussions revolved around the question as to how, within its multidisciplinary environment, architects could uphold their traditional role as leaders of the building team and retain creative control over its output – a vital concern in light of the dispiriting housing schemes produced by the valuer's department of the LCC at the time.<sup>437</sup> In April 1948,

---

<sup>434</sup> Summerson 1947, p. 50. For a detailed discussion of public sector work between 1945 and 1955 see: Bullock 2002, pp. 219-221.

<sup>435</sup> The committee report was published in October 1950 and could not substantiate the fear that the continued existence of private practice was threatened by the rapid expansion of public work. (A. Graham Henderson, 'Report of the Committee on Private Architectural Practice – A Message from the President', *RIBA J*, October 1950, p. 430; 'The Future of Private Practice / RIBA Report on Private Practice', *AJ*, 23 Nov 1950, pp. 414-417.)

<sup>436</sup> Roderick Enthoven, 'Presidential Address', *AAJ*, Nov 1948, vol. 64, no. 726, p. 77.

<sup>437</sup> Jordan was one of the most outspoken critics of the department's work: 'We live in a confusing age, and it is not easy for a valuer to work out a basic philosophy for a vast concept. After all, there are not many precedents, but then he who controls LCC housing must not look for precedents, he must create them. [...] I went to County Hall expecting to see bad housing and I saw what I expected [...].' (Quoted in: 'LCC Housing', *AJ*, 26 May 1949, p. 474.) In 1946 the LCC had transferred responsibility for the housing

Anthony Cox read a paper to the AA in which he laid out how, by dividing them into semi-autonomous units and implementing a mechanism of continual research and development, departments could be organised in a way which would avoid the inhibiting effect of a rigid administrative hierarchy and foster the creativity and self-responsibility of its architect members.<sup>438</sup>

In the following year Jordan himself hosted a three-part BBC broadcast consisting of talks by Frederick Gibberd, who made the case for private practice, and Percy Johnson-Marshall, who championed the public office, followed by a discussion between the two adversaries at the AA.<sup>439</sup> Though acting as a neutral moderator in the debate, Jordan made no attempt to disguise his sympathies:

There are old-fashioned architects, and some not so old-fashioned, who take a real if slightly snobbish pride in the fact that architecture is a profession as well as an art. They are rather alarmed at what is happening. They think, perhaps not very rationally, that it means the end of architecture as a fine art. What it probably does mean is the end of architecture as they have known it.<sup>440</sup>

Jordan considered the existing organisation of the architectural profession and its education to be ‘quite unrelated either to the scope or the scale of modern needs’ and saw the progressive public office as ‘the spearhead in the reorganisation of the profession to fit new conditions and in creating the demand for architects trained for the new type of job.’<sup>441</sup> Consequently, he actively sought the proximity of both the LCC and the Hertfordshire County Council, whose architect’s departments epitomised the compartmentalised and collaborative research environment Anthony Cox (who had worked at Hertfordshire before rejoining ACP in 1947) had called

---

programme to its valuer, Cyril Walker, but only four years later it returned it to the architect’s department – not so much as a result of protests from Jordan and like-minded colleagues but because the expected surge in housing production failed to materialise, at least in the short term. (See: Bullock 2002, pp. 212-216; Simon Pepper, ‘The beginnings of high-rise social housing in the long 1940s: the case of the LCC and the Woodberry Down estate’, in: Mark Swenarton, Tom Avermaete, Dirk van den Heuvel (eds.), *Architecture and the Welfare State*, London / New York 2015, pp. 81-82.)

<sup>438</sup> Anthony Cox, ‘Public and Private Architecture’, *AAJ*, April 1948, vol. 63, no. 721, pp. 205-213.

<sup>439</sup> ‘Public Architecture’, *AAJ*, Dec 1949, vol. 65, no. 737, pp. 94-102.

<sup>440</sup> Quoted *ibid.*, p. 94.

<sup>441</sup> R. Furneaux Jordan, ‘The Situation in Architecture’, report of a talk given to the LCC branch of the Association of Building Technicians, *Keystone*, Oct 1950, in: *Records of the Association of Building Technicians*, Modern Records Centre, University of Warwick, Coventry (hereafter cited as MRC/ABT), MSS.78/BT/4/6/10, p. 37.

for.<sup>442</sup> Jordan was anxious to involve official architects in the teaching of his students, focusing his efforts on the LCC and the Architects and Buildings Branch of the MOE, presumably because they were both based in London and a mutual arrangement seemed therefore more easily conceivable. Hoping that it would set a significant precedent, the AA in October 1949 entered protracted, albeit ultimately unsuccessful, negotiations with the MOE to get permission for one of their employees, the prodigious Michael Ventris, to take up a part-time position at the AA as member of its 'post-graduate group' (see page 86).<sup>443</sup> Historically, the LCC's architects' department entertained stronger links with the Regent Street Polytechnic and the Brixton School of Building, which were run by the same council. However, with Robert Matthew's accession to office in 1946 and the return of the housing department under his control three years later, it became a haven for AA graduates, many of whom looked, in the words of one chronicler, 'to the LCC as a kind of postgraduate school'<sup>444</sup>, and strengthened its links with the AA. In early 1951 the LCC provided the basic material for three housing theses on its Wimbledon and Roehampton sites and allowed the group around Howell and Killick, which was in charge of the latter project, to visit the AA for weekly meetings with the students concerned.<sup>445</sup>

A fourth-year programme in 1949 exemplified Jordan's efforts to forge a link with public authorities. Assisted by both the MOE and the Hertfordshire architects, who provided site material, technical details and critical input, students were required to design a secondary school based on the Hills system, which had been pioneered at Hertfordshire and adopted by the LCC.<sup>446</sup> Evidently, though, the key accomplishment of the Hertfordshire group had not consisted in applying an existing structural system but in adapting it to their specific requirements, based on a

---

<sup>442</sup> Michael Colborne Brown, Jordan's administrative assistant, had been chief education officer at Hertfordshire, and both Charles Aslin and Stirrat Johnson-Marshall were frequent visitors to the AA. According to Saint, the latter used such opportunities to 'unabashedly woo the best students, even trying to persuade them to forget their exams.' (Saint 1987, p. 75.)

<sup>443</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 30 Jan 1950, SCM 1944-51, p. 162. Ventris started tutoring unofficially and without remuneration in October 1949 but was ultimately not released by the MOE.

<sup>444</sup> McNab 1972, op. cit., p. 74.

<sup>445</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 2 March 1951, SCM 1944-51, p. 223.

<sup>446</sup> 'School Notes', *AAJ*, Nov 1949, vol. 65, no. 736, p. 86. A similar programme in the following year asked for the design of a three-form entry secondary school based on MOE requirements: 'The Architects Group at the MOE have virtually written this programme and are maintaining a close interest in it.' ('Principal's Report', Meeting of the School Committee, 6 Oct 1950, SCM 1944-51, p. 195.)

thorough analysis of the building problem and in close collaboration with the manufacturer.<sup>447</sup> Moreover, they had implemented a revolutionary ‘rolling programme’<sup>448</sup> whereby user feedback was gathered to inform future stages of the undertaking. In other words, Hertfordshire suggested a method to approach an unprecedented ‘problem’ and bridge the gap to the anonymous ‘client’ by linking up technological and consumer research. In this sense it was the quintessential manifestation of the ‘ideal of research’, which had been a conscious if always ill-defined pursuit of British pre-war modernists in general and the AA in particular.<sup>449</sup>

It was only after the war that such societal and scientific aspirations became compatible with real-life conditions as the welfare state provided the political and legislative framework for architectural ‘research’ to emerge from the purely speculative into the realm of practical applicability. ‘In short,’ wrote Summerson, ‘for many young men returning to their drawing-boards after the war, the hypothetical had become the real [...].’<sup>450</sup> In his final year as principal Brown had tentatively allocated one term for third-year students to conduct investigations into subjects of their choosing, but it was Jordan who fully incorporated the notion of research into the curriculum since he took the view that it was only through enquiry and analysis that the student could hope to acquire an understanding of the ‘contemporary scene’ in its unprecedented complexity.<sup>451</sup> Consequently, Jordan gave his students far-reaching liberties in the interpretation and execution of their tasks: ‘The AA School probably allows more freedom to its students and has a more flexible curriculum than any other parallel institution.’<sup>452</sup> Indeed, subject to satisfactory performance in previous terms, students had the option to disregard the set tasks altogether and draft their own briefs, enabling the best of them to write a large proportion of their

---

<sup>447</sup> For a discussion of the Hertfordshire school building programme see: Saint 1987, pp. 58-111 passim.

<sup>448</sup> Ibid., p. 63.

<sup>449</sup> Ibid., p. 10.

<sup>450</sup> John Summerson, ‘Introduction’, in: Trevor Dannatt, *Modern Architecture in Britain*, London 1959, p. 19.

<sup>451</sup> ‘Students of architecture are likely, in the future, to use techniques in which even their own teachers have not been trained [...].’ (Jordan, CID Conference, p. 129.) Jordan had made the same point before the war: ‘An incomplete understanding of that for which we are designing will lead us into fundamental failure at the start. [...] The country-house architects of twenty years ago understood well enough the life of the rather limited class for whom they built. No very precise definition of analysis was necessary. The complexity of the contemporary scene has involved the younger architect in a good deal of such definition and analysis.’ (R. Furneaux Jordan, ‘Competitive Education’, *Focus*, no. 4 (1939), p. 59.)

<sup>452</sup> ‘AA Information and Curriculum Notes 1950-51’, AAA, Box 1991:31, p. 1.

programmes themselves and thus, to a considerable degree, devise their own education.<sup>453</sup>

Whether working to a given brief or writing their own, students were encouraged to work in groups, not least because the sheer scope of the tasks usually made this a necessity. Unlike Brown, who dismissed the ‘big subject’<sup>454</sup> as a Beaux-Arts relict and preferred students to design smaller projects in a more thorough manner instead, Jordan considered any diminution of the scope of programmes to be at odds with the conditions students were likely to encounter upon entering the profession:

Building programmes generally (e.g. new towns, C.C. schools, health centres or industrial buildings) are likely to be larger rather than smaller – the client a corporate body rather than a single patron – and in such schemes the vision of the artist will be preserved and implemented only if he can co-operate and organise with others.<sup>455</sup>

An occasional feature under Rowse and his successors, group work was temporarily abandoned after the war – presumably for organisational rather than pedagogical reasons, for it was Brown who re-introduced it in spring 1947, when fourth-year students collaborated on their Penguin schemes (see p. 91) whilst groups of fifth-year students developed plans for an international exhibition on the South Bank.<sup>456</sup> Jordan extended group work over the entire course – in fact, the ‘primitive hut’ was one of only three (out of a total of 25) subjects for which it was explicitly prohibited, the others being ‘Office Procedure 1 + 2’ in the two so-called ‘examination terms’.<sup>457</sup> A significant departure from previous practice, even final theses were regularly done in groups, and two in particular seem noteworthy as not only were they planning theses – a subject matter which even under Jordan was confined to students who had achieved honours’ degree standard in their previous work – but both were

---

<sup>453</sup> ‘We were all writing our own programmes according to what we thought the world wanted. There was always a set programme, but you could always write your own programme as well.’ (Maguire, interview, 10 Sep 2013.) Stephen Macfarlane recalls that it was the main objective of the annual crits to assess ‘how you moved and how much responsibility you could take on in future.’ (Macfarlane, interview, op. cit.)

<sup>454</sup> Brown, ‘Architectural Education’, p. 97.

<sup>455</sup> ‘AA Information and Curriculum Notes 1949-50’, p. 10.

<sup>456</sup> ‘International Exhibition’, *AJ*, 1 May 1947, pp. 356, 360. The programme had been worked out on the basis of information provided by the Board of Trade, and Stafford Cripps visited the AA to examine the schemes.

<sup>457</sup> ‘AA Information and Curriculum Notes 1949-50’, pp. 10, 11. Terms 8 (intermediate) and 14 (final) were regarded as ‘examination terms’, meaning that all students had to get a ‘pass’ in ‘Office Procedure 1 + 2’ (i.e. working drawings) before presenting their portfolios to the external examiner of the RIBA.

chosen by the MARS Group as official contributions to the CIAM congresses of 1951 and 1953, respectively.<sup>458</sup> The first, 'Pin Green, Stevenage', was submitted in 1950 by a group comprising John Killick, Hugh Morris, Stephen Macfarlane, Bill Howell and his future wife Jill Sarson.<sup>459</sup> Taking the existing Stevenage master plan as a starting point, the group developed one of the proposed six neighbourhood units by combining single-storey houses with a number of high-rises, thereby arriving at densities which proved incompatible with the original plan and inducing them to reconceive the town as a whole. Unlike the Stevenage thesis, which did not question the underlying thinking of the New Town programme, 'Zone – a sustainable city region' was an explicit and prescient critique of prevailing urban theory.<sup>460</sup> Completed in 1952, the Zone thesis was the result of a two-year collaboration between Pat Crooke, John Voelcker and Andrew Derbyshire, who devised a self-sufficient and hierarchically structured 'micro-region' for 72,000 inhabitants, consisting of a city core surrounded and supported by an interdependent network of farming communities – 'a staggering piece of student work which is still referred to with respect and awe,' as Gowan observed more than a quarter of a century later.<sup>461</sup>

Although group work was not mandatory, Jordan was unambiguous that in due course it would be.<sup>462</sup> He strongly encouraged the formation of discussion groups early on in the course, hoping that they would form the nuclei of more highly organised working partnerships which would persist throughout, and possibly beyond, the duration of the course:

The AA should produce a 'school' of architects – in the sense in which one speaks historically of a 'school' of painters – but this, in the conflicts of contemporary life, can only be done when there is a conscious effort to form a corporate will.<sup>463</sup>

---

<sup>458</sup> Group theses were not uncommon in the late 1930s but exceptionally rare in the wartime period, the housing thesis by Powell, Moya and Taylor (see p. 42) being the only known example.

<sup>459</sup> [Bill Howell et al.], 'Stevenage', *PLAN*, no. 8 (1950), pp. 24-31; see also: J. Tyrwhitt, J. L. Sert, E. N. Rogers (eds.), *The Heart of the City*, London 1952, pp. 121-122.

<sup>460</sup> Banham identified it as 'the earliest project for anything resembling a megastructure that I remember seeing.' (Reyner Banham, *Megastructure*, London 1976, pp. 84-85; see also: pp. 142-143.)

<sup>461</sup> Quoted in: Dennis Sharp (ed.), 'Arthur Korn (1891-1978) in memoriam', *AA quarterly*, vol. 11, no. 3 (1979), p. 49; for a contemporary description of the project by Crooke and Derbyshire see: 'Living in Cities', *AAJ*, July/Aug 1953, vol. 69, no. 774, pp. 61-62; for a discussion see: Mardell 2013, pp. 89-93.

<sup>462</sup> 'At no point in the AA training is group work *yet* [italics added] compulsory.' ('AA Information and Curriculum Notes 1949-50', op. cit., p. 10)

<sup>463</sup> 'AA Information and Curriculum Notes 1949-50', p. 11.

Few remained unaffected by the collaborative spirit which pervaded the school at the time. One such was Patrick Horsbrugh, a star student and future professor at Notre Dame. Unfashionably averse to collectivism, he insisted on completing even the most comprehensive schemes entirely on his own. As one fellow student recalled:

I remember [he] refused – ‘You can’t design a building with a committee.’ Later he produced the project we were given on time, beautifully done, with a model, while we were still arguing. ‘There is Horsbrugh on his lofty peak,’ said the year master!<sup>464</sup>

### Shades of Left – The AA in the Crossfire of Political Controversy

Jordan’s emphasis on collaborative methods was a way to meet the needs of a society whose progression toward socialism was, in his worldview, a historical inevitability. With the approach of the war Jordan had become actively concerned with radical left-wing politics, editing the bulletin *Comparative Broadcasts* and acting as secretary for the ‘Cambridge Peace Aims Group’, in which capacity he wrote and published two manifestos, viz. ‘World Radicalism’ (1939) and ‘Charter of the Rights and Duties of Man’ (1940).<sup>465</sup> Amongst the first wave of British modernists, to which Jordan belonged, such views were by no means exceptional.<sup>466</sup> Although the British generally lacked the fervour of their continental counterparts, in and beyond the 1930s the political connotation was pronounced enough for ‘Modernismus’ to present an easy target for chauvinist polemic.<sup>467</sup>

---

<sup>464</sup> Arthur Lewis, email to Edward Bottoms, 22 Feb 2008, AAA. Horsbrugh showed no fewer than twenty models of his third-year project to the external examiners for the RIBA Intermediate, and his final presentation two years later apparently took up the entire library space. (Patrick, ‘Architectural Aspirations’, op. cit.; ‘Patrick Horsbrugh interviewed by Yona R. Owens’, 13 Jan 2009, *Lewis Clarke Oral Histories*, NCSU Libraries, [https://www.lib.ncsu.edu/documents/scrc/lewisclarke/content/oh/docs/horsbrugh\\_patrick\\_transcript1.pdf](https://www.lib.ncsu.edu/documents/scrc/lewisclarke/content/oh/docs/horsbrugh_patrick_transcript1.pdf) [accessed 28 Dec 2016], p. 11.)

<sup>465</sup> Edward Bottoms, ‘Jordan, (John) Robert Furneaux (1905–1978)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford 2011, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/63137> [accessed 21 June 2014].

<sup>466</sup> Born in 1905, Jordan was roughly the same age as Lubetkin, Goldfinger and Richards. His fellow students at Birmingham included Gibberd, Yorke, Sheppard and Colin Penn. (Richard Sheppard (rev. Alan Powers), ‘Yorke, Francis Reginald Stevens (1906–1962)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford 2004 (online ed., 2011), <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37067> [accessed 21 June 2014].)

<sup>467</sup> For a discussion see: Nigel Whiteley, ‘Modern Architecture, Heritage and Englishness’, *Architectural History*, vol. 38 (1995), pp. 220-237; William Whyte, ‘The Englishness of English Architecture: Modernism and the Making of a National International Style, 1927–1957’, *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 48 (2009), pp. 441-465.

An unprecedented sense of national solidarity, engendered by the shared experience of air raids and wartime rationing as well as the abatement of left-wing reservations vis-à-vis ‘Churchill’s war’ as a result of the country’s alliance with the USSR from 1941 onward, momentarily reconciled antagonisms of class and politics. According to Lowe, the Second World War thus ‘marked a decisive step towards collectivism, towards the corporate state; and the extension of state planning into the post-war years served only to emphasise the permanence of this process.’<sup>468</sup> Indeed, the landslide victory of the Labour Party left no doubt that hitherto distinctively leftist causes had acquired broad appeal across the political spectrum.<sup>469</sup> In other words, Jordan’s assumption of office coincided with a brief period in which his radical political views were commonly deemed acceptable.

Yet the political climate was changing. The Czech coup and the division of Germany in 1948 cemented the Cold War, and Britain’s active role in setting up NATO in 1949 and its participation in the Korean War in the following year crushed the widespread but, given the country’s economic dependence on its transatlantic partner, entirely illusory hope of many on the left that a socialist Britain might establish itself as a third, non-aligned power on the world stage.<sup>470</sup> Domestically, the government in 1948 initiated a purge of the civil service, and the Labour Party disallowed any form of affiliation between its members and Communists, who, in turn, hardened their stance towards an administration they had initially welcomed but now increasingly condemned as ‘the alternative mask of the capitalist system.’<sup>471</sup> Fuelled by a fierce anti-communist rhetoric of both the government and large sections of the press, the schism between the political mainstream and the Communist Party (CP) widened, leaving its supporters marginalised and deeply suspect.

---

<sup>468</sup> Lowe 1988, pp. 1-2 et pass.

<sup>469</sup> See e.g.: Bullock 2002, p. 9.

<sup>470</sup> Childs argues that ‘Europe’s apparent demise enhanced Britain’s status and sense of its own importance. The British Empire, being transformed into a Commonwealth and with Britain at its head, appeared poised for a new world-wide role.’ (David Childs, *Britain Since 1945*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed., London 2006, p. 42.)

<sup>471</sup> ‘Chris Whittaker interviewed by Kevin Morgan’, n.d., *Communist Party of Great Britain Biographical Project*, British Library Sound Archive, London (hereafter cited as BLSA/Whittaker), Tape 1, Side A; see also: Childs 2006, pp. 19-20.



With architecture a part of the state machinery and thus an inherently political subject it was inevitable that it got caught up in these controversies. For instance, in 1950 Oliver Cox, Cleeve Barr, Beak Adams and Anthony Garrod, who were promoting the agenda of the Association of Building Technicians (ABT), the communist-led trade union of salaried architects and technicians, within the Hertfordshire County Council, felt compelled to resign in the face of political dissension.<sup>472</sup> Encouraged by existing staff such as Graeme Shankland, a CP member and recent AA graduate, who had assisted Jordan in his work on ‘World Radicalism’, the group joined the LCC, where a formidable communist faction with some success resisted mounting political pressure.<sup>473</sup> Nonetheless, official moves to impose a ban on the employment of communists such as Colin Penn, a member of the ABT’s executive committee, compelled the CP to disband its LCC branch and encourage its members to pursue their activities in a more clandestine manner.<sup>474</sup>

The AA was particularly vulnerable to politically motivated defamation. The student rebellion of the 1930s had in some corners been seen as the result of concerted agitation by a small group of communist students, and left-wing undercurrents were traditionally strong at the school.<sup>475</sup> Having forbidden students to hold political meetings prior to the general election in July 1945<sup>476</sup>, the council within a few

---

<sup>472</sup> Saint 1987, p. 96; see also: Stephen R. Parsons, ‘Communism in the Professions: The Organisation of the British Communist Party among Professional Workers, 1933–1956’, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Warwick, 1990, p. 447; for a general discussion of the ABT and its communist context: *ibid.*, pp. 417–461 *passim*.

<sup>473</sup> According to Parsons, there was a contingent of fifteen to twenty CP members in the LCC architect’s department, and the LCC staff branch of the ABT grew from sixty to a hundred members in 1949 – in contradistinction to ABT membership generally, which dropped continuously from 1947 onward (*ibid.*, pp. 447, 459). For Shankland see: Nares Craig, *Memoirs of a Thirties Dissident*, [2008], chapter 6, <http://narescraig.co.uk/memoirs>; Graham Stevenson, ‘Graeme Shankland’, <http://www.grahamstevenson.me.uk> [both accessed 25 June 2014].

<sup>474</sup> Parsons 1990, pp. 458, 470. For instance, AA graduate Thurston Williams, a CP member and ABT delegate to the LCC, completely ignored the ABT and built up the powerful LCC staff association in its stead, becoming, in 1953, the chief negotiator for all administrative, professional, technical and clerical staff at the LCC. Chris Whittaker recalls: ‘There was a very big party presence at the LCC. I don’t remember that we met as an LCC branch, but there was the LCC staff association, which was very active and [...] had a number of party people at the top of it. [...] There was almost a purge of party members at one time. Everybody was having to behave very circumspectly.’ (BLSA/Whittaker, Tape 2, Side A.) Colin Penn had joined the AASTA, the precursor of the ABT, in 1936 and worked as its national organiser during the war before joining fellow ABT and (presumably) CP member Ernö Goldfinger in private practice in 1946. He remained a leading figure within the ABT and from March 1949 served on its executive committee. (Parsons 1990, pp. 424, 440, 443; *Keystone*, Jan 1946, MRC/ABT, MSS.78/BT/4/6/8, p. 6; Meeting of the General Council of the ABT, 20 March 1949, MRC/ABT, MSS.78/BT/1/4/12.)

<sup>475</sup> Saint 1987, p. 4; Darling, *Re-forming Britain*, pp. 185–186.

<sup>476</sup> Meeting of the Council, 28 May 1945, CM 1940–49, p. 284.

months bowed to pressure from the students' committee, approving, in October, their request to hold a debate on the Palestine situation, provided 'that it was not reported and that no members of the press were present.'<sup>477</sup> In early 1947 the council allowed the 'Socialist Society' and the short-lived conservative '45 Club' to display their posters on the school notice boards,<sup>478</sup> and in February 1948 the council, on Brown's advice and despite legal concerns, granted political and religious sub-sections of the students' club permission to hold their meetings on AA premises, with the hopeful proviso that they would not affiliate with outside bodies and limit their discussion to educational matters.<sup>479</sup> The most active political student group was the Communist Society (ComSoc), which was officially approved by the council in October 1949 but had been operating without its knowledge for at least a year as a branch of the Architects' Group of the CP.<sup>480</sup> With estimates ranging between eight and twenty-five members, the ComSoc was, as one of them remembers, 'absolutely a tiny cluster of people'.<sup>481</sup> Nonetheless, in the politically charged climate of the late 1940s they were conspicuous enough to arouse the interest of the secret service, one of whose officials questioned a disgusted Gabriel Epstein about communist students and – grossly overestimating their number – regarded the AA, according to Whittaker, as a 'hotbed of communism'.<sup>482</sup> One reason for this misrepresentation

---

<sup>477</sup> Meeting of the Council, 29 Oct 1945, *ibid.*, p. 303.

<sup>478</sup> Meetings of the Council, 24 March 1947, 14 July 1947, *ibid.*, pp. 390, 415.

<sup>479</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 1 Dec 1947, SCM 1944-51, p. 101; Meetings of the Council, 5 Jan 1948, 26 Jan 1948, 23 Feb 1948, CM 1940-49, pp. 446, 456-457, 465-466.

<sup>480</sup> Meeting of the Council, 24 Oct 1949, CM 1949-55, pp. 34, 35. At the end of the 1947/48 session the council was convinced that there was no Communist Party branch at the AA (Meeting of the Council, 24 May 1948, CM 1940-49, p. 477); yet one ex-service student, who returned to the school for the 1948/49 session, remembered that he 'rejoined a strong Party group' there. (John Kay, autobiographical note for the general organisation department of the CP, 22 May 1950, private collection; also: [John Kay], 'Archts Grp: WW/AA', 29 Nov 1950, MS, *ibid.*)

<sup>481</sup> Whittaker, interview, 11 Jan 2014. In his oral history interview for the British Library's CP collection Whittaker estimated that 'at its high point there were sixteen party members in the AA' (BLSA/Whittaker, Tape 1, Side A), but he later reduced this figure to 'never more than about eight or ten people' (Whittaker, interview, 11 Jan 2014). In contrast Parsons, based on conversations with Hugh Morris and Colin Boatman, suggests that 'an estimated 25 out of 500 in 1950 were Party members' (Parsons 1990, p. 446). Known members of the ComSoc included future ABT executive committee members Graeme Shankland, Henry Swain and Thurston Williams, as well as Whittaker, Morris, Boatman, David Gregory-Jones, David Embling, Colin Jones, Jennifer Dennis and John Kay.

<sup>482</sup> 'The reason I know this is through a comrade, Hugh Morris, who joined a private but very cooperative partnership, RMJM, later on. [...] Someone from some security echelon approached Morris as chairman of the partners to enquire about one of his colleagues and former fellow students who was considered for a good-and-great appointment: "Is he reliable?" Hugh gave him a proper build up, as they had been together for many years and known each other since student days. "Ah," says the man, "he was at the AA, you know – a hotbed of communism. There were at least fifty party members there in his time. Wasn't he one of them?" – "No," says Hugh, "he wasn't." – "How do you know this?" – "I was the secretary of the party at the AA at that time, and he wasn't on the books."' (BLSA/Whittaker, Tape 1, Side A.) Gabriel Epstein, who was

may be the fact that communist students were, in keeping with the party's infiltration stratagem, disproportionately represented on the students' committee; however, more important was the simultaneous presence of a prominent and partially overlapping group of AA students who, between 1948 and 1951, edited *PLAN*, the magazine of the 'Architectural Students' Association' (ArchSA), and used it as a platform for the dissemination of their pacifist-anarchist (rather than communist) ideas, which at times caused severe embarrassment to the council (see page 109).<sup>483</sup>

Whilst the students' political activities had been a feature at the AA since the war, under Jordan the school itself became increasingly a forum for political debate. In July 1949 Clement Attlee, the incumbent prime minister, addressed the annual prize ceremony – a first in AA history, no doubt arranged by Jordan's brother Philip, who happened to be Attlee's press adviser.<sup>484</sup> Although impressed with Jordan's exploit, Howard Robertson, who proposed the vote of thanks to the prime minister, felt obliged to stress the fact that the AA was 'not a political organisation'.<sup>485</sup> Yet under the circumstances the AA's traditionally non-political stance was becoming something of an anachronism. The rules which prohibited students from providing school premises to outside bodies or using them for political meetings applied equally to the association itself, and when in April 1948 the MARS Group asked for permission to use AA facilities for the CIAM Summer School, the council – against legal advice from its solicitor – consented only because it was assumed that 'half of the course would be English and probably AA members'.<sup>486</sup> One year later, no such pretext seemed necessary to loan a lecture hall to the ABT and the 'Society for Cultural Relations between the British Commonwealth and the USSR' (SCR) for a

---

teaching at the AA at the time, remembers being probed by an officer in the course of his naturalisation process: "Who are the communists amongst the students and the youngsters at the AA?" I said: "You only have to go and have lunch there and listen to them talking away. They are not embarrassed about it, so you will find out easily enough, but you can't expect me to sit here and talk about my friends." [...] He wanted to know names, and I said thank you very much but no, so I left. I was disgusted by it.' (BLSA/Epstein, Track 3/7 (25 Sep 2009).)

<sup>483</sup> Core members of the *PLAN* editorial group included John Killick, Stephen Macfarlane, Andrew Derbyshire, Hugh Morris, Sam Scorer and John Turner; for a discussion see p. 131ff.

<sup>484</sup> Meeting of the Council, 23 May 1949, CM 1949-55, pp. 9-10. Attlee, whose brother had studied at the AA, had not been Jordan's first choice. He had originally invited the rather more controversial Stafford Cripps, who was, however, unable to attend. In addition, in October 1949 Jordan invited Aneurin Bevan to address a general meeting of the association – despite concerns by its treasurer A. R. F. Anderson, who wondered 'whether the Council considered it the right time to ask a politician to speak at the AA'. Bevan, too, was unable to come. (Meeting of the Council, 24 Oct 1949, *ibid.*, p. 35.)

<sup>485</sup> Quoted in: 'Prize-Giving 1949', *op. cit.*, p. 34.

<sup>486</sup> Meeting of the Council, 12 April 1948, CM 1940-49, pp. 473-474.

talk by Marxist scientist J. D. Bernal on his recent visit to the Soviet Union,<sup>487</sup> and in March 1950 the AA itself hosted a discussion of the Architecture and Planning Group of the SCR, which suggests that it, too, was composed predominantly of AA members and that the council, somewhat naively, did not consider the SCR to be a political organisation.<sup>488</sup>

Governed by a council which seemed oblivious to the political sensitivities of the wider populace and showed no signs of attempting to contain the fomenting activities of its students, the AA made itself an easy target for those intent on pursuing an anti-communist witch-hunt. On 19 July 1950 Jordan informed the council that he had held a four-hour meeting with his vice-principal David Goddard and asked for his immediate resignation.<sup>489</sup> In a detailed report to the council Jordan claimed that two defects in Goddard's character – 'violent reaction to criticism and inability to do well a job in which he had lost interest' – made any further collaboration inconceivable.<sup>490</sup> Moreover, he accused his deputy of wilfully undermining his, Jordan's, efforts to formulate a coherent long-term policy:

Whether one runs an orthodox school, a "progressive" school or an academic school and so on are all arguable matters, but there must sooner or later be agreement on such matters between a principal and vice-principal. [...] Vacillation, whereby responsibility for the results of policy could be avoided, seems to me to have become his deliberate policy [and] he seems to have used this absence of a clear policy, which he forced on me, as a vehicle for criticising me.<sup>491</sup>

Jordan deplored Goddard's 'excessive rudeness'<sup>492</sup> to both students and staff, many of whom had asked not to have to work under him anymore, and reported that

---

<sup>487</sup> J. D. Bernal, 'Building Construction in the USSR', *Keystone*, Feb 1950, MRC/ABT, MSS.78/BT/4/6/10, pp. 30-33 (continued in: *Keystone*, March 1950, *ibid.*, pp. 53-61).

<sup>488</sup> 'Tendencies in Post-War Housing: A Discussion Requested by Russian Architects', *Builder*, 31 March 1950, pp. 430-431. Founded in 1924, the SCR immediately after VE Day created a special 'Architecture and Planning Group' to facilitate the dissemination of Russian building news. With Charles Reilly as president and Arthur Ling as chairman the group attracted both communists and others from a slightly broader political spectrum, including Jordan, Lubetkin, Richards, Shankland, Casson and Summerson. (Stephen V. Ward, 'Soviet communism and the British planning movement: rational learning or Utopian imagining?', *Planning Perspectives*, Oct 2012, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 506-507.) Though not a communist organisation per se, between the dissolution of the Architects' Branch of the CP in 1945 and the formation of the Architects' Group in 1948, the SCR was, according to Parsons, along with the party branch at the AA, the main meeting point for communist architects (Parsons 1990, p. 450).

<sup>489</sup> Meeting of the Officers of the Council, 1 Aug 1950, CM 1949-55, p. 107.

<sup>490</sup> 'Principal's Report to the Officers', 30 July 1950, att. to: Meeting of the Officers of the Council, 1 Aug 1950, *ibid.*, p. 110.

<sup>491</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>492</sup> *Ibid.*

subsequent to his meeting with Goddard he had consulted the other members of the school executive, who had assured him of their ‘completely unanimous support, in two cases most forcibly expressed.’<sup>493</sup> Goddard, who asked for a meeting with Anthony Chitty, one of the vice-presidents, disputed Jordan’s allegations, expressing his opinion ‘that the Principal is on the edge of a breakdown [and] that the whole business had been engineered by the communists, of which [sic] party the Principal had been a member (and probably still is).’<sup>494</sup> Consequently, Goddard initially refused to tender his resignation and only changed his mind when the AA’s solicitor threatened that, as there was no doubt that Jordan’s statements could be corroborated, the AA had sufficient grounds to terminate his contract for serious neglect of duty and misconduct.<sup>495</sup> A concluding discussion within the council revealed widespread concern about Jordan’s management since not only had this been ‘one of a series of cases of staff disagreements which had taken place in the past year’ but Jordan had, in fact, put Goddard’s name on his list of staff appointments, dated July 1950, and ‘appeared to have changed his mind within a few days.’<sup>496</sup> Unsurprisingly, the council refrained from investigating Goddard’s allegation as to a possible political motive behind his dismissal. Yet within only two months another controversy brought the issue back to the fore, and whilst the row with Goddard was confined to the AA’s inner circle, this one played out in full public view.

---

<sup>493</sup> Ibid. The recollections of former students largely support Jordan’s account; for a different point of view see: John S. Ambrose (chairman of the 1949/50 students’ committee), letter to S. E. T Cusdin, 8 Aug 1950, AAA, Box 2006:S34. There are indications that the problems between Jordan and Goddard were of a private nature (see especially: Goddard, letter to H. J. W. Alexander, 10 Aug 1950, *ibid.*).

<sup>494</sup> ‘AA Council File: Note of a meeting with David Goddard on 24 July 1950’, att. to: Meeting of the Officers of the Council, 1 Aug 1950, CM 1949-55, p. 109.

<sup>495</sup> J. C. Medley (Field Roscoe & Co.), letter to H. J. W. Alexander, 21 July 1950, *ibid.*; ‘Minute of a meeting held between Mr S. E. T. Cusdin (President), Mr Anthony Chitty (Vice-President) and Mr J. C. Medley (Solicitor)’ 3 August 1950, *ibid.*, p. 113; Meeting of the Officers of the Council, 11 Aug 1950, *ibid.*, pp. 111-112; George Wiltshire, letter to Goddard, 14 Aug 1950, AAA, Box 2006:S34; Goddard, letter to Alexander, 16 Aug 1950, *ibid.*; Meeting of the Officers of the Council, 23 Aug 1950, CM 1949-55, p. 117. Goddard was not replaced as vice-principal. At first, Jim Cadbury-Brown and John Madge shared his post as head of the senior school. Two months later Madge gave his notice, and R. A. Duncan and Goddard’s former assistant Henry Elder took charge of the fourth year. (Meetings of the School Committee, 6 Oct 1950, 8 Dec 1950, SCM 1944-51, pp. 193, 200.)

<sup>496</sup> Meeting of the Council, 14 Aug 1950, CM 1949-55, p. 114. One month prior, the school clerk, H. L. Bromley, had written to the council, asking for a redress of grievances and claiming that his post on the school administration was being made untenable. The differences between Bromley and Jordan were subsequently reconciled at the mediation of the council. (Meeting of the Council, 10 July 1950, *ibid.*, pp. 98-99; Meeting of the Officers of the Council, 1 Aug 1950, *ibid.*, p. 108.) While the exact nature of the dispute remains unclear, one can assume that it arose from the fact that there were with Bromley, Goddard and Colborne Brown three people on the staff whose job it was to relieve Jordan of administrative duties and whose responsibilities inevitably clashed. Other staff disputes concerned Eric Jarrett and John Brandon-Jones, as discussed previously.

On 25 October 1950 AA President S. E. T. Cusdin delivered his inaugural address under the heading 'Fumbling in the Quiver', which involved his firing metaphorical arrows at a number of architectural 'targets', including the AA itself.<sup>497</sup> The speech prompted one member of the audience, Winston Walker, to invite Cusdin to aim another arrow at the communist members of staff, who, in his view, had been appointed for their political orientation rather than their teaching ability.<sup>498</sup> Four weeks later Walker repeated these accusations in a letter to the *Builder*, which accompanied it with an editorial to ensure that the letter would not escape the attention of its readers.<sup>499</sup> Praising Walker for 'bringing into the open a matter which has been causing much uneasiness not only inside the Association but [...] in the outside world'<sup>500</sup>, the editors urged the AA council to ensure that students 'are not taught in an atmosphere in which politics, and especially Communism, could be admixed with general or technical learning.'<sup>501</sup> In order to do so, the paper pressed the AA to carry through a purge of its staff and to abandon its internationalism, thus reverting, 'as many members would like to see it, to being a school of British architects, staffed as a natural consequence by British architects.'<sup>502</sup>

Three years earlier Walker, an AA graduate, member of the Labour Party and teacher at the Hammersmith School of Building, had been expelled from the ABT for his 'public anti-ABT correspondence'<sup>503</sup> and blamed this, perhaps not unreasonably, on communist machinations within the association.<sup>504</sup> Walker was convinced that communist cliques were using the ABT as a strategic basis from which to infiltrate professional organisations in general, and – through a politically biased staffing

---

<sup>497</sup> Cusdin, S. E. T., 'Fumbling in the Quiver', presidential address, *AAJ*, Nov 1950, vol. 66, no. 746, pp. 70-75.

<sup>498</sup> Meeting of the Officers of the Council, 13 Nov 1950, CM 1949-55, p. 131. Walker's actual statement was not included in the published version of the speech, but apparently he had asked Cusdin to 'clean out the Reds'. (Cusdin, presidential address, p. 75; 'Archts Grp: WW/AA', op. cit.)

<sup>499</sup> Walker, letter to the editor, *Builder*, 24 Nov 1950, p. 537; 'Architecture and Politics', *ibid.*, pp. 521-522.

<sup>500</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 522.

<sup>501</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>502</sup> *Ibid.* In fairness it should be mentioned that Walker himself did not suggest a connection between the communist tendencies within the staff and its international makeup.

<sup>503</sup> Meeting of the General Council of the ABT, 15 June 1947, MRC/ABT, MSS.78/BT/1/4/12.

<sup>504</sup> In June 1946 Walker had accused the executive committee of the ABT, and specifically Colin Penn, of 'propaganda of the Left', i.e. of publicly recommending candidates standing for election to the RIBA council based on their political persuasion. (*ABN*, 7 June 1946, pp. 152, 165; see: the original letter by Colin Penn's wife Virginia, the general secretary of the ABT (*ABN*, 31 May 1946, p. 148), a follow-up letter by Walker attacking the ABT (*ABN*, 14 June 1946, p. 169) and replies by Colin and Virginia Penn, both ridiculing the fact that Walker had mistaken the two (*ABN*, 21 June 1946, p. 185); see also: Walker, letter to the editor, *Builder*, 14 May 1948, p. 584.)

policy – the AA in particular.<sup>505</sup> While the allegation that staff appointments were influenced by the candidates' political affiliation seems preposterous and Walker, despite repeated requests by the council, was not prepared to substantiate (or retract) his assertion, the presence of staff with links to both the CP and the ABT was undeniable.<sup>506</sup> They included Arthur Korn<sup>507</sup> and the members of ACP, particularly Leo De Syllas<sup>508</sup>, as well as Graeme Shankland, who taught sociology to third-year students, and – above all – Colin Penn, who had rejoined the studio staff in 1948 and harboured profound and, to many, rather alarming sympathies with the USSR. At a time when Richards championed the 'New Empiricism' as a middle path between an uncompromising functionalism (which lacked appeal to the 'Common Man') and a state-imposed architecture along the lines of Zhdanov's socialist realism (which was philosophically and aesthetically reprehensible to most British architects), Penn startled attendees at a meeting of the CP Architect's Group by implicitly advocating the latter course.<sup>509</sup> Asked whether the CP's cultural policy meant that architects would have to follow the style cultivated in the USSR, Penn replied that 'this question of artistic style has not been settled yet'<sup>510</sup>, which was, according to the *Builder*, 'itself a conclusive answer to everything that was asked.'<sup>511</sup>

---

<sup>505</sup> See: Walker, letter, 24 Nov 1950, op. cit.; also: Walker, letter to the editor, *Builder*, 8 Dec 1950, p. 592.

<sup>506</sup> Meetings of the Officers of the Council, 13 Nov 1950, 8 Dec 1950, 18 Dec 1950, CM 1949-55, pp. 131, 139, 140. Jordan himself was not a member of the CP, but in April 1950 he served on the ABT's education and students committee. (Meeting of the Executive Committee of the ABT, 12 April 1950, MRC/ABT, MSS.78/BT/1/1/11.)

<sup>507</sup> Korn, a member of the CP, sat on the general council of the ABT and was the chairman of its Willesden and District branch as well as a secretary of its planning committee. (BLSA/Whittaker, Tape 1, Side B; *Keystone*, Nov 1948, MRC/ABT, MSS.78/BT/4/6/9, p. 184; Meeting of the Executive Committee of the ABT, 12 April 1950, op. cit.)

<sup>508</sup> According to Parsons, the political nature of ACP became 'watered down' in the postwar years, reflected by the change of their name from 'Architects Co-operative Partnership' to the less controversial 'Architects Co-Partnership'. Anthony Cox had left the CP at the beginning of the war; Capon was still a member after the war; and Leo De Syllas, who was the chairman of the ABT's education and students committee, remained a member until at least 1956. (Parsons 1990, pp. 445-446; John Kay, notes of meeting of the Architects' Group, 29 June 1948, MS, private collection; Meeting of the Executive Committee of the ABT, 12 April 1950, op. cit.)

<sup>509</sup> 'Architects and Communism – A London Meeting', *Builder*, 26 March 1948, pp. 368-369; for Richards' views see: James Richards, 'Architecture and the Common Man', *AAJ*, Feb 1948, vol. 63, no. 719, pp. 153-161; see also: Erten 2004, pp. 216-220, 240-248.

<sup>510</sup> 'Architects and Communism', op. cit.

<sup>511</sup> 'Architects and Politics', *ibid.*, p. 356. Penn was deeply critical of modern architecture: 'Since 1918 [...] it has been necessary to do a lot of social building – houses, schools, hospitals and the rest. Because capitalism has had no money to waste it has been necessary to do these buildings as cheaply as possible [...]. We architects have given ourselves wholeheartedly to this task and have even created a philosophical justification for the way we have carried it out. We have told the people that this architecture of bare surfaces, stark shapes and unadorned rooms is the architecture of the future! [...] I hope, and believe, that in another twenty years we shall be hanging our heads in shame because we didn't tell the workers that it is starved, bleak and unworthy of them.' (Quoted in: 'Marxism & Modern Architecture', discussion meeting on

Few, if any, at the AA shared these views (least of all Jordan himself), and even the ABT immediately distanced itself from ‘Mr. Colin Penn’s doctrines’.<sup>512</sup> Nonetheless, the presence of a devoted communist such as Penn seemed to confirm the suspicions of those who regarded the AA as infested with radical left-wing ideology, and the council, alive to the potential damage such rumours could cause, discussed the Walker case at an emergency meeting, at which they confirmed that as a matter of principle no attempt should be made to find out the politics of staff members.<sup>513</sup> Instead, the council considered legal proceedings against Walker, and Ann MacEwen, probably instructed by the CP, proposed to call a special general meeting with a view to expelling him from the AA.<sup>514</sup> The association’s solicitor, however, advised strongly against either course as Walker’s statement did not qualify as ‘slander’ in a legal sense, nor could the AA ‘expel a member merely because he was disliked.’<sup>515</sup>

Trying to avoid any controversial correspondence in the press, the council limited itself to a brief reply from President Cusdin to the *Builder*, in which he rejected Walker’s allegations and confirmed that ‘it is and will continue to be the practice of the AA to admit members, appoint staff and enrol students irrespective of their religious or political beliefs or of their nationality.’<sup>516</sup> In another letter, Jordan, who responded on behalf of his staff, stressed that the use of school premises for political ends by members, students and staff alike was strictly regulated: ‘The only member of the AA who has, to my knowledge, smashed deliberately through the spirit of this

---

25 Nov 1949, *Bulletin of the Architects’ and Allied Technicians’ Group of the Communist Party*, no. 1 (March 1950), in: *Communist Party of Great Britain Archive*, People’s History Museum, Manchester, CP/CENT/CULT/5/1, p. 14; see also e.g.: Andrew Boyd, Colin Penn (eds.), *Homes for the People*, London 1946, p. 134.)

<sup>512</sup> F. E. Shrosbree (national organiser, ABT), letter to the editor, *Builder*, 9 April 1948, p. 431. For Jordan’s take on socialist realism see e.g.: Jordan, Inaugural, p. 140: ‘Soviet architecture [shows] how a people who have suffered great fluctuations in their social system may revert nostalgically to historical art forms, realizing almost too late that they have thrown out a healthy aesthetic baby with the bourgeois bathwater.’

<sup>513</sup> Meeting of the Council, 27 Nov 1950, CM 1949-55, pp. 137-138.

<sup>514</sup> Meeting of the Officers of the Council, 8 Dec 1950, *ibid.*, p. 139. Ann MacEwen had graduated from the AA in 1940 and was the widow of ACP founding member John Wheeler. In 1950 she was a planner with the LCC and, like Korn, a secretary of the planning committee of the ABT. (Meeting of the Executive Committee of the ABT, 12 April 1950, *op. cit.*)

<sup>515</sup> Meeting of the Officers of the Council, 18 Dec 1950, CM 1949-55, p. 141. Walker subsequently cancelled his membership, and the council in 1954 rejected his application for reinstatement. (Meeting of the Council, 12 July 1954, *ibid.*, p. 437.)

<sup>516</sup> S. E. T. Cusdin, letter to the editor, *Builder*, 1 Dec 1950, p. 571; see also: Meeting of the Council, 27 Nov 1950, *ibid.*, pp. 137-138. A further statement by Cusdin appeared in the *AA Journal* (‘The Annual General Meeting’, *AAJ*, Jan 1951, vol. 66, no. 748, p. 131).



ruling is Mr. Walker.<sup>517</sup> Unlike the ABT, whose representatives invariably shunned enquiries about its communist membership, Jordan freely admitted that ‘two (possibly three – but this is chance knowledge which I have no power to verify) are supporters of the Communist cause’, all of whom had, in fact, been appointed under his predecessor.<sup>518</sup> Moreover, he fiercely attacked the editors’ criticism of the AA’s international staff makeup, pointing out that, apart from British nationals, it currently included architects from Sweden, Italy, Turkey, Argentina and the USA:

I have yet to learn that either the Argentine or the USA are dangerous satellite states beyond the Iron Curtain; yet, if they are not, what in Heaven’s name has the presence of these gentlemen at the AA got to do with Mr. Walker’s outburst?<sup>519</sup>

Coming from within the suspect association, these letters had little prospect of changing the minds of those who shared Walker’s concerns, and neither did a note in the *Architects’ Journal* which, evoking the spectre of McCarthyism, criticised the *Builder* for appearing ‘bent on carrying the American inquisitorial technique into the heart of English architectural education’ and praised both Jordan for his ‘spirited letter’ and Cusdin for his ‘brief, dignified, factual statement of AA policy’.<sup>520</sup> This was all the more the case as the controversy coincided unhappily with the eighth edition of *PLAN*, which contained an article giving detailed advice to students intending to register as conscientious objectors.<sup>521</sup> Deploring this ‘curious pacifist propaganda’, the *Builder* accused the AA council of a lack of control over its students<sup>522</sup>, and the *Sunday Empire News* raised the question whether the article constituted a treasonable offence – a matter which was eventually raised (and rejected) in parliament.<sup>523</sup> A. B. Knapp-Fisher, a member of the AA’s advisory

---

<sup>517</sup> Jordan, letter to the editor, *Builder*, 1 Dec 1950, p. 571.

<sup>518</sup> *Ibid.* Jordan was likely referring to Penn, Korn and possibly De Syllas. For obvious reasons the CP did not run a central membership register.

<sup>519</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>520</sup> *AJ*, 7 Dec 1950, p. 469. Amusingly, James Richards, who was the author of the note, sang his own praises, as it was also he, who had written Cusdin’s letter to the *Builder*. (Meeting of the Council, 27 Nov 1950, CM 1949-55, pp. 137-138; ‘Archts Grp: WW/AA’, op. cit.)

<sup>521</sup> [John Turner], ‘Military Service’, *PLAN*, no. 8 (1950), p. 32.

<sup>522</sup> *Builder*, 29 Dec 1950, p. 685; see also letters from Chris Whittaker on behalf of Arch. S. A. and Pat Crooke on behalf of the PLAN group in: *Builder*, 5 Jan 1951, p. 6. The council itself decided not to take any action (Meeting of the Council, 1 Jan 1951, CM 1949-55, p. 143).

<sup>523</sup> Meeting of the Council, 19 March 1951, *ibid.*, p. 164; see also: *House of Commons Hansard*, 12 March 1951, vol. 485, c114W, [http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/written\\_answers/1951/mar/12/architectural-journal-article](http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/written_answers/1951/mar/12/architectural-journal-article) [accessed 10 Sep 2016].

council, called the article ‘seditious, subversive, immoral and irresponsible’<sup>524</sup>, and others such as Arthur Kenyon and John Murray Easton felt alarmed by the ‘general anxiety in the profession about politics in the AA’ and asked the council to take a harder stand.<sup>525</sup> Meanwhile, the affair threatened to have financial repercussions as potential donors rejected an appeal for funds on the grounds ‘that they were not prepared to give financial support to an association in which communism was apparently allowed to flourish.’<sup>526</sup> In fact, the council itself, whilst taking a united stand in public, was clearly divided over the issue.<sup>527</sup> When A. R. F. Anderson as the council member responsible for the hanging of pictures in AA premises asked for his colleagues’ support in having a print of Picasso’s *Dove of Peace* removed because it had ‘Communist association’ and was, as such, ‘a direct affront to the council’, the motion was only defeated by a narrow margin.<sup>528</sup>

The controversy continued to put a strain on the AA throughout the first half of 1951. As late as April the president felt it necessary to calm the waves at a meeting with Cyril Spragg and Everard Haynes, respectively the secretaries of the RIBA and its Board of Architectural Education, who expressed concerns about the criticism directed at the AA, particularly as it ‘had been made from widely diverse sources.’<sup>529</sup> In the end the continuous pressure proved too much for Jordan, who informed the council on 28 May 1951 that due to health reasons he had been ‘advised to have some relief from his exacting duties.’<sup>530</sup> He suggested that either the leadership of the school be divided into an administrative and a purely educational position or, alternatively, that a new head be appointed under whom he, Jordan, would serve in a secondary capacity. The council accepted neither of these proposals and persuaded Jordan to carry on until the end of the summer term whilst looking for a suitable vice-principal. Yet within a few weeks, possibly triggered by the premature death of

---

<sup>524</sup> Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 16 Feb 1951, CM 1949-55, p. 186.

<sup>525</sup> Ibid., pp. 186-187; see also: Kenyon, letter to the editor, *Builder*, 8 Dec 1950, p. 592.

<sup>526</sup> Meeting of the Council, 26 Feb 1951, *ibid.*, p. 158. The people in question were Banister Fletcher, G. I. Clay and H. Austen Hall (see also: Meetings of the Council, 19 March 1951, 23 April 1951, 28 May 1951, *ibid.*, pp. 164, 170, 176).

<sup>527</sup> See: Meeting of the Council, 27 Nov 1950, *ibid.*, pp. 137-138.

<sup>528</sup> Meeting of the Council, 1 Jan 1951, *ibid.*, p. 147.

<sup>529</sup> Meeting of the Council, 23 April 1951, *ibid.*, pp. 170-171.

<sup>530</sup> Meeting of the Council, 28 May 1951, *ibid.*, p. 181. Jordan had been in frail health for years: in January 1946 he had resigned his position as year master after only one term (see p. 78), and exhaustion due to his workload as principal had forced him to dissolve his partnership with Fairweather in February 1950 (Meeting of the Council, 20 Feb 1950, CM 1949-55, p. 68).

his older brother, Jordan suffered a nervous breakdown and was ordered four to five weeks' complete rest in the countryside by his physician.<sup>531</sup> Ten days later, on 9 July 1951, he resigned with immediate effect.<sup>532</sup>

### Unfinished Business after Jordan's Departure

Jordan's sudden departure left important policy matters unresolved. In July 1949 the council's development sub-committee, instituted two years prior (see page 71), had at long last concluded its deliberations.<sup>533</sup> These had revolved around the question of safeguarding the AA's long-term independence or, if this proved impracticable, affiliation with either an existing university or the LCC, neither of which was deemed appealing nor pursued any further. Jordan hoped to transform the AA into a government-funded national college akin to the RCA, but the MOE dismissed this idea out of hand.<sup>534</sup> In light of this, the development sub-committee sounded out the conditions for a reinstatement of the direct MOE grant but did not recommend this course of action to the council, largely because it was divided over the scope of the problem: Jordan predicted that, although the school was in a rare state of affluence at the time, with rising costs and the foreseeable end of FET grants it was likely to face a deficit of nearly £6,000 in 1954/55<sup>535</sup> – an estimate which treasurer Anderson rejected, alleging that Jordan had purposely 'taken a pessimistic view in order to support a case for aid being put to the Ministry'.<sup>536</sup>

The final report of the development sub-committee was thus inconclusive, and three months later, in November 1949, Jordan and the council agreed on a vague policy statement which emphasised the intention of the AA to 'maintain its complete

---

<sup>531</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 29 June 1951, SCM 1951-63, pp. 1-2.

<sup>532</sup> Meeting of the Council, 9 July 1951, CM 1949-55, pp. 193-194. Jordan resumed his history lectures at the school towards the end of the following academic year.

<sup>533</sup> Henry Braddock, 'Report of the Development Sub-Committee', July 1949; att. to: Meeting of the Council, 11 July 1949, CM 1949-55, p. 27.

<sup>534</sup> Ibid.

<sup>535</sup> Ibid. £6,000 amounts to approximately £150,000 in today's money.

<sup>536</sup> Quoted in: Special Meeting of the Council, 20 Oct 1949, p. 31; for the financial state of the AA see also: Henry Braddock, 'The Future of the AA', *AAJ*, May 1950, vol. 65, no. 742, p. 208 ('Financially the Association has never been in better case.');

Cusdin, presidential address, pp. 71-72; 'The Audited Accounts. Session 1949-1950', *AAJ*, Jan 1951, vol. 66, no. 748, pp. 134-135.

educational and financial independence<sup>537</sup> and envisaged over the coming five years a gradual reduction of the school from currently more than five hundred students to its pre-war size of three hundred students, entailing a possible deficit which, it was hoped, could be cushioned by vacating some of the premises in Bedford Square and attracting a greater number of scholarships and grants.<sup>538</sup> Based on this outline policy, the council discharged the development sub-committee and gave Jordan the mandate to ‘prepare within the next twelve months a carefully worked out educational scheme for the school at a finally reduced size [...]’.<sup>539</sup> Embroiled in a controversy with his vice-principal, Jordan failed to make any significant progress with his scheme and, in November 1950, asked the school committee to assist him with the assignment.<sup>540</sup> With the help of a sub-committee he eventually completed the first stage of his ‘Plan for the Future of the AA School’, consisting of three proposals, viz. the ‘re-moulding of the course and curriculum to include builders as trainees, up to the third year’; ‘the enlargement of the idea of a country school [...] and incorporation as a permanent part of the curriculum’; and ‘additional courses to draw more students from outside’.<sup>541</sup> Jordan’s illness prevented any further work, and the question of financing, in particular, remained unanswered.

Equally in the balance was the AA’s relationship with the RIBA. The RIBA’s Board of Architectural Education (BAE) had acted with considerable restraint in the immediate postwar years (see page 208), but in December 1950 it set up an ad-hoc committee to investigate the various means of attaining qualification for associate membership, including a possible recognition of part-time courses.<sup>542</sup> Jordan, who was a member of the committee, contributed a separate appendix to its final report outlining the different measures he had implemented to inject more realism into the AA course.<sup>543</sup> The report itself recommended a greater degree of control over the schools’ examinations through lists of suggested external examiners prepared by the

---

<sup>537</sup> ‘Statement of Policy in Respect of the Educational and Financial Future of the Association’, Meeting of the Council, 28 Nov 1949, *ibid.*, p. 47.

<sup>538</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 47-48.

<sup>539</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48; see also: Meeting of the Council, 28 Nov 1949, *ibid.*, p. 44; Special Meeting of the School Committee, 22 Nov 1949, SCM 1944-51, p. 150.

<sup>540</sup> Meeting of the Council, 27 Nov 1950, *ibid.*, pp. 132-133.

<sup>541</sup> Meeting of the Council, 26 Feb 1951, *ibid.*, p. 163.

<sup>542</sup> Crinson and Lubbock 1994, pp. 129-130.

<sup>543</sup> ‘Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Architectural Education’, att. to: Special Meeting of the Board of Architectural Education, 17 July 1951, Inset A, RIBA/ED 7.1.1.

officers of the BAE, but the universities, which saw their academic sovereignty threatened, joined forces and blocked it on the BAE.<sup>544</sup> The AA found itself largely isolated on the BAE and particularly its schools committee, a standing committee comprising the heads of the recognised schools, and Jordan was under no illusion – and evidently entirely indifferent to the fact – that his approach differed profoundly from the mainstream of architectural education at the time. Examining over a hundred portfolios of senior students wishing to transfer from their schools to the AA, he concluded drily:

Either what we are doing and intend to go on doing at the AA, in the way of experiment, freedom, site-work, et cetera, is wildly wrong, or else architectural education as administered under the Registration Act is wildly wrong. We are only too conscious of the hundreds of things to be put right at the AA, but it seems clear – for good or ill – that in our outlook at least (if not as yet in our actual work) we are no longer part of the national ‘set-up’ in architectural education.<sup>545</sup>

Accordingly, Jordan regarded the forthcoming visit of the RIBA’s visiting board in June 1950 as little more than a nuisance, although ‘their comments will at least be interesting.’<sup>546</sup>

The report of the visiting board, issued in November 1950, though perhaps not quite as negative as the rather thin-skinned Jordan believed, did contain several criticisms.<sup>547</sup> The board had reservations about the second-year village scheme with its distinct planning bias, which it thought too advanced for junior students. It also did not appreciate the value ‘of students interviewing specialists and sub-contractors for specialist work’, i.e. the close involvement of services lecturer Henry Goddard and structures lecturers Felix Samuely and Ove Arup, who were – as at Harvard, but singularly in Britain – seen as members of the studio staff and thus an integral part

---

<sup>544</sup> Special Meeting of the Board of Architectural Education, 17 July 1951, *ibid.* The RIBA Council eventually approved it in an amended form. (‘Royal Institute of British Architects: The Annual Report of the Council for the Official Year 1951-52’, *RIBAJ*, March 1952, p. 6.)

<sup>545</sup> ‘Principal’s Report’, Meeting of the School Committee, 16 May 1950, SCM 1944-51, p. 175. Elsewhere Jordan wrote: ‘Whatever lip-service may be paid, whatever gold medals were awarded, every architectural student has a right to know that neither a Taliesin nor a Bauhaus would for one moment be tolerated either by the Architects’ Registration Council or by the RIBA [...]. Neither Lethaby nor Gropius was ever put in charge of an English architectural school; both were available at different times.’ (‘The Training of Architects: Interim Survey’, *Architectural Review*, June 1950, vol. 107, no. 642, pp. 368-369.)

<sup>546</sup> ‘Principal’s Report’, 16 May 1950, *op. cit.*

<sup>547</sup> ‘Visiting Board’, Nov 1950, *op. cit.*; Jordan’s comments, dated 24 Nov 1950, att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 6 Dec 1951, SCM 1951-63, p. 20.

of the design teaching process.<sup>548</sup> Most importantly, the board criticised the preponderance of group working, which ‘should be confined to one or possibly two subjects in the course’, and thus challenged the cornerstone of Jordan’s educational approach.<sup>549</sup> It is indeed difficult to imagine how his intention to make group work a mandatory element of the course could possibly have been reconciled with the board’s objections.

## Conclusion

Jordan’s untimely retirement caused profound regret and concern in the architectural press. According to the *Architects’ Journal*,

Jordan is having to leave what is obviously just the right post for him at a time when he was beginning to prove a triumphant success in it, and the AA is losing a first-rate principal at a moment when continuity is specially needed.<sup>550</sup>

In the space of little more than two years Jordan had changed the face of the AA school, even if his course did not in itself represent a radical departure from the status quo as key measures, particularly group work, had been introduced under Brown, if only on a trial basis and in concert with other, more traditional methods. What distinguished Jordan’s educational approach was the fact that it lacked any such ambiguity, reflecting an overarching socio-historical worldview which permeated every aspect of the course – from lecture syllabus and studio curriculum to working methods and staff selection.

Saint argues that ‘Brown’s resignation in 1949 and his replacement by Jordan seemed to confirm that social architecture as an ideal, public architecture as a career,

---

<sup>548</sup> ‘I think constant contact with such people in the studio (as well as through their lectures) is essential.’ (Jordan, *ibid.*) The reviewer of the *Builder* concurred: ‘One excellent point in the “AA” teaching is that the later subjects are handled as near to life as possible; “clients” are appointed, and various people on the staff act as specialists, sub-contractors, etc., which gives invaluable training to the student in “handling” the job and is something which could well be introduced into other schools.’ (Edward Passmore, ‘Exhibitions of Students’ Work’, *Builder*, 20 July 1951, p. 91.) Henry Goddard had been teaching at the AA since 1946. Samuely, the senior structures lecturer, had joined the staff in 1937; Arup and his partners (notably Ronald Jenkins) were appointed in April 1949 under a collective contract similar to ACP’s.

<sup>549</sup> ‘Visiting Board’, Nov 1950. The fact that the Thomas Report (see p. 93) explicitly recommended the formation of group practices, whilst the visiting board criticised the AA’s attempts to address the issue in its curriculum, highlights the RIBA’s inconsistent stance at the time.

<sup>550</sup> *AJ*, 19 July 1951, p. 65.

were at last legitimated in architectural education.<sup>551</sup> Indeed, while the suggestion that Brown disagreed with this view is debatable,<sup>552</sup> Jordan's predilection for public service was unequivocal, and local authorities, particularly the LCC with its expansive and socially ambitious building programme, became the first port of call for those who graduated in the late 1940s and early 1950s. This was all the more the case since few private practices had job vacancies, and even fewer were in a position to satisfy the creative ambitions and salary expectations of AA graduates.<sup>553</sup>

Favourable financial conditions and little interference from the RIBA allowed Jordan to implement his pedagogical vision with few restrictions, and he took advantage of his liberties by consciously distancing his school from the educational mainstream. Jordan's sincere and uncompromising convictions – socialist, progressive, anglocentric – made him popular with his students (see next chapter), yet he alienated sections of the membership and the council and was ill-equipped to cope with their opposition. As the *Architect and Building News* wrote: 'The running of a large school at the sort of temperature at which the AA runs burns up the toughest and Jordan, fine scholar though he is, could never be described as tough.'<sup>554</sup>

Jordan's tenure and premature departure left the school in a polarised and inherently vulnerable state, which in many ways recalled the situation in the late 1930s. Much of the blame for this lay with the council, which over two years had not managed to agree a long-term financial and educational policy and eventually delegated the task to an understandably overwhelmed Jordan, whose plan for the school remained unfinished. In 1951 the AA faced a future without FET-funded students and therefore without a secure source of funding, and it had isolated itself educationally and politically at just the moment when both the MOE and the RIBA began to play a more active role in guiding the affairs of the schools. How the council and its new principal tackled these challenges shall be examined in Chapters 4, 5 and 6.

---

<sup>551</sup> Saint 1987, p. 30.

<sup>552</sup> Brown praised the approach of progressive public offices such as Hertfordshire and the LCC in his inaugural speech at Edinburgh. ('New Techniques and Traditions – Prof. Gordon Brown's Inaugural Address at Edinburgh', *Builder*, 25 March 1949, p. 373.)

<sup>553</sup> See e.g.: Meeting of the School Committee, 29 June 1951, CM 1951-63, p. 3.

<sup>554</sup> *ABN*, 19 July 1951, p. 55.





## CHAPTER 3

### CHUZZLEWIT'S HEIRS – THE POSTWAR STUDENT BODY (1945-1951)

Chapters 3 and 4 discussed the tenures of principals Gordon Brown and Robert Furneaux Jordan in the first five years following the end of the Second World War. The period saw the gradual implementation of a more liberal curriculum which afforded unprecedented liberties to students and laid great emphasis on group working methods. The success of these measures owed much to the particular composition of the student body, which came to be dominated by more mature ex-service personnel. The following chapter, which covers the same timeframe as the previous two, looks at this cohort of students and the wide-ranging educational (rather than political) activities they unfolded within and beyond the AA. The first section analyses the increasingly homogenous makeup of the student population, which became considerably older and almost entirely male. The students' interest in their education was not limited to the AA, and the second section describes how they strategically infiltrated and, by 1947, effectively controlled the nationwide Architectural Students' Association – the latter a topic which thus far has not attracted any scholarship whatsoever. The third section traces the activities of the students' committee of the late 1940s, without doubt the most enterprising in the school's history as it formed a largely autonomous education sub-committee to liaise with the principal, launched an ambitious programme of events in connection with the association's centenary and organised the first-ever truly international architectural students' conference at the RIBA. The students' endeavours were inspired by their pre-war counterparts, and the fourth section illustrates this link through the MARS/ArchSA Interim Report on Architectural Education with its explicit criticism of the RIBA's educational policy and, most notably, *PLAN*, the journal of the Architectural Students' Association, which – edited by AA students and actively supported by Jordan – became a worthy successor to *Focus*.

## Moth-Eaten Old Students and Noisy Little Schoolboys

After the war the school was invaded by a large number of service personnel whose training had been interrupted by the war. Ripened through their wartime experiences, these ‘moth-eaten old students’, as they were referred to by one of the year masters,<sup>555</sup> were serious, industrious and anxious to make up for lost time. Driven by idealism and a pronounced single-mindedness vis-à-vis the task at hand, they were neither in need of nor prepared to accept top-down instruction in a traditional sense, especially since many of their tutors were barely older than themselves and, not insignificantly at the time, often of lower or no military rank.<sup>556</sup> The students, writes Saint, ‘exuded the confidence of victory [and] came back to the AA with the marks and bearing of an officer class.’<sup>557</sup>

Gordon Brown, who shared the same background, was sympathetic to their general outlook and accorded them preferential treatment. A case in point was the supposedly mandatory entrance examination, which Brown, according to Herbert Morel, only demanded from unwanted applicants, i.e. non-service personnel:

[It] was almost a joke. I found him, in the full uniform of a paratroop major sitting in his office. All I had to show him was a rather bad copy I had made of a portrait by Rembrandt of an old man. Gordon Brown said: ‘Okay young man you are in (looking at my subbies stripe).’ I said: ‘Isn’t there an entrance examination?’ He said: ‘Oh yes, but we only give it to people we don’t want.’<sup>558</sup>

Brown respected the maturity of his students and tried to accommodate their wish to play a more active role in the affairs of the school. He supported the students’ request to hold political and religious meetings on school premises (see page 102) and contended that ‘the student should be given a much greater part in determining

---

<sup>555</sup> John Greenwood (fifth-year student), quoted in: ‘Prize-Giving 1948’, op. cit., p. 34.

<sup>556</sup> Jim Cadbury-Brown, who taught third-year students between 1945 and 1948, remembered: ‘[The] students were getting much too uppity. They had moral values; they wouldn’t do things; they wouldn’t do a church because it was religious. They always had some reason for not wanting to do what you were asking them to do.’ (‘H. T. Cadbury-Brown interviewed by Jill Lever’, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects’ Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Tape 2, Side A (July 1999).)

<sup>557</sup> Saint 1987, p. 31.

<sup>558</sup> Herbert Morel, letter to Edward Bottoms, 4 Feb 2008, AAA. Ralph Smorzewski (see p. 121), who joined the AA in 1946, having been rejected by all the other London schools, recalls: ‘The deciding factor, I believe, was my sharing war experiences with the Principal of the AA, something we discovered over several glasses of sherry during my extended interview with him.’ (Ralph Smorzewski, *Bridging the Gap*, Leicester 2007, p. 213.)

the form and direction of his education,<sup>559</sup> meeting on a weekly basis with the students' committee to discuss changes to the curriculum.<sup>560</sup> Yet Brown's goodwill had its limits. While he certainly did not 'see architectural education as an extension of military discipline'<sup>561</sup>, as one chronicler claimed, he was a self-confessed autocrat who was prepared to give students a 'large part in the direction and running of the school' as long as it was a 'consultant's part'; he clearly did not tolerate insubordination.<sup>562</sup> When Chris Whittaker was given the brief for a one-day sketch which expected him to imagine himself in the agora of his Roman villa, he thought it 'so far removed from the present urgencies of rebuilding Britain'<sup>563</sup> that he refused to complete the task and handed in a 'long diatribe'<sup>564</sup> justifying his decision instead:

The following day Gordon Brown called me in and gave me the most terrific rocket for thinking I knew more than [year master] Brandon-Jones, which I wasn't really trying to say, and told me if I don't like it here I can get out. So, my tail between my legs, very contrite, I grovelled and fortunately stayed the course.<sup>565</sup>

More serious was the case of fourth-year student Joseph Rykwert, an outspoken member of the students' committee, who, according to the official account in the minutes, was asked to leave the school in December 1946 after councillors Hugh Casson and Hilton Wright had examined his portfolio and deemed it 'totally inadequate'.<sup>566</sup> According to Rykwert, who recalls the traumatic incident vividly, the original examiner had in fact been Christopher Nicholson, who was friendly and enthusiastic about his work.<sup>567</sup> Gordon Brown, who judged Rykwert's project unacceptable, had the portfolio immediately re-examined by S. E. T. Cusdin, who pointed out that there were some drawings missing and insisted that Rykwert must replace them. It was at this point that Brown demanded that the council exclude him from the school for unspecified insubordination. In sharp contrast to the school committee minutes, Rykwert remembers that his defenders on the council were

---

<sup>559</sup> Brown, quoted in: 'Modern Trends in Education', *AAJ*, Jan 1947, vol. 62, no. 709, p. 84.

<sup>560</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 20 Jan 1947, SCM 1944-51, p. 78.

<sup>561</sup> McNab 1972, p. 72.

<sup>562</sup> Brown, 'Architectural Education', *op. cit.*, p. 98; see also: Brown, quoted in: 'Modern Trends', *op. cit.*, p. 84: 'Those who knew him might regard him as autocratic, and there must be enough control to ensure the smooth working of a school, but beyond that the control should be loosened, and even abandoned.'

<sup>563</sup> Whittaker, interview, 11 Jan 2014.

<sup>564</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>565</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>566</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 9 Dec 1946, SCM 1944-51, pp. 74-75.

<sup>567</sup> Rykwert, emails to the author, 5 and 6 Feb 2014.

Casson and Hilton Wright, and the fact that the latter immediately offered Rykwert a job in his office (which he accepted) seems to support this. Rykwert suggests that the minutes may have been ‘doctored’<sup>568</sup> by H. L. Bromley, the school registrar, whom he also suspects of ‘losing’<sup>569</sup> his drawings:

My position in this was conditioned by my being the secretary of the Architectural Students Association [see page 123], and we had ideas about how we were being taught. [...] I suspect the whole thing was meant as a warning to insubordinate students.<sup>570</sup>

The enlarged student body itself was initially a heterogeneous group, and there seem to have been considerable tensions not just with the principal, but between the different factions themselves. Apart from a growing contingent of ex-service personnel there was, immediately after the war, still a significant number of students who had started their course in the more relaxed and – both literally and metaphorically speaking – escapist atmosphere of suburban Barnet. Many of them had difficulties adapting to the new realities in Bedford Square and exhibited an ‘attitude to their work [that] was casual and somewhat indifferent’<sup>571</sup> and, as such, markedly at odds with the work ethic of the homecomers.

As to the latter, it would be inaccurate to portray them as a coherent entity although many had served in the same branches (see page 47). Most ex-service personnel had held assignments remote from the front lines or were – like Chris Whittaker, John Killick and Stanley Amis – still in training when the war ended.<sup>572</sup> At the opposite pole of the spectrum, however, were battle-hardened and highly decorated warriors such as Jacqueline Cromie, a lieutenant in the French army and recipient of the *Légion d'honneur* for bravery;<sup>573</sup> Douglas Bailey, a lieutenant colonel with the Royal Engineers and holder of the American Bronze Star;<sup>574</sup> Paul Hamilton, an Austrian Jew who had narrowly escaped the Holocaust and volunteered for highly perilous

---

<sup>568</sup> Rykwert, email to the author, 6 Feb 2014.

<sup>569</sup> Ibid. Rykwert’s inverted commas.

<sup>570</sup> Rykwert, email to the author, 5 Feb 2014.

<sup>571</sup> Meeting of the Council, 15 July 1946, CM 1940-49, p. 355.

<sup>572</sup> Incidentally, they all served with the Fleet Air Arm but seem not to have met. (‘School Notes’, *AAJ*, March 1945, vol. 60, no. 693, p. 139; John Partridge, interview with the author, 23 April 2013; Whittaker, interview, 11 Jan 2014.)

<sup>573</sup> *AJ*, 14 Feb 1946, p. 135.

<sup>574</sup> *AAJ*, March 1946, p. 62.

intelligence missions behind enemy lines;<sup>575</sup> or Ralph Smorzewski, a Polish count who joined the armed resistance and participated in acts of sabotage and the elimination of SS units.<sup>576</sup> John Cordwell, an airman with the RAF Bomber Command, had been shot down over Belgium in 1941 and spent four years in the notorious Stalag Luft III prisoner-of-war camp, where he was involved in the failed tunnel escape famously commemorated in the 1963 film *The Great Escape*.<sup>577</sup> Cordwell's recollections of his AA years resonate with contempt for fellow students whose upper-class background may have saved them from a similar fate by their having been placed in less hazardous branches:

So all my competition were all very aristocratic people. 'Johnny, I don't have a clue. I don't know what I am doing,' and they really didn't know what they were doing. [...] They were awfully nice people, you know, and they talked too much. All they could do was talk all the time in very affected accents.<sup>578</sup>

Though perhaps not representative of the majority of ex-service personnel, Cordwell's statement reflected the sentiments of a vocal faction amongst them. This in turn complicated the position of the small group of teenagers who entered directly from school, completing the social makeup of the AA and giving further cause for irritation to some of the older students. When Brown, mainly due to staff shortages, tried to involve the latter in the tutoring of first-year students, they outright refused to act on juries and the plan was dropped for the time being.<sup>579</sup> In fact, supported by Brown they asked to be separated completely from the younger students, which, however, foundered on the resistance of second-year master Brandon-Jones:

---

<sup>575</sup> Dennis Sharp, 'Obituary: Paul Hamilton - Modernist architect specialising in transport buildings', *Independent*, 20 April 2004, p. 35.

<sup>576</sup> Smorzewski 2007, pp. 163, 164-165 et pass.

<sup>577</sup> 'John Donald Cordwell interviewed by Betty J. Blum', *Chicago Architects Oral History Project*, Ryerson and Burnham Libraries, Art Institute of Chicago, 1993 (rev. 2004) (hereafter cited as CAOHP/Cordwell), <http://digital-libraries.saic.edu/cdm/compoundobject/collection/caoHP/id/2502/rec/1> [accessed 25 Jan 2014], pp. 24-26. Cordwell and fellow inmate and future AA student Frank Knight were among the few who sat for RIBA examinations in a German POW camp, an arrangement facilitated by the Red Cross (Ibid., pp. 29, 32; *ABN*, 18 Feb 1944, pp. 123, 127; 'The Annual Report of the Council for the Official Year 1945-46', *RIBAJ*, April 1946, p. 212). After qualifying, Cordwell worked briefly for Fry and Drew before emigrating to Chicago, where he became the director of planning. Knight took over his vacant position and was made a partner of the firm in 1951.

<sup>578</sup> CAOHP/Cordwell, p. 52. Bill Mullins, who – like Cordwell – came from a working-class background and attended evening classes at the Regent Street Polytechnic before joining the AA, remembers similar class distinctions: 'In a way he's right. I remember sitting in the studio, and there was Barbara Priestley, who was J. B. Priestley's daughter; her friend was Mary Crittall of Crittall Windows; one of their friends was Bertie Harland of Harland & Wolff – they built the Titanic, you know. I went to a local grammar school, as did John. I think he was more worried about this than I was. It was a great experience.' (Interview, op. cit.)

<sup>579</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 9 Dec 1946, SCM 1944-51, p. 71.

I thought it ridiculous and wasn't prepared to run my second-year course like that, so I spoke to the students. I called them up – servicemen first, which were about three quarters if not more. Then I called up the schoolboys, and there were about two, so I said: 'Well if you can't put up with two noisy little schoolboys, I don't think much of you.' So that settled it.<sup>580</sup>

With time the tensions between the different groups abated, presumably because ex-service students were largely amongst their own as wartime students reached graduation and the younger ones either managed to fit in or dropped out.<sup>581</sup> The school thus became older, and – in stark contrast to the war years – it also became male-dominated. In order to fill the places in the school, the council had, for the duration of the war, agreed an intake quota of fifty per cent women, which due to the earlier call up for men often resulted in a slight preponderance of women over men, most notably in the senior years.<sup>582</sup> The concurrence of young women in their late teens or early twenties and a rapidly growing share of, at times, considerably older men returning from war service apparently caused problems. In November 1945 Gordon Brown reported to the council that 'as the work became more intense, he had a number of cases of young women amongst the students who could not stand the strain, and had breakdowns.'<sup>583</sup> Brown asked the council in vain to raise the entry age of women from 17 to 19 and announced, in December, 'that in future only twenty per cent women students would be admitted, reverting to the pre-war arrangement.'<sup>584</sup> Due to slow demobilisation he could only gradually decrease the intake of women, but from autumn 1946 there was a drop in absolute numbers. In September the ratio between female and male students was 1:3, equivalent to the overall ratio at English universities, and one year later, by limiting the actual intake

---

<sup>580</sup> BLSA/Brandon-Jones.

<sup>581</sup> Some, such as Robert Maguire, who was one of three 'schoolboys' in his year, thrived under these circumstances: 'I went in there 18 years old and I had to grow up very quickly because all the guys I was working with were 24, 25, 26, and our tutors had just qualified in 1938, 1939 [...] so there wasn't all that much of an age difference. We argued like hell. The whole place was seething with argument. Very healthy.' (Maguire, interview, 10 Sep 2013.) However, others such as John Miller, who first applied to the AA in 1948, found the place intimidating. Brown advised him to complete his national service first and come back in two years time, which he did. (John Miller, interview with the author, 17 June 2013.)

<sup>582</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 7 July 1944, SCM 1944-51, p. 5. Both Brown and the council use the expression '50 per cent intake of women' (or '20 per cent intake of women' when referring to the pre-war numbers) in a misleading fashion. What was meant was a ratio of 1:2 (one woman to two men), which amounts to a 33 per cent intake. Likewise, a '20 per cent intake' meant a ratio of 1:5, i.e. an intake of 17 per cent.

<sup>583</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 2 Nov 1945, *ibid.*, p. 38.

<sup>584</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 3 Dec 1945, *ibid.*, p. 40; see also fn. 582.

of women to approximately ten per cent, this figure was lowered to 1:4.<sup>585</sup> That the AA in spite of these efforts never returned to its pre-war gender ratio of roughly 1:5 may suggest that the ‘erosion of the male dominance which had been a striking characteristic of earlier periods’<sup>586</sup> was seamlessly continued after the Second World War; however, the fact that the council’s policy was never officially rescinded and its implementation only stalled for financial reasons indicates that – at least at the AA – this ‘erosion’ was in fact slow in coming.<sup>587</sup>

### Beyond the AA: The Architectural Students’ Association

For lack of money and alternative amenities in a capital mired in austerity the students’ social life centred upon Bedford Square, which accounts for the sudden reinvigoration of the various student societies after the war.<sup>588</sup> The students’ main interest lay, of course, in architectural matters, and in February 1946 the students’ committee organised a general meeting to discuss, and overwhelmingly defeat, Paffard Keatinge-Clay’s provocative motion that ‘Architecture in England is Dead’.<sup>589</sup> A few months later Hugh ‘Sam’ Scorer instigated the formation of the ‘Foundation Society’ as a restricted sub-section of the students’ club aimed at giving ‘a more organised and permanent form to the sort of general discussion about architecture [...] which goes on in the school’<sup>590</sup>, and at the same time the students’

---

<sup>585</sup> Meetings of the School Committee, 30 Sep 1946, 29 Sep 1947; SCM 1944-51, pp. 68, 95; for the comparison with English universities see: Lowe 1988, p. 64.

<sup>586</sup> *Ibid.*, p. i.

<sup>587</sup> That said, Elizabeth King, the only female tutor at the time, received the same salary as her male colleagues, even though she was not legally entitled to it. (Meeting of the Council, 26 Feb 1946, CM 1940-49, p. 325.)

<sup>588</sup> For the financial hardship of ex-service students see esp.: Brown, ‘Architectural Education’, pp. 97-98; see also: ‘Geoffrey Salmon interviewed by Sandy Yin Lee and Svetlana Demchenko’, 27 Nov 2013, AAA: ‘There was a lot of poverty among students at the time. Some were really on the breadline and lived in very simple circumstances. [...] The majority of students, the ex-service students, were very poorly off [...] in their clothes and also in their entertainment.’

<sup>589</sup> ‘Debate – That Architecture in England is Dead’, *AAJ*, April 1946, vol. 61, no. 702, pp. 63-67. Keatinge-Clay argued that architecture in England was dead because it did not adopt the ‘scientific method’ and did therefore not reflect contemporary society; he was opposed by Christopher Knight, who argued that the existence of a respective philosophy of architecture was sufficient to prove that architecture was alive even if it did not (yet) manifest itself in actual buildings. The motion was defeated 45 to 13. ‘It should be said’, wrote the *Builder*, ‘that everybody spent a pleasant evening and that none enjoyed themselves more than the pseudo-pessimists. The bleak prospect of practising a dead profession did not depress them in the least.’ (*Builder*, 8 March 1946, p. 231.)

<sup>590</sup> C[hristopher] K[night], ‘The Foundation Society’, *AAJ*, March 1948, vol. 63, no. 720, p. 190; see also: Meeting of the Council, 28 Oct 1946, CM 1940-49, p. 364.

committee absorbed a different, if probably overlapping, group of students which had been organising informal lunch-time discussions on questions of architectural education and at Brown's suggestion reconstituted it as its official education sub-committee to liaise directly with the principal.<sup>591</sup>

The surge in student activism was by no means limited to the AA. 'An encouraging post-war development has been the emergence of strong international youth and student movements,' wrote *Keystone*, the journal of the ABT, enthusiastically – and quite rightly – in 1948.<sup>592</sup> The British National Union of Students (NUS) had been founded in 1922, and unlike many of its counterparts in other countries it not only upheld but in fact expanded its activities during the war. In 1940 five hundred students attended its largest annual congress to date; in the following year the number more than doubled; and yet another year later it tripled.<sup>593</sup> Similarly to the role of MARS within CIAM, the NUS thus emerged from the war as a driving force within the international student movement, and in November 1945 it organised a meeting of foreign students exiled in Britain at which a preparatory committee was entrusted with the task of formulating the constitution for an international student

---

<sup>591</sup> Meeting of the Students' Committee, 26 Sep 1947, private collection. The group consisted of Hugh Morris, Henry Swain, Bill Hodges, John Broome and David Waterhouse. At a general meeting in 1952 John Kay recalled how a series of 'lunch-time discussions [...] led to the students' committee setting up the education sub-committee, which proved to be one of the most important tools of educational reform in the AA, translating what had been mere protest into constructive criticism and action [...].' (Kay, quoted in: 'Quo Vadis, Architectural Association', *AAJ*, March 1952, vol. 67, no. 760, p. 209.) Brown, now in Hong Kong, replied in a letter to the editor, insisting that it was he, who had originally requested the creation of the education sub-committee 'so that we might have a smaller and more workable group to consider the student contribution to education at the AA.' (Brown, letter to the editor, *ibid.*, June 1952, vol. 68, no. 763, p. 20) This provoked further correspondence by Kay (letter to the editor, *ibid.*, July/Aug 1952, vol. 68, no. 764, p. 37) as well as Morris, who supported Kay's version: 'Can it be that Mr. Gordon Brown's memories of this critical period in the chequered history of AA staff-student co-operation are coloured by a little wishful thinking?' (Morris, letter to the editor, *ibid.*) An earlier announcement in the *AA Journal*, drafted by the students' committee itself, suggests that Brown was right: 'Last term concluded with a stimulating request from the principal for the work of the students' committee to be directed to a fully-co-ordinated enquiry with the staff into the present system of architectural education, and to this end a sub-committee has been elected.' ('School Notes – Contributed by the Students' Committee', *ibid.*, Jan 1947, vol. 62, no. 709, p. 89.)

<sup>592</sup> 'International Architectural Students' Congress', *Keystone*, July/Aug 1948, MRC/ABT, MSS.78/BT/4/6/9, p. 119.

<sup>593</sup> 'Report on National Union of Students Congress (Interim Report)', 17 May 1940, *Mass Observation Online*, <http://www.massobservation.amdigital.co.uk/Documents/Details/FileReport-115>; 'National Union of Students' Congress', 8 April 1941, *ibid.*, <http://www.massobservation.amdigital.co.uk/Documents/Details/FileReport-115> [both accessed 7 Oct 2014]; [NUS], *NUS Congress, Liverpool, April 1947*, Liverpool 1947, p. 40.



organisation.<sup>594</sup> In August 1946 representatives of 38 countries ratified the document at the inaugural ‘World Student Congress’ in Prague and established the International Union of Students (IUS) headquartered in the Czech capital.<sup>595</sup> The IUS was divided into different sections, one of which – the ‘Architectural Faculty Bureau’ (AFB), headed by Italian Giuseppe ‘Bubi’ Campos – sought to stimulate the formation of national architectural students’ organisations and co-ordinate their activities with a view to promoting reforms in architectural education. At the time the AFB was formed in May 1947 Great Britain was the only country in the world where such an organisation already existed.<sup>596</sup>

The Architectural Students’ Association (ArchSA) had its origin in a congress of six northern schools of architecture at Manchester in February 1934, which gave birth to the North British Architectural Students’ Association, renamed the Northern Architectural Students’ Association (NASA) in 1937.<sup>597</sup> The editors of *Focus*, who attended the annual NASA congress in Hull in 1939, were anxious to set up a southern equivalent with a view to ‘collaborate or merge into a national association.’<sup>598</sup> However, the plan failed due to the lack of support, and the AA was conspicuously absent when, in April 1941, eleven schools of architecture from all parts of Britain met in conjunction with the NUS congress at Cambridge to transform the NASA into the countrywide ArchSA and launch *PLAN* as its

---

<sup>594</sup> This account of the history of the IUS is based on: ‘Constitution of the International Union of Students’, Prague 1946, private collection; Bubi Campos, ‘The Architectural Faculty Bureau of the I.U.S.’, [Prague], Feb 1948, *ibid.*; J. C. C., ‘Students in World Politics: The Role of the IUS’, *The World Today*, Aug 1951, vol. 7, no. 8, pp. 346-356.

<sup>595</sup> Representatives from 43 countries attended the inaugural congress (*ibid.*, p. 346); by 1948 51 ‘countries’ had joined the IUS (Campos 1948, *op. cit.*, p. 4); by 1949 it comprised 54 ‘countries’ ([Bubi Campos], ‘IUS Report to the Conference’, IUS/ArchSA International Architectural Student Conference, 24 April 1949, private collection) – inverted commas because, in contrast to the apolitical NUS, some of the organisations which joined the increasingly Communist-controlled IUS in the name of their respective countries were far from nationally representative (see ‘Students in World Politics’, *op. cit.*, p. 355; Geoffrey Spyer, untitled memoirs, n.d., private collection, p. 48).

<sup>596</sup> Campos 1948, p. 7. According to Campos, the inauguration of the AFB triggered the formation of national organisations in Italy and Belgium (followed shortly after by Sweden and Czechoslovakia). However, according to Lyndon Cave, a student at Liverpool and NUS delegate to the 1946 congress in Prague, there existed at the time national architectural students’ organisations in the USSR, Czechoslovakia, Sweden and Great Britain (letter to the editor, *AJ*, 7 Nov 1946, p. 330). For obvious reasons, Campos is considered the more reliable source.

<sup>597</sup> This account of the history of the ArchSA is based on: Architectural Students’ Association, ‘The Origins and Development of National Architectural Student Activity – in Great Britain’, Feb 1944, private collection. For a more accessible source see: M. P. J., ‘Comments’, *PLAN*, no. 4 (1943), pp. 8-9.

<sup>598</sup> ‘Editorial’, *Focus*, no. 3 (1939), p. 9; see also: ‘Architectural Education’, *ibid.*, no. 4 (1939), pp. 83-84. The council had previously rejected the students’ request for permission to form a Southern Architectural Students’ Association. (Meeting of the Council, 22 March 1938, CM 1935-40, p. 251.)

trimestrial journal.<sup>599</sup> The AA eventually joined the ArchSA in August 1943, when thirteen AA students headed by John Beloff, later a leading authority on parapsychology at Edinburgh University, registered Mount House in Barnet as the organising centre of its southern section.<sup>600</sup> The AA council, which had not been informed, let alone asked for permission, reacted with irritation when the fact was eventually brought to their attention but sanctioned the affiliation retroactively.<sup>601</sup>

Beloff, though entitled, never actually served on the ArchSA council.<sup>602</sup> The first AA student who did was John Kay in April 1945<sup>603</sup>, and it was under his successor Bruce Martin (Kay having been called up for national service) that the AA began to call attention to itself. In December 1945 Martin led a delegation of five AA students to the annual ArchSA congress in Liverpool, where, upon hearing the schedule prior to the opening of the proceedings, they complained that ‘it confirmed their worst fears and that they were disgusted with the whole thing.’<sup>604</sup> The council overwhelmingly supported the AA students’ proposal to abandon the planned programme and focus the discussion on the aims of the ArchSA and its journal instead (the sole dissenter presumably being Lyndon Cave, the organiser of the congress); the council also asked the AA representatives to take on the organisation of the following congress, which, however, they declined.<sup>605</sup> Nonetheless, the AA was clearly intent on taking a more active part in the affairs of the ArchSA and increasingly clashed with some of the longer-standing factions. At the following council meeting half a year later the two new AA representatives, Joseph Rykwert and Fabian Olins, continued where Martin (who had meanwhile qualified) had left off and reignited the argument over the principles guiding the association.<sup>606</sup> Rykwert, who chaired the meeting in the absence of the incumbent president, took

---

<sup>599</sup> ArchSA 1944, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

<sup>600</sup> *PLAN*, no. 2 (1943), p. 21; ‘Directory for 1944’, *PLAN*, no. 4 (1943), p. 18.

<sup>601</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 14 Feb 1944, SCM 1937-44, p. 244; Meeting of the Council, 13 March 1944, CM 1940-49, p. 217.

<sup>602</sup> The constitution of the ArchSA stated that each ‘centre’ (i.e. member school) was qualified for a seat on the council (ArchSA 1944, p. 7); see also: ‘Announcements and Centre News’, *PLAN*, no. 4 (1943), p. 13; Meeting of the ArchSA Council, 12 Dec 1944, private collection.

<sup>603</sup> Meeting of the ArchSA Council, 7 April 1945, *ibid.*

<sup>604</sup> Meeting of the ArchSA Council, 17 Dec 1945, *ibid.* The delegation consisted of Martin, Paffard Keatinge-Clay, Margaret Dent, Anthony Williams (Thurston Williams’s older brother) and, presumably, Douglas Stephen. The content of the original programme is unknown.

<sup>605</sup> *Ibid.*; Meeting of the ArchSA Council, 21 Dec 1945, *ibid.*; see also: ‘AA Reports’, *PLAN*, no. 1 (1946), pp. 17-18. The AA did agree to act as southern region organising centre for 1946.

<sup>606</sup> Meeting of the ArchSA Council, 9/10 April 1946, private collection.

exception with the second clause of the constitution, which stated that ‘the aims of the Association shall be to promote unity in architectural ideals’<sup>607</sup>, and managed to incite a lengthy debate about the aims of the ArchSA, which ‘failed to achieve any measure of agreement’<sup>608</sup> and highlighted the divisions within the ArchSA.

Determined to take command of the association and its journal, over the course of the following months members of the AA students’ committee – specifically Graeme Shankland, Michael Ventris and Oliver Cox – mobilised the support of fellow students and in April 1947 led a fourteen-strong delegation to the annual ArchSA congress: ‘We went to Brighton for a conference and virtually [...] wrested the entire thing from Northern.’<sup>609</sup>

### The Wonder Years – The AA Students’ Committee in the Late 1940s

The formation of the education sub-committee and the appropriation of the ArchSA secured AA students a voice within and without the confines of their school. They set the scene for what was, with hindsight, the *annus mirabilis* of the AA student movement as the new students’ committee, elected in September 1947 and chaired by Bernard Feilden, persevered with – and indeed expanded – the activities of its predecessor body. It constituted no fewer than seven different sub-committees, all headed by a current member of the students’ committee but with permission to co-opt outsiders.<sup>610</sup> The only pre-existing one, i.e. the education sub-committee (now chaired by Oliver Cox), was confirmed as a permanent and largely autonomous entity empowered to discuss educational matters with the principal on behalf of the students’ committee.<sup>611</sup> In addition, the students’ committee set up sub-committees to

---

<sup>607</sup> ArchSA 1944, p. 6.

<sup>608</sup> ‘Secretary’s Report of the Discussion on Implementation of ArchSA Aims’, att. to: Meeting of the ArchSA Council, 9/10 April 1946, private collection.

<sup>609</sup> ‘Oliver Cox interviewed by Neil Bingham’, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects’ Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 5/14 (23 Nov 1999), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 2 Jan 2017] (hereafter cited as BLSA/Cox). There was a total of eighty delegates from eighteen different schools (‘Schools and Students’, *RIBAJ*, June 1947, p. 428). On a side note, in 1947 the president and secretary of the northern section organising centre at Newcastle were Peter Smithson and Jack Lynn, respectively. (‘ArchSA News’, *PLAN*, no. 2 (1947), p. 15.)

<sup>610</sup> Meeting of the Students’ Committee, 26 Sep 1947, private collection.

<sup>611</sup> Meeting of the Students’ Committee, 26 Sep 1947, *ibid.* The education sub-committee comprised the original members apart from Broome (see p. 124, fn. 591), plus Graeme Shankland and Oliver Cox. Cox was the only member of the current students’ committee (all others having been co-opted) and therefore served as

liaise directly with the two relevant national student organisations, viz. the NUS (chaired by Stephen Macfarlane) and the ArchSA (chaired by Herbert Morel). The AA was, as Feilden proudly proclaimed, ‘the only architectural school directly represented in the National Union of Students.’<sup>612</sup> It had in fact been so for more than ten years, and for the rather prosaic reason that it lacked affiliation via a mother institution; nonetheless, the current students’ committee saw this as an opportunity to inject itself directly into the broader national student discourse, and its sub-committee sent a delegation to the NUS council meeting in Brighton in February 1948 (subsequent to which it set up yet another sub-committee to investigate the question of fees and grants in conjunction with the NUS).<sup>613</sup> The more immediately relevant organisation was, of course, the ArchSA, and the students’ committee evidently decided the policy of the respective sub-committee in plenum.<sup>614</sup> Owing to this strategic approach, the AA managed to consolidate its supremacy within the ArchSA – to the satisfaction of a well-informed Bubi Campos:

The students of the AA have begun to win the executive positions in the ArchSA and are gradually making of it a more active and progressive organisation. [...] In the space of a few months [...] the entire structure of the ArchSA will be changed.<sup>615</sup>

The students’ committee underlined its ambitions by organising a separate programme of events in connection with the AA centenary celebrations in December 1947 (see page 65). It famously persuaded Le Corbusier, who had rejected an official invitation from the council, to give a talk to the students.<sup>616</sup> His appearance was but one, if certainly the most spectacular, item in a densely packed two-week schedule

---

*de jure* chairman of the education sub-committee. However, it seems that the *de facto* chairman was, and remained, Hugh Morris. (Morris, letter to Siegfried Giedion, 26 Jan 1948, gta/ETH/CIAM, 42-SG-19-51/52; Morris, letter to the editor, *AAJ*, July/Aug 1952, vol. 68, no. 764, p. 37.)

<sup>612</sup> Quoted in: ‘The Centenary of the Architectural Association’, op. cit., p. 75.

<sup>613</sup> Meeting of the Students’ Committee with Gordon Brown, 5 Feb 1948, private collection; Meeting of the Council, 7 June 1948, CM 1940-49, pp. 485, 488; see also: Meeting of the School Committee, 6 Oct 1936, SCM 1928-37, p. 206.

<sup>614</sup> See e.g.: Meeting of the Students’ Committee with Howard Robertson, 30 Jan 1948, private collection. At this meeting the students’ committee elected John Turner as its representative on the ArchSA council and Thurston Williams as its (successful) nominee for the ArchSA presidency. Williams was also given the overall responsibility for *PLAN*, but since he was not a current member of the students’ committee his (initially separate) *PLAN* sub-committee was merged into the ArchSA sub-committee. In addition, there were sub-committees on ‘International Newsletter’ (chaired by Edward Samuel), ‘Entertainment’ (chaired by Marjorie Hitchisson and Alec Bright) and ‘Sports’.

<sup>615</sup> Giuseppe Campos, ‘Report on the International Meeting of Architecture Students on the Occasion of the Centenary of the School of Architecture of the Architectural Association’, Dec 1947, private collection, p. 3.

<sup>616</sup> Le Corbusier’s talk centred upon the Modulor and was published in: *AJ*, 8 Jan 1948, pp. 35-36.

which included lectures by other distinguished architects such as Jaromír Krejcar and Jens Dunker as well as a series of organised tours in London, each attended by two to three hundred students and culminating in a discussion meeting on ‘Your City – Your Future’.<sup>617</sup> The programme came to a close on 19 December with a one-day international conference on the problem of adapting methods of architectural education to meet the requirements of a changed society. Organised by the education sub-committee, the symposium brought together sixteen student delegates from ten countries, who along with representatives of the AA and four other British schools passed a resolution promoting the creation of national unions of architectural students and their affiliation with the IUS, the arrangement of international exchange schemes, the preparation of a full conference in the following year, and cooperation with CIAM in the field of architectural education.<sup>618</sup>

Campos used the centenary celebrations to introduce himself to executive members of the RIBA, the British Council and the ABT, all of whom pledged (and subsequently gave) their support for the first ‘World Conference of Architectural Students’ in London under the aegis of the IUS.<sup>619</sup> Together with the AA – ‘which virtually means ArchSA’<sup>620</sup> – Campos set up an organising committee, and the congress, having had to be postponed twice in order to secure full international participation, eventually took place in April 1949 at the RIBA under the patronage

---

<sup>617</sup> The tours were introduced by talks on the MARS and LCC plans, given by, respectively, Arthur Korn and Arthur Ling. The discussion meeting on 16 December 1947 was chaired by Feilden, introduced by Robertson, and featured as invited speakers Peter Shephard and Donald Reay, both from the Ministry of Town and Country Planning. The 250 attending AA students passed a resolution in support of the County of London and the Greater London plans, and in January the students’ committee – characteristically – decided that the ‘resolution made by AA students at “Your City – Your Future” be adopted for all students of architecture’, which appears to have happened at a meeting of the ArchSA council in the following month (Meeting of the Students’ Committee with Howard Robertson, 30 Jan 1948, private collection; *RIBA J*, March 1948, p. 225). For an account of the students’ centenary week see e.g.: ‘AA Centenary Celebrations’, *Builder*, 26 Dec 1947, pp. 726-729; ‘Students’ Centenary Celebrations’, *AAJ*, Jan 1948, v. 63, n. 718, pp. 140-148. Brown had shortened the winter term to enable his students to carry out their programme of events. (Meeting of the School Committee, 3 March 1947, SCM 1944-51, p. 82.)

<sup>618</sup> Students’ Discussion on Architectural Education’, 19 Dec 1947, private collection; Campos 1947, op. cit., pp. 2-3; ‘Students’ Centenary Celebrations’, op. cit., pp. 142-143. The education sub-committee sent these resolutions to Giedion. It seems likely that they inspired him to issue an invitation to students to take part in the discussions on architectural education at CIAM 7 in Bergamo in 1949, which was attended by four current or recent AA students (viz. Andrew Derbyshire, John Turner, Mary Crittall and Joseph Rykwert); see: Hugh Morris, letter to Siegfried Giedion, 26 Jan 1948, gta/ETH/CIAM, 42-SG-19-51/52; ‘Participants observateurs au VIIème Congrès’, *ibid.*, 42-AR-8; ‘IIIème Commission – Réform de l’enseignement de l’architecture et de l’urbanisme’, *ibid.*, 42-X-116; ‘The School Abroad’, *AAJ*, Jan 1950, vol. 65, no. 738, pp. 124-127.

<sup>619</sup> Campos 1948, p. 11; see also: Campos 1947, p. 2; ‘ArchSA News’, *PLAN*, no. 2 (1948), pp. 36-37.

<sup>620</sup> Campos 1947, p. 4.

of Patrick Abercrombie and with discussions chaired by Arthur Ling and Robert Furneaux Jordan.<sup>621</sup> The four-day event, which despite continuing visa difficulties was attended by over sixty delegates from twenty-three countries across the globe, stood under the theme 'Unite and Rebuild for Peace', and the *Architects' Journal* praised the students for their idealism:

The theme [...] is a brave one, and at a time when post-war unity on any subject is fast disappearing it ill behoves anybody to disparage this youthful attempt. [...] It is refreshing that students have avoided the cynicism and pretentiousness that in their elders could make such an endeavour futile [...].<sup>622</sup>

Yet the same magazine was less enthusiastic about the outcome, describing it as a 'strange affair – vague and inconclusive with its generalised clichés and its undertow of half-repressed political emotion,'<sup>623</sup> and the *RIBA Journal* deplored 'a certain laxity about the organisation of the conference, definition of purpose and the itinerary itself which left much to be desired.'<sup>624</sup> The harshest criticism, however, arose from within the AA itself. In May 1949 a general meeting of AA students passed a motion stating that 'in view of the politically biased nature of the main resolution of the International Architectural Students' Conference, the students of the Architectural Association desire to dissociate themselves from the political sentiments expressed therein [...]', indicating that in the increasingly polarised political climate of the late 1940s the left-wing radicalism of the students' committee ceased to reflect the views of the student body as a whole.<sup>625</sup>

---

<sup>621</sup> John Kay, who had returned to the school, was put in charge of the organising committee; Thurston Williams, by then president of the ArchSA, spent two months in Prague to liaise with the IUS as the temporary head of the AFB (*ibid.*, pp. 4-5; 'ArchSA News', *PLAN*, no. 4 (1949), p. 29).

<sup>622</sup> 'International Students' Congress', *AJ*, 21 April 1949, pp. 357-358.

<sup>623</sup> *AJ*, 26 May 1949, p. 472; see also dissenting correspondence from Leo De Syllas as well as ArchSA officials Thurston Williams, John Kay and Howard Walker in: *AJ*, 16 June 1949, p. 540.

<sup>624</sup> *RIBAJ*, May 1949, p. 298.

<sup>625</sup> Margaret Swann (secretary of the AA students' committee), letter to the editor, *AAJ*, May 1949, vol. 64, no. 732, p. 225 (also published in: *ABN*, 20 May 1949, p. 440; *RIBAJ*, June 1949, p. 373; *Architectural Review*, June 1949, vol. 105, no. 630, pp. 310, 312). The resolution – essentially an anti-war, anti-colonialism manifesto infused with the tenets of AA postwar pedagogy such as 'real problems, real clients', site work, student participation, etc. – was signed by all delegates with the exception of three Italian dissentients and published in: *ABN*, 20 May 1949, p. 441; see also: John Kay, letter to the editor, *AJ*, 26 May 1949, p. 472. The students' motion elicited further correspondence in the *Architect and Building News*. A group of AA students felt that 'the decision to publish this statement is an irresponsible act of political chicanery which will obscure the real achievements of the conference in the field of international cooperation' and claimed that it 'does not give a balanced view of the opinion in the school itself', since only two hundred of the 560 students in the school had been present at the meeting and hardly any of them had in fact attended the conference: 'The meeting, originally called to support the work and achievements of the conference, soon divided on the issue for and against Communism, and a vote was forced in an atmosphere of hysteria which prevented objective discussion of the business in hand.' On behalf of the 'more progressive

Nonetheless, the dominance of the AA within the ArchSA itself remained unchallenged and reached its pinnacle at the annual congress in Oxford on 19 July 1949, at which its delegates pushed through a fourteen-point circular ‘as a basis for discussion’.<sup>626</sup> The points (real sites and real clients, cross-year group working, experimental workshops, etc.) reflected either current or envisaged AA practice and marked the penultimate step of a three-year effort to redefine the aims of the ArchSA and align them with progressive AA thought. At the annual congress in Brighton in the following year a final resolution was passed which incorporated key aspects of the ‘Fourteen Points’ and turned them thus into official ArchSA policy.<sup>627</sup>

### Cross-generational Links: From *Focus* to *PLAN*

The 1950 resolution and particularly the more idealistic amongst its ‘Fourteen Points’ such as the ‘substitution of lectures by free discussion’<sup>628</sup> and ‘control of the school curriculum by joint student-staff committees’<sup>629</sup> owed a manifest debt to the pre-war insurgents and recalled similar proposals in *Focus* and the Yellow Book. Oliver Cox, who had designed the covers of *Focus* as a second-year student, remembered: ‘We were welcomed back by the students as victors – not of the war – but victors over the old regime at the pre-war AA.’<sup>630</sup> The same applied to two of the editors of *Focus*, Oliver’s older brother Anthony Cox and Leo De Syllas, who returned to the school as members of the ACP teaching collective. Cox, in particular, had never severed his ties with the AA, serving on Jellicoe’s advisory panel and

---

body of opinion in the school’, the correspondents argued that the congress was ‘too valuable an event to be dismissed as an affair of mere political chauvinism’ and stressed the need to maintain the channels of international communication at a time of increasing political polarisation. (Andrew Derbyshire et al., letter to the editor, *ABN*, 20 May 1949, pp. 440-441.) This, in turn, provoked a retort from AA student Roderick Ham, who rejected the portrayal of the general meeting by ‘the self-stylised “progressive” body of opinion’ as misleading and the assertion that it did not represent a balanced view of the opinion of the school as ‘quite unjustified’. Ham concluded: ‘They [the students] took the opposite view and asked for it to be publicised, because they felt that the AA School as a whole is too often judged by the outpourings of its more articulate extremists.’ (Ham, letter to the editor, *ABN*, 3 June 1949, p. 500.)

<sup>626</sup> *PLAN*, no. 6 (1949), p. 29. The editors of *PLAN* had first proposed the ‘Fourteen Points’ in the preceding issue of the journal ([Andrew Derbyshire et al.], ‘*PLAN* in Transition’, *PLAN*, no. 5 (1949), p. 2; see also: C. J. Briggs, letter to the editor, *ABN*, 2 Dec 1949, p. 573.)

<sup>627</sup> ‘Architectural Students’ Association’, *PLAN*, no. 7 (1950), p. 28; see also: Chris Whittaker, letter to the editor, *Builder*, 5 Jan 1951, pp. 6, (15).

<sup>628</sup> ‘*PLAN* in Transition’, op. cit.

<sup>629</sup> Ibid.

<sup>630</sup> BLSA/Cox.

teaching staff and contributing to the *AA Journal*.<sup>631</sup> Most importantly, from 1947 onward he and AA student Graeme Shankland (the former representing MARS, the latter ArchSA) became the driving force on the ‘MARS/ArchSA Joint Committee on Architectural Education’, which had been formed in December 1945 ‘for a survey of architectural education and recommendations’ under the chairmanship of Jane Drew but had not made any progress since.<sup>632</sup> The committee’s interim report, which was eventually issued in June 1948, presumably written by Anthony Cox himself, comprised a first, introductory section giving a general history of architectural education from the mediaeval period to the present, and a second, rather less substantial, section outlining the current position in Britain.<sup>633</sup> The close AA involvement did not escape Douglas Jones, the head of the architectural school at Birmingham, who wrote:

The authors of the report do not scatter many bouquets, but when they do praise one particular educational establishment – however right and sincere they may be – it is a pity that it happens to live in the same building from which the report was sent out [...].<sup>634</sup>

Jones’s sneer notwithstanding, a distinct AA bias was barely perceptible, for the report did not specifically address the training in recognised schools: its key finding was that such training was, in fact, still the exception as a much larger proportion of students than previously presumed qualified by way of external examinations, the

---

<sup>631</sup> For instance, in September 1942 he enquired about alleged changes to the curriculum and called on Gibberd and the council to outline their intentions. (Anthony Cox, letter to the editor, *AAJ*, Sep 1942, vol. 58, no. 667, p. 23.)

<sup>632</sup> ‘MARS GROUP. 1946-7 Session. Report of the Executive Committee to the AGM’, June 1947, *AAL/MARS*; see also: ‘ArchSA News’, *PLAN*, no. 1 (1947), p. 22; ‘ArchSA News’, *ibid.*, no. 2 (1947), p. 16. The suggestion to approach the MARS Group came from the Liverpool students, who had affiliated with it in 1944. (Meetings of the ArchSA Council, 12 Dec 1944, 17 Dec 1945, 9/10 April 1946, private collection.) To carry out the work with the MARS Group, the ArchSA amalgamated its education and professional relations committees. George Anselevicius, an evening student at the Regent Street Polytechnic and future chair of architecture at Harvard, was elected secretary, Ruth Pocock of the Bartlett and Bruce Martin of the AA members of the combined committee. (‘ArchSA News’, *PLAN*, no. 1 (1947), pp. 20, 21; ‘Schools and Students’, *RIBAJ*, March 1947, p. 278.)

<sup>633</sup> ‘MARS/ArchSA Committee on Architectural Education – Interim Report’, June 1948, *AAL/MARS* (published in an abridged version in: Andrew Derbyshire, ‘Interim Report of MARS/ArchSA Committee on Architectural Education’, *PLAN*, no. 3 (1948), pp. 19-22); see also: ‘MARS Group: Minutes of a General Meeting Held at the RIBA’, 6 Dec 1948, *AAL/MARS*.

<sup>634</sup> A. Douglas Jones, ‘Mars/ArchSA Interim Report on Architectural Education’, *ABN*, 24 Dec 1948, p. 533. Jones was critical of the final outcome: ‘Further reports are promised in which recommendations are to be made, but it is two years since the ArchSA approached the Mars Group on this subject, and after all this time one had hoped for more than a 21-page report, made up of about 16 pages of historical review [...].’ (*Ibid.*, p. 532.)



vast majority of them without any school training whatsoever.<sup>635</sup> With its unconcealed criticism of the RIBA, which focused its attention on recognised schools and played down the educational needs of external students as a ‘special problem’<sup>636</sup>, the report attracted a great deal of publicity but failed to make a lasting impact as the RIBA responded by publishing corrective statistics which seemed to prove that the MARS/ArchSA figures were grossly inaccurate and their deductions therefore invalid.<sup>637</sup> The MARS Group subsequently discontinued its participation in the joint committee, and the ArchSA instead approached the ABT with a request ‘to take over and complete [the] MARS/ArchSA Education Report.’<sup>638</sup> Although the ABT was not prepared to take charge of the entire report, it did agree to carry out a joint enquiry into the situation of the ‘unrecognised’ student, to whom it felt a particular responsibility, and formed a new education committee under Leo De Syllas for this purpose.<sup>639</sup> In light of this, the ArchSA briefly considered a closer affiliation with the ABT and, in April 1949, met its executive committee for a preliminary discussion;<sup>640</sup> yet only half a year later the ArchSA, having presumably come to realise that the proximity to the politically suspect union defeated any prospect of the long sought-after RIBA recognition, reversed its policy and disassociated itself completely from the ABT, the joint enquiry thus remaining inconclusive.<sup>641</sup>

---

<sup>635</sup> ‘MARS/ArchSA Interim Report’, op. cit., p. 19.

<sup>636</sup> Ibid.

<sup>637</sup> ‘Architectural Education: Numbers under training’, *RIBAJ*, Jan 1949, pp. 131-132. The joint committee accepted the RIBA’s figures but argued that they did not refute the core findings of its report (Thurston Williams, Peter Cocke, letter to the editor, *RIBAJ*, Feb 1949, p. 180; for coverage of the report see e.g.: ‘The Interim Report of the MARS/ArchSA Committee on Architectural Education’, *ABN*, 15 Oct 1948, p. 308; ‘Architectural Education’, *Builder*, 29 Oct 1948, pp. 491-492; ‘The Future for Students’, *AJ*, 18 Nov 1948, pp. 459-460.

<sup>638</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee of the ABT, 13 Dec 1948, MRC/ABT, MSS.78/BT/1/1/10; see also: ‘ArchSA News’, *PLAN*, no. 4 (1949), p. 29.

<sup>639</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee of the ABT, 10 Jan 1949, MRC/ABT, MSS.78/BT/1/1/10; ‘Statement of Policy for ABT Education Committee’, *Keystone*, Feb 1949, p. 33, *ibid.*, MSS.78/BT/4/6/10. Leo De Syllas resigned his position as secretary in July 1949 due to increasing pressure of work and was replaced by Thurston Williams, who co-opted Robert Jordan to the committee. In April 1950 it was amalgamated with the pre-existing ‘Students’ Liaison Committee’, and De Syllas returned as chairman of the new ‘Education and Students Committee’, assisted by Williams as secretary. (Edna Mills, ‘Students Have a Part’, *ibid.*, Dec 1948, p. 203, MSS.78/BT/4/6/9; Agenda of the Meeting of the Executive Committee of the ABT, 11 July 1949, MRC/ABT, MSS.78/BT/1/1/10; N. Taper, ‘Policy Report – ABT Students’ Liaison Committee’, June 1949, *ibid.*; Meeting of the Executive Committee of the ABT, 23 Jan 1950, *ibid.*, MSS.78/BT/1/1/11; Thurston Williams, ‘The Future Form and Policy of the Student and Education Committee’, att. to: Meeting of the Executive Committee of the ABT, 12 April 1950, *ibid.*)

<sup>640</sup> Meetings of the Executive Committee of the ABT, 28 Feb 1949, 28 March 1949, 25 April 1949, *ibid.*, MSS.78/BT/1/1/10.

<sup>641</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee of the ABT, 9 Jan 1950, *ibid.*, MSS.78/BT/1/1/11.

The ArchSA/MARS interim report was the only tangible outcome of a direct collaboration between the pre-war and postwar generations of AA students, yet nowhere was the former's influence on the latter more evident than in *PLAN*. 'We decided that we must reproduce what my brother had done just before the war,' recalled Oliver Cox, 'an architectural magazine for the students.'<sup>642</sup> In fact, the very idea to turn NASA's existing journal into a national – and indeed international<sup>643</sup> – platform for student thought appears to have been Anthony Cox's. In December 1940, faced with the impracticality of producing a fifth issue of *Focus*, Cox wrote to his former tutor Max Lock, now the head at Hull:

There is one thing that we can do – or rather, that perhaps you at Hull, as the secretariat of NASA can do. It is this, plan a magazine that will keep things alive amongst the students in all the schools – [...] a medium for keeping alive the rigorous thought in the schools that the oppression of war and the heavy hand of Authority is [sic] now blunting.<sup>644</sup>

*PLAN* replaced the *NASA Journal* following the inaugural ArchSA congress in 1941, but initially it remained 'a little newsletter, a broadsheet'<sup>645</sup>, offering the expectable mixture of news items, illustrated school work and travel reports. The AA students took charge of the journal at the 1947 Brighton congress (see page 127) but refused to produce the first issue until a considerable debt, accumulated by the previous editor, was finally cleared in late 1947.<sup>646</sup> In autumn Sam Scorer approached the AA council requesting assistance in obtaining more advertisement revenue for *PLAN* in order to enlarge the publication.<sup>647</sup> This was clearly successful as when the first AA number was released it comprised four times as many advertisements as the previous one, allowing for twice the number of editorial pages, which in turn justified a significantly higher price. In form and content it bore little resemblance to the unassuming leaflet which had preceded it, its layout design and

---

<sup>642</sup> BLSA/Cox.

<sup>643</sup> The British Council distributed *PLAN* to seventeen countries, including India and China. (Neil Steedman, 'Student magazines in British architectural schools', *AA quarterly*, July/Sep 1971, vol. 3, no. 3, p. 37.)

<sup>644</sup> Anthony Cox, letter to Max Lock, 9 December 1940, *Max Lock Papers*, Box 11.7: Hull, University of Westminster Archives, cited in: Darling, *Re-forming Britain*, p. 190.

<sup>645</sup> BLSA/Cox.

<sup>646</sup> Meeting of the Students' Committee, 26 Sep 1947, private collection; see also: 'ArchSA News', *PLAN*, no. 1 (1947), p. 21.

<sup>647</sup> The council 'expressed willingness to help, and it was [...] decided that the honorary editor, the editor, advertisement manager and secretary should meet Mr. Scorer, to go fully into the matter and try and work out a means of helping him.' (Meeting of the Council, 27 Oct 1947, CM 1940-49, pp. 430-431.)

spiral binding emulating the character of *Focus* instead.<sup>648</sup> As opposed to the previous editions of the journal, which had been the result of individual efforts by students at Manchester and Liverpool, the AA's *PLAN* was a group enterprise from the outset – to the extent that in the final three numbers articles ceased to be attributable to individual writers.<sup>649</sup> The high quality of the journal and its considerable impact on students at the AA owed much to the fact that the core of the continually changing editorial team consisted of some of the school's most admired students, notably the future Stevenage and Zone thesis groups (see page 98).<sup>650</sup> As with *Focus*, the editors envisaged *PLAN* as a medium facilitating the 'exchange of ideas between students and professional circles'<sup>651</sup>, with ArchSA affairs increasingly sidelined. The attempt to 'widen the scope so as to attract a larger circulation'<sup>652</sup> through contributions of more general appeal such as Michael Ventris's influential essay on Swedish architecture,<sup>653</sup> an account of the sixth CIAM conference by Anthony Cox and Leo De Syllas,<sup>654</sup> or Stephen Macfarlane's early report on the

---

<sup>648</sup> John Killick, letter to Sigfried Giedion, 1 Jan 1948, gta/ETH/CIAM, 42-SG-23-211: 'Vous vous souvenez, sans doute, de notre journal Focus, don't la publication a été interrompu à cause de la guerre. Il est dans notre but de donner à notre nouveau journal le même caractère.'

<sup>649</sup> Appropriately enough, one of the first issues featured a discussion on group working between Howard Robertson, Stirrat Johnson-Marshall, MIT professor Carl Koch, AA fourth-year master David Goddard and Oliver Cox. Michael Ventris, who chaired the debate, concluded by putting forward his own elaborate group working methodology. According to Oliver Cox, this system not only guided the work of their specific group but influenced the school as a whole (BLSA/Cox; Ventris, 'Group Working', op. cit.; see also: Oliver Cox, 'Method in Design', *PLAN*, no. 5 (1949), pp. 17-20.)

<sup>650</sup> John Winter referred to this cohort of students simply as the 'bright boys at the AA [...] who I really used to look up to,' and Geoffrey Spyer remembered: 'For much of the first three years I felt somewhat overawed by what seemed to me to be the intellectual superiority of many of my fellow students like Andrew Derbyshire, Pat Croke, John Voelcker, Philip Dowson and John Turner [...]. I constantly wondered if I could ever achieve a comparable level of understanding, articulation and self-confidence as these mostly former public school and Oxbridge students.' (Adrian Forty, Thomas Weaver, 'In Conversation with John Winter', *AA Files*, no. 63 (2011), p. 20; Spyer, memoirs, op. cit., p. 34.) Many others have expressed similar sentiments in conversations with the author. The composition of the editorial boards was as follows. *PLAN*, no. 1 (1948): Anthony Hunt, Norman Hyams, Sam Scorer; *PLAN*, 2/1948: Hunt, Hyams, Scorer, Hugh Morris, Michael Ventris; *PLAN*, no. 3 (1948): Hunt, Morris, Scorer, Julian Keable, John Killick, Stephen Macfarlane, Thurston Williams; *PLAN*, no. 4 (1949): Killick, Andrew Derbyshire; *PLAN*, no. 5 (1949): Killick, Derbyshire, Macfarlane, Michael Willis; *PLAN*, no. 6 (1949): Derbyshire, Keable, Killick, Macfarlane, Morris, Pat Croke, Alan Emmerson, Alan Gore, Bill Howell, Tony Moore, John Ollis, John Turner, John Voelcker; *PLAN*, no. 7 (1950): Croke, Derbyshire, Gore, Howell, Keable, Killick, Macfarlane, Morris, Ollis, Turner, Voelcker, Anita Flateau, Jack Howard, Harry Spencer; *PLAN*, no. 8 (1950): Croke, Derbyshire, Flateau, Macfarlane, Turner.

<sup>651</sup> Killick to Giedion, op. cit: 'Dans notre périodique d'avant guerre paraissent des articles écrits par des étudiants aussi que des articles de la plume des architectes renommés comme Walter Gropius et Le Corbusier. Nous espérons que "Plan" formira l'occasion à un pareil échange d'idées entre les étudiants et les cercles professionnels.'

<sup>652</sup> Subscription form att. to: 'PLAN – Journal of the Architectural Students' Association', gta/ETH/CIAM, 42-SG-23-212.

<sup>653</sup> Michael Ventris, 'Function and Arabesque', *PLAN*, no. 1 (1948), pp. 6-12.

<sup>654</sup> Anthony Cox, Leo De Syllas, 'CIAM Congress, 1947', *PLAN*, no. 1 (1948), pp. 13-16.

*Unité d'Habitation*,<sup>655</sup> proved exceedingly successful, with *PLAN* growing its circulation from 600 to 2,500 during the AA's editorship.<sup>656</sup>

In January 1949 Gordon Brown resigned as principal of the school, and the five *PLAN* issues which were produced between 1949 and 1950 reflected the preoccupations of the school under his successor Robert Furneaux Jordan. Dissatisfaction with the anticlimactic reality of New Town planning was a recurring theme,<sup>657</sup> but the greatest bone of contention was the inefficiency of the building industry. The fifth issue with its superbly illustrated technical report on the new London Transport double-decker bus RT3 highlighted the superiority of industrial manufacturing in terms of prefabrication and dimensional precision, and in the same vein the eighth issue praised the achievements of the aviation industry as an inspiration for the development of new technologies.<sup>658</sup> In later numbers the editors increasingly advocated a 'synthetic view'<sup>659</sup> of architecture, exemplified by the ingeniously structured sixth issue, which examined the 'process of breakdown [...] in the fields of building, architecture, and education'<sup>660</sup> and – whilst maintaining a profoundly pessimistic outlook – praised the Hertfordshire schools programme as a rare paragon of successful reintegration.<sup>661</sup> Jordan, who contributed regularly to *PLAN*, complimented the editors on their achievement: 'It is a magnificent effort in every way – a fine gesture against ineptitude in spite of its undercurrent of despair. Does it end there? What do we all do next?'<sup>662</sup>

---

<sup>655</sup> Stephen Macfarlane, 'Unité d'Habitation', *PLAN*, no. 4 (1949), pp. 23-27.

<sup>656</sup> 'Annual General Meeting of the ArchSA, Brighton, 3/4 April 1950', private collection. In comparison, *Focus* had a print run of 1,500 (Darling, *Re-forming Britain*, p. 190).

<sup>657</sup> E.g.: Anthony Hunt et al., 'National Planning', *PLAN*, no. 5 (1949), pp. 22-27; 'Progress Report', *ibid.*, no. 7 (1950), pp. 2-4.

<sup>658</sup> [Stephen Macfarlane], 'RT3', *ibid.*, no. 5 (1949), pp. 5-16; [Andrew Derbyshire], 'New Feelings, New Techniques', *ibid.*, no. 8 (1950), pp. 12-23.

<sup>659</sup> 'PLAN in Transition', *op. cit.*

<sup>660</sup> *PLAN*, no. 6 (1949), p. 2.

<sup>661</sup> The discussion was continued in the following issue with particular emphasis on the Peckham Health Centre ([Stephen Macfarlane], 'Peckham', *PLAN*, no. 7 (1950), pp. 22-27).

<sup>662</sup> Jordan, letter to Anita Flateau, 30 Jan 1950, private collection. John Newsom, county education officer at Hertfordshire, likewise congratulated the editors on their work: 'It would obviously be silly to say that I agree with all their conclusions, but, in general, the line taken is so vigorous and different from the accustomed turgid generality that it gave unwonted pleasure to at least one bureaucrat! You have, of course, said things that will raise a howl of indignation in a good many quarters, but the trouble with so much that is written about education and architecture today is that it produces yawns rather than howls.' (Newsom, letter to Anita Flateau, 9 Feb 1950, *ibid.*) For Jordan's contributions to *PLAN* see: Jordan, 'The Teaching of Architectural History', *op. cit.*; Jordan, letter to the editor, *PLAN*, no. 5 (1949), p. 3. Jordan actively supported the ArchSA in other ways. Apart from chairing a discussion at the ArchSA/IUS conference in

Unlike *Focus*, which had essentially been a means to voice the students' dissent with current AA school policy and inherently subversive, *PLAN* was progressive but by no means controversial. Whilst Brown had encouraged student participation as long as it did not challenge his or his year masters' authority (see page 119), Jordan unreservedly embraced, and in fact actively encouraged, the students' rebelliousness: 'I have had a very strong suspicion that they are allowing me to settle down. I can assure them that I hope for a more polemical future.'<sup>663</sup> Jordan collaborated closely with the students' committee and particularly its education sub-committee, which was 'always larger and more important than the actual students' committee itself.'<sup>664</sup> Moreover, he invited his students to form themselves into permanent groups whether or not they chose to tackle their design projects as teams and to elect a chairperson who would represent them in fixed weekly meetings with the respective year staff.<sup>665</sup> Group working was thus more than just an ad-hoc design method: it gave students formal status within the administrative machinery of the school (albeit not the association), aimed at creating a veritable 'school of architects' based on close collaboration between principal, staff and students. It was in keeping with this precept that Jordan, in December 1950, removed one of the few remaining dividers between the latter two parties by replacing the students' education sub-committee with a highly influential staff-student committee.<sup>666</sup>

*PLAN* embodied the self-confidence of a student generation whose standing was recognised within and beyond the educational setting of their own school and whose sense of mission and faith in the permanence of their contribution was not clouded by doubts. In this sense, the years 1949 to 1950 marked the climax of the AA student movement. By mid-1950 political controversies began to poison the climate within the AA and, perhaps inevitably, overshadow the 'intense practicality of outlook', which, according to Saint, had previously characterised *PLAN*.<sup>667</sup> With professional (and therefore educational) matters considered inseparable from their

---

London in April 1949 (see p. 129) he also gave a speech on architectural education at the ArchSA congress in Brighton in spring 1950. ('Architectural Students' Association', *PLAN*, no. 7 (1950), p. 28.)

<sup>663</sup> Quoted in: 'Prize-Giving 1949', op. cit., p. 32.

<sup>664</sup> 'Principal's Report', Meeting of the School Committee, 8 Dec 1950, SCM 1944-51, p. 205.

<sup>665</sup> 'AA Information and Curriculum Notes 1949-50', op. cit., p. 11.

<sup>666</sup> 'Principal's Report', 8 Dec 1950, op. cit. The staff-student committee had a student as chair and a member of staff as vice-chair.

<sup>667</sup> Saint 1987, p. 30.

political context, a distinctive left-wing undercurrent – anarchist-pacifist rather than communist – had always run through the pages of *PLAN*, but, appropriately enough, only the final issue published under the AA’s editorship in autumn 1950 was overtly political in content, featuring an anti-war editorial as well as an open letter in support of a ban on nuclear weapons signed by, among others, Cox and De Syllas, and, as mentioned in the previous chapter, a highly controversial guide for intending conscientious objectors (see page 109).<sup>668</sup> In early 1951 the AA students in accordance with ArchSA regulations handed over *PLAN* to their colleagues at Birmingham, and only half a year later Jordan resigned as principal of the school. Within the space of six months the AA students lost both their mentor and their medium. Worse still, an ambitious yet ill-conceived international ‘Architectural Students’ Festival’, jointly organised by the London schools in connection with the Festival of Britain, left the ArchSA in discord and, more importantly, irrecoverable debt, which after two more numbers put an end to *PLAN* and eventually, in 1953, the association itself.<sup>669</sup>

## Conclusion

After the Second World War the AA school was invaded by a vast number of ex-service students, whose maturity and wartime experiences made them little inclined to tacitly accept the traditional hierarchies of the school environment and gave them a sense of entitlement regarding the content and organisation of their training. This phenomenon was not limited to the AA, but only the AA with its adaptable structures and ingrained tradition of student participation offered a sufficiently

---

<sup>668</sup> ‘Editorial’, *PLAN*, no. 8 (1950), p. 1; Bertram Carter et al., letter to the editor, *ibid.*, p. 34; [John Turner], ‘Military Service’, *ibid.*, p. 32.

<sup>669</sup> Chris Whittaker, who was the national secretary of the ArchSA at the time, remembers: ‘The Festival rather crippled ArchSA because there were a number of foreign students who came to this country who weren’t properly looked after. There was nowhere for them to stay, and we had great trouble. ArchSA couldn’t really keep its head above water as a result of commitments we had to undertake for these visiting students. It folded shortly after, and that was the reason for it basically.’ (Whittaker, interview, 11 Jan 2014.) The AA council had advised the students that the plans were ‘vague and uncertain [...] and the time too short for proper organisation’ and therefore declined to accept any responsibility for the event. (Meeting of the Council, 11 June 1951, CM 1949-55, pp. 189-190.) The ArchSA was resurrected in December 1955, first as the National Architectural Students’ Association and from 1957 as the British Architectural Students’ Association (BASA), which resumed an active role in the early 1960s. For the students’ festival see e.g.: *AJ*, 14 June 1951, p. 760; *ABN*, 26 July 1951, p. 83.

responsive setting to accommodate the students' aspirations. Their unprecedented activism was inspired, supported and incited by their pre-war counterparts, whose *Yellow Book* and *Focus* appeared to set an unreachable benchmark. Ironically, in their attempt to pick up the pre-war initiatives and match the achievements of their predecessors the postwar students arguably surpassed them. In the late 1940s the students had a greater part in shaping their own education than they had had ten years prior, and through their dominance of the ArchSA, and specifically through their editorship of *PLAN*, they managed to radiate their ideas nationally and even internationally, and in a more sustained fashion than had been possible before the war. In Gordon Brown and particularly in Robert Furneaux Jordan the students encountered principals who were sympathetic to their outlook and supportive of their cause. The collective spirit which by the end of the decade permeated the AA school owed much to Jordan's vision and approach, and it clearly benefitted from the fact that the school itself was as homogenous as it could possibly be: students and teachers were more or less in the same age bracket, predominantly male, and they generally shared the same progressive-modernist outlook.

In 1951 the students lost Jordan and *PLAN* (and soon after the ArchSA itself). Thus, in the course of only a few months their accomplishments, both within and without the school, seemed to vanish into thin air. Simultaneous events in the wider world added to their growing sense of disillusionment. The implementation of drastic building cuts meant that for the first time since the war there was a decline in building production and therefore employment prospects for young architects, and the victory of the Conservative Party in the general election seemed to seal the fate of the New Jerusalem, which had driven the aspirations of postwar students and provided a tremendous stimulus to their training. It was in this situation that the council faced the task of finding a new principal for the school.





## CHAPTER 4

### MICHAEL PATTRICK'S TROUBLES WITH THE STUDENTS (1951-1956)

Following the popular Robert Furneaux Jordan would have been a challenge for any incoming principal and particularly so for the unapproachable and much disliked Michael Pattrick (1913-1980). This chapter traces the turbulent early years of Pattrick's principalship, during which he became the target of a sustained and unprecedented campaign by the students' committee to remove him from office. The first section describes the circumstances of Pattrick's controversial appointment against the students' wishes. Pattrick's initial measures, which included the restriction of group working, incensed an increasingly hostile student body, even though they were, as the second section shows, largely the result of RIBA intervention and the council's own outline policy. The students' agitation against their principal culminated in their issuing an inflammatory report on the state of the school in June 1953, and the third section illuminates the ensuing altercations within the short-lived council/staff/students' committee. The students' report reinvigorated calls for a restoration of their voting rights, and the final chapter explains how President Peter Shephard in protracted negotiations with the Ministry of Education and the Board of Trade eventually managed to achieve a compromise which from March 1956 gave students once again a say in council elections.

#### **The Reluctant Principal**

On 29 June 1951, shortly before the end of the spring term, Jordan took sick leave, and the council, at his recommendation, appointed Michael Pattrick, the most senior of the current members of staff, as acting principal.<sup>670</sup> When Jordan handed in his resignation ten days later, the council retained Pattrick as interim principal and, alarmed at the untimely departure of its previous principals, decided to give careful

---

<sup>670</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 29 June 1951, SCM 1951-63, p. 2.

consideration to its next appointment, possibly leaving the position vacant for up to a year in order to attract suitable candidates under contract elsewhere.<sup>671</sup>

William Michael Thomas Pattrick was born in 1913 and from 1931 onward had a distinguished career as an AA student, winning three annual travelling scholarships awarded to the best student in each year and selected as the council's nominee for the prestigious Rome Prize in both 1938 and 1939.<sup>672</sup> After qualifying in 1936 he was briefly employed by George Grey Wornum before entering private practice and taking up a teaching position at Cambridge in 1937. Between 1938 and 1940 he worked in Liverpool and taught at the local university as second-in-command to Brandon-Jones, now a member of the AA council.<sup>673</sup> During the war Pattrick was in charge of various projects for the Ministry of Supply and the Ministry of Aircraft Production, and in 1945 he resumed his small private practice, in later years often collaborating with his wife Jo, an interior designer, whose renown surpassed his. In September 1945 Pattrick joined the AA as a part-time tutor and began his rise through the ranks when Brown, in the wake of George Fairweather's resignation, asked the council to give his 'adjutant' a full-time contract.<sup>674</sup> As Brown's administrative assistant Pattrick masterminded the reorganisation of the school in the first half of 1946 and, once this work was completed, took charge of the third year before becoming, under Jordan, the director of technical studies.<sup>675</sup> Pattrick was thus well known and, by most accounts, rather unpopular with (at least the more vocal section of) students. This was partially due to his somewhat aloof disposition, which made him compare unfavourably with his approachable predecessor. Moreover, although Pattrick had been a member of Jordan's executive, it was assumed that he shared neither his pedagogical vision nor its underlying socio-political worldview. The choice of Pattrick as interim principal therefore caused great

---

<sup>671</sup> Meeting of the Council, 9 July 1951, CM 1949-55, p. 194; Special Meeting of the Council, 8 Oct 1951, *ibid.*, p. 201.

<sup>672</sup> In addition to winning travelling studentships in his first, third and fifth year, Pattrick was awarded a second prize in the second year. Surgery prevented him from completing his work for the Rome Prize in 1938, and AA Director Goodhart-Rendel convinced the authorities of the British School at Rome to allow Pattrick to be the AA's nominee in the following year, although he would be slightly over age. (Meetings of the School Committee, 28 June 1938, 10 Oct 1938, SCM 1937-44, pp. 49, 53.

<sup>673</sup> BLSA/Brandon-Jones.

<sup>674</sup> H. J. W. Alexander, letter to Michael Pattrick, 28 Aug 1945, AAA, Box 2003:37c; Meeting of the Council, 26 Feb 1946, CM 1940-49, p. 327; Meeting of the School Committee, 18 March 1946, SCM 1944-51, p. 53.

<sup>675</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 8 July 1946, *ibid.*, p. 63.

concern amongst the students, who feared that his permanent appointment and, by implication, the repeal of Jordan's educational system was a 'foregone conclusion'.<sup>676</sup>

The students' committee acted immediately and, on the first day of the new academic year, mobilised the student body in protest against Michael Patrick. Peter Ahrends, one of the new first-year students, remembers:

No sooner were we settled into our places when some much older students came around the studio and said that there was a protest meeting in the hall downstairs about the new principal and told us to come down. It was more or less an order because these were older people, some of whom had gone through military service. So, we all went, as a body, filtered downstairs. [...] There was no sense that one was not to participate in this completely unforeseen, unheard-of activity. Within two hours on the day you arrived you were part of this protest group which you knew nothing about. You didn't know about Patrick or Jordan or what their politics were. There was a sense of excitement which was immediately inclusive.<sup>677</sup>

Shortly after, two representatives of the students' committee met with liaison officers Hugh Casson and Peter Shephard to convey two resolutions passed almost unanimously by a students' general meeting on 5 October, demanding, respectively, the continuance of the present educational policy on the basis of staff-student co-operation and Jordan's participation in developing it further.<sup>678</sup> The council discussed these resolutions and advised the students' committee that 'decisions in these matters were in abeyance pending the appointment of a new principal, which it was hoped would be soon.'<sup>679</sup>

The position was advertised in July 1951, and by closing date on 1 September twenty-five applications had been received, out of which the officers of the council compiled a shortlist of eight candidates.<sup>680</sup> Apart from Michael Patrick the list comprised three other members of the current teaching staff (viz. Henry Elder,

---

<sup>676</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 8 Oct 1951, CM 1949-55, pp. 201-202.

<sup>677</sup> Peter Ahrends, interview with the author, 4 July 2013.

<sup>678</sup> 'Report on Recent Events in the School, and Suggestions Toward a New Policy', June 1953, AAA, Box 1991:26 (hereafter cited as Report 1953), p. 6; see also: Special Meeting of the Council, 8 Oct 1951, CM 1949-55, p. 202; Meeting of the School Committee, 11 Oct 1951, SCM 1951-63, p.11.

<sup>679</sup> *Ibid.*, p.12.

<sup>680</sup> Meeting of the Officers of the Council, 17 Sep 1951, CM 1949-55, p. 203. The twenty-five applicants were: Freddie Charles, Henry Elder, J. Godfrey Gilbert, Henry Goddard, John Netherby Graham, Denis Harper, Rolf Jensen, Norman Keep, Leonard Manasseh, Edward Mills, T. Milnes-Foden, Guy Oddie, Robert Paine, Michael Patrick, John W. Poltock, Donald Reay, Frank Risdon, J. Francis Smith, Raglan Squire, Frederick Lamond 'Jock' Sturrock, Mark Hartland Thomas, Hilton Wright, Duncan Wylson and – somewhat optimistically – David Goddard and Winston Walker.

Hilton Wright and Leonard Manasseh), along with Donald Reay, Robert Paine, Denis Harper and Edward Mills. The council itself added Guy Oddie and Jock Sturrock to this list and formed a selection sub-committee to interview the ten candidates.<sup>681</sup> In addition to a dual background in teaching and architectural practice as the standard requirements for AA principals, the council, in light of the planned reduction of the school to pre-war numbers, sought for a candidate capable of overseeing this administrative transition.<sup>682</sup> Given the extensive list, Sturrock, who was based in Cape Town, did not feel justified in making the journey to attend an interview, and of the remaining nine applicants only three managed to impress the committee. Robert Paine, the youthful head of the recently established and already highly regarded architectural school at Canterbury, was perceived as being of ‘strong character’<sup>683</sup>, but the committee felt that ‘his ideas for the future did not seem large enough.’<sup>684</sup> Donald Reay, then chief architect and planning officer for East Kilbride, on the other hand, ‘had many good ideas but no background of teaching on the scale required at a school the size of the AA.’<sup>685</sup> Moreover, Reay made it a condition that he would be allowed to continue working as a consultant for his current employer and was unable to give an assurance that he would be staying at the AA, and the committee, which considered him a ‘first-rate man’, feared that he was likely to be attracted elsewhere.<sup>686</sup>

The selection committee ‘had started upon the interviews thinking of Pattrick as scarcely in the running’<sup>687</sup> but ultimately recommended him to the council due to his ‘immense enthusiasm and knowledge of the problems to be tackled.’<sup>688</sup> In fact, there is evidence that Pattrick himself was reluctant to apply for the position. In addition to the resolutions mentioned above, the students at their general meeting on 5 October passed a further motion advising the council that ‘the confirmation of the

---

<sup>681</sup> Ibid.; Special Meeting of the Council, 8 Oct 1951, CM 1949-55, pp. 201-202. The selection committee consisted of Anthony Chitty (president), A. R. F. Anderson (vice-president), Hugh Casson (vice-president), John Brandon-Jones and Peter Shephard.

<sup>682</sup> Ibid., p. 202; ‘Principalship – Notes of the Conclusions of the Special School Committee’, att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 22 October 1951, SCM 1951-63, p. 14.

<sup>683</sup> Meeting of the Council, 30 Oct 1951, CM 1949-55, p. 206.

<sup>684</sup> Ibid.

<sup>685</sup> Ibid.

<sup>686</sup> Ibid., p. 207.

<sup>687</sup> Ibid.

<sup>688</sup> Ibid., p. 206.

acting principal as principal would not have the support of the school<sup>689</sup> and only withdrew it when Patrick assured them that he did not intend to stand for principal. Geoffrey Spyer, then the chairman of the students' committee, remained convinced that the dismissal of Jordan and the installation of Patrick were the constituent parts of a plot masterminded by a faction of the council led by Casson,<sup>690</sup> and the recollections of Brandon-Jones, one of the members of the selection committee, seem to support the assertion: 'Michael Patrick was persuaded to take the job on against his better judgment, I think. He would have liked to have been appointed vice-principal. He didn't really want to be the head.'<sup>691</sup>

Whatever the circumstances, the council was, on the whole, satisfied with the committee's recommendation. Gontran Goulden, for instance, was 'relieved at the choice'<sup>692</sup>, and Basil Ward expressed 'relief and full approval'.<sup>693</sup> When S. E. T. Cusdin wondered whether Patrick 'carried sufficient weight and was an agreeable personality likely to recruit teaching staff,'<sup>694</sup> Chitty conceded that if Patrick had a defect it was a 'slight querulousness at times and a lack of tact.'<sup>695</sup> Patrick was, however, 'well aware of criticisms from outside'<sup>696</sup> (see page 106) and gave, according to Anderson, the impression that he knew what to do to alter the 'cliquiness' in the teaching staff.<sup>697</sup> Anderson added that 'Patrick was the only candidate who made the committee sit up and think, and if he can make them feel like this, so he can the students,'<sup>698</sup> and Brandon-Jones brushed away the suggestion that Patrick was unpopular with students, insisting that this was only the case with those who had not worked with him and therefore did not actually know him.<sup>699</sup> In spite of this, two members of the council voiced reservations. Walter Atkinson admitted that he had favoured Reay, and Anthony Pott, who had studied with

---

<sup>689</sup> Report 1953, p. 6.

<sup>690</sup> Spyer, memoirs, op. cit., pp. 57-58. Spyer remembers that Casson 'fought tooth and nail to get rid of Jordan', whom he disliked both politically and personally. Jordan's 'resignation' came at just the moment when, according to Spyer, he intended to sack Michael Patrick, a close friend of Casson's. (Spyer, interview with the author, 24 July 2014.)

<sup>691</sup> BLSA/Brandon-Jones.

<sup>692</sup> Meeting of the Council, 30 Oct 1951, CM 1949-55, p. 207.

<sup>693</sup> Ibid., p. 206.

<sup>694</sup> Ibid., p. 207.

<sup>695</sup> Ibid.

<sup>696</sup> Ibid.

<sup>697</sup> Ibid.

<sup>698</sup> Ibid.

<sup>699</sup> Ibid.

Sturrock and shared an office with Oddie at the Building Research Station, expressed his disappointment over the choice since he ‘had not suspected Patrick of having a broad view of architectural education in the widest sense.’<sup>700</sup> Pott stressed that he did not doubt Patrick’s ability but wished to be convinced personally, and Patrick was invited to attend a special meeting of the council in the following week to give a prepared statement.<sup>701</sup> Patrick spoke for almost an hour, and the council after short deliberation arrived at the unanimous decision to appoint him with immediate effect.<sup>702</sup> Unprecedentedly, Patrick, who received an initial five-year contract with the stated intention to continue it for a further five-year period, was given permission to attend council meetings as a non-voting observer.<sup>703</sup>

### Unpopular Changes to the School Model

Patrick’s initial measures as principal seemed to confirm the fears of those who had seen his accession to office as spelling the end of Jordan’s educational policy. On 29 June 1951, at his first meeting with the school committee as acting principal, Patrick had been informed that the school was operating over budget, and the need to effect savings put an immediate end to the appointment of foreign teaching staff and lavish prize-giving ceremonies, both popular features of Jordan’s principalship.<sup>704</sup> In addition to this, Patrick was expected to implement the council’s policy to reduce the numbers in the school, impelling him to relegate or expel weaker students, which had rarely happened under his predecessor.<sup>705</sup>

---

<sup>700</sup> Ibid.

<sup>701</sup> Ibid., pp. 207-208.

<sup>702</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 7 Nov 1951, CM 1949-55, pp. 214-215.

<sup>703</sup> Meeting of the Council, 26 Nov 1951, *ibid.*, p. 222; H. J. W. Alexander, letter to Michael Patrick, 28 Nov 1951, AAA, Box 2003:37c; J. C. Medley, letter to Alexander, 28 Nov 1951, *ibid.*

<sup>704</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 29 June 1951, SCM 1951-63, p. 3.

<sup>705</sup> To the indignation of other schools and astonishment of the AA school committee it emerged that under Jordan some students had been allowed to transfer to the fourth-year of the AA even after failing the RIBA intermediate examination at their previous schools. (Meeting of the School Committee, 11 Oct 1951, *ibid.*, pp. 10, 11; Meeting of the Council, 30 Oct 1951, CM 1949-55, p. 209, Meeting of the School Committee, 10 Jan 1952, SCM 1951-63, p. 23; see also: Meetings of the Schools Committee, 4 Oct 1951, 3 Jan 1952, in: *Schools Committee Minutes, 1926-1973*, RIBA/ED 7.1.3, RIBA Archive, London (hereafter cited as: RIBA/ED 7.1.3.) At the end of the 1951/1952 session fourteen students were put on probation, six were relegated, and seven were advised to leave. (Meeting of the School Committee, 9 Oct 1952, *ibid.*, p. 53.)

Meanwhile, the RIBA in a departure from previous practice called on the AA to set out the action it was taking in response to the suggestions and recommendations contained in the June 1950 visiting board report (see page 113).<sup>706</sup> Patrick, who generally agreed with Jordan's comments about the report, deferred fundamental changes to the inherited curriculum;<sup>707</sup> however, he did take immediate steps to restrict group working, one of the key issues raised in the report, partly to facilitate the individual assessment of students and partly because it was the only element of the course he could change without altering the curriculum itself.<sup>708</sup> The decision brought Patrick into direct conflict with some of the more influential students in the school, notably the Zone thesis group. Rumours that the RIBA might disqualify group work altogether, and the apparent disinclination of their principal to oppose this, placed the successful completion of the two-year project in serious jeopardy. According to Andrew Derbyshire, it was only due to the backing of their tutors, specifically Arthur Korn and Ernesto Rogers, that the final thesis was eventually passed (helped, no doubt, by the fact that the lead external examiner happened to be John Madge, who had counselled the group when they started their project).<sup>709</sup> Likewise, Robert Maguire and Peter Matthews, who simply ignored Patrick's objections, only succeeded in completing their joint thesis in the following year thanks to the support of their year master Richard Eve.<sup>710</sup> Self-evidently, Patrick's measures were not primarily aimed at such outstanding students but at preventing weaker students from being carried by a stronger team – a problem which Jordan himself had acknowledged but thought negligible.<sup>711</sup>

---

<sup>706</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, *ibid.*, 11 Oct 1951, p. 11; Meeting of the Council, 30 Oct 1951, CM 1949-55, p. 210.

<sup>707</sup> 'Principal's Report', att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 6 Dec 1951, SCM 1951-63, p. 19; Jordan's comments, dated 24 Nov 1950, att. *ibid.*, p. 20. Patrick's eventual reply to the visiting board was more diplomatically worded than Jordan's original draft but similar in content: Patrick, letter to Everard Haynes, 30 Jan 1952, Meeting of the RIBA Visiting Board, 27 Feb 1952, Inset A, RIBA/ED 7.1.2.

<sup>708</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 6 Dec 1951, SCM 1951-63, p. 21.

<sup>709</sup> Andrew Derbyshire, interview with the author, 17 Oct 2013. As social housing officer at Stevenage (and AA tutor between July and December 1950) Madge was an important advisor to both the Stevenage and Zone thesis groups.

<sup>710</sup> Maguire, interview, 10 Sep 2013.

<sup>711</sup> 'The danger of group work is not that it may produce more bad results than good, but that it may produce more good results than bad – deceptively good in that individual weaknesses may be hidden. This has to be watched but on balance we feel that group work is a good form of education for the weak students who learn a great deal from others in the group.' (Jordan, comments, *op. cit.*)

Relations between Patrick and the students were dealt a further blow when the RIBA followed through with a controversial ruling on its requirements for office experience. Precipitated by reports suggesting that British architects (in comparison with their American counterparts) often lacked a proper grounding in practical knowledge and office procedure, the RIBA had, in November 1949, announced a requirement of twelve months' *postgraduate* office experience before the examination in professional practice could be taken and application for registration and associateship could be made – a directive which came into force in January 1951.<sup>712</sup> At the AA students were required to complete a year's practical experience *before* they could apply for their diploma, and the retrospectively applied RIBA regulations meant that for those graduating at the end of the 1950/1951 academic year the possibility of entering the profession and earning a living wage would be delayed by an additional year at just the moment when the postwar employment boom was drawing to an end. Worse still, the RIBA's Board of Architectural Education (BAE) refused to set up tribunals to deal with cases of hardship, and AA students, who for the past nine months had been 'protesting vigorously'<sup>713</sup> to the RIBA, felt a growing sense of disappointment, 'which in many cases amounts to real bitterness,'<sup>714</sup> and suspected the school authorities, and Michael Patrick in particular, of under-representing them on the BAE.<sup>715</sup>

---

<sup>712</sup> 'Notes and Notices', *RIBAJ*, Nov 1949, p. 29.

<sup>713</sup> Geoffrey Spyer, letter to the editor, *Builder*, 5 Oct 1951, p. 454.

<sup>714</sup> Tony Moore, letter to the editor, *AJ*, 6 March 1952, p. 296.

<sup>715</sup> Discussing two letters from Stephen Rosenberg, who had succeeded Spyer as chairman of the students' committee, the council agreed that it was 'in favour of the students' argument in this matter' and assured Rosenberg that its members serving on the relevant RIBA committees 'had expressed their views very strongly on the point of principle and that it is felt that the students were represented as forcibly as possible.' Cusdin pointed out that Patrick had filed a protest on behalf of the students; the BAE, however, had taken a 'democratic decision and [the students] should accept it as final.' (Meeting of the Council, 25 Feb 1952, CM 1949-55, p. 237; see also Report 1953, p. 6). The *Architects' Journal*, too, was sympathetic to those affected by the RIBA ruling: 'No one in the profession would think of complaining because the RIBA is seeking to improve standards within its members' ranks. But students, near the end of a five-year course – which they embarked on confident that they would finish it with their necessary qualifications – do have a righteous quarrel with the Institute.' ('Students Complaint Against RIBA', *AJ*, 5 June 1952, p. 685.) It was due to the combined pressure from students, schools and the architectural press that the RIBA council, in July 1952, changed its course and 'empowered the Board of Architectural Education to set up a machinery to deal with special cases', postponing the enforcement of the original regulations until November 1955. ('Notes and Notices', *RIBAJ*, July 1952, p. 348.)



## The Battle of the Principal

Distrustful of their principal and, by extension, the council, which – against their expressed wishes – had put him in place, the students sought closer relations with and support from the AA membership. Spyer prompted the council to consider ways of promoting the integration of students and members,<sup>716</sup> and in February 1952 the students committee organised a general meeting to discuss the state of the association.<sup>717</sup> Both ventures remained largely ineffectual, and – concerned about the apparent financial difficulties of the association, which led to a substantial rise in school fees effective from September and seemed to affect the council's deliberations regarding a possible restoration of the student vote (see page 157) – the students' committee throughout the summer term of 1952 pushed for a joint meeting with the council to 'discuss a number of matters concerning the association and its finances.'<sup>718</sup> Anxious to prevent any attempts by the students to circumvent him and undermine his authority, Patrick used his influence with the council and its school committee to ensure that no such meeting took place.<sup>719</sup> Instead, on 8 October 1952 President Anderson called an informal meeting with Patrick, secretary Alexander, staff member Ronald Sims, liaison officers Neville Conder and Richard de Yarburgh-Bateson, and three members of the students' committee (Brian Falk, Tony Shepherd and Alan Graham), which resulted in the formation of the so-called 'council/staff/students' committee' – an unprecedented, if ultimately short-lived, panel bringing together the various stakeholders with the objective to bridge the 'split between the club and the school' and 'make the AA more of an association.'<sup>720</sup>

Though initially conducted in a constructive, almost amicable fashion, the meetings of the council/staff/students' committee could not dispel the students' mistrust and

---

<sup>716</sup> Prize Giving 1951, op. cit., pp. 56-57; Geoffrey Spyer, 'AA Students' Club', *ibid.*, Sep/Oct 1951, vol. 67, no. 755, p. 91; Meeting of the Council, 30 Oct 1951, CM 1949-55, p. 213.

<sup>717</sup> 'Quo Vadis, Architectural Association', op. cit., pp. 206-217. The speakers were Anthony Cox on the past, John Kay on the present, and Terry Knight on the future of the AA.

<sup>718</sup> Meeting of the Council, CM 1949-55, 7 July 1952, p. 276.

<sup>719</sup> See e.g.: Meetings of the School Committee, 19 June 1952, 9 Oct 1952, SCM 1951-63, pp. 46, 51. Patrick also obtained a change to the regulations guiding the meetings between the students' committee and the liaison officers, which henceforth were only allowed to take place in his presence. ('Summary of Findings of Special School Committee', 15 April 1953, *ibid.*, p. 64.)

<sup>720</sup> Tony Shepherd (chairman of the students' committee), quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 8 Oct 1952, CSSCM 1952-53, p. 1; see also: Meeting of the Council, 28 Oct 1952, CM 1949-55, p. 284. Between October 1952 and December 1953 the committee met a total of eight times to discuss social, financial and educational matters.

dislike of Patrick, who appeared intent on changing the face of the school and who, true to the 'querulousness' which Chitty had attributed to him, aggravated matters through his rather ruthless approach.<sup>721</sup> Over the course of almost two years the students' committee pursued an overt campaign initiated by chairman Spyer and vice-chairman John Smith to get Patrick removed from office, and things eventually came to a head at an extraordinary general meeting of students on 12 March 1953. Two days prior, Anderson, upon hearing of the students' intention to debate a motion of censure on the principal, had advised the students' committee that no meeting involving a discussion of the association's employees must take place and ruled the item on the agenda out of order.<sup>722</sup> He did, however, give his consent to a meeting on 'the education at the AA and present state of unrest', whereupon the students – unsurprisingly and much to Patrick's indignation – reverted to their original plan and 'discussed exactly what they had been told not to discuss.'<sup>723</sup> Just over half of all students attended the meeting and passed an almost unanimous vote of no confidence in the principal and a request to the council to consider a new appointment.<sup>724</sup> The council, which met on 30 March, refused to examine the report of the students' meeting in detail and expressed their 'complete confidence in [Patrick] as principal of the school', forbidding the students any further discussion about its employees.<sup>725</sup> Patrick himself, who had been 'completely unaware [...] that something like this was brewing up,'<sup>726</sup> hoped that, given the unqualified support of

---

<sup>721</sup> Spyer remembers a 'very unpleasant' meeting in summer 1951 between himself, his deputy John Smith and Patrick concerning a fourth-year student who was threatened with expulsion: 'He had been a submarine commander in the war and, as a result of his experiences, was having regular psychiatric treatment. His work was well above par but he had some difficulties in meeting the hand-in dates. Jordan and all the year staff had been supportive of him and had not penalised him for this, but Patrick was determined to set an example. We protested and were told it was none of our business and were threatened with suspension if we took the matter any further. Again there was a hastily called students' meeting at which there was total solidarity with us and the threat of a general walk-out combined with notification to the press and the ex-servicemen's organisations if any action were taken against the student himself or John and me. Patrick backed down.' (Spyer, memoirs, op. cit., pp. 58-59.) In an interview with the author Spyer recalled similar occurrences, which for ethical reasons are not deemed fit for publication (Spyer, interview, op. cit.)

<sup>722</sup> H. J. W. Alexander, letter to Alan Graham (chairman of the students' committee), 10 March 1953, AAA, Box 1991:26; see also: Meeting of the Council, 30 March 1953, CM 1949-55, pp. 312-313.

<sup>723</sup> Patrick, quoted in: Special Meeting of the Council, 25 June 1953, verbatim minutes, AAA, Box 1991:26. Anderson himself was fully aware that this was going to happen and told the officers of the council in a closed meeting: 'I knew the students would discuss the principal and I knew it would probably be improper and unconstitutional, but I thought it was a good thing to let them blow off steam [...].' ('Statement made by the President to the Officers of the Council', 16 March 1953, *ibid.*)

<sup>724</sup> Meeting of the Council, 30 March 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 313.

<sup>725</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>726</sup> Patrick, letter to A. R. F. Anderson, 13 March 1953, AAA, Box 1991:26.

the council, he might be able to ‘ease matters’<sup>727</sup> with the students. However, despite holding a series of weekly meetings with them during the Easter holidays, in May 1953 he conceded that he was ‘not able to say that any common ground of agreement had been reached.’<sup>728</sup>

In fact, Pattrick underestimated the gravity of the situation. Drawing their inspiration from the Yellow Book (see page 34), the students’ committee had appointed a sub-committee to draft a ‘Report on Recent Events in the School, and Suggestions Toward a New Policy’, which it intended to circulate to the membership.<sup>729</sup> Completed in June 1953, the report was a peculiar hybrid of two wildly inconsistent parts reflecting the dual catalyst for what Peter Ahrends recalled as the ‘rumbling discontent’<sup>730</sup> amongst the student body: on the one hand, the growing alienation between the school and the association, which had its origins in the disenfranchisement of the students in 1939; on the other, the more immediate issues pertaining to the circumstances and consequences of Pattrick’s appointment.

Accordingly, the main body of the report outlined the ‘factors which have lead [...] to the present decline of the AA school’<sup>731</sup> and put forward a number of ‘constructive proposals’ towards improving the situation. The majority of these concerned the educational policy of the school and included the re-introduction of the unit system, the continuance of training into practice through refresher and postgraduate courses, the coordination of the training of builders and architects, the continuance and expansion of contacts abroad through exchange schemes and foreign staff, the adoption of a liberal educational model and – triggered by recent events and somewhat quixotic – the possible foregoing of RIBA recognition to enable the AA to ‘follow its own course unhindered.’<sup>732</sup> In addition, the report listed

---

<sup>727</sup> Meeting of the Council, 30 March 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 313.

<sup>728</sup> Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 21 May 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 330.

<sup>729</sup> Report 1953; see also: Meeting of the Students Committee, 8 June 1953, AAA, Box 1991:26. The students’ committee at the time comprised Alistair Bevington, John Winter, Derek Montefiore (5<sup>th</sup> year); Theo Jacobs, Robin Clarke (4<sup>th</sup> year); Colin Glennie, John Guest, Frank Musson (3<sup>rd</sup> year); Sam Stevens, Lynden Herbert, David Heal (2<sup>nd</sup> year); Joanna Bridgwater, Stuart Lewis, Derek MacLean (1<sup>st</sup> year). Ronald Jones, the third 4<sup>th</sup>-year representative had resigned before his term was over – whether in connection with the report or not is unknown.

<sup>730</sup> Ahrends, interview, *op. cit.*

<sup>731</sup> Report 1953, Preamble.

<sup>732</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5; see also p. 209.

a number of suggestions relating to the association as a whole, specifically the re-branding of the *AA Journal* as a proper architectural magazine run by an editorial board with student participation, the furtherance of collaborative projects between members and students, and – most importantly – the restoration of the student vote (see page 157).

In sharp contrast to the constructive proposals in the main section of the report, the preamble and particularly the appendix, which gave a history of events over the past two years, served no discernible purpose other than to launch a scathing attack on the principal and, to a lesser extent, the council itself. Predictably, neither of them was inclined to sanction the dissemination of such a document, and on 9 June 1953 the council resolved that ‘no lobbying of this nature be permitted and that, through the Principal, the students be so informed.’<sup>733</sup> Having secured the consensus of the council, the year masters’ committee and the AA’s solicitor ‘that the most important issue was to prevent, at all costs, the distribution of an unauthorised document which might harm the association’<sup>734</sup>, Patrick on 12 June sent a letter to Colin Glennie, the new chairman of the students’ committee, advising him that a ‘deliberate disregard of the council’s order’ might result in the expulsion of those concerned.<sup>735</sup> Four days later, unsatisfied with Glennie’s reply, Patrick summoned Derek Montefiore, the chairman of the students’ report sub-committee, and told him to instruct his printers to stop all work at once.<sup>736</sup> On the following day Patrick met with the students’ committee as a whole, assuring it that the matters referred to in its report were to be discussed in the first instance by the council/staff/students’ committee whilst reminding them that he had ‘sole and complete authority over all student activities’ and that no matter touching on the school or its educational policy could be made the subject of any type of report unless it received his prior

---

<sup>733</sup> Meeting of the Council, 9 June 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 337.

<sup>734</sup> ‘Principal’s Report’, 18 June 1953, att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 22 June 1953, SCM 1951-63, p. 77.

<sup>735</sup> Patrick, letter to Glennie, 12 June 1953, AAA, Box 1991:26.

<sup>736</sup> Montefiore remembers: ‘I went to his study and said: “This is the situation. The students object very strongly to the way you handle matters.” He turned around and said: “I’m running this school now, and I am going to run it my way. I think you’d better go back to the students’ committee and tell them this. If you don’t climb down and withdraw what you are going to write, I am going to expel you all.” And I said: “But you can’t do a thing like that.” And he said: “I can”, and he produced something that said that he could on the principal’s rights and said: “This is your last year, isn’t it? You’re in the last term. Do you really want to be expelled and not be able to be qualified?” He was quite mean.’ (Interview with the author, 5 July 2013.)

approval.<sup>737</sup> Patrick rejected the students' justification of their conduct as being in keeping with a 'type of "unwritten" constitution'<sup>738</sup> and acted on the legally sound, if somewhat insensitive, premise that 'they have no constitutional rights whatever.'<sup>739</sup>

Even so, Patrick empathised with the students, whose recalcitrance he saw as an understandable reaction to the worsening employment prospects awaiting them upon qualification, and stubbornly refused to take their attacks personally (even when they were meant to be). In a memorandum to the school committee he considered that the students' report was 'undoubtedly quite unsuitable for printing and distribution, but when compared with some student manifestos it would seem to be quite tame' and asked the members of the committee to 'understand that however wild and illogical the students' proposals may be, they are, for the most part, entirely sincere, and therefore deserve serious consideration.'<sup>740</sup> In order to do so, Hugh Casson, who had taken over the presidency from Anderson, called a meeting of the council/staff/students' committee on 18 June to examine the report paragraph by paragraph.<sup>741</sup> The non-student members were impressed with the students' constructive proposals, many of which they considered 'worthy of support'<sup>742</sup>, but saw the overall validity (and therefore publishability) of the report severely diminished by a number of 'inaccuracies and misconceptions'<sup>743</sup>. In particular, the council representatives on the committee rejected the appendix as being 'detrimental to the interests of the association'<sup>744</sup> and – given the students'

---

<sup>737</sup> 'Principal's Report', 18 June 1953, op. cit. Colin Glennie resigned his position as chairman of the students' committee following the meeting with Patrick in favour of Alan Diprose, but he remained a member of both the students' committee and the council/staff/students' committee.

<sup>738</sup> Ibid.; see also: Patrick to Anderson, 16 March 1953, op. cit.: 'The events of the last eighteen years have provided the AA student with an unwritten, but very real constitution. They believe most sincerely that they have a right to discuss these matters publically, and even the most mature would be genuinely affronted if anyone disagreed with this view.'

<sup>739</sup> Patrick, quoted in: Special Meeting of the School Committee, 15 April 1953, verbatim minutes, att. to: SCM 1951-63, p. 66. The other members of the school committee (with the exception of Casson) agreed with Patrick's assessment but were hesitant to put it to the students so bluntly: 'It is absolutely true to say that they have no constitutional rights, but that will only make them even more angry.' (Gontran Goulden, quoted *ibid.*) The committee also shared Patrick's conviction that 'the students of today were under a false impression as to their privileges, and were filled with incorrect propaganda as to their powers before the removal of the student vote.' (*Ibid.*, p. 64.)

<sup>740</sup> 'Principal's Report', 18 June 1953.

<sup>741</sup> The new panel comprised Casson, Patrick, Alexander, Conder, Peter Shephard (who had replaced Yarburgh-Bateson as liaison officer), Sims, John Dennys (as additional staff member), and Glennie, Alan Diprose, John Winter and Alistair Bevington for the students' committee.

<sup>742</sup> Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 18 June 1953, CSSCM 1952-53, p. 10.

<sup>743</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>744</sup> Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 18 June 1953, *ibid.*, p. 10.

unwillingness to withdraw it – categorically refused to consider issuing the report to the membership. Casson warned the students that they might be expelled should they proceed with their plans for publication,<sup>745</sup> and Patrick himself threatened to take legal action:

You cannot surely in your wildest dreams imagine that I am going to agree to the circulation of this document on recent history. It would put me in a position of having to sue for damages [...]. I would certainly bring an action on it.<sup>746</sup>

Alarmed by indications that the report was being leaked to sympathetic sections of the membership, the council on 25 June 1953 convened a special meeting to discuss the situation.<sup>747</sup> Patrick himself made it clear that he ‘did not want to sack anybody’,<sup>748</sup> but some members of the council were considerably less lenient. Brandon-Jones felt that ‘the time has come now for something to be done’,<sup>749</sup> and so did Yarbrugh-Bateson:

Regarding what has become the Battle of the Principal, I think that the students should be informed as strongly as possible [...] that any student, who is dissatisfied with the way that the Principal is running the school, has the remedy in his own hands. He can seek his architectural education elsewhere.<sup>750</sup>

---

<sup>745</sup> Casson, quoted *ibid.*: ‘It does not do you or the AA any good if you are sent down. [...] It is in your contract that you are subject to conditions and if you don’t agree to them you are bound to leave or run the risk of being asked to leave.’

<sup>746</sup> Patrick, quoted *ibid.* Patrick’s threat to sue for libel was directed at the AA rather than the students.

<sup>747</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 25 June 1953, CM 1949-55, pp. 343-345; Special Meeting, 25 June 1953, verbatim, *op. cit.* On 20 June Casson had received a letter from Geoffrey Salmon, a recent graduate of the school, who asked him on behalf of a group of members to revoke the previous council’s directive forbidding students to discuss the school staff at their meetings. (Salmon, letter to Casson, 20 June 1953, AAA, Box 1991:26.) Casson defended the council’s ruling (Casson, letter to Salmon, 22 June 1953, *ibid.*), and three days later the group consisting of Salmon, Thurston Williams, Terry Knight, John Smith and six unnamed others sent in a notice of requisition for a special general meeting on the subject of the ‘lamentable state of discord within the AA school.’ (Special Meeting of the Council, 25 June 1953, *op. cit.*, p. 343.) Owing to a loophole in the constitution of the AA the council could not prevent members from discussing this topic and the respective personalities publicly at a special general meeting; however, it could – and made clear that it would – prevent students from attending. The requisitionists therefore withdrew their request for a special general meeting and instead organised an ‘informal discussion’ (which allowed the presence of students but not the passing of any resolutions). The discussion under the heading ‘Future of the AA’ took place on 30 June 1954 and was followed by a similar informal general meeting on 19 Jan 1955. (‘A Policy for the AA’, *AAJ*, July/Aug 1954, vol. 70, no. 784, pp. 50-57; ‘Integration of Members and Students’, *ibid.*, Feb 1955, vol. 70, no. 789, pp. 176-186.)

<sup>748</sup> Quoted in: Special Meeting, 25 June 1953, verbatim.

<sup>749</sup> Brandon-Jones, quoted *ibid.*

<sup>750</sup> Yarbrugh-Bateson, letter to Casson, 23 June 1953, AAA, Box 1991:26. Graeme Shankland took the view that ‘the situation will get very much worse, if action of this rather disciplinary kind is put forward’ (quoted in: Special Meeting, 25 June 1953, verbatim), and Patrick – unlike the majority of council members – concurred.

After lengthy discussion the council passed a vote of confidence in Patrick and defeated a motion by two new members, Graeme Shankland and Oliver Cox, to allow the publication of the report 'subject to the students excluding references to personalities [i.e. without the appendix] and correcting inaccuracies.'<sup>751</sup> The council expressed the hope that the discussion on the students' constructive proposals would be continued and, at the beginning of the following month, reconvened the council/staff/students' committee to this end.<sup>752</sup> The student representatives, however, were not content with limiting the debate to their proposals and urged the council to rescind its directive banning any discussion of the association's employees, not least because it prevented the council/staff/students' committee from examining the report in full. Unimpressed by the students' committee's threat to resign, the council confirmed its ruling at a special meeting on 13 July,<sup>753</sup> though it held out little hope that this would change the attitude of the student representatives on the council/staff/students' committee. In anticipation of the coming meeting on 21 July, Sims wrote to Casson: 'There remains the offending appendix. In my view it would be monstrous for the Principal to sit through any discussion of this; yet I feel that the students are looking forward to this being done.'<sup>754</sup> In the event, Casson used a doctor's appointment as an excuse to cancel the meeting and decided not to re-assemble the committee until a meeting of the officers of the council had been held on 28 July, at which they reaffirmed that preamble and appendix of the report 'were not to be treated as a subject for discussion.'<sup>755</sup>

---

<sup>751</sup> Ibid. Brandon-Jones was in no doubt that much of the students' agitation was due to the fact that they had been 'deliberately misinformed on certain matters for the reason that people have been wanting to make things difficult for Patrick' (quoted *ibid.*). One of these people was Cox, and a brief verbal exchange highlights the differences in view. Cox: 'There are certain things in the report which would make it impossible for me to vote in favour of this issue [i.e. confidence in the principal]. We have had no discussion on the detailed points in this report which leave things open to me. The students maintain [...] that they were not in favour of Mr. Patrick's appointment.' – Shephard: 'The appointment of the principal has nothing to do with the students.' – Cox: 'Personally I feel it has a great deal to do with the students.' – Atkinson: '[...] I think Mr. Cox's remark is out of order and should be over-ruled.' (*Ibid.*)

<sup>752</sup> The panel now comprised Casson, Alexander, Patrick, Sims, Shephard, Beak Adams (who had replaced Conder as liaison officer) as well as Alan Diprose, John Winter and Theo Jacobs for the students' committee and Brandon-Jones as co-opted member.

<sup>753</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 13 July 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 354; see also: [Casson], 'President's Address to All Students', 15 July 1953, AAA, Box 1991:26.

<sup>754</sup> Sims, letter to Casson, 17 July 1953, *ibid.*

<sup>755</sup> Meeting of the Officers of the Council, 28 July 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 358; see also: Casson, letter to Sims, 17 July 1953, AAA, Box 1991:26.

Despite the students' continuing objections, which caused growing irritation amongst the members of council,<sup>756</sup> the final meetings of the council/staff/students' committee were thus solely concerned with the progress made in connection with the constructive proposals. The council had set up a sub-committee to investigate means to foster the integration of members and students as well as an 'AA Journal advisory group', whose recommendation for the creation of an editorial board with student participation was eventually implemented in January 1955.<sup>757</sup> However, the most significant outcome of the controversy surrounding the student report was the council's decision – rather unceremoniously agreed at its meeting of 13 July 1953 – to work towards a restoration of the student vote.<sup>758</sup> In fact, the members of council urged the students to withdraw the appendix of their report not least because they felt that it would jeopardise their case before the membership: 'If this is leaked to the members it would stop all hope of the vote being returned.'<sup>759</sup> Yet the students' committee, to the council's amazement, valued their opposition to the principal higher than the implementation of any of their proposals and, after another unsuccessful attempt to have the matter discussed at the council/staff/students' committee meeting of 1 December, resigned en bloc.<sup>760</sup>

---

<sup>756</sup> 'We do feel absolutely at the end of our tether. I think if you had any sense at all you would drop this thing and never bring it up again. It is a document which can only be described as childish and does you no good at all.' (Shepherd, quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 12 Nov 1953, CSSCM 1952-53, p. 20.)

<sup>757</sup> The 'Sub-Committee for Integration of Students and Members' was chaired by Beak Adams and presented its final report in May 1954. (Meeting of the Council, 24 May 1954, CM 1949-55, p. 407; see also: Beak Adams, 'Integration of Students and Members – Preliminary Report of Working Party, 30 Oct 1953', 13 Nov 1953, AAA, Box 1991:26.) The AA Journal advisory group, which consisted of Oliver Cox (council), Arthur Korn (staff), and students Appleyard and Glennie (the latter subsequently replaced by, first, Kenneth Frampton, and then Derek Maclean) submitted its report in June 1954. ('Report of the Journal Advisory Group on the AA Journal', June 1954, in: *Minutes of the AA Journal Advisory Group 1953-1954*, AAA, Box C302, pp. 60-63; see also: Meetings of the Council, 13 July 1953, 27 Oct 1953, 3 Jan 1955, CM 1949-55, pp. 352; 359, 454.)

<sup>758</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 13 July 1953, *ibid.*, p. 354.

<sup>759</sup> Brandon-Jones, quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 12 Nov 1953, CSSCM 1952-53, p. 20. At an earlier meeting Casson had told the students: 'If you are accepted as a member you have got to be responsible about what you do, and the fact that the students' committee produce irresponsible suggestions would not help you. As a member receiving this through the post I think I would not do anything but be unsympathetic, putting it mildly.' (Meeting of the Council/Staff/Student' Committee', 18 June 1953, *ibid.*, p. 11.)

<sup>760</sup> Meeting of the Council, 4 Jan 1954, CM 1949-55, p. 375.



## The Return of the Student Vote

The most momentous proposal contained in the students' report was their plea for a restoration of their voting rights, and to fully understand the ensuing debate we need to briefly redirect our attention to the immediate postwar years. When the council relinquished its annual MOE grant in March 1946 (see page 51), it effectively removed the chief obstacle for a reinstatement of the student vote. However, it was not until the following year and the publication of Summerson's booklet on the history of the AA that the students in their majority became aware that their predecessors had been equal members of the association. The students' committee took the matter up at once and in December 1947 obtained President Robertson's assurance that it was on the agenda of the council's development sub-committee.<sup>761</sup> In January 1948 Gordon Brown told the council that the student vote was one of the matters 'holding the attention of students at the present time'<sup>762</sup>, and one month later, concerned about 'any intense feeling on the matter being aroused in the school'<sup>763</sup>, he urged it to 'come to an immediate decision about the student vote or, alternatively, postpone discussion for a definitely stated time.'<sup>764</sup> The council, however, advised that the matter was in abeyance pending completion of the sub-committee's enquiry – a process which, as we saw in previous chapters, dragged on until July 1949.<sup>765</sup> By that time Jordan had succeeded Brown as head of the school, and though the question of the student vote never disappeared entirely from the agenda, the initial sense of urgency was clearly lost, presumably because Jordan involved students actively in the school's affairs and their lack of influence on council policy seemed therefore of lesser importance.<sup>766</sup>

---

<sup>761</sup> AA Students' Committee, 'The Student Vote: A Report on Its History, the Present Position and the Future', Nov 1951, AAA, Box 1991:7.

<sup>762</sup> Quoted in: Meeting of the Council, 26 Jan 1948, CM 1940-49, p. 454.

<sup>763</sup> Quoted in: Meeting of the Council, 23 Feb 1948, *ibid.*, p. 465.

<sup>764</sup> Quoted *ibid.*

<sup>765</sup> *Ibid.* The students' committee meanwhile discussed the matter in a series of 'compulsory' (but nonetheless poorly attended) year meetings and submitted its own findings as evidence to the development sub-committee. ('Reinstatement of the Student Vote. Condensed Report of Discussion Groups open to all Students Held on 3 March 1948', attached to: Garland Grylls (chairman of the students' committee), letter to Howard Robertson, 22 June 1948, AAA, Box 1991:7; see also: 'Student Vote', Nov 1951, *op. cit.*)

<sup>766</sup> Even so, the council discussed the matter on a number of occasions; see e.g.: 'The Student Vote', 6 January 1950, AAA, Box 1991:7; Meeting of the Council, 29 Jan 1951, CM 1949-55, p. 153.

Michael Patrick's appointment changed all this. In November 1951 Stephen Rosenberg, who had succeeded Spyer as chairman of the students' committee, raised the matter of the student vote with the council's general purpose committee, which agreed to call a special meeting and asked him to submit a written report as a basis for discussion.<sup>767</sup> The council itself was meanwhile preoccupied with finding additional sources of income (see Chapter 8) and, whilst not in principle averse to the idea of reinstating the students' voting rights, sought to avoid any controversial topic which might jeopardise its approaches to outside bodies, specifically the MOE. Thus, when it discussed the question in February 1952, it felt it 'not an opportune time to take a vote on the matter'<sup>768</sup> and referred it back to the general purpose committee, which two months later submitted a memorandum advocating the granting of voting rights to fourth- and fifth-year students of 'no less than one year's standing.'<sup>769</sup> The council decided to consult 'certain outside authorities'<sup>770</sup> on this proposal and made a tentative approach to Frederick Bray, the responsible under-secretary at the MOE, who, however, took an 'unfavourable view' of even a partial restoration of the student vote.<sup>771</sup>

It was in this situation that in October 1952 President Anderson called the inaugural meeting of the council/staff/students' committee with the dual purpose of discussing means to improve the students' relations with the ordinary members and informing them about the financial reasons for the council's hesitation in addressing the student vote. From the students' point of view, the two issues were causally linked since the schism dividing the association evidently only existed because there were two separate classes of membership to begin with. Whilst the students welcomed suggestions for greater cooperation with the membership, they saw these as 'interim provisions'<sup>772</sup>, subordinate to the restoration of the student vote (and thus the

---

<sup>767</sup> [Stephen Rosenberg], 'Report from the Chairman of the Students' Committee to the General Purpose Committee', 4 Dec 1951, att. to: 'Student Vote', Nov 1951. The chairperson of the students' committee was ex-officio member of the general purpose committee.

<sup>768</sup> Meeting of the Council, 25 Feb 1952, CM 1949-55, p. 242.

<sup>769</sup> 'The AA Student Vote. Memorandum for Submission to the Council on 28 April 1952 from the General Purpose Committee', Box 2006:S57, AAA.

<sup>770</sup> Meeting of the Council, 28 April 1952, CM 1949-55, p. 263.

<sup>771</sup> Meeting of the Council, 26 May 1952, *ibid.*, pp. 265-266.

<sup>772</sup> Rosenberg, 'Report to GPC, 4 Dec 1951, *op. cit.*

abolition of probationary membership), which they consequently put forward as one of the proposals in their 1953 report.<sup>773</sup>

The student representatives on the council/staff/students' committee, which discussed the issue at three consecutive meetings in June and July (i.e. the ones called by Casson; see page 153), demanded no less than 'full membership'<sup>774</sup>, including the right to elect student members to the council. Patrick had no objections to students casting their votes for ordinary members but rejected any scenario which might result in 'a student in the school to sit on the council' and thought it unlikely that the membership would agree to this.<sup>775</sup> As representative of the staff, who were themselves debarred from serving on the council, Ronald Sims was concerned about the 'possibility of students controlling the staff'<sup>776</sup>, and the other non-student members of the committee, all of whom supported the return of the student vote in some form, were almost unanimous in their view that there would have to be safeguards to prevent students from controlling the policy of the school (which was, of course, precisely what the students had in mind).<sup>777</sup> Nonetheless, the committee agreed to recommend that the council should 'favourably consider [...] the abolition of the probationary membership class and the awarding to students of complete parity of membership with entitlement to vote,'<sup>778</sup> and the council duly did so at its special meeting on 13 July. Somewhat suspiciously, it reached its agreement to recommend the restoration of the student vote at just the moment when Patrick had momentarily left the meeting, thereby overturning an earlier decision to review the past history concerning the student vote and discuss it at a future meeting.<sup>779</sup> Patrick was understandably taken aback by this 'direct reversal of the policy expressed [...] earlier on in the evening' and, in view of the fact that 'the staff are

---

<sup>773</sup> Report 1953, p. 3.

<sup>774</sup> Alan Diprose, quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 2 July 1953, CSSCM 1952-53, p. 14.

<sup>775</sup> Patrick, quoted *ibid.*; see also: Patrick, quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 30 Jan 1953, *ibid.*, p. 9: 'If this is a vote for getting members on the council I cannot see anything against it at all.'

<sup>776</sup> Sims, quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 18 June 1953, *ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>777</sup> The sole exception was Beak Adams, who sided with the students: 'I don't want the whole point of the Association to be lost by giving the students the vote and taking away from them the responsibility of controlling the Association. In that case there is no point in students having their vote. I think they should really be allowed to control their own education to a certain extent.' (Quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 2 July 1953, *ibid.*, p. 14.)

<sup>778</sup> Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 2 and 8 July 1953, *ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>779</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 13 July 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 354.

strongly opposed to this,' asked Casson to meet his year masters to tell them directly 'what it is the council proposes to do.'<sup>780</sup> In fact, the council itself was 'confused as to exactly what had been agreed,'<sup>781</sup> and almost four months later it was, to Patrick's growing despair, still 'divided in its view as to what form of vote it was intended to recommend the membership to restore.'<sup>782</sup>

On 23 November the council at long last met to decide whether to advance complete parity for students or merely the granting of voting rights, i.e. the abolition or the modification of the probationary class of membership. After lengthy debate the council agreed upon the latter course, and within a couple of days the AA's solicitor, R. G. Medley of Field Roscoe & Co., approached the Board of Trade (BOT), whose prior consent to any alteration in the articles of the association was indispensable under the Companies Act.<sup>783</sup> The students' committee resigned shortly after, and the council/staff/students' committee was dissolved and never reconvened.<sup>784</sup> The students thus forfeited the opportunity to obtain first-hand information of – and possibly contribute to – the protracted negotiations which began at the beginning of the following year when the BOT upon consultation with the MOE declined to consent to the proposed alteration.<sup>785</sup> Pressed for the reasons for its refusal, R. J. Crabb of the BOT informed Medley that the MOE, having insisted on the AA introducing the change before the war, was not prepared to depart from this view. However, off the record, the BOT indicated 'just a possibility, but no more than that' that the Ministry might assent to an amended proposal whereby students would be permitted to nominate and vote for a small minority of the council.<sup>786</sup>

---

<sup>780</sup> Patrick, letter to Casson, 14 July 1953, AAA, Box 1991:26.

<sup>781</sup> Meeting of the Officers of the Council, 28 July 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 357.

<sup>782</sup> Meeting of the Council, 9 Nov 1953, *ibid.*, p. 366.

<sup>783</sup> Meeting of the Council, 23 Nov 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 373; H. J. W. Alexander, letter to Medley, 24 Nov 1953, AAA, Box 1991:7; Medley, letter to the BOT, 26 Nov 1953, AAA, Box 2006:S57.

<sup>784</sup> The timing might suggest that the students' committee resigned in protest to the council's decision not to recommend full parity, of which the students were informed on 1 Dec 1953 (Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 1 Dec 1953, CSSCM 1952-53, p. 22). However, if anything, this was only the final straw, the real reason being the council's continued unwillingness to rescind its ruling regarding discussion of its employees, as discussed on page 155.

<sup>785</sup> R. J. Crabb (BOT), letter to Field Roscoe & Co., 21 Jan 1954, AAA, Box 2006:S57; see also: S. J. Barker (MOE), letter to R. J. Crabb (BOT), 14 Jan 1954, TNA: ED 74/72.

<sup>786</sup> Medley, letter to Alexander, 2 Feb 1954, AAA, Box 2006:S57; see also: Medley, letter to the BOT, 27 Jan 1954, *ibid.*

In a letter to the students' committee Casson expressed the council's 'great disappointment'<sup>787</sup> with the BOT's decision and promised to make representation 'at the highest level'<sup>788</sup>. Thus, at the end of April 1954 he led an AA delegation to meet with under-secretary Frederick Bray, who told them that, as a matter of principle, the MOE considered it reprehensible that students should have control over the government of the school; however, if the AA felt strongly about it, he himself would not object to limited rights being given to students whereby they might vote for not more than two (out of a total of 18) members of the council.<sup>789</sup> Whilst Medley was working out a new proposal along these lines, the financial situation of the AA worsened (see page 207), and the council, in the process of approaching possible donors (including the MOE), informed its advisory council on 27 April 1954 that the student vote was now 'temporarily an academic question' which was not being considered 'as one of tremendous urgency'.<sup>790</sup>

It was not until November that the new president, Peter Shephard, resumed negotiations with the MOE<sup>791</sup>, and on 13 December he met with Bray, Patrick and Alexander to discuss the latest proposal whereby students would have the right to nominate as many candidates for the council as they wished, provided these were full (i.e. non-student) members, but would only be entitled to cast two votes (as opposed to full members, who could cast a maximum of ten votes, one for each ordinary member of the council, the eight officers being returned unopposed).<sup>792</sup> Bray considered this suggestion practicable, and the BOT eventually approved the intended alteration to the articles of association at the end of April 1955.<sup>793</sup>

---

<sup>787</sup> Casson, letter to Brian Smith (chairman of the students' committee), 1 March 1954, *ibid.*

<sup>788</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>789</sup> Ministry of Education, 'Interview Memorandum', 23 April 1954, TNA: ED 74/72. The AA delegation consisted of Casson, Shephard, Clarke-Hall, Patrick and Alexander.

<sup>790</sup> Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 27 April 1954, CM 1949-55, p. 411.

<sup>791</sup> Memorandum of a telephone conversation between Shephard and Bray, 3 Nov 1954, AAA, Box 2006:S57; see also: Meeting of the Council, 22 Nov 1954, CM 1949-55, p. 448.

<sup>792</sup> Meeting between Shephard, Patrick, Alexander and Bray, 13 Dec 1954, AAA, Box 2006:S57; see also: Minute of a telephone conversation between Shephard and Bray, 21 Dec 1954, *ibid.* The AA advised students to complete their National Service before entering the school but admitted them to probationary membership if they so desired. In light of that, the council narrowly carried a motion precluding first-year students from voting in order to prevent people who had no personal knowledge of the AA from having a say in its affairs. (Meeting of the Council, 3 Jan 1955, CM 1949-55, p. 453; see also: Alexander, letter to Medley, 5 Jan 1955, AAA, Box 2006:S57.)

<sup>793</sup> Medley, letter to the BOT, 8 Feb 1955, *ibid.*; Meeting of the Council, 25 April 1955, CM 1949-55, p. 482.

Predictably, when the proposed changes were put up for discussion at a special general meeting of the AA on 7 December 1955, many attendees expressed disappointment about the fact that they would not ‘see the restoration of the 1938 situation.’<sup>794</sup> It was, however, generally accepted that under the circumstances it was the best outcome that could be achieved, and a motion to circulate the voting papers along with a verbatim report of the meeting to the membership was passed.<sup>795</sup> Peter Shepherd, due to whose initiative a workable compromise had finally been manufactured, remained sceptical whether the general membership would actually agree to it,<sup>796</sup> but his concerns proved unfounded, for when the result of the postal ballot was announced on 8 March 1956, an overwhelming majority had voted in favour of the proposal.<sup>797</sup> Two months later the AA elected a new council, and both Anthony Cox and Bill Howell, the two candidates put forward by the students’ committee, obtained the necessary number of votes.<sup>798</sup>

By the time the student vote was finally restored, the ex-service students, who had originally orchestrated the fight for re-enfranchisement and against the principal, had mostly left the school. The last FET-grant-aided students had entered the AA in 1951, and one year later the average age in the first-year course dropped from twenty-four to eighteen.<sup>799</sup> The student body in the mid-1950s was not only younger but – unaffected by the hopes and ambitions of the immediate postwar period – politically and socially considerably less enthused. John Miller, who started his course in 1950, when the first signs of this change were becoming evident, remembers being confronted by the promoters of the various political societies on his second day in school: ‘We were bemused by these energetic and rather hairy men who came in and tried to ingratiate us into their clubs. I didn’t join any of them, nor did any of my mates at the time.’<sup>800</sup> Four years later, Dennis Spencer Roberts, the

---

<sup>794</sup> Gordon Michell, quoted in: ‘Alteration of By-laws – Report of the Discussion at the Special General Meeting Held on 7<sup>th</sup> December 1955’, AAA, Box 1991:7.

<sup>795</sup> Ibid.

<sup>796</sup> Ibid.

<sup>797</sup> Ibid.; Ralph Spicer, Brian Taylor, Patrick Barry (scrutineers), letter to Alexander, 8 March 1956, AAA, Box 1991:7. The result was 708 for, 182 against.

<sup>798</sup> Meeting of the Council, 28 May 1956, CM 1955-61, p. 58; see also: John Williams (chairman of the students’ committee), ‘The Student Vote 1956’, circular letter to students, n.d., AAA, Box 2003:6b.

<sup>799</sup> ‘Annual Prize-Giving’, *AAJ*, Sep/Oct 1952, vol. 68, no. 765, p. 46.

<sup>800</sup> Miller, interview, op. cit.

chairman of the students' committee, used the opportunity of his prize-giving speech to express his regret about the changed mood amongst students:

Symptomatic [...] is the virtual extinction of many of the clubs and societies which now exist only on paper, and some not even that. [...] I shall not bore you by dwelling too much on the old days, but the difference between 1948 and 1954 is only too apparent to anyone who knows the school.<sup>801</sup>

Shepherd shared the sentiment, but not the regret, and welcomed that 'the students' committee now consisted much more of people who were level-headed and real leaders in the best sense rather than political leaders.'<sup>802</sup> Times had changed – the 1950s had arrived.

## Conclusion

In the six years following the end of the Second World War the school had witnessed the progression towards an increasingly liberal educational system which gave students unprecedented participatory powers and self-determination in designing their courses of study. Jordan's departure and the appointment of Michael Patrick as his successor put an immediate end to this development as group working opportunities were limited and academic standards more rigorously enforced. The fact that these changes were largely driven by external influences, notably the council's policy to reduce the student numbers and particularly the RIBA's more direct interventions in the workings of the school, makes it difficult to imagine how Jordan could have avoided similarly unpopular measures. Yet this did little to alleviate the outrage of the student body, whose leaders over the course of several years campaigned for Patrick's dismissal.

The students' efforts culminated in an uncompromising report on the state of the school, inspired by the Yellow Book but less sophisticated and considerably more aggressive in tone. Unlike its famous paragon, the report of 1953 remained unpublished and therefore unknown. It was, however, by no means inconsequential.

---

<sup>801</sup> Quoted in: 'Annual Prize-Giving', *AAJ*, Sep/Oct 1954, vol. 70, no. 785, p. 70.

<sup>802</sup> Quoted in: Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 23 June 1955, CM 1955-61, p. 7.

Though the students failed in their main objective of removing the principal from office as the remarkably resilient Pattrick weathered the storm and consolidated his position, the more practicable amongst their constructive proposals were adopted and partially implemented. The council set up machinery to promote the integration of students and members, and the students' committee was represented on the new editorial board of the remodelled *AA Journal*. Most importantly, the report revitalised the debate on the students' voting rights, which were partially restored in March 1956. The fact that at the end of protracted negotiations with the Ministry of Education and the Board of Trade only a relatively mild compromise proved viable, shows that even at a time of financial self-sufficiency the AA's room for manoeuvre was severely restricted, its independence largely a myth.



## CHAPTER 5

### THE AA SCHOOL UNDER MICHAEL PATTRICK (1951-1961)

Turning the focus away from the uneasy co-existence of students and school authorities in the early 1950s, the following chapter centres upon the educational approach of the school under Michael Patrick. The starting section covers Patrick's first three years in office, which saw changes to the administrative setup of the school and the gradual implementation of a new curriculum. The second section discusses the introduction of a modified unit system in 1954, partially as a result of the students' report discussed in the previous chapter. The new unit system had a profound impact on the school, not least because – as the third section shows – it stimulated staff recruitment. Like his predecessors, Patrick was driven by the goal to improve the employment prospects of his students. His ambitious, if ill-fated, 'office adoption scheme', discussed in the fourth section, sought to address criticism concerning the practical shortcomings of his students by making office training an integral part of the school curriculum. In addition, Patrick developed a number of schemes for postgraduate specialisation, only one of which – the Department of Tropical Architecture (DTA) – he managed to realise. Complementing a substantial body of existing scholarship (see page 10), the fifth section explains the inception of the DTA within the specific context of the AA school. By the mid-1950s Patrick had consolidated his position and raised the profile of the school. In part this was due to the instant success of the DTA, but also because of the presence of John Killick and Peter Smithson, who came to dominate the school at just the moment when their international renown as figureheads of the nascent brutalist movement peaked. The sixth section of this chapter investigates the role of the AA school as one the breeding grounds of this movement, and the final section traces the introduction of a new curriculum which reflected the architectural credo of its brutalist creators and survived their departure at the end of the decade.

## New Curriculum

Michael Patrick was still acting principal when, in October 1951, he recommended that the school revert to the year master system, which Jordan had abolished in favour of a division into preliminary, intermediate and final schools. The fact that as temporary head he felt entitled to propose such a fundamental change to the administrative setup of the school and the ease with which he secured the support of the school committee suggests that the reintroduction of the year master system, which became effective immediately, may have been pre-agreed.<sup>803</sup> Jordan had run the school in conjunction with his triumvirate of ‘directors’, and the abolition of this system was presumably Patrick’s way of altering the ‘cliquiness’ in the teaching staff to which he had referred in his job interview with the council (see page 145).<sup>804</sup>

The year master system spread the second-tier responsibility amongst five rather than three senior members of staff. It thus strengthened the position of the principal whilst curtailing the influence of the present directors Leonard Manasseh, Kenneth Capon and Henry Elder. Manasseh stayed on as first-year master until 1953, when he left for Malaya and was replaced by one of his tutors, Neville Ward. Capon took over the second year, Hilton Wright the third, and Fello Atkinson, who had just returned from a one-year teaching stint at Harvard, the fourth.<sup>805</sup> Elder continued as fifth-year master but resigned after only two months in protest at the new principal.<sup>806</sup> Patrick struggled to fill the vacancy, and in July 1952 he eventually appointed Richard Eve, then working with the Hertfordshire County Council, as Elder’s successor.<sup>807</sup>

In pedagogical terms the system change was initially of little consequence since Patrick was, as the previous chapter showed, reluctant to effect changes to the course and did so only in response to critique by the RIBA visiting board, specifically

---

<sup>803</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 11 Oct 1951, SCM 1951-63, p. 10.

<sup>804</sup> Meeting of the Council, 30 Oct 1951, CM 1949-55, p. 207.

<sup>805</sup> Hilton Wright relinquished his year master position at the end of the 1952/53 session in favour of Ronald Sims, who had been in charge of the fourth year during Atkinson’s absence in the United States.

<sup>806</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 6 Dec 1951, SCM 1951-63, p. 19; Bob Gatje, email to the author, 23 March 2015,

<sup>807</sup> Between January and July 1952 Capon ran the fifth year, whilst fellow ACP member Michael Cooke-Yarbrough took over the second.

by limiting opportunities for group work. It was not until the end of his first session as principal in June 1952 that Patrick announced a fundamental revision of the curriculum to be gradually implemented over the following three years.<sup>808</sup> Initial changes were largely limited to the second-year village scheme, which expected students to collaborate on a master plan for an existing village as the framework for a number of individual buildings. The visiting board had criticised this particular element of the curriculum, partly for the prevalence of group work, which over an extended period of the second year was effectively mandatory, but mostly for the pronounced town planning aspect of the programme:

The Visiting Board considered that a scheme such as that for a village is too advanced for second-year students. Before handling the whole, a student should surely endeavour to grasp the importance of a small unit, for example a cottage.<sup>809</sup>

Jordan had rejected the suggestion that students were asked to design a village and stressed that the context of the village was merely given to introduce students at an early age to 'simultaneous thinking'<sup>810</sup>, and Patrick concurred: 'Our intention is to make students consider the cottage in its relation to the village as a whole; we do not look upon this programme as an essay in town planning.'<sup>811</sup> Nevertheless, Patrick moved the village scheme to the later part of the third year and instituted a series of 'shorter and more controlled' programmes relating to different basic types of structure in the second, making it thus 'virtually [...] a continuation of the first year.'<sup>812</sup>

In the course of the following session the reorganisation of the second year was complemented by a number of changes in other parts of the course, which together completed the transition to the so-called 'new curriculum' by the beginning of the

---

<sup>808</sup> Meetings of the School Committee, 19 June 1952, 9 Oct 1952, SCM 1951-63, pp. 49, 51.

<sup>809</sup> 'Visiting Board', Nov 1950, op. cit. Discussing student work at the end of the 1951/52 session, the *Architects' Journal* strongly disagreed with the visiting board's assessment: 'The second-year village schemes, which form the basis for the design of various small buildings, are excellent. I hope the RIBA will not, as rumoured, blunder in and ask for this programme to be changed. A village is *not* more difficult to design than a cottage – only different – and the programme compels the student to design his little buildings – cottage, pub, village hall, etc. – as part of a whole.' (*AJ*, 17 July 1952, p. 63.)

<sup>810</sup> Jordan, comments, 24 Nov 1950, op. cit.

<sup>811</sup> Patrick, letter to Everard Haynes, 30 Jan 1952, att. to: Meeting of the RIBA Visiting Board, 27 Feb 1952, Inset A, RIBA/ED 7.1.2.

<sup>812</sup> Meeting of the Council, 7 July 1952, CM 1949-55, p. 278. Complementing the structure studies, the second year also contained the bulk of technical lectures, which had thus far been concentrated in the third and fifth years.

academic year 1953/54. The common feature of the new subjects was their diminished scale, intended for individual rather than group work.<sup>813</sup> The first part of the third year, for instance, was given to a detailed study of a small building as opposed to the ‘first major building’ stipulated in Jordan’s curriculum. Under both Brown and Jordan the fourth year had centred upon complex cultural and industrial schemes, almost always done as group exercises. Under Pattrick the year became the domain of the ‘London Type buildings’ – larger structures in compliance with London bylaws, complete with structural calculations and full sets of working drawings and previously part of the fifth-year course – and was divided into one term each for housing, industry and, in response to planning law changes and the lifting of building controls, commerce. Finally, the greater part of the fifth year was spent on the thesis, but whilst the first term had previously featured another large-scale planning problem, again usually done in groups, Pattrick, perhaps inspired by the much-debated competition for Coventry Cathedral, introduced a ‘building whose symbolic character is of particular importance and is likely to dominate considerations of planning or structure.’<sup>814</sup> The subject required students to develop the given outline programme based on their own individual research, providing a ‘final test of the student’s ability as a creative artist’<sup>815</sup> and a ‘gradual transition between the closely regulated work of the earlier years and the freedom of choice allowed in the thesis.’<sup>816</sup> In June 1953 the school committee reviewed student portfolios and generally approved of the new curriculum, welcoming in particular the introduction of the ‘symbolic building’ in the fifth year.<sup>817</sup> Two months later it conducted an inspection of the year’s work and considered it to be ‘well up to the standard required’ and expressed the view that, subject to minor amendments, ‘the curriculum should not be altered.’<sup>818</sup>

---

<sup>813</sup> See: AA School of Architecture Prospectuses, 1949, 1953, 1954, AAA; ‘AA Information and Curriculum Notes’, 1949/50, 1950/51, 1951/52, 1952/53, 1953/54, AAA, Box 1991:31.

<sup>814</sup> Prospectus 1953, p. 23. Fello Atkinson had encountered a similar programme at Yale and may have suggested it to Pattrick. (‘Symbolism and Architecture’, *AAJ*, Nov 1953, vol. 69, no. 776, p. 100.) Cedric Price, quite characteristically, designed a pub. (Stanley Mathews, *From Agit-Prop to Free Space: The Architecture of Cedric Price*, London 2007, p. 26.)

<sup>815</sup> ‘AA Information and Curriculum Notes’, 1953/54, op. cit.

<sup>816</sup> Prospectus 1953, p. 23.

<sup>817</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 22 June 1953, SCM 1951-63, p. 74.

<sup>818</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 1 Oct 1953, *ibid.*, p. 82.

## 'Liberal Education' vs Unit System

The school committee summarised the main features of the new curriculum as being 'stricter control, more closely regulated programmes for the first four years, and greater opportunity for thesis work and individual study in the fifth year.'<sup>819</sup> Yet whilst the 'symbolic building' in the first term of the fifth year did indeed afford students wide-ranging liberties, as far as theses were concerned, the restrictions on group work clearly diminished their options.<sup>820</sup> Moreover, Patrick deplored the growing tendency amongst students, in the wake of the Stevenage and Zone projects, to consider regional planning aspects as part of their thesis, with the result that 'too little time was devoted to the purely architectural side,' and the school committee concurred with his view that in future 'purely town planning theses should be discouraged.'<sup>821</sup>

The students' dismay about the perceived paradigm shift in the school's pedagogical approach was, as the previous chapter showed, at the heart of their agitation against their principal. Accordingly, in their report of June 1953 they pleaded for the 'adoption of a liberal system of education'<sup>822</sup>, involving, in the first instance, the reinstatement of Jordan's popular policy of giving students the freedom to write their own programmes but ultimately aiming at a 'liberal type of education, such as one gets at an university'<sup>823</sup> whereby the AA would provide lectures and infrastructure but leave the organisation of the course to each student individually. In addition to this, the students also called for a return of the unit system, and given the conflicting nature of these two demands one is inclined to sympathise with Patrick, who complained that the students 'don't know what they want, but they don't like what they have got.'<sup>824</sup> As Beak Adams, the students' strongest ally on the council and one who had started his course under the unit system and completed it under Jordan, pointed out:

---

<sup>819</sup> 'School Committee – Report for the Session 1952/53', att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 7 May 1953, *ibid.*, p. 73.

<sup>820</sup> So far as can be established, there were only five group theses in the years between 1953 and 1957.

<sup>821</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 3 Dec 1953, *ibid.*, p. 84.

<sup>822</sup> Report 1953, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

<sup>823</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>824</sup> Quoted in: Special Meeting of the School Committee, 15 April 1953, *verbatim*, *op. cit.*

If you have a liberal system with a tutor and you all do different things, then to me it seems to be entirely against the unit system of education where you have a small group of people working together and terribly closely with the man who is teaching them.<sup>825</sup>

Other members of the council rejected the students' notion of university education, which they considered to be 'much less liberal than that offered at the AA',<sup>826</sup> and Patrick, too, insisted that 'at other schools of architecture a very much stricter check is kept on students' studio work.'<sup>827</sup> He was ready to concede that 'one or two students might benefit from a completely free system' but adamant that for the majority of students this was not the case, especially now that their average age was dropping.<sup>828</sup> Patrick was convinced that the school had a 'definitive responsibility to keep a constant check on students' and that failure to do so would be tantamount to forfeiting RIBA recognition, which in turn would almost certainly result in parents withdrawing their children from the school – a risk neither he nor the council was prepared to take.<sup>829</sup>

The students' plea for a reintroduction of the unit system found a more favourable reception. In its original form the system had been based on fifteen term-based units, each ideally numbering between fifteen and seventeen students. If one wished to avoid the administrative and pedagogical problems involved in organising several parallel units within terms, there was evidently a mathematical limit to the size of institution in which the unit system could be operated. Realising that the school would soon reach twice that size, Gordon Brown had abolished the unit system in 1945, and Furneaux Jordan, who left little else in the school untouched, tellingly never tried to reinstate it. The reduction of the number of students to pre-war levels made the unit system once more a viable option, and contrary to the students'

---

<sup>825</sup> Quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Student' Committee, 8 July 1953, CSSCM 1952-53, p. 16.

<sup>826</sup> Casson, President's Address, 15 July 1953, op. cit.

<sup>827</sup> Quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Student' Committee, 8 July 1953.

<sup>828</sup> Quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Student' Committee, 18 June 1953, *ibid.*, p. 11. Beak Adams supported Patrick in his view: 'It is a question of age. We had that tutorial system [under Brown] but we were mostly ex-service students, and it did not particularly help us. Most of the boys at the school now come at the age of 17 or so and it is very important for them to have a tutor. The younger you are the more you have to be looked after.' (Quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Student' Committee, 8 July 1953.)

<sup>829</sup> Patrick, quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Student' Committee, 8 July 1953, op. cit., p. 16; see also: Patrick to Anderson, 16 March 1953, op. cit.: 'To bring the average student up to a level of competence required by statute, calls for his close attention to a regulated curriculum. [...] A system of study which might suit some people cannot guarantee to produce a qualified architect, and if we adopt it, we must relieve a conscience, already overtaxed, about our remaining as a recognised school.'

suspensions there was growing support for its reintroduction within the council. Patrick, who had himself studied under the unit system, fully appreciated its advantages and shared the students' assessment that 'the mixing of students at various stages in their course [by placing units of different years in the same studio] might be of considerable value to them.'<sup>830</sup> At the same time he was conscious of the system's inherent drawbacks, specifically the problems involved in synchronising the annual lecture course with termly entry, which had driven Gibberd to despair and which Patrick, too, considered to be 'insuperable difficulties'.<sup>831</sup>

To solve the predicament, Patrick – using Goodhart-Rendel and Billerey's original terminology of a 'parallel unit system' – revived Brown's 'stream system' (which, as Brown's administrative assistant, he had likely devised himself).<sup>832</sup> In Patrick's latest variation of the scheme, submitted as a draft proposal in October 1953, students would enter the school in September and work together as a 'year', before being split into three parallel units of approximately sixteen students each at the beginning of their second year. Each unit would be under the charge of a master, who would be given sole responsibility for drafting its programmes. Students would change their units every second term to provide a 'better period of time during which [they] remained with one member of staff.'<sup>833</sup> In the eleventh term, i.e. midway through the fourth year, the students' abilities would be assessed and the units would be rearranged according to their proficiency: the most able students would be expected to complete their studies by the end of the fourteenth term, the average by the fifteenth, and the less able after the sixteenth, thus providing an incentive to stronger students and, more importantly, allowing weaker students a term's grace without the penalty of relegation.

---

<sup>830</sup> Report 1953, p. 4. One copy of the report includes handwritten comments, presumably by Patrick.

<sup>831</sup> Quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Student' Committee, 18 June 1953, op. cit., p. 11; see also Chapter 1, p. 53.

<sup>832</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 1 Oct 1953, SCM 1951-63, pp. 79-80; see also: 'AA Information and Curriculum Notes', 1954/55, AAA, Box 1991:31.

<sup>833</sup> Patrick, quoted in: Meeting of the School Committee, 1 Oct 1953, op. cit. p. 80. It is difficult to see how, in a year made up of three terms, masters could have changed their units every second term. This is presumably the reason why the school eventually adopted a system whereby unit masters in the second and third years changed over halfway through the second term whilst fourth-year staff changed at the end of each term. ('The AA School of Architecture: Information Notes 1956-57', *ibid.*, p. 16.)

The chief advantage of the scheme was that it retained annual entry and did therefore not necessarily require changes to the lecture programme or the curriculum itself. Yet it was not without its downside in that the need to co-ordinate twelve unit masters instead of four year masters would obviously put a heavier administrative burden on the principal. More problematically, these senior members of staff would have to be paid accordingly, and the school committee supported Patrick's proposal not least because, involving, as it would, greater expenditure on the running of the school, it would 'add weight to the need for obtaining without delay substantial financial support', suggesting that in the eyes of the committee the council was not addressing the school's funding shortfall with the appropriate urgency.<sup>834</sup> Over the following weeks Patrick developed his proposal into a full report to the council, one major amendment concerning the fifth year, which was not to be divided into units, and on 4 January 1954 the council approved the school committee's recommendation that 'the improved unit system be introduced, without further discussion, when the necessary finance is available.'<sup>835</sup>

Patrick was not prepared to let matters rest in this nebulous state and used the terms of staff contracts as leverage to force an immediate ruling by the council. At a meeting of the school committee on 4 March 1954 he drew attention to the fact that teaching staff contracts were due for renewal (or otherwise) three months before they terminated.<sup>836</sup> This meant that the council at its next meeting would have to decide whether the unit system would be introduced for the coming academic year since in that case no part-time tutors would be needed in the second, third and fourth years.<sup>837</sup> Treasurer Denis Clarke Hall, the chairman of the finance committee, was unequivocal that 'the financial position had not improved since this question was discussed some months ago and there could be no possibility of introducing a unit system.'<sup>838</sup> Yet only eleven days later his committee capitulated to mounting pressure from Patrick and the school committee and joined them in their espousal of the unit system, offering to meet the inevitable initial deficit from the association's

---

<sup>834</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 1 Oct 1953, op. cit. p. 80; for a discussion of the school's financial position see next chapter.

<sup>835</sup> Meeting of the Council, 4 Jan 1954, CM 1949-55, p. 375; see also: Meeting of the School Committee, 3 Dec 1953, SCM 1951-63, pp. 84, 85.

<sup>836</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 4 March 1954, *ibid.*, p. 90.

<sup>837</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 92.

<sup>838</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 90.



limited reserves.<sup>839</sup> Thus, on 22 March 1954 the council followed the recommendations of its two sub-committees and formally inaugurated the new unit system.<sup>840</sup>

### Staff Changes under the Unit System

In October 1951, when considering Patrick's candidature, Cusdin had wondered whether he 'carried sufficient weight and was an agreeable personality likely to recruit teaching staff.'<sup>841</sup> Cusdin's concerns soon appeared justified as Patrick's initial staffing efforts looked rather uninspired when compared to his predecessor's. In part this was due to the council's policy of reducing the number of students, which often obviated the need to replace retiring staff. Yet even when vacancies arose, as was the case when Elder left, Patrick struggled to attract applications, not least because unlike other schools the AA could neither afford to offer prospective teachers a pension plan nor raise their salaries in accordance with the new Burnham Scale.<sup>842</sup> Patrick addressed the issue by reducing the working hours of year masters from seven to six hours per day, which indirectly improved their financial conditions.<sup>843</sup> Part-time staff, however, remained grossly underpaid, and as a consequence Patrick's staffing problems persisted throughout his first three years in office.<sup>844</sup>

---

<sup>839</sup> Meeting of the Council, 22 March 1954, CM 1949-55, p. 394.

<sup>840</sup> Ibid.

<sup>841</sup> Meeting of the Council, 30 Oct 1951, *ibid.*, p. 207.

<sup>842</sup> Most schools of architecture (including Birmingham, Liverpool and – in London – the Northern Polytechnic and the Hammersmith School of Building) adopted the Ministry of Education's 'Report of the Burnham Committee on Scales of Salaries for Teachers in Establishments for Further Education' as the basis for their salaries. (Meetings of the School Committee, 6 Dec 1951, 19 June 1952, SCM 1951-63, pp. 18, 48.) It appears that the AA followed an unwritten rule whereby the tenure of tutors was limited to seven years to absolve it from having to enrol them in a pension scheme. Patrick was irritated when he eventually learned of this after almost two years in office: 'It is my job to engage the staff, and it is the first I have heard of it that they must not be here for more than seven years. [...] Am I to tell them that they can only be paid on a scale one-third less than the Burnham Scale, and that they cannot stay here longer than seven years?' (Quoted in: Meeting of the Council, 27 April 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 323.)

<sup>843</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 7 Feb 1952, SCM 1951-63, p. 27.

<sup>844</sup> Full-time year masters at the AA were paid £900 p. a. (30 hours per week) as opposed to a minimum of £1150 p. a. (25 hours per week) for senior lecturers as specified by the Burnham Scale; part-time studio staff received £520 p. a. pro rata (30 hours per week) as opposed to a minimum of £1050 p. a. (25 hours per week) for lecturers under the Burnham Scale. ('Salaries in Schools of Architecture', att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 6 Dec 1951, SCM 1951-63, p. 18.)

Unaware of his financial predicament, the students put the blame for the unsatisfactory personnel situation on their principal. In their 1953 report they alleged that Patrick's appointment had not only put an end to the engagement of foreign staff but also caused popular members of staff to resign.<sup>845</sup> The latter claim was easily rebutted as only Elder had in fact left because of Patrick's appointment and staff turnover was demonstrably slower than in previous years.<sup>846</sup> Yet there was some justification to their first claim as the council had in 1951, presumably in response to criticism in the *Builder* (see page 106), instructed the principal to reduce the number of foreign staff.<sup>847</sup> Given the students' feelings on the matter, the council rescinded this directive in July 1953, but Patrick, who would have welcomed the presence of foreign teaching staff, did not have the means to cover their higher salaries and only two weeks later had to reject an enquiry regarding the possibility of a Swedish architect joining the AA in the forthcoming session.<sup>848</sup> The growing disparity between salaries in Britain and abroad (and in particular the United States) made any future attempt at resuming the internationalism of previous years illusory.<sup>849</sup>

---

<sup>845</sup> Report 1953, p. 2; see also: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 18 June 1953, CSSCM 1952-53, p. 11.

<sup>846</sup> The 1951/52 session marked an all-time low with only three new staff joining the school: Hilton Wright, John Milnes-Smith, and Horacio Caminos (who was funded by the British Council).

<sup>847</sup> 'In 1951 it was thought that the number of foreign architects on the staff was too large and the Principal was asked to reduce the number.' (Hugh Casson, quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 8 July 1953, CSSCM 1952-53, p. 14.) There is no mention of this directive in the contemporary minutes, but presumably it was given out when Jordan was the principal since he – uncharacteristically – made no provisions for foreign visiting staff in his school budget for 1951/52. (Meeting of the School Committee, 29 June 1951, SCM 1951-63, p. 5.)

<sup>848</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, CM 1949-55, 13 July 1953, p. 353; Meeting of the Officers of the Council, *ibid.*, 28 July 1953, p. 356.

<sup>849</sup> In the winter and spring terms of session 1952/53 Harlan McClure, then an associate professor at the University of Minnesota, joined the fourth-year staff in exchange for Fello Atkinson, fees and expenses funded by a Fulbright grant. (Meeting of the School Committee, 9 Oct 1952, SCM 1951-63, p. 53.) Five years later Patrick negotiated an arrangement with Gropius whereby two of his partners in The Architects' Collaborative, Norman Fletcher and Robert McMillan, would share a unit master position. Although they were both successful in obtaining a Fulbright grant and their practice was prepared to supplement their income, the scheme fell through as the salaries paid by the AA were only about 25 per cent of their American equivalent. (Meetings of the School Committee, 3 May 1956, 7 March 1957, 9 May 1957, *ibid.*, pp. 152, 170, 173, 175.) An exchange between Richard Eve and a teacher from North Carolina State University – where Horacio Caminos, who had briefly taught at the AA in 191/52, was meanwhile earning six to eight times his previous salary – failed for the same reason. (Meeting of the Council, 30 May 1957, CM 1955-61, p. 173; Brook 2005, p. 49.)

Patrick himself shared the students' dissatisfaction with the current staff makeup,<sup>850</sup> and one possible reason why he pushed so vigorously for the reintroduction of the unit system was the fact that it would give him free rein to reshape it to his liking. There were initially no major changes in those parts of the course which were not affected by the new system. Neville Ward continued as first-year master until March 1956, when he relinquished his position in favour of John Dennys.<sup>851</sup> Fifth-year master Richard Eve stayed on until May 1957, when he was replaced by Peter Smithson, who had joined the staff in February 1955 and run a fourth-year unit in the 1955/56 session.<sup>852</sup> Patrick approached twenty-two candidates to fill the new staff positions in the second, third and fourth years. Of the current year masters, who had a running contract and were therefore by default included in this list, Oliver Carey (second year) took over one of the second-year units, whilst the other two – Ronald Sims (third year) and Fello Atkinson (fourth year) – declined.<sup>853</sup> Also approached were eight part-time members of staff, two of whom – Arthur Korn and Gordon Michell – were prepared to run a unit. In addition to these, one of four past members of staff – Denys Lasdun – and one of five recent graduates of the school – John Killick – accepted Patrick's offer.<sup>854</sup> Of the remaining candidates, Peter Moro joined the staff, but not Frank Rutter or Donald Reay, Patrick's rival for the principalship three years prior.<sup>855</sup>

Given the zeal with which its members had campaigned for the unit system as students, there is a certain irony in the fact that the Architects' Co-Partnership was the prime casualty of its reintroduction. With the virtual abolition of teamwork in 1951 the group's collaborative approach had become somewhat anachronistic, and

---

<sup>850</sup> See e.g.: Meeting of the School Committee, 1 Oct 1953, SCM 1951-63, p. 82.

<sup>851</sup> Dennys' successors were Peter Summersgill in 1959/60 and John Lloyd from 1960 to 1962. For a list of tutors see Appendix 2.2.

<sup>852</sup> Smithson was originally appointed as a temporary replacement for Eve, who was expected to take a one-year sabbatical at North Carolina (see fn. 849). When this arrangement fell through, Eve stayed at the AA, but as a third-year unit master. (Meeting of the Council, 30 May 1957, CM 1955-61, p. 168.). For a list of tutors see Appendix 2.2.

<sup>853</sup> Sims resigned due to pressure of work. Patrick initially agreed to Atkinson's request of including his firm under the terms of his contract, as was the case with ACP, but this proved incompatible with the unit system. (Meetings of the School Committee, 4 March 1954, 14 May 1954, 24 June 1954, SCM 1951-61, pp. 92, 96, 100.)

<sup>854</sup> The other past members of staff were Francesco Gnechi-Ruscone, Alf Bydén and John Madge; the other graduates were Peter Bosanquet, Peter Newnham, Henry Swain and Patrick Tetley.

<sup>855</sup> Moro left in February after only one term and was replaced by James McKay Spence, who changed to the Department of Tropical Architecture at the beginning of the 1955/56 session (see p. 184).

starting with the complete revision of its second-year course (see page 167) its influence in the school gradually diminished. In March 1952 the school committee expressed doubts whether the staffing arrangement with ACP was ‘entirely satisfactory’<sup>856</sup>, and when it was discussed in council, one member, Basil Ward, objected against it in principle ‘as he felt they would try to impose their views on architecture on the school.’<sup>857</sup> Although Patrick defended the arrangement against repeated criticism from the council, insisting that it ‘had always worked satisfactorily,’<sup>858</sup> Capon lost his position as second-year master in 1953 to Oliver Carey, and the group was broken up, with three of its seven members subsequently tutoring in Atkinson’s fourth-year course.<sup>859</sup> In May 1954 Patrick offered two unit master positions to ACP, but they all declined.<sup>860</sup>

Such rejections notwithstanding, the introduction of the unit system invigorated Patrick’s staffing efforts, with applications outnumbering the available positions from the outset. To fill the remaining posts, Patrick engaged Elizabeth Chesterton, the first woman to join the studio staff since 1946, for the second, and Stirling Craig for the third year.<sup>861</sup> An interesting novelty concerned the presence of David Jones, an architect with the Ministry of Works. Unlike Brown and Jordan, who had been equally eager to attach public architects to their teaching staff, Patrick, in February 1954, succeeded in negotiating an agreement with Leslie Martin, chief architect to the LCC, whereby members of his staff would be given a period of leave to teach full-time at the AA, which would in turn pay their salaries to the LCC.<sup>862</sup> Martin was at first unable to release an architect from his staff, and Patrick presented the scheme to other public offices, including the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of

---

<sup>856</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 7 March 1952, *ibid.*, p. 31.

<sup>857</sup> Quoted in: Meeting of the Council, 31 March 1952, CM 1949-55, p. 255; see also: Meeting of the Council, 28 April 1952, *ibid.*, p. 260.

<sup>858</sup> Quoted in: Meeting of the Council, 30 March 1953, *ibid.*, p. 314.

<sup>859</sup> Capon intended to take up a scholarship in the United States, but when this failed he joined the fourth year along with Cooke-Yarborough and De Syllas. (Meetings of the School Committee, 5 March 1953, 1 Oct 1953, SCM 1951-61, pp. 61, 82.) Patrick was satisfied with these changes: ‘The various appointments made at the beginning of the session appear to be working out well, particularly in the second year. Both the quality and quantity of work done by this year during the term is a very noticeable improvement of previous sessions. This is almost certainly due to the work put in by Mr. Carey.’ (‘Principal’s Report’, att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 3 Dec 1953, *ibid.*, p. 85.)

<sup>860</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 14 May 1954, *ibid.*, p. 96.

<sup>861</sup> Both appointments proved successful: Chesterton ran the same unit for seven years – longer than anyone else in the postwar history of the AA; Craig, who also took over the position as director of technical training from Patrick, stayed until 1960. For other unit masters in the second and third years see Appendix 2.2.

<sup>862</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 9 Feb 1954, *ibid.*, pp. 86, 88.

Works, both of which pledged their support.<sup>863</sup> Thus, in the academic year 1954/55 David Jones joined the third year, followed one year later by Hugh Morris, a recent graduate and architect with the LCC, who took charge of a second-year unit.<sup>864</sup>

The most far-reaching changes occurred in the fourth year, initially run by Killick, Korn and Lasdun. Though allowed to conduct the teaching and supervision of his unit from his office, Lasdun resigned voluntarily after only one term due to pressure of work, whilst Korn relinquished his position after two years and rejoined the fifth-year tutorial staff.<sup>865</sup> Unlike many of his colleagues, Killick considered teaching a calling rather than a mere stopgap and soon emerged as a key figure at the AA – a development which came as a surprise even to his closest friends. As John Partridge recalled:

John was a natural teacher. We didn't expect he would be. When he was at the LCC he didn't talk a lot – he always liked to sit at his drawing board, quietly and on his own. That's what changed when he became a teacher. He found his niche.<sup>866</sup>

James Gowan attributed Killick's impact on his students to his 'fastidious intelligence [which] must have washed off on a great many,'<sup>867</sup> and Peter Ahrends concurs:

He was an intellectual, and he had a way of using that informed view of architecture in connection with each student. At the time we were already working as a group – ABK – and he had a way of enabling us to have conversations about architecture which perhaps we didn't know existed.<sup>868</sup>

Patrick praised Killick as 'one of the best teachers and critics that the AA has ever had,'<sup>869</sup> and John Chisholm, one of Killick's students, remembered his 'ability to instil enthusiasm and confidence into even the least promising of students; perhaps his finest quality.'<sup>870</sup>

---

<sup>863</sup> Meeting of the Council, 22 Feb 1954, CM 1949-55, p. 387; 'AA School Committee – Report for Session 1953/54', att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 14 May 1954, SCM 1951-61, p. 98.

<sup>864</sup> The scheme was subsequently discontinued for unknown reasons.

<sup>865</sup> Denys Lasdun, cover letter att. to employment contract with the AA, 2 June 1954, LaD/234/8, Lasdun Archive, RIBA Archives, London; Meeting of the School Committee, 2 Dec 1954, SCM 1951-61, p. 110.

<sup>866</sup> John Partridge, interview, op. cit. When Partridge and Howell transformed their loose affiliation into a formal partnership in 1959, Killick chose to be a consultant to the practice and devote his energies to teaching at the AA.

<sup>867</sup> Gowan, 'AA 125', op. cit., p. 5.

<sup>868</sup> Ahrends, interview.

<sup>869</sup> Quoted in: 'Annual Prize Giving', *AAJ*, Sep/Oct 1960, vol. 76, no. 845, p. 77.

<sup>870</sup> John Chisholm, 'Obituary: John Killick', *Design*, no. 265 (1971), p. 85.

Killick's professional experience and predilection made him particularly suited to run a unit in the fourth year, which centred more and more on urban renewal tasks. (Incidentally, the mere scope of these tasks made a return of group working almost inevitable – a development which Pattrick himself had anticipated.)<sup>871</sup> Drawing on connections with his former employer, Killick always related his programmes to current LCC problems, be it a housing scheme for Paddington using the site of the controversial Kadleigh-Horsbrugh scheme or a commercial development in the hotly debated St Paul's precinct, which not only raised their appeal for students but gave them relevance beyond the confines of the school. In October 1955 Leslie Martin opened an exhibition of the St. Paul's schemes at County Hall,<sup>872</sup> and one year later the *Architectural Design* featured a number of high-density housing schemes from Killick's course alongside (and almost undistinguishable from) real-life projects by Chamberlin, Powell and Bon.<sup>873</sup> Killick hoped that some of these schemes 'may become pointers' for CIAM 10 and its discussion on the subject of 'habitat' in an urban context.<sup>874</sup> Closer to home, Killick, who in January 1957 became the editor of the *AA Journal* at the students' suggestion, used his position to link student work into a broader architectural discourse.<sup>875</sup>

### Pattrick's Office Adoption Scheme

Two novelties characterised Pattrick's course in the first half of the 1950s, neither of which resulted from his own initiative. The new curriculum, instituted in 1953, combined a number of measures necessitated by RIBA pressure, whilst the

---

<sup>871</sup> The 1954/55 edition of the 'Information and Curriculum Notes', a more detailed version of the prospectus for staff and students, featured a section on group working which was almost identical to the one Jordan had included in his 1949/50 edition but which had subsequently been omitted. (AAA, Box 1991:31.)

<sup>872</sup> *AJ*, 27 Oct 1955, p. 547.

<sup>873</sup> Michael Pattrick, John Killick, 'The Decaying Neighbourhood', *Architectural Design*, Oct 1956, pp. 318-326.

<sup>874</sup> Quoted *ibid.*, p. 321. It was also Killick who suggested the inclusion of Peter Ahrends's thesis as one of the contributions of the MARS Group to the congress. (Ahrends, interview.) A housing scheme for Paddington, designed by John Dalton, Anthony Eardley, Ian Fraser and Ralph Knott under Killick's supervision, achieved a degree of international acclaim in its own right when it was displayed at an international student conference in Moscow in August 1957: 'The scheme became the centre of attraction. Russian students came to photograph it; students from West Germany, France and Italy studied the eighteen drawings with keen interest. I was invited to explain the scheme and found myself confronted by a large and inquisitive audience who bombarded me with numerous questions.' (Roman Halter, 'Students in Moscow, 1957', *AAJ*, March 1958, vol. 73, no. 820, p. 200.)

<sup>875</sup> Meetings of the Council, 26 Nov 1956, 28 Jan 1957 CM 1955-61, pp. 102, 120.

reintroduction of the unit system in the following year was the outcome of student agitation. Unlike Jordan, Patrick was not motivated by an overarching vision for the AA. He had no intention to revolutionise the pedagogical system of the school and was content with making specific adjustments if and when they were required. Patrick sought to prepare his students for their work as practicing architects by infusing the course with the utmost sense of realism, but he pursued this in a rather more pragmatic way than his predecessor. Questions as to how architects could maintain their role as leaders of the integrated building teams of the future were of secondary importance – Patrick’s main concern was with the here and now:

However much [...] the students may desire radical changes in the building industry, we realise that these changes are not going to come about overnight. It is therefore our duty to train our students to take their place within the framework of the industry as it is today.<sup>876</sup>

Consequently, Patrick’s own most ambitious schemes aimed at maximising the students’ job prospects under current conditions. Invited to submit evidence to the RIBA’s McMorrان Committee in January 1953 (see page 210), Patrick drafted a letter on behalf of the AA which focused solely on the ‘relationship between the training and the later employment of the architect’ and put forward three proposals for consideration.<sup>877</sup> The first of these called for office training (as distinct from office ‘experience’) to become an essential part of any recognised course, whilst the other two revolved around the idea of a two-tier qualification for architects, with the higher level taking the form of postgraduate training confined to students of proven ability. The council agreed that these proposals were to ‘form the basis of future policy, whether they were accepted by the [McMorrان] Committee or not.’<sup>878</sup>

Patrick’s ‘office adoption scheme’, which he first presented in autumn 1952, sought to feed the ‘better side of the pupilage system’<sup>879</sup> back into the school curriculum. It envisaged small groups of second-year students to be attached to a private or public

---

<sup>876</sup> Quoted in: ‘Prize-Giving 1952’, op. cit., p. 45.

<sup>877</sup> Michael Patrick, draft letter to the chairman of the RIBA Joint Committee on Education, 20 Jan 1953, att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 16 Jan 1953, SCM 1951-63, p. 59; for the final letter signed by the AA president but written by Patrick see: A. R. F. Anderson, letter to the chairman of the RIBA Joint Committee on Education, 27 Jan 1953, AAA, Box 1991:8 (hereafter cited as Patrick, proposals, Jan 1953).

<sup>878</sup> ‘Memorandum for Special School Committee, 14 November 1955’, att. to: Special Meeting of the School Committee, 14 Nov 1955, SCM 1951-63, p. 135.

<sup>879</sup> Patrick, quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students’ Committee, 8 Oct 1952, CSSCM 1952-53, p. 1.

office, which they would visit at fixed times during the term to catch up on its current work. The students would continue their visits to the same office throughout their second and third years, subsequent to which they would join a different one, possibly of a different type, for the remainder of their course. The idea itself was not new. Brown had advanced a similar scheme in his farewell lecture in November 1948, as did Jordan in his inaugural address two months later (see page 82). However, efforts to fully implement it had subsequently foundered on the difficulty of finding the support of a sufficient number of practices, and Patrick felt that ‘the thing has got to be on a very much more organised basis for all students to benefit.’<sup>880</sup> In May 1953 he approached twenty-five selected firms, eighteen of which agreed to participate when the scheme was inaugurated in October.<sup>881</sup> By December thirty-four students had been ‘adopted’ by an office, and in the course of the academic year Patrick succeeded in extending the scheme over the entire second year of just over fifty students – a feat he managed to repeat in each of the following sessions.<sup>882</sup>

Office adoption continued until 1958 and – on a voluntary basis – beyond, but it remained limited to the second and third years. To address this, Patrick in March 1957 put forward another proposal whereby fourth-year students would spend the entire summer term and part of the following holiday period working in an office at a nominal fee. The council approved the scheme in principle, but since it was to form part of the regular curriculum, with complementary lectures given in the evenings, a remission of fees was out of the question, and this raised objections from the students themselves as well as the local education authorities (LEAs) and ultimately the MOE, which sustained them with grants. In light of these difficulties, the council decided to start the fourth-year practical training scheme in March 1958 on a trial basis involving twenty-one volunteer students working in nineteen offices.<sup>883</sup> Patrick

---

<sup>880</sup> Quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students’ Committee, 11 Dec 1952, *ibid.*, p. 4.

<sup>881</sup> Meetings of the School Committee, 7 May 1953, 22 June 1953, 3 Dec 1953, SCM 1951-63, pp. 69, 70, 77, 85.

<sup>882</sup> ‘AA School Committee – Report for Session 1953/54’, att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 14 May 1954, *ibid.*, p. 97. At the beginning of session 1954/55 twenty-two practices participated in the scheme, which was now operating in both the second and the third year, and by the end of the session 102 students had been ‘adopted’ and spread among, now, twenty-five offices. (Meeting of the School Committee, 2 Dec 1954, *ibid.*, p. 110; ‘School Committee: Report for the Session 1954/55’, *ibid.*, p. 123.)

<sup>883</sup> Meeting of the Council, 25 March 1957, CM 1955-61, p. 139; Meeting of the School Committee, 4 July 1957, SCM 1951-63, pp. 186-187; Meeting of the Council, 28 Oct 1957, CM 1955-61, p. 197.



and the school committee deemed the experiment successful, and the MOE indicated that it was likely to let it continue.<sup>884</sup> However, half of the staff, and in particular a working party in the process of examining the curriculum (see page 196), opposed the scheme on the grounds that fourth-year students were not able to take a useful wage-earning place in an office, that there were not enough suitable offices to cope with a full fourth year, and – most importantly – that the interruption of the course had an adverse effect on the flow of design subjects in the curriculum.<sup>885</sup> Although he did not share these views, Patrick considered the dissenters' reasons to be 'perfectly rational' and felt that the scheme could not be operated against considerable staff opposition.<sup>886</sup> Subsequent attempts to revive it in a modified form failed for financial reasons, and it therefore remained a one-off.

## The Department of Tropical Architecture

The second suggestion in Patrick's submission to the McMorran Committee in January 1953 concerned provisions for postgraduate training, aimed at limiting the number of subjects in the syllabus and thus maintaining – or even shortening – the length of the basic course at a time of increasingly demanding requirements for specialist knowledge within the profession. The list of potential subjects which the AA put forward included town planning, landscape architecture, structure, interior decoration, and industrial design; yet from July 1953 the idea of a course in tropical architecture took precedence.<sup>887</sup>

---

<sup>884</sup> Antony Part, the under-secretary for further education at the MOE, which covered half the value of awards given out by LEAs, had threatened to advise them that they would be in contravention of MOE directives if they provided grants to trainee students since he took the view that the architectural firms were liable for their fees. Patrick managed to secure the support of the RIBA's Board of Architectural Education, and Part, a member of the BAE, eventually dropped his objections. (Special Meeting of the Council, 10 Feb 1958, p. 231; Meetings of the Board of Architectural Education, 10 Feb 1958, 19 May 1958, RIBA/ED 7.1.1.)

<sup>885</sup> 'Principal's Report', att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 26 June 1958, CM 1955-61, p. 219. Smithson felt that 'the existing course was already too short and that no time should be given to office training at the expense of design projects,' and Killick warned that 'the present fourth-year programme would be ruined if part of it were removed [and that] he was opposed to the existing training scheme because he thought it was destructive.' (Special Meeting of the School Committee, 22 Sep 1958, *ibid.*, pp. 221, 222.)

<sup>886</sup> Quoted in: Meeting of the Council, 9 July 1958, CM 1955-61, p. 276; see also: 'Principal's Report', 26 June 1958, *op. cit.*

<sup>887</sup> Patrick, 20 Jan 1953, *op. cit.*; Special Meeting of the Council, 13 July 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 348.

The lack of information about the specific challenges involved in building in the tropics was a matter of growing concern in British architectural circles – Gordon Brown, now in Hong Kong, was one of many who complained about it in a letter to the *Architect & Building News* in May 1951.<sup>888</sup> In March 1953 University College London organised a one-week conference on tropical architecture, which brought together a small group of architects and scientists with expert knowledge in the matter and passed a five-point resolution calling, amongst other things, for ‘improved educational facilities for students and architects interested in work in the tropics and particularly the establishment of permanent centres for the study of architecture and planning at ordinary and post-graduate level.’<sup>889</sup> Addressing a general meeting of the AA in the following month, George Atkinson, the colonial liaison officer to the Building Research Station and one of the conveners of the conference, reaffirmed the need to provide specialised training for the great number of British architects required for work in the tropics: ‘Is there not room for at least one school to take a special interest in tropical architecture?’<sup>890</sup>

Otto Koenigsberger, a researcher at the School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine and fellow organiser of the conference, meanwhile drew up the outline for such a course and approached three London schools to find a home for it.<sup>891</sup> Patrick seized the opportunity and in October 1953 formed a committee consisting of Atkinson, Koenigsberger, Leo De Syllas and himself to consider how a self-supporting and largely autonomous ‘Department of Tropical Architecture’ might operate within the AA.<sup>892</sup> Owing, presumably, to Koenigsberger’s preparatory work, it took the committee merely two months to work out a draft syllabus.<sup>893</sup> Targeted primarily at

---

<sup>888</sup> Gordon Brown, letter to the editor, *ABN*, 4 May 1951, p. 508.

<sup>889</sup> Arthur Foyle (ed.), *Conference on Tropical Architecture 1953*, London 1954, p. 125. The chairman of the conference was RIBA representative Alister MacDonald; architect speakers included Patrick Abercrombie, Robert Gardner-Medwin, William Holford, Percy Johnson-Marshall, George Atkinson, Fello Atkinson, Frank Rutter, Arthur Foyle and Max Lock. For a concise account of the conference proceedings see e.g.: Arthur Foyle, ‘Tropical Architecture’, *Builder*, 10 April 1953, pp. 558-560; Derek Plumstead, ‘Report of the Conference on Tropical Architecture’, *ABN*, 16 April 1953, pp. 455-456.

<sup>890</sup> G. Anthony Atkinson, ‘British Architects in the Tropics’, *AAJ*, June 1953, vol. 68, no. 773, p. 14. George Atkinson was the older brother of fourth-year master Fello Atkinson and at the time a member of the AA council.

<sup>891</sup> Toppin 1982, op. cit. p. 36; see also Wakely 1983, pp. 337-338.

<sup>892</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 1 Oct 1953, SCM 1951-63, p. 82.

<sup>893</sup> ‘Syllabus for a Course in Tropical Architecture at the AA, 5<sup>th</sup> Year’, att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 3 Dec 1953, *ibid.*, p. 85; see also: ‘Minutes of the Ad-hoc Committee for the Department of Tropical Architecture’, *ibid.*

British postgraduates but also open to overseas architects and fifth-year students of the AA, provided they had achieved a suitably high standard in their previous work, the six-month full-time course comprised specialist lectures on climatology, tropical air-conditioning and social and economic aspects, complemented by a series of design exercises related to different tropical conditions. On 4 January 1954 the council approved the report of the ad-hoc committee and inaugurated the Department of Tropical Architecture<sup>894</sup> – a momentous event, which, according to Chang, marked ‘the institutionalization of modern tropical architecture [and] heralded in a new form of architectural education.’<sup>895</sup>

Patrick approached forty-three organisations and government departments to secure the starting capital for the new department, and in April 1954 Maxwell Fry agreed to supervise the course, which was to commence in October.<sup>896</sup> The number of applications was three times higher than anticipated, and instead of twelve the school eventually admitted thirty students.<sup>897</sup> Quality and content of the course fell short of the expectations of the first cohort of AA students, and their coexistence with international postgraduates was not without problems. Two AA students – David Gray and Neave Brown – caused annoyance with the DTA staff by refusing to collaborate with foreign students, and the school committee warned that ‘in future if any student showed a similar uncooperative attitude towards the Course, he should be asked to leave it immediately.’<sup>898</sup> Hans Heyerdahl Hallen, a South African architect who spent a year at the AA as a postgraduate and attended DTA crits along with Geoffrey Bawa, a fellow student from Sri Lanka, remembers an air of prejudice:

---

<sup>894</sup> Meeting of the Council, 4 Jan 1954, CM 1949-55, p. 375.

<sup>895</sup> Chang 2009, p. 290; for a discussion of the DTA see: *ibid.*, pp. 289-319.

<sup>896</sup> ‘AA School Committee – Report for Session 1953/54’, att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 14 May 1954, SCM 1951-63, p. 97; Meeting of the Council, 26 April 1954, CM 1949-55, p. 399.

<sup>897</sup> Michael Patrick, letter to the editor, *AAJ*, June 1954, vol. 69, no. 783, p. 28; Meeting of the School Committee, 30 Sep 1954, SCM 1951-63, p. 106; ‘Annual Prize Giving’, *AAJ*, July/Aug 1955, vol. 71, no. 794, p. 48. For an account of the first instalment of the course see: James McKay Spence, ‘The New Role of the Architect in the Tropics’, *AAJ*, July/Aug 1955, vol. 71, no. 794, pp. 56-61.

<sup>898</sup> ‘DTA, Advisory Committee, Minutes of Meeting, 27 April 1955’, att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 5 May 1955, SCM 1951-63, p. 122.

As a South African I was considered a ‘Colonial’, not worth listening to! Few thought that critiques from people who had experienced sub-tropical climates were worth listening to. Geoffrey Bawa and I, who grew up and practised in this sort of climate, were ignored. It gave us both a laugh.<sup>899</sup>

Even so, as far as the school authorities were concerned, the fact alone that in June 1955 the Gold Coast Development Board announced the recruitment of five highly paid DTA graduates for its operations justified a course intended to generate employment prospects for its participants.<sup>900</sup> At the annual prize-giving ceremony Patrick told the audience that the department already had a waiting list for the second instalment, and although the number of applications was eventually lower than in the inaugural session, James McKay Spence, who replaced Fry as the head of the department, had no difficulties filling the desired fifteen places.<sup>901</sup>

In spite of this, there were growing doubts regarding the future prospects of the department. In April 1956 Fry predicted a decline in the demand for British architects with special expertise in tropical architecture, yet Patrick – upon consulting other experts who took the view that this was not likely to happen for the next five to ten years – suggested that the course be continued for at least another two sessions.<sup>902</sup> Nevertheless, Spence resigned and the council appointed as his successor Otto Koenigsberger, whose existing commitments, however, did not allow him to take up his post for another twelve months.<sup>903</sup> In light of this, Spence agreed to continue as the nominal director of the DTA for the following session, although it would seem that it was his assistant, Roger Johnson, who actually ran it.

Koenigsberger’s arrival in October 1957 proved highly beneficial for the development of the DTA (although it was clearly not in crisis, as Wakely suggests).<sup>904</sup>

---

<sup>899</sup> Hans Heyerdahl Hallen, letter to the author, 2 April 2015.

<sup>900</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 30 June 1955, SCM 1951-63, p. 129; Spence 1955, op. cit., pp. 60-61.

<sup>901</sup> ‘Annual Prize Giving’, *AAJ*, July/Aug 1955, vol. 71, no. 794, p. 48; ‘School Committee. Report for the Session 1955/56’, att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 3 May 1956, SCM 1951-63, p. 148. In fact, session 1955/56 began with twenty-two students. Spence, who had been engaged to help Fry cope with the unexpected workload, was given the sole responsibility for the running of the DTA, whilst Fry himself retained the merely honorary title of director and joined the DTA’s advisory committee.

<sup>902</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 3 May 1956, SCM 1951-63, p. 151, 6024; Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 21 June 1956, CM 1955-61, p. 73; see also: Otto Koenigsberger, letter to Leo De Syllas, 30 Aug 1956, Otto Koenigsberger Archive, AAA (hereafter cited as AAA/OK), Box 27.

<sup>903</sup> Meeting of the Council, 29 Oct 1956, *ibid.*, p. 91.

<sup>904</sup> Wakely 1983, p. 338; see also fn. 908.

Despite frequent, pre-agreed absences as expert advisor overseas, Koenigsberger managed to run the department with great success at a time when its complexion changed rapidly.<sup>905</sup> Fry's prediction had been vindicated sooner than expected as the interest of domestic students began to decline from the second session onward. Though conceived as a further education and employment scheme for British architects, the DTA soon mutated into a finishing school for overseas professionals – a position for which the AA with its traditionally strong links to the 'Colonies' considered itself particularly well-suited.<sup>906</sup> Nineteen of the thirty participants of the inaugural course had been students or recent graduates of the AA, with the remaining third coming predominantly from the developing countries. (The DTA never succeeded in attracting a significant number of non-AA British graduates.) In the following year the number of AA students dropped to nine out of twenty-two, and in 1956 to five out of twenty-three.<sup>907</sup> Under Koenigsberger this trend was firmly entrenched as for the remainder of the decade the DTA usually had around twenty participants and never more than one AA student.<sup>908</sup> In response to the diverse educational backgrounds of his polyglot student body, Koenigsberger devised a highly structured curriculum based on a lecture programme which was closely linked to the corresponding design subjects and incorporated integral feedback mechanisms.<sup>909</sup> According to Chang, 'tropical architecture was researched and taught [...] by elevating climatic conditions as the central considerations and dealing with these considerations using building science.'<sup>910</sup> It was this scientific bias, aimed at grasping 'fundamental principles' rather than relying on 'ready made

---

<sup>905</sup> See e.g.: Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 12 May 1958, CM 1955-61, p. 260.

<sup>906</sup> As early as 1946 council member Henry Braddock saw the solution to the school's financial worries in its overseas connections and suggested that 'as the AA had always had very good relations with the Colonies, they might help, with a view to making the AA School into some kind of architectural centre for colonial students.' (Meeting of the Centenary General Committee, 25 April 1946, Minutes of the Centenary General Committee and Sub Committees, AAA, Box C304, p. 4.) By 1947 more than a hundred practising architects in the Dominions had trained at the AA. (*AJ*, 17 April 1947, p. 313.)

<sup>907</sup> Meeting of the Council, 21 Feb 1955, CM 1949-55, p. 471; Meetings of the Council, 27 Feb 1956, 25 Feb 1957, CM 1955-61, pp. 46; 133.

<sup>908</sup> Meetings of the Council, 24 Feb 1958, 23 Feb 1960, 22 Feb 1960, 20 Feb 1961, *ibid.*, pp. 237, 317, 401, 462. Wakely claims that the intake dropped to only three students in session 1956/57, jumped dramatically to 36 in Koenigsberger's inaugural session, and then stabilised at persistently over twenty in the following years. (Wakely 1983, p. 338.)

<sup>909</sup> For instance, Koenigsberger collected reports from students on the lectures of visiting specialists and got the other students to vote on the merits of these reports. This, according to the *Guardian*, revealed what students accustomed to different languages and disciplines had learned from them and which changes in presentation were required. ('Architecture in the Tropics', *Guardian*, 7 April 1958, p. 7; see also: Wakely 1983, p. 339.)

<sup>910</sup> Chang 2009, p. 304.

recipes<sup>911</sup>, which distinguished Koenigsberger's course from his predecessors' and laid the foundation for the department's lasting renown (see also page 251).

The success of the DTA inspired proposals for a number of similar postgraduate schemes, the most important of which was the so-called 'Department of Building Management', which the AA pursued over a period of three years in conjunction with leading members of the building industry and which was eventually superseded by the MOE's plan for an integrated 'College of Building Technology' in 1957 (see next chapter). Another scheme which preoccupied the AA in the second half of the 1950s was Graeme Shankland's proposal for a postgraduate course in urban design – the so-called 'Department of Town Planning' – which was left in abeyance in January 1958 after two years of planning as the AA professed itself unable to cover the anticipated starting deficit.<sup>912</sup> Unperturbed by these setbacks, Patrick, who was convinced of the need to provide facilities for postgraduate specialisation, continued to advance similar schemes, including separate departments for building services, landscape architecture and the 'care of old buildings'.<sup>913</sup> Ultimately, though, all his attempts to emulate the success of the DTA failed.

### **The Brutalist Period at the AA**

The unit system and the DTA, approved at the same momentous council meeting on 4 January 1954, revitalised the AA after the relative stalemate of the previous years and contributed to raising its international profile. From 1955 onward distinguished foreign visitors inspected the school on a regular basis, and an exhibition illustrating the AA's curriculum travelled to all corners of the globe.<sup>914</sup>

---

<sup>911</sup> Otto Koenigsberger, letter to H. J. W. Alexander, 30 Aug 1956, AAA/OK, Box 27.

<sup>912</sup> Meeting of the Council, 6 Jan 1958, CM 1955-61, p. 217; for Shankland's proposal see: 'Proposal for a Post Graduate Course in Urban Design – Report of the Ad-hoc Committee', att. to: Meeting of the Council, 15 July 1957, *ibid.*, p. 189.

<sup>913</sup> For 'building services' see: Meeting of the School Committee, 6 Dec 1956, SCM 1951-63, p. 164; Meeting of the Council, 28 Oct 1957, CM 1955-61, p. 193; for 'landscape architecture' see: Meetings of the School Committee, 8 Oct 1959, 10 Dec 1959, 3 March 1960, SCM 1951-63, pp. 268, 269, 271, 273, 277; for 'care of old buildings' see: Meetings of the Council, 25 Jan 1960, 22 Feb 1960, CM 1955-61, pp. 392, 397.

<sup>914</sup> Between 1956 and 1958 the exhibition was shown in various Scandinavian countries, followed by South Africa, the USSR, the United States, New Zealand, Denmark, Poland and Germany, with further requests from Argentina, Portugal and Turkey pending. Sadly, it was lost on an overseas trip to Khartoum and

Impressed with the work of its principal, the council in 1956 reappointed him for another five-year period.<sup>915</sup> In his second term in office Patrick assumed a more directorial role, similar to Brown's ten years prior: he involved himself more actively in the council's policy considerations (see next chapter), and he spent considerable time nurturing the AA's international contacts whilst delegating much of the running of the school to his trusted senior staff. In early 1957 Patrick undertook an extended study tour to the United States, and from 1958 onward he lectured widely on the continent, particularly in Poland and Germany. At the same time Patrick, upon receiving enquiries from several continental schools, decided to revive the series of international summer schools which had taken place at Venice until the dissolution of CIAM in 1957 (based, of course, on an initial idea by Gordon Brown; see page 69).<sup>916</sup> Patrick managed to assemble an eminent international advisory committee but had to cancel the event at short notice due to his own commitments and the illness of his co-organiser Ernst Priefert.<sup>917</sup>

The heightened reputation of the AA in the second half of the 1950s owed much to the fact that it provided a home for the vanguard of British architecture, notably Peter Smithson and John Killick, at just the moment when, through their activities in CIAM and the agency of *Architectural Design*, they were thrust into the international limelight.<sup>918</sup> In 1954 the Smithsons had completed their controversial Miesian school at Hunstanton, whilst Killick and his future partners Howell, Partridge and Amis were designing the Alton West estate at Roehampton, the first large-scale adaptation of Le Corbusier's *Unité d'habitation*. Both schemes attracted international interest and are today seen as early examples of an architectural style – brutalism – which from the late 1950s began to spread worldwide.

The use in the context of this study of the contentious term 'brutalism', nowadays indiscriminately applied to almost any building in exposed concrete, requires

---

Bombay. ('Architectural Association School of Architecture: Notes for Staff. Session 1962-1963', AAA, Box 2003:37c, p. 7.)

<sup>915</sup> Meeting of the Council, 9 July 1956, CM 1955-61, p. 78.

<sup>916</sup> 'Principal's Report', att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 20 March 1958, SCM 1951-63, p. 206.

<sup>917</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 8 May 1958, *ibid.*, p. 208; Meeting of the Council, 5 Jan 1959, CM 1955-61, p. 303.

<sup>918</sup> For the role of *Architectural Design* in the postwar debate see: Steve Parnell, 'Architectural Design, 1954-1972', unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Sheffield, 2011.

clarification. In 1966 Reyner Banham, in an attempt to claim British provenance for what was clearly an international phenomenon, proposed a differentiation between ‘New Brutalism’ as a distinctly British ‘ethic’ and ‘Brutalism’ as an internationally applied ‘aesthetic’.<sup>919</sup> Despite the obvious difficulties involved in synthesising a definite relationship between the two, illustrated by Banham’s failure to provide a coherent canon of buildings, historians such as Kenneth Frampton who from the early 1980s onward established brutalism as an integral part of the historiography of twentieth-century architecture by and large adopted his line of argument.<sup>920</sup> More recent scholarship has done little to negotiate the dichotomy inherent in Banham’s definition, with writers either situating brutalism within the international Team 10 context of the late 1950s and early 1960s and thus to some degree downgrading the British contribution<sup>921</sup> or, conversely, embedding it in the London art discourse of the early 1950s and divorcing it from subsequent architectural developments.<sup>922</sup>

Banham’s British bias is understandable since – whilst the brutalist style derived from Le Corbusier’s postwar oeuvre and had its parallels (or even precedents) in other countries – the rhetoric surrounding the term ‘brutalism’, albeit not the term itself, was undeniably homegrown.<sup>923</sup> The Smithsons first used it to describe their unbuilt project for a house in Soho in December 1953,<sup>924</sup> and their prominence amongst young British architects following the completion of Hunstanton ensured

---

<sup>919</sup> Reyner Banham, *The New Brutalism*, London 1966.

<sup>920</sup> See e.g.: Kenneth Frampton, *Modern Architecture: A Critical History*, London 1980, pp. 262-268.

<sup>921</sup> See e.g.: Dirk van Heuvel, ‘Team 10 and its Topicalities’, conference paper, TU Delft, 5-6 June 2003, <http://www.team10online.org/research/papers/delft2/heuvel.pdf> [accessed 26 Feb 2012]; see also: Max Risselada, Dirk van Heuvel (eds.), *Team 10 1953-81. In Search of a Utopia of the Present*, Rotterdam 2005.

<sup>922</sup> See e.g.: Irénée Scalbert, ‘Leben und Kunst als Parallelen’, *Daidalos*, no. 75 (2000), pp. 53-65. According to Scalbert, the brutalist movement ended in 1956, bequeathing no architectural legacy whatsoever. Barnabas Calder, whose most recent book celebrates the beauty of brutalism in terms of its Corbusier-inspired architectural manifestations of the 1950s to 1970s, deliberately ignores the British debate of the early 1950s and thus implicitly supports Scalbert’s notion. (Barnabas Calder, *Raw Concrete*, London 2016.)

<sup>923</sup> The origin of the term ‘brutalism’ was unclear to Banham, who put forward three different versions of events: according to the first, the term was inspired by Le Corbusier’s reference to ‘les matières bruts’; according to the second, it was a conflation of ‘Brutus’ (apparently Peter’s nickname as a student) and ‘Alison’; according to the third, it was coined by a Communist faction within the LCC as a term of abuse directed against the opponents of their ‘New Humanism’. (Reyner Banham, ‘The New Brutalism’, *Architectural Review*,

Dec 1955, vol. 118, no. 708, p. 356.) Hidden in a footnote (ibid.) he suggested a fourth possibility, according to which the term was first used in the English summaries in a 1950 issue of the Swedish journal *Byggmästaren*. However, Banham was not able to trace this reference, and neither was the present author.

<sup>924</sup> [Alison Smithson], ‘House in Soho, London’, *Architectural Design*, Dec 1953, p. 342. Incidentally, the Smithsons claimed to have invented the term ‘brutalism’ whilst writing the text. (Alison and Peter Smithson, quoted in: Jeremy Baker, ‘A Smithson File’, *Arena*, Feb 1966, vol. 81, no. 899, p. 183.)



that it triggered a sustained debate in the correspondence columns of the architectural press (and presumably many a social gathering).<sup>925</sup> It is noteworthy how closely this debate remained linked to the Smithsons' thinking. Independent views on brutalism were conspicuously absent as contributors confined themselves to interpreting the possible meaning of the Smithsons' characteristically obscure statements, much like the ancient Greeks tried to make sense of Pythia's prophecies. Robin Middleton argued that brutalism was essentially 'what [the Smithsons] said and did,' and in the 1950s the two were indeed coextensive.<sup>926</sup>

The Smithsons themselves did little to clarify things as their priorities shifted over time. Hunstanton, their brutalist manifesto scheme *ante litteram*, was a major contribution to the postwar discourse on proportion;<sup>927</sup> in January 1955 they published their first written statement on brutalism, stressing its affinity to 'peasant dwelling forms', which provided the ideological backdrop for the MARS Group's village housing schemes for CIAM 10;<sup>928</sup> in the same year Banham, in consultation with the Smithsons, published his own take on brutalism, introducing image memorability as one of its objectives and a-formalism based on topology as the methodological device to accomplish it, which enabled him to bring the Smithsons' recent competition projects for Golden Lane and Sheffield under the brutalist

---

<sup>925</sup> Peter Shephard, for instance, referred to the 'new brutalism' in his presidential address to the AA in October 1954. (Peter Shephard, 'The Importance of Being Earnest', presidential address, *AAJ*, Nov 1954, vol. 70, no. 786, p. 92.)

<sup>926</sup> Robin Middleton, 'The New Brutalism or a clean, well-lighted place', *Architectural Design*, Jan 1967, p. 7. For instance, both Denys Lasdun and John Voelcker used the terms 'brutalists' and 'Smithsons' interchangeably. ([Denys Lasdun, J. H. V. Davies], 'Thoughts in Progress: the New Brutalism', *ibid.*, April 1957, pp. 111–112. John Voelcker, letter to the editor, *ibid.*, June 1957, p. 184.) Ridiculing the preponderance of new stylistic movements included in *knaurs lexikon der modernen architektur*, an encyclopaedia of modern architecture published in 1963, German critic Hermann Funke wrote: 'Brutalism has the smallest number of followers, namely two, Alison and Peter Smithson; but these two brutalists are married to each other. So more may come.' (Hermann Funke, 'Wortmagie und vor allem viele Architekten', *Die Zeit*, 26 April 1963, p. 18.)

<sup>927</sup> See: *Eva-Marie Neumann*, 'Architectural Proportion in Britain, 1945-1957', *Architectural History*, vol. 39 (1996), pp. 197-221. The chief 'formalist' within the Smithsons' inner circle was John Voelcker; see: Ruth Olitsky, John Voelcker, 'Form and Mathematics', *Architectural Design*, Oct 1954, pp. 306-307, see also: Voelcker, letter to the editor, *RIBA J*, Feb 1952, pp. 140-141; Voelcker, letter to the editor, *AJ*, 14 Oct 1954, p. 456.

<sup>928</sup> Alison and Peter Smithson, 'The New Brutalism', *Architectural Design*, Jan 1955, p. 1. James Stirling, who designed one of the schemes, saw the reappraisal of indigenous, anonymous building and traditional methods (which he called 'regionalism') as a reaction to the preceding formalism originating in the schools of architecture, and he supported his argument through AA student schemes by Peter Ahrends (see also p. 178, fn. 874) and Janet Kaye. (James Stirling, 'Regionalism in Architecture', *Architects' Year Book*, no. 8 (1957), pp. 62-68.)

umbrella;<sup>929</sup> finally, in 1959, the Smithsons linked their definition of brutalism to their growing preoccupation with urbanism: ‘The essential ethic of Brutalism is in town planning.’<sup>930</sup> In other words, the Smithsons’ priorities changed, and so did their notion of brutalism.

The one consistent thread running through the Smithsons’ writings was a recall to first principles and a corresponding insistence on ‘clear exhibition of structure’ and ‘valuation of materials “as found”’, to use Banham’s phrasing.<sup>931</sup> The Smithsons saw these as the core values of early modernism (i.e. prior to its being codified as an International Style and popularised for local consumption at the Festival of Britain) and called for a ‘re-evaluation of those advanced buildings of the twenties and thirties whose lessons [...] have been forgotten.’<sup>932</sup> There was just a little step from ‘re-evaluating’ to emulating or even imitating these buildings, and in principle at least the Smithsons’ approach differed little from the historicism of previous periods apart from the fact that their models stemmed from the more recent past. In essence, brutalism was, as Banham himself conceded, ‘modern-movement historicism’.<sup>933</sup>

This notion resonated with AA students such as Bob Maguire, John Miller, David Gray and Neave Brown, who were equally disenchanted with the state of modern architecture in their country and sought their inspiration for a new formal expression in the ‘heroic period’ of continental modernism. As Miller recalled: ‘It seemed in the early fifties that architecture had been diverted from its true antecedents and, in consequence, the source material of the 1920s and 1930s was exhumed after being neglected for over a decade.’<sup>934</sup> It seems worth pointing out in this context that some students’ reaction against the Festival style was immediate.

---

<sup>929</sup> Banham 1955, op. cit., pp. 354-361; for an analysis see: Laurent Stalder, ‘“New Brutalism”, “Topology” and “Image”: Some remarks on the architectural debates in England around 1950’, *Journal of Architecture*, vol. 13, no. 3 (2008), pp. 263-281.

<sup>930</sup> Peter Smithson, Alison Smithson, Jane Drew, E. Maxwell Fry, ‘Conversation on Brutalism’, *Zodiac*, April 1959, p. 74.

<sup>931</sup> Banham 1955, p. 361.

<sup>932</sup> Smithsons 1955, op. cit. The Smithsons made this point repeatedly; see e.g.: Alison and Peter Smithson, ‘Statement’, *Architectural Review*, April 1954, p. 274: ‘It is necessary to create an architecture of reality [...] which takes as its starting point the period 1910 – of de Stijl, Dada and Cubism – and which ignores the waste land of the four functions.’

<sup>933</sup> Reyner Banham, ‘The history of the immediate future’, *RIBA J*, May 1961, p. 253.

<sup>934</sup> Quoted in: Gowan 1973, pp. 30-31. Miller remembers that the students’ interest in continental modernism bemused their teachers, specifically ACP: ‘They thought it was slightly retrogressive, that we should be moving on.’ (Miller, interview, op. cit.)

Maguire, who thought it ‘a sort of betrayal of modern architecture’, recalls ‘tremendous arguments’ with his tutors who were in the process of building the South Bank exhibition,<sup>935</sup> and the emergence of a ‘modern-movement historicism’ at the AA is noticeable in third-year student work by, for instance, Gray and Miller as early as 1953 (see Appendix 3). The modern-movement revival at the AA should thus be seen as a largely independent process which – though echoing the Smithsons’ activities – was not directly influenced by them and predated their first substantive writings. Indeed, the students’ outlook in the early 1950s seemed largely resistant to external influences. An exhibition of thesis designs by Liverpool students in December 1953, which displayed ‘that curious post-war development, rudely referred to as *Maniera Liverpooliana* – rigidly symmetrical Beaux-Arts plans (with just the teeniest naughty deviations),<sup>936</sup> caused some irritation amongst the ‘honest plods of Bedford Square,<sup>937</sup> and the exhibition *Parallel of Life and Art*, which was the subject of another student forum in the same week, met with similar disdain as students accused the organisers of the ‘deliberate flouting of the traditional concepts of photographic beauty, of a cult of ugliness<sup>938</sup> and variously condemned the display as ‘shallow, eclectic, [and] an example of the New Picturesque.’<sup>939</sup>

This is not to say that AA students were unconcerned about questions of architectural expression. According to Robert Maxwell, ‘for [the postwar students] the most important thing about the idea of modern architecture was not its freedom from style, but its potentiality as style,<sup>940</sup> and whilst the derivative idiom of the Festival of Britain provided its most readily available target, the students’ architectural insurrection was driven by a more deep-seated disillusionment with the postwar building programme and its lack of formal vigour. In a talk to the AA in

---

<sup>935</sup> Maguire, interview, 10 Sep 2013.

<sup>936</sup> *AJ*, 3 Dec 1953, p. 679.

<sup>937</sup> *Ibid.*; see also: Robert Maxwell, letter to the editor, *ibid.*, 24 Dec 1953, p. 776. The exhibition was organised by AA student Sam Stevens and showed, amongst others, a project for a New Town centre by James Stirling and a Turkish bath on the Grand Canal in Venice by Tony Beckles-Willson. John Miller remembers: ‘[The drawings] were works of art, and in this sense anticipated the drawings the AA would get into much later in the 1970s and 80s. [...] At the time we all said how socially irresponsible they were [...] but secretly we were deeply impressed by them all.’ (Swenarton and Weaver 2015, p 127.)

<sup>938</sup> Banham 1955, p. 356.

<sup>939</sup> Hugh Pope, letter to the editor, *Architectural Review*, June 1954, vol. 115, no. 690, p. 364. According to Pope, one of the initiators of the forum, an editor of the *Architectural Review*, presumably Banham, subsequently ‘labelled the AA students as a reactionary body.’

<sup>940</sup> Robert Maxwell, *New British Architecture*, London 1972, p. 15.

April 1954 fourth-year student Colin Glennie acknowledged the high standard of housing and schools in the country but maintained that ‘architecture is not simply the fulfilling of a social programme,’<sup>941</sup> and two months later fellow student Neave Brown expressed the changing attitude at a general meeting:

By the immediate post-war students the work was seen to have an enormous social importance to the community, far more than its particular aesthetic importance, but now we see around us the failure of so many schemes, and the student’s sense of responsibility has become more introverted, and he considers how his work is an aesthetic contribution to what may be called Western culture.<sup>942</sup>

A mystified Lewis Mumford urged AA’s students not to follow Mies and Le Corbusier into the ‘bottomless pit [...] of purely formal and aesthetic solutions.’<sup>943</sup> Yet with Killick emerging as the dominant force in the fourth year and Smithson taking charge of the fifth, the students’ preoccupation with matters of form gathered momentum. Smithson was clear about his intentions:

Style is a problem that I think has been completely neglected since the days of William Morris. [...] In the key year of 1913 there were the beginnings of four distinct architectural styles: Constructivism, de Stijl, Purism and Bauhaus. Each of these movements had an attitude and a complete, comprehensive, plastic system, that is what used to be known as style. The schools and institutes, the academies of today, do not teach style. They make no approach to the problem of architecture; they make an approach to technology, to technique, but the central problem of creating an actual architecture they ignore. [...] The schools and institutes should attempt to focus their students with the same energy on the plastic systems, particularly the plastic systems we have inherited from the immediate past, as they do on technique.<sup>944</sup>

Smithson’s impact was felt throughout the school: ‘His lectures were sell-outs. Whenever he gave a lecture, they would be hanging from the light fittings to get in to hear him.’<sup>945</sup> Inspired by Banham’s research into the early history of modern

---

<sup>941</sup> Colin Glennie, ‘Architecture – a Personal Point of View’, *AAJ*, April 1954, vol. 69, no. 781, p. 238.

<sup>942</sup> Quoted in: ‘A Policy for the AA’, op. cit., p. 52.

<sup>943</sup> ‘Talk by Mr Lewis Mumford’, *ibid.*, July/Aug 1953, vol. 69, no. 774, p. 49.

<sup>944</sup> Quoted in: Reyner Banham, ‘Futurism and Modern Architecture’, *RIBA J*, Feb 1957, p. 137.

<sup>945</sup> ‘Edward Jones interviewed by Niamh Dillon’, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects’ Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 3/11 (9 March 2012), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 15 Jan 2017] (hereafter cited as BLSA/Jones). Jones recalls that Smithson’s juries had a similar effect: ‘When there was a good crit going it would be packed. [...] Smithson would come into the room and sit down, and the place would go full silent because here was the big cheese, and he would always play to the occasion.’ (*Ibid.*)

architecture, Smithson drew the students' attention to its 'major minor figures'<sup>946</sup> (notably the futurists and expressionists), expanding the catalogue of possible precedents and placing 'modern-movement historicism' on a much broader basis.<sup>947</sup> In doing so, Smithson was chiefly responsible for the brutalist eclecticism which took hold of the AA in the late 1950s. Discussing the annual exhibition of student work in 1957, the *Architects' Journal* noted that 'one can pick one's style according to one's taste, particularly if it is early 20<sup>th</sup> Century,'<sup>948</sup> and Michael Patrick observed a predilection for 'the irregular, the severe, the brooding and sometimes the convulsive'<sup>949</sup>, which he suspected 'might come as a disagreeable surprise [to] architects who have spent the last twenty years lightening and refining every detail over their buildings.'<sup>950</sup>

Smithson and Killick's own work at the time reflected the changing mood. In 1956 they prepared a sculpturally bold (and unplaced) project for the Sydney Opera competition consisting of two asymmetrical auditoria cantilevered from a central tower, with the exteriors covered in white and grey mosaic and the interiors lined with a continuous, tortoise-like shell made of lacquered scarlet and crimson. The *Architect and Building News* praised the design, which was 'clearly [...] the outcome of the disciplined thought of the early militant days of the modern movement when function indisputably generated form', though it feared that 'the resulting form will not be everybody's cup of tea.'<sup>951</sup> Peter Cook felt that 'in many ways' Smithson and

---

<sup>946</sup> 'John Outram interviewed by Niamh Dillon', *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 8/27 (27 November 2007), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 15 Jan 2017] (hereafter cited as BLSA/Outram).

<sup>947</sup> '[Smithson] more or less exploded the myth of the great masters [...]. My generation was not enthralled to the great masters. We were looking for something much hotter, much wilder. We were in a kind of meltdown period.' (Ibid., Track 16/27 (18 Dec 2007); for Banham's doctoral research, supervised by Pevsner, see: Banham, *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age*, London 1960; see also Banham 1957, op. cit.

<sup>948</sup> *AJ*, 1 Aug 1957, p. 165.

<sup>949</sup> Patrick, quoted in: 'Annual Prize Giving', *AAJ*, Sep/Oct 1957, vol. 73, no. 815, p. 62.

<sup>950</sup> Ibid. Patrick – despite being one of those architects – welcomed the development as a healthy sign of the students' independence: 'To those engaged in teaching it is more likely to be something of a relief, not because its outward appearance is a reversal of the graph-paper style of four years ago, but because it shows quite clearly that the students will not necessarily accept the architectural philosophy of an earlier generation but prefer to work things out for themselves. It is precisely this process of working things out on your own that is the beginning and end of architectural education and the only possible way of achieving any degree of aesthetic maturity. Whatever we may have as a personal preference for this or that type of architecture is really irrelevant.' (Ibid.)

<sup>951</sup> 'An Interesting Entry', *ABN*, 14 March 1957, p. 352. The Sydney Opera project was one of only three HKPA projects in which Killick, who suffered from multiple sclerosis, was actively involved as a designer. (John Partridge, interview with the author, 23 April 2013.) According to Peter Cook, writing a quarter of a century later (and misinterpreting its materiality), 'It heralds the period of the mature Brutalist style. A big

Killick's joint submission was 'the link back to the student work carried out under their wing,'<sup>952</sup> and the students' creative efforts clearly mirrored, perhaps inspired, and certainly seized upon the work of their year masters. 'In 1958 some kind of dam burst,' recalls John Outram. 'After that everything went haywire.'<sup>953</sup> According to Peter Cook, Killick alone absorbed a year consisting of 'five Christian Weirdies, two Bowellists, half a dozen proto-Neo-Futurists, *recherché* Edwardians and various persons of no particular persuasion at all,'<sup>954</sup> and though both he and Smithson nurtured this diversity, their tolerance with eccentric deviators had its limits, particularly when they resorted to pre-modern precedents. Killick, for instance, fiercely opposed the work of the Christian Weirdies, a group including Andrew Anderson, Quinlan Terry and Malcolm Higgs, whose quest for originality found its stimulus in Arts and Crafts models.<sup>955</sup> According to Outram (one of the 'Bowellists'), by the time Smithson left the AA in autumn 1960 he too had become exceedingly uncomfortable about his part in inspiring the extreme eclecticism of his students: 'Smithson said he regretted giving these lectures because they had created this enormous outburst of strange buildings, but it was too late by then.'<sup>956</sup>

Writing in 1959, John Summerson discussed the emergence of the 'New Brutalism', praising it for its rigour whilst hesitating to acknowledge it as a movement in its own right.<sup>957</sup> Yet at the AA this movement had been in the making since the early 1950s and reached its heyday under Killick and Smithson. Looking back on student work of the past three decades, Michael Patrick in 1958 had no qualms about attaching

---

concrete lump. Loveable, like a friendly rhinoceros.' (Peter Cook, 'Regarding the Smithsons', *Architectural Review*, July 1982, vol. 172, no. 1025, p. 40.)

<sup>952</sup> Cook, 'Responses', op. cit., p. 139.

<sup>953</sup> BLSA/Outram.

<sup>954</sup> Cook 1966, op. cit., p. 139.

<sup>955</sup> Malcolm Higgs recalls that Killick was 'really rather vitriolic' about their work (interview with the author, 19 Aug 2016), and it appears that it only passed thanks to Patrick, whose judgment evidently trumped his year masters'. In his annual report about Anderson in 1959 Killick criticised his student's tendency to develop his style 'from a selective dip into the past', which meant that his ability was 'rapidly degenerating into eccentricity, which is a sad waste [...]' Accordingly, Killick felt that Anderson had developed little beyond his third-year standard and had therefore had a 'relatively unsuccessful year'. (AAA, Box 2012:P12.) In contrast, Patrick considered Anderson 'one of the five best students in the year' and advised the Leverhulme scholarship committee that his progress in the fourth year had been 'excellent'. (Meeting of the Leverhulme Scholarship Committee, 22 April 1959, in: *Minutes of the Leverhulme Scholarship Committee*, AAA, Box C303, p. 116). For a discussion of the Christian Weirdies see: Powers 2012, pp. 48-58.

<sup>956</sup> BLSA/Outram.

<sup>957</sup> Summerson 1959, op. cit., p. 28. Summerson had made a similar point at a meeting on brutalism at the Institute of Contemporary Arts in early 1956. (*AJ*, 12 April 1956, p. 339.)

the label ‘brutalist’<sup>958</sup> to the most recent phase in the school’s history, and fifteen years later James Gowan remembered the late 1950s and early 1960s as ‘the old brutalist period’<sup>959</sup> at the AA.

### **Smithsonian Curriculum**

Though the AA witnessed a recognisable drive towards brutalism, in the mid-1950s it still co-existed with other tendencies. The second year, for instance, remained firmly in the hands of the ‘Festival generation’ (mainly Oliver Carey and Elizabeth Chesterton); in the third there was James Gowan, who was in the process of building the canonically brutalist Ham Common estate, but there was also Stirling Craig, who had designed the displays exhibited in the Festival of Britain’s Dome of Discovery; the fourth year had John Killick, but it also had Leonard Manasseh. Not surprisingly, there was growing consensus amongst students and staff that the school’s obvious lack of a guiding philosophy was making it difficult to discern what precisely its aims and objectives were.

Patrick shared this assessment, but he saw the school’s eclecticism as an appropriate reflection of a British architectural landscape marked by factional disputes and the absence of a unifying theory, and he deliberately reinforced it through his staffing policy. According to McNab, ‘Patrick chose his staff irrespective of their affinity with his own views and was shrewd enough to select them for their articulate expression of opinion.’<sup>960</sup> Indeed, whilst fundamentally opposed to imposing his own views on the school, Patrick saw it as the duty of his tutors to advocate theirs with conviction:

---

<sup>958</sup> Patrick, ‘Architectural Aspirations’.

<sup>959</sup> Gowan, ‘AA 125’, p. 4. Likewise, Ed Jones, who entered the AA in 1958, recalls: ‘The AA was very preoccupied with what has been later described as the period of brutalism [...] When one arrived at the AA, one was very much aware that there was a definite ethos, style operating there, and it was very different to the style one saw in America. When I went to work in America in my third year, one spoke about the brutalist sensibility, and they were bemused by it, critical of it to some extent.’ (BLSA/Jones.)

<sup>960</sup> McNab 1972, p. 74

[The architectural teacher] cannot just stand aside and wait for somebody to produce an argument which has universal acceptance. He is expected to offer guidance and criticism. He must have a point of view and establish in his own mind a basis for criticism. The fact that his theory is an individual one rather than universal may be his misfortune, but in the present circumstances it is certainly not his fault.<sup>961</sup>

The division of the second, third and fourth years into largely autonomous parallel units enhanced the fragmentation of the school, particularly as Patrick insisted that masters should take charge of different groups of students over the course of the year.<sup>962</sup> When in the second half of the decade a ‘theory’ – brutalism – appeared to gain ‘universal’ appeal, Patrick’s eclecticism was beginning to look out of touch with the mood in the school.

The shortcomings of the course in terms of its lack of cohesion and overarching vision preoccupied the staff-student committee throughout the academic year 1956/57, and in May 1957 it formed a sub-committee to review the curriculum, which apart from minor modifications had remained largely untouched since its inception four years prior. Chaired by fifth-year student Francis Baden-Powell, the so-called ‘curriculum working party’ comprised student members Robert Howard and Brian Young (both in their fifth year), George Kasabov (fourth year), and Malcolm Higgs (third year), as well as unit masters John Killick, Stirling Craig and James Gowan, and, as secretary, Patrick’s administrative assistant Michael Tree.<sup>963</sup>

The two main aspects of the report which the curriculum working party submitted in February 1958 centred upon the educational system of the school, i.e. the organisation of the teaching staff, and the curriculum itself, specifically the teaching contents of the various years and their linkage with each other.<sup>964</sup> With regards to the former, the working party took the view that, on balance, the drawbacks of the unit system outweighed its advantages – a somewhat surprising verdict given how

---

<sup>961</sup> Patrick, quoted in: John Summerson, ‘The Case for a Theory of Modern Architecture’, *RIBA J*, June 1957, p. 312; see also: Michael Patrick, ‘AA Policy’, *AAJ*, April 1956, vol. 71, no. 801, p. 244: ‘Quite a number of schools, some in this country and some on the continent, believe in a very strict adherence to one method of approach and consequently nearly all the work looks as though it was done by one man. The AA is in complete disagreement with this attitude.’

<sup>962</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 2 Dec 1954, SCM 1951-63, p. 110.

<sup>963</sup> ‘Curriculum Working Party Report’, Feb 1958, AAA, Box 1991:31 (hereafter cited as CWP Report), p. 1. Kasabov and Higgs also served on the editorial board of the *AA Journal*.

<sup>964</sup> *Ibid.*



zealously the students had advocated the return of this system and how short a trial it had been given:

The unit system, which was in general agreed by the committee to be advantageous, nonetheless creates certain weaknesses in the teaching method. Particularly in years where there are as many as four units, the continuity of the teaching aim and the maintenance of a consistent standard, both within the year and through the course as a whole can be hindered.<sup>965</sup>

To address this problem, the working party recommended the appointment of ‘co-ordinators’ from within the ranks of the unit masters in the second, third and fourth years. Year masters in anything but title, these co-ordinators would represent the year in policy discussions with the principal, assist him in the selection of unit staff and synchronise their year’s programmes, visits, lectures and tests in compliance with its teaching objective, with unit masters themselves retaining the responsibility for the detailed setting and handling of programmes.<sup>966</sup>

As to the course itself, the curriculum working party put its recommendations forward in the form of a model curriculum (along with a number of changes to the lecture syllabus).<sup>967</sup> The working party attached great value to the series of second-year studio projects related to a particular material and recommended that the idea be extended.<sup>968</sup> Thus, the final term of the first year would feature a first, ‘primitive’ building in timber, followed by masonry, steel, and in-situ concrete in the second, and precast concrete and synthetics in the third year. Another element of the existing course which found the working party’s approval was the village scheme, which provided the context for the design subjects in the third year – an approach which, in the eyes of the working party, could be developed throughout the course.

---

<sup>965</sup> Ibid., pp. 1-2.

<sup>966</sup> Ibid., p. 5. Masters in each year had, in fact, taken turns as co-ordinators from 1955/56 onward, but their additional duties were merely administrative. (‘School Committee. Report for the Session 1955/56’, att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 3 May 1956, SCM 1951-63, p. 147.)

<sup>967</sup> Gowan presented the working party’s curriculum in an article for the *Architectural Review* one year later. Though it had by then been put into operation, his piece – oddly – lacks any reference to the AA. (James Gowan, ‘Curriculum’, *Architectural Review*, Dec 1959, vol. 126, no. 754, pp. 315-323.) With regards to the lecture syllabus, the curriculum working party suggested, amongst other things, that the number of lectures on general history should be reduced to enable the modern movement to be covered more thoroughly. Accordingly, the first year would comprise lectures on modern history by Reyner Banham, Peter Smithson, James Stirling, Sandy Wilson, Colin Rowe and Fello Atkinson. Lectures on general history (by Robert Furneaux Jordan) would be spread over the first two years, and history from the Renaissance onward (John Summerson) as well as the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries (Jordan, Graeme Shankland, John Brandon-Jones) would be covered in the third year. (CWP Report, p. 7 et pass.)

<sup>968</sup> Ibid., pp. 2-3.

Following the preparatory first year (whose Bauhaus-inspired emphasis on abstract design exercises the working party rejected), all major programmes in the following years were to be linked to a specific gradation of architectural scale: the village in the second year, the town in the third, the city sector in the fourth, and the city in the fifth.<sup>969</sup> Each year would include an initial period of group research into the conditions and growth of the chosen area, resulting in a redevelopment plan which would form the basis of the subsequent design projects.<sup>970</sup>

According to Gowan, the students had reviewed the lecture course, Killick the staffing system, and he and Craig the curriculum itself.<sup>971</sup> However, in both constituent parts the new curriculum reflected the intellectual leadership of Peter Smithson, even though he was not himself a member of the curriculum working party. The sequence of building studies in the lower years presupposed materiality to be a decisive factor in architectural design, and the contextual framework of the proposed curriculum echoed the Team 10 approach to urban planning based on different 'scales of association'. In other words, with its dual emphasis on materiality and context as the prime determinants of architectural form, the report of the curriculum working party drew together the two theoretical strands which pervaded the Smithsons' writings in the 1950s.<sup>972</sup>

---

<sup>969</sup> Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>970</sup> After one year the progressive order of design tasks was limited to the middle years, i.e. the village in the second year, the town in the third, and the city or 'metropolis' in the fourth. The main reason for this was a basic flaw in the setup of the curriculum, which expected students to tackle the largest and most complex architectural scale in their thesis year when they were required to work as individuals. As they 'appeared to lack the necessary maturity for independent study' (Patrick, quoted in: Meeting of the Council, 13 July 1959, CM 1955-61, p. 363), the students tended to engage in over-ambitious schemes, both in their free, so-called 'city studies' in the first term and in the theses themselves, which in turn led an exceedingly high number of them to fail in the 1958/59 session. In light of this, Patrick reintroduced a set subject in the first term, and, in an attempt to limit the scope of theses, he also convinced the council to change the diploma regulations, which had thus far given students twelve months' grace for handing in unfinished work. (Ibid., pp. 361-362; Meeting of the Council, 26 Oct 1959, *ibid.*, p. 371.) The students protested vehemently against these changes as they considered them to be 'inconsistent with the recent tendency [...] to give them more freedom for exploration and experiment' and felt that the 'necessity of completing their theses by the end of the course would make them more cautious in their choice of subject and cut down their scope', which was, of course, precisely the point. (Meeting of the Council, 28 March 1960, *ibid.*, p. 404; see also: Meeting of the Council, 25 April 1960, *ibid.*, pp. 407-409.)

<sup>971</sup> Woodman 2008, p. 187.

<sup>972</sup> In Smithson's view, the Economist cluster, completed in 1964, exemplified the idea of the new curriculum: 'For those who were at the AA School during the years '56 - '59, when the curriculum was aimed at trying to train students to "build into the situation", "to build towards the community structure" and so on, it is hoped that The Economist Building will explain what all that was about without any more words.' (Alison and Peter Smithson, 'Architectural Association Visit to 25 St James's Street "The Economist Building"', Nov 1964, AAA, Box 2003:45c.)

Given how tenaciously Patrick had asserted his authority against the students in his early years in office, it may seem out of character for him to consent to a working party reviewing his curriculum. Yet, provided the proper procedures were adhered to, Patrick welcomed the input of staff and students, and – having participated in the preliminary discussions of the staff-student committee – he probably anticipated, and generally agreed with, the line the curriculum working party was likely to take.<sup>973</sup> The proximity of its recommendations to his own views certainly explains why Patrick implemented them almost at once and with only minor modifications. The new curriculum retained the succession of tightly controlled, single-material studies he had introduced in 1952, and it related design tasks to a progressive order of scales, which, in his view, promised to promote a visual and contextual approach in keeping with townscape principles.<sup>974</sup> The fact that the curriculum also involved a broad return of group working and town planning (the latter being its very essence as far as Smithson was concerned)<sup>975</sup> suggests that Patrick, having secured a second

---

<sup>973</sup> At a meeting of the school committee Brandon-Jones criticised the staff for changing the curriculum and thus preventing the council from implementing the office-training scheme, which it favoured (see p. 181, fn. 885). Patrick supported the curriculum working party in the strongest terms: '[He] said he considered it most unfair to refer to the school staff as preventing the council from carrying out its intentions. If the council wished to continue the tradition of the association of forming a number of committees to discuss and formulate school policy, they must be prepared for a conflict of opinion. He personally found this traditional policy useful; but, if asked, he could carry on and plan the educational programme of the school without committee assistance.' (Meeting of the School Committee, 3 Dec 1958, SCM 1951-63, p. 237.)

<sup>974</sup> 'In general terms our aim is to give students a greater awareness of the environment of which their studio designs form part. [We are trying] to provide an exercise which will stimulate imagination, encourage students to get to grips with townscape, and, most important, create an awareness of town scale. [...] If we really care about the appearance of our towns, we must try to shift the emphasis more towards a visual approach and away from the present position, where the needs of the traffic planner and the real estate man seem to be the only considerations.' (Patrick, quoted in: 'Annual Prize Giving', *AAJ*, Sep/Oct 1959, vol. 75, no. 835, p. 59.) Smithson, unsurprisingly, had a rather different take: 'Town planning seen as a radical organisational/building-type/aesthetic problem requires the development of a special mental technique, of what I have called elsewhere "context thinking". As far as architecture is concerned, this does not mean "fitting in", or the creation of elegant but phony spaces in the pictorial tradition of the English Picturesque or Camillo Sitte, but a consideration of the building as being involved in an existing pattern of living and in a given technological context [...]. It should be the purpose of architectural education to induce "thinking in a context" from the beginning.' (Peter Smithson, 'Education for Town Building: An Outline of the Intention of the Architectural Association School Curriculum', *ibid.*, Jan 1961, vol. 76, no. 848, p. 191). In spite of their stylistic differences, there was a considerable degree of affinity between the brutalists and the members of the 'Festival generation' in so far as they both challenged the CIAM doctrine and its distinction into four urban functions. Critique directed at the inherently non-contextual approach of CIAM had predated the Smithsons' polemic as the MARS Group ahead of CIAM 8 in 1951 had suggested that the 'core' be studied in relation to five scale levels, viz. the village, the neighbourhood, the town or city sector, the city, and the metropolis. As Welter shows, this cross-generational British preoccupation with scale distinctions traces back to the theories of Patrick Geddes. (Volker Welter, 'Talking Squares - Grids and Grilles as architectural analytical and communicative tools', conference paper, TU Delft, 5-6 June 2003, <http://www.team10online.org/research/papers/delft2/welter.pdf> [accessed 10 Sep 2015]; see also: Mumford 2002, pp. 203, 239-241.)

<sup>975</sup> Smithson, 'Education for Town Building', *op. cit.*

term in office, felt sufficiently empowered to ignore the RIBA's reservations, which, presumably, he did not share in the first place.

Patrick also welcomed the reintroduction of year masters, which relieved him from administrative duties and allowed him to delegate much of the running of the school to his senior staff, whom he vested with great authority and sheltered from interference by the council. According to John Partridge, Patrick held his staff 'like puppets on a string'<sup>976</sup>, and James Gowan recalled:

[He] was in charge of the school and he ran it much like a ship, as if any minor deviation in the crew's behaviour could, and probably would, result in an immediate titanic disaster. In the regalia of full authority, he stared out from the bridge, ever alert for the enemy, the marauding flotilla of the council.<sup>977</sup>

Patrick appointed Robert Maxwell and David Oakley as co-ordinators for, respectively, the second and third year, but he departed from the working party's recommendations with regard to the fourth year, where he dropped the division into units, giving Killick the same scope of powers as fifth-year master Smithson.<sup>978</sup> This decision had a profound effect on the staffing situation as Killick and Gowan, whom he chose as his assistant year master, surrounded themselves with tutors who shared their outlook, notably Bill Howell, John Voelcker and Peter Chamberlin.

(Incidentally, Smithson's selection was less one-sided: In addition to his 'assistant studio master' Arthur Korn, who embodied the sought-after link to the heroic period of modernism, Smithson's 'tutors' included likeminded colleagues such as Alan Colquhoun, Theo Crosby and John Partridge, but also Eric Lyons and John Weeks.)<sup>979</sup>

---

<sup>976</sup> Partridge, interview, op. cit.

<sup>977</sup> Gowan 1994, p. 12.

<sup>978</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 26 June 1958 (SC), p. 219.

<sup>979</sup> In 1956 Patrick introduced an informal 'fifth-year tutorial scheme', which allowed him in addition to his studio tutors to use the services of experienced practitioners who were otherwise too busy to teach at the AA. Two years later the scheme superseded the previous tutorial arrangements in the fifth year, and Korn, the only part-time member of the fifth-year staff who had a contract with the AA, was given the title of 'assistant studio master'. Prior to that, the nomenclature did not clearly distinguish between formal 'tutors' and informal 'visiting tutors' (who, though remunerated, were not considered members of the AA teaching staff). This peculiarity might clear up a long-standing confusion amongst scholars over James Stirling's role at the AA. In March 1956 both Stirling and Gowan applied for a teaching post at the AA. Patrick offered a position to Gowan but not to Stirling, who joined the Regent Street Polytechnic instead. Malcolm Higgs, who worked for the partners in the late 1950s, has no doubt that Gowan himself did his utmost to keep Stirling out of the AA (interview, op. cit.), and Mark Crinson rightly states that Stirling 'was never appointed as a tutor' (Mark Crinson, *Stirling and Gowan*, New Haven / London 2012, p. 311). That being said, it is possible that Stirling

Key members of staff left the AA in quick succession at the closing of the decade. Gowan resigned in October 1959 due to pressure of work following Stirling's invitation to Yale, and Killick left half a year later when his deteriorating health made it impossible for him to continue his teaching.<sup>980</sup> Peter Smithson followed them in December 1960 to focus his full attention on designing the Economist building,<sup>981</sup> and Michael Patrick left one year later (see page 231). Their curriculum survived the departure of its instigators into the mid-1960s.

## Conclusion

Over the ten years during which he served as the principal of the AA Michael Patrick effected a fundamental transformation of the school. Having changed its administrative system immediately upon taking office, he implemented a series of modifications to the course itself, culminating, in 1953, in a new, more strictly regulated curriculum which marked the end of the liberal teaching model his predecessor had sought to establish. Patrick's educational aspirations for the school became evident in his third year in office, and at a most momentous meeting in January 1954 the council sanctioned two proposals which enhanced the school's claim as a cradle of progressive pedagogical ideas.

The AA's famous Department of Tropical Architecture is today largely associated with Otto Koenigsberger, who was without doubt instrumental to its success and considered himself rightly 'one of its fathers.'<sup>982</sup> Yet it seems important to acknowledge that he was not the only one as the DTA was an integral part of Patrick's prescient, if largely unsuccessful, policy of extending the AA's educational range through provisions for postgraduate specialisation. The following chapter will examine the broader implications of this policy in detail.

---

acted as visiting tutor to a select group of students, as he himself claimed. (James Stirling, 'An architect's approach to architecture', *RIBA J*, May 1965, p. 233.) For the fifth-year tutorial scheme see: Meeting of the School Committee, 3 May 1956, SCM 1951-63, p. 152; Meeting of the Council, 9 July 1956, CM 1955-61, p. 78; Meeting of the School Committee, 20 March 1958, SCM 1951-63, p. 206.)

<sup>980</sup> Killick suffered from multiple sclerosis and died in 1971 at the age of 47.

<sup>981</sup> Peter Smithson, letter to Michael Patrick, 18 Aug 1960, AAA, Box 2012:13.

<sup>982</sup> Otto Koenigsberger, letter to Michael Patrick, 13 Nov 1956, AAA/OK, Box 27.

As far as the AA itself was concerned, the watershed moment of Patrick's principalship was the introduction of a modified unit system, which stimulated his recruitment efforts, presumably because the prospect of having sole responsibility for their teaching programmes without having to answer to a superior year master appealed to the more mission-conscious amongst the leading young architects.<sup>983</sup> In the second half of the 1950s the school came to be dominated by John Killick and Peter Smithson, whose brutalist recall to early modernist principles resonated with students who were equally disenchanted with the state of architecture in their country and inspired a remarkable creative outburst in student work. The curriculum of 1958, devised by a working party of staff and students, incorporated the key elements of Smithson's thinking on brutalism and was his educational legacy.

---

<sup>983</sup> Smithson stressed this point in his resignation letter, in which he expressed his 'thanks for the opportunities I have been given in the School, to teach without any compromise of my deepest beliefs [...].'  
(Smithson to Patrick, 18 Aug 1960, op. cit.)

## CHAPTER 6

### IN SEARCH OF A NEW POLICY (1951-1961)

Architectural education does not take place in a vacuum. Throughout Michael Patrick's tenure, and increasingly so in his second term, external developments and interaction with outside bodies determined and at times dominated the agenda of the school authorities. The following chapter illuminates the broader educational context within which the AA sought to redefine its long-term policy. To do so, it will be necessary in the first section to return briefly to the early 1950s, when growing financial difficulties threatened the existence of the school and forced the AA for the first time in its history to seriously reconsider its hitherto sacrosanct independence. Meanwhile, the RIBA assumed increased regulatory powers over the schools, and the second section illustrates how Patrick, in the middle years of the decade, emerged as a key figure in its momentous debates on architectural education. The third section discusses the AA's prolonged negotiations with the Ministry of Education and the London County Council regarding the incorporation of its school into a new college of architecture and building, which at the end of the decade promised a chance to realise the long-held ambition of a truly integrated training for all building trades. The fourth and final section redirects its attention to the AA itself and traces the developments in the second half of the decade, which culminated in Patrick's dismissal in 1960.

#### **State of Crisis in the Early 1950s**

The last FET-grant-aided students entered the AA school in 1951. In anticipation of this, the council had, in 1949, decided to gradually shrink the total number of students in the school from more than five hundred in 1949/50 to approximately three hundred from 1953/54 onward (see page 112). Unlike Robert Furneaux Jordan, who had expected the school to incur a deficit of £6,000 owing to the lack of income through student fees, the council had downplayed the financial implications of its policy, assuming that expenditures could be scaled down in tandem with the size of the school and that any

potential shortfall could be compensated by attracting more industry-sponsored scholarships and local authority grants. This assumption proved fundamentally flawed as it overestimated the school's capacity to reduce overheads whilst at the same time underestimating the effect of rising costs, and when in June 1951 Michael Patrick took over as acting principal, the AA school was already in financial straits.<sup>984</sup>

In February 1952 the council announced an increase of student fees from £100 to £120 p. a. effective from the beginning of the following academic year.<sup>985</sup> In spite of this, only two months into the new session Patrick painted a dismal picture of the financial prospects of the school, pointing out that with a fall in numbers and rising costs the school was likely to face a deficit, and that this deficit could not be balanced by a sudden reduction in educational facilities as it would occur before the majority of current students would have completed their course.<sup>986</sup> Since Patrick vehemently opposed further cuts to school expenditure, especially staff salaries, the only solution was to either find a new source of income or to alter the AA's educational model altogether.<sup>987</sup> The then president, A. R. F. Anderson, who felt that the AA was 'far too big' and did a job which was 'being done equally well outside,'<sup>988</sup> preferred the latter course. Unable to keep up with the university schools and the polytechnics, both generously funded by the government (the former by the Treasury through the University Grants Committee, the latter by local education authorities and thus, in part, the MOE), Anderson suggested that the AA return to its roots as a part-time

---

<sup>984</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 29 June 1951, SCM 1951-63, p. 3; Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 5 March 1952, CM 1949-55, p. 247. One major issue concerned the accommodation of students. The finance committee had estimated that it would be possible to balance the budget if the number of students was maintained at a minimum of 330 and housed in the Bedford Square premises alone. This proved impracticable, and as a result the AA had to extend the lease for the Morwell Street site, which ran out at the end of 1951, for another two years. In April 1954, at the end of the council's five-year plan to reduce the numbers in the school, Jordan's prediction had proved completely accurate. ([H. J. W. Alexander], 'Memorandum for the Ministry of Education', April 1954, TNA: ED 74/72.)

<sup>985</sup> Meeting of the Council, 25 Feb 1952, CM 1949-55, p. 243.

<sup>986</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 4 Dec 1952, SCM 1951-63, p. 54.

<sup>987</sup> With the finance committee blocking new staff appointments, Patrick was effectively working on a staff-student ratio of 27 to 1 (as opposed to 15 to 1 immediately after the war), and this staff was, as discussed in the previous chapter, grossly underpaid. The financial situation of the AA led to tensions between the finance committee on one side, and Patrick and the school committee on the other. Brandon-Jones expressed the general feeling: 'It seems to me that we waste our time in the school committee deciding what we are going to do. The council blesses it and then the finance committee agrees that it cannot be done.' (Meeting of the Council, 27 April 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 323.)

<sup>988</sup> Quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 30 Jan 1953, CSSCM 1952-53, p. 9.



evening school running an atelier scheme for a limited number of selected postgraduate students.<sup>989</sup>

Though there was some support for this view, especially from Hugh Casson, in its majority the council rejected any radical departure from the AA's traditional setup, not least because it considered itself 'committed more or less' to deliver the promised five-year full-time course to its current students.<sup>990</sup> In January 1953 a sub-committee formed to consider the financial outlook of the school concluded that the only hope for additional revenue lay in attracting donations from manufacturers and trade associations, specifically in the form of lectureships – a course which Patrick, in particular, championed.<sup>991</sup> However, by the end of the year the limitations to the degree and continuity of support from the building industry became evident. In December Patrick urged the council to come to a conclusion about the future policy of the school:

The matter is becoming increasingly urgent. [...] We are committed to offering our educational facilities on our present scale until 1959, and unless there is a radical improvement in the present financial position, we cannot possibly hope to carry out these obligations.<sup>992</sup>

One month later, council member Walter Atkinson expressed the view that 'if no financial aid was forthcoming, the council should consider at the end of the current financial year the termination of the existing school course of five years.'<sup>993</sup>

In this desperate situation the council appeared prepared to sacrifice the school's treasured independence by attaching it to a larger academic institution. Talks with London University regarding the incorporation of the AA into its Imperial College were abandoned before they entered a formal stage;<sup>994</sup> however, negotiations about a

---

<sup>989</sup> Ibid.

<sup>990</sup> A. R. F. Anderson, quoted in: Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 21 May 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 327; see also: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Student' Committee, 18 June 1953, CSSCM 1952-53, p. 11.

<sup>991</sup> Meeting of the Council, 26 Jan 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 300. The committee comprised Patrick, Anderson and Gontran Goulden, the honorary secretary of the AA. Anderson – unlike Patrick – was doubtful about the prospects: 'Builders – why should they support the AA anyway?' (Council/Staff/Students' Committee Minutes, 11 Dec 1952, CSSCM 1952-53, p. 6.)

<sup>992</sup> 'Principal's Report', att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 3 Dec 1953, SCM 1951-63, p. 85.

<sup>993</sup> Meeting of the Council, 4 Jan 1954, CM 1949-55, p. 374.

<sup>994</sup> 'It [i.e. London University] already has a school of architecture, and we did not have to go very deeply into the matter to find out that it did not want another one.' (Peter Shepherd, quoted in: 'A Policy for the

possible amalgamation with the University of Cambridge, which were carried out in the presence of high-ranking officials of the RIBA, including its president, Howard Robertson, and the chairman of its BAE, Anthony Chitty, reached an advanced stage.<sup>995</sup> The AA had traditionally strong links with Cambridge, which at the time only offered a recognised course up to intermediate standard and fed many of its students into the senior years of the AA to complete their studies. Patrick considered their prior education deficient, particularly in technical subjects, and in 1952 he had instituted an annual five-week summer course to bring them up to the required AA standard, thus enabling them to enter directly into the fourth year without having to repeat the third.<sup>996</sup> In light of this, Patrick, who devised the merger scheme with Cambridge, was palpably resentful when in March 1954 the university turned it down ‘on the grounds that what we had to offer was not, in their view, worth the money they would have to pay.’<sup>997</sup>

With all other options exhausted, the AA council, in a last-ditch attempt to secure the needed funding, applied to the MOE for a resumption of its annual grant – a course which it had dismissed only half a year prior.<sup>998</sup> The AA had relinquished this grant in 1946, at a time of abnormally high student numbers financed almost exclusively through the FET scheme. In other words, the AA had effectively substituted a recurring, long-term government subsidy with a temporary one, and this, with hindsight, turned out to be a myopic and costly miscalculation. When in May 1949 the development sub-committee tentatively approached Frederick Bray, the under-secretary for further education at the MOE, to enquire about the conditions for a reinstatement of the grant it was told that such a request could only

---

AA’, op. cit., p. 54; see also: ‘Interview Memorandum – Architectural Association School of Architecture’, 23 April 1954, TNA: ED 74/72.)

<sup>995</sup> Meeting of the Council, 22 Feb 1954, CM 1949-55, pp. 384-385.

<sup>996</sup> Meeting of the Council, 26 May 1952, *ibid.*, p. 268; Meeting of the School Committee, 9 Oct 1952, SCM 1951-63, p. 53. Patrick saw the course as a gesture of goodwill toward Cambridge, although – characteristically – it also generated additional income and allowed the school to make use of its premises and staff during the summer vacations. As one would expect, the students concerned were less than thrilled. Edward Cullinan, for instance, remembers: ‘They assumed we were backward, so Michael Patrick gave us a summer school, which was very boring. He showed us some of his own houses at Hatfield, and then he gave us a scheme to do, then we were let in.’ (‘Edward Cullinan interviewed by Niamh Dillon’, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects’ Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 4/15 (16 March 2010), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 18 Jan 2017].

<sup>997</sup> Hugh Casson, quoted in: Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 27 April 1954, CM 1949-55, p. 410; see also: Meeting of the Council, 22 March 1954, *ibid.*, p. 390.

<sup>998</sup> H. J. W. Alexander, letter to Frederick Bray, 30 March 1954, TNA: ED 74/72; see also: Meeting of the Council, 27 Oct 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 363.

be considered if the AA could cover fifty per cent of its deficit through other sources.<sup>999</sup> Five years later, at a meeting on 23 April 1954, Bray advised President Casson that the MOE had since tightened its policy and was not prepared, either now or in the foreseeable future, to add to the number of establishments on its direct grant list even if the AA could meet this condition.<sup>1000</sup> Not only that, the MOE also rejected a scheme to attach the AA as an associated college to the Royal College of Art (RCA), one of the few grant-aided educational institutions, as it took the view that ‘there already existed ample provision for training architects.’<sup>1001</sup>

The failure, over a period of almost three years, to raise sufficient funds to guarantee the future of the school left the AA in a state of crisis. Several members of the council’s advisory committee shared Henry Braddock’s feeling that the school ‘had really finished its job [and] should run down and close,’<sup>1002</sup> whilst a meeting called to discuss the future of the AA attracted a disappointing eighty members and failed to suggest a possible course of action leading out of the current predicament.<sup>1003</sup> At the end of the 1953/54 session the financial situation was such that the council felt it improper to issue a prospectus advertising a five-year course and – dismissing the ‘madman’s course’ of draining the AA’s meagre reserves ‘until we run into a blank

---

<sup>999</sup> Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 27 April 1954, *ibid.*, p. 410; see also: ‘Report of the Development Sub-Committee’, July 1949, *op. cit.*

<sup>1000</sup> Memorandum, 23 April 1954, *op. cit.* There were two different types of establishments which received financial aid from the MOE: ‘Direct grant establishments’ were previously independent establishments whose catchment area was usually regional, or at least larger than the local authority in which they were situated, and the MOE’s policy was not to make itself responsible for more than 50% of their net running costs. ‘National colleges’ were fully funded but limited to cases where the industry concerned, though important to the national economy, threw up a supply of students sufficient only to require one centre. In 1920, when the AA was first classified as a ‘direct grant establishment’ it was one of a handful of architectural schools in the country and the case for regional or even national relevance was strong – in 1954 it was clearly untenable. Bray suggested, and actively supported, an approach to the LCC instead: ‘The school [...], as you know, has a very high reputation. [...] Personally, I should be sorry to see the school closed down, but I have to admit that the present provision in the country for training architects is reasonably good. However, if you decide to help them, we should be quite glad.’ (Bray, letter to John Brown, 23 April 1954, *ibid.*) Two weeks later Casson met with Brown, the chief education officer of the LCC, and G. Mavor, his senior assistant, who stressed that even if the LCC agreed to support the AA (which they considered highly unlikely), it would be obliged to charge out-county students fees covering the full cost of their education. This meant that seventy per cent of all AA students would face a considerable increase in fees, and the council decided not to pursue the matter any further. (Meeting of the Council, 24 May 1954, CM 1949-55, p. 401; Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 21 July 1954, *ibid.*, pp. 431-432.)

<sup>1001</sup> Meeting of the Council, 24 May 1954, *ibid.*, p. 402. The RCA was a unique form of ‘national college’ in that it had been set up in 1837, long before local authorities existed, and was subsequently integrated with the MOE with the aim to improve the quality of British design as part of a government-led export drive.

<sup>1002</sup> Quoted in: Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 27 April 1954, *ibid.*, p. 411.

<sup>1003</sup> ‘A Policy for the AA’, *op. cit.*, pp. 50-57; see also: Meeting of the Council, 12 July 1954, CM 1949-55, p. 429.

wall,' as President Peter Shephard put it<sup>1004</sup> – decided to raise its student fees again from £120 to £150 p. a., which was estimated to be the actual cost of training an architectural student in Britain at the time.<sup>1005</sup> It did so with the greatest reluctance as it assumed (rightly) that some local authorities, already hesitant to support students wishing to attend the AA, would simply refuse to do so – a worrying prospect at a time when sixty per cent of applicants depended on such grants.<sup>1006</sup> Yet the problem was not only the quantity of students but also – and equally alarmingly – their quality. Any increase in fees automatically enlarged the group of those whose parents were too wealthy to qualify for local authority grants (i.e. earning upward of £1,200 p. a.) but not wealthy enough to cover the costs themselves. This was precisely the section of the populace which was generally assumed to be a 'fruitful one from which to recruit architectural students', not least because it included the vast majority of architects.<sup>1007</sup> 'Thus,' wrote the *Architect and Building News*, 'we have the paradox of a school of architecture set up and run independently for a hundred years by architects whose professional descendants cannot now afford to send their sons to the school but must have them trained elsewhere.'<sup>1008</sup>

### **The AA and 'The Other Place' –**

#### **Patrick, the McMorran Committee and the Oxford Conference**

Ongoing financial difficulties were not the only reason why the AA felt it necessary to reconsider its long-term policy as from the early 1950s onward the RIBA – often referred to as 'the other place' in AA debates<sup>1009</sup> – took an increasingly direct interest in the workings of the schools. The late 1940s had seen architectural education in a state of flux, due in part to the specific circumstances after the war, particularly the surge of student numbers and the realignment of the profession in the context of the

---

<sup>1004</sup> Quoted in: 'A Policy for the AA', p. 54.

<sup>1005</sup> Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 27 April 1954, CM 1949-55, p. 409.

<sup>1006</sup> Meetings of the School Committee, 9 Feb 1954, 30 Sep 1954, SCM 1951-63, pp. 88, 104; 'Minute of Meeting with Mr. Bray and Messrs. Peter Shephard, Michael Patrick and H. J. W. Alexander', 13 Dec 1954, AAA, Box 1991:7.

<sup>1007</sup> Peter Shephard, presidential address, op. cit.

<sup>1008</sup> *ABN*, 12 Aug 1954, p. 175.

<sup>1009</sup> See e.g.: Michael Brawne, quoted in 'Debate – That in the opinion of this House the AA is a defunct and apathetic body and has as yet to justify its existence', *AAJ*, April 1951, vol. 66, no. 751, pp. 194, 195; Gontran Goulden, quoted *ibid.*, p. 197; Henry Elder, quoted *ibid.*, 198.

nascent welfare state, but also because the deadlock between modernisers and traditionalists on the RIBA's Board of Architectural Education (BAE) paralysed its ability to agree upon a coherent policy.<sup>1010</sup> Though the BAE as a whole began to recognise the need to reform architectural education, its members were, according to Crinson and Lubbock, 'divided and probably a little confused'<sup>1011</sup> about the manner in which this should be done, as exemplified by the ill-fated report of its 1951 ad-hoc committee (see page 112). This state of affairs changed in the early 1950s, and the previous chapter showed how Michael Patrick at the beginning of his tenure felt compelled to modify the course in compliance with the wishes of the RIBA's visiting board. Crinson and Lubbock describe the BAE's policy at the time as 'one of gentlemanly persuasion'<sup>1012</sup>, yet to many at the AA it represented an unacceptable degree of interference. The authors of the 1953 student report went so far as to suggest that the 'possibility of foregoing RIBA recognition should at least be considered, as it would leave the school free to follow its own course unhindered,'<sup>1013</sup> and there was considerable support for this view, not least from President Anderson, who felt that 'the only logical conclusion [...] is to break away from the RIBA.'<sup>1014</sup>

Even so, the majority of the council agreed with Patrick, who argued that this course of action, whilst offering the desired freedom in the short term, would ultimately defeat its object as students would before long demand to be coached for the RIBA's external examinations, thus forcing the AA to conform to the very system it so firmly rejected.<sup>1015</sup> Avoiding direct confrontation with the RIBA, Patrick's strategy was to build coalitions with colleagues who were thought to be in sympathy with the AA's approach. Yet, with growing pressure for a more coherent educational system, there appeared to exist little goodwill towards the AA and its independent streak. On the contrary, Hugh Casson pointed out that, though not a matter of AA policy, 'the removal of recognition might easily be considered as the

---

<sup>1010</sup> For a discussion see: Crinson and Lubbock 1994, pp. 125-129.

<sup>1011</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 127.

<sup>1012</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 134.

<sup>1013</sup> Report 1953, p. 6.

<sup>1014</sup> Quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 30 Jan 1953, CSSCM 1952-53, p. 9.

<sup>1015</sup> Patrick, *ibid.*

RIBA's policy,<sup>1016</sup> and Peter Shephard impressed on the students:

There are so many people gunning for the AA in the RIBA and other places and this [report] would be the best piece of ammunition they could get. [...] There are an enormous number of people who would be ready to demote the AA.<sup>1017</sup>

In light of this, it was perhaps not surprising that when the RIBA, in April 1952, formed an 'architectural education joint committee' to continue the investigations of the 1951 ad-hoc committee, Patrick, though nominated, was not elected to the schools committee's contingent and only invited to join when one of his colleagues withdrew.<sup>1018</sup>

The so-called McMorran Committee – named after its chairman Donald McMorran, a principal with Farquharson & McMorran (later McMorran + Whitby) and at the time the honorary secretary of the BAE – invited evidence from interested parties, and in January 1953 Patrick summarised his views in a memorandum (see page 179) which the council submitted as the 'AA's views on the future education of the architect.'<sup>1019</sup> Praised by Casson for its 'completely uncompromising character,'<sup>1020</sup> Patrick's report contained three basic recommendations, one of which – the suggestion that 'office training be considered an essential part of any course, irrespective of qualifying levels'<sup>1021</sup> – has been discussed in the previous chapter. The other two related to these 'qualifying levels' and centred upon the need to reframe architectural education to cater to an emerging two-tier profession consisting of a small elite of principals (either in private or public practice) and a large number of qualified architects working in a subordinate capacity. Patrick was critical of an educational system which prepared all students to 'attain a single level of proficiency leading to qualification as a registered architect,' given that few of them were ever called upon to 'exercise the full responsibilities that are implicit in this

---

<sup>1016</sup> Casson, 'President's Address', 15 July 1953, op. cit.

<sup>1017</sup> Quoted in: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 18 June 1953, CSSCM 1952-53, p. 11.

<sup>1018</sup> The joint committee was composed of four (later five) members each from the BAE's schools and examination committees. Patrick replaced W. A. Eden, the principal of the Leeds School of Architecture, who had been a dissenting member of the ad-hoc committee and chose not to serve on the joint committee. (Meetings of the Schools Committee, 3 Jan 1952, 5 June 1952, RIBA/ED 7.1.3.)

<sup>1019</sup> Meeting of the Council, 26 Jan 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 301; see also: Patrick, proposals, Jan 1953.

<sup>1020</sup> Casson, 'President's Address', 15 July 1953

<sup>1021</sup> Patrick, proposals, Jan 1953.

qualification.<sup>1022</sup> He therefore appealed to the RIBA to recognise two levels of qualification, one equivalent to the existing RIBA associateship (excluding the need for a thesis), the other at a considerably higher grade confined to those who ‘show real ability’<sup>1023</sup> and with ample provision for postgraduate study.

Unaffiliated with any school of architecture and openly disdainful of full-time training,<sup>1024</sup> McMorran aimed the work of his committee at defining uniform examination standards (interim report, May 1953) and uniform lists of examination subjects (final report, February 1955) for full-time and part-time courses, thus creating a greater measure of equality between the two and making the latter suitable for RIBA recognition. With the backing of the MOE, whose figures indicated a growing demand for part-time facilities following the end of the FET grants, ‘the forces of the anti-school brigade [were] gathering strength,’ as a dismayed editor of the *Architects’ Journal* observed.<sup>1025</sup>

Unlike the university schools, to which the idea of part-time training was anathema, the AA was not opposed to it on principle. On the contrary, from January 1954 Patrick organised free evening classes for junior assistants who had passed the RIBA intermediate but could not afford to attend any school of architecture.<sup>1026</sup> Patrick was equally alive to the shortcomings of his own students as newly qualified assistants, and the integration of office and school training was, as we have seen, one of the key elements in his report to the McMorran Committee. However, Patrick’s ideas, briefly realised in his fourth-year practical training scheme in 1958 (see page 180), centred on so-called ‘sandwich’ courses, i.e. alternating periods of school and

---

<sup>1022</sup> Patrick, proposals, Jan 1953.

<sup>1023</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1024</sup> See e.g.: ‘Conference on Building Training’, *RIBAJ*, Feb 1956, p. 165.

<sup>1025</sup> *AJ*, 4 March 1954, p. 267; see also: Ministry of Education, ‘Memorandum on “Part-time Education of the Intending Architect” and related topics’, Meeting of the Architectural Education Joint Committee, 1 July 1953, Inset D, RIBA/ED 7.1.2.

<sup>1026</sup> Michael Patrick, ‘Evening Classes in Design’, 1 Dec 1953, att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 3 Dec 1953, SCM 1951-63, p. 85. The highly popular classes were free of charge and supplemented by special lectures. Dozens of AA members, including Jordan, Gibberd and several members of the council, volunteered to give tuition, and over the three years in which they were run about 140 assistants benefitted from the opportunity. The scheme was cancelled to introduce a new ‘composite course’, which had been in planning since March 1956 but was eventually left in abeyance due to lack of space. (Michael Patrick, ‘Part-time Training at the AA School (Composite Course)’, 27 Feb 1956, att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 5 March 1956, *ibid.*, p. 142; ‘School Committee: Report for the Session 1957/58’, att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 8 May 1958, *ibid.*, p. 212.)

office training,<sup>1027</sup> and he took the view that any scheme leading to recognition of part-time courses would need to be established and run under the auspices of already recognised full-time schools. Whilst there was thus some common ground, however shaky, between Patrick and McMorran in terms of part-time training, they were poles apart in any other respect, as illustrated by the fact that the committee deemed the other two aspects of Patrick's report – two-tier qualification and postgraduate specialisation – outside its terms of reference and refrained from discussing them.<sup>1028</sup>

Patrick was suspicious of the committee's intention to align the training of internal and external students and fought any interference with the AA's methods. The committee's resolution to prohibit the use of notebooks and text books in examinations, for instance, directly challenged the AA, where this had been allowed since 1948.<sup>1029</sup> Patrick's attempt to defend the practice against a BAE ruling confirming the resolution was futile, as was his opposition to a proposal to introduce Beaux-Arts type en-loge design examinations in recognised schools in order to create equal conditions for internal and external students.<sup>1030</sup> In both cases Patrick was outvoted by a committee on which he felt completely isolated:

---

<sup>1027</sup> The BAE had difficulties defining the difference between part-time and sandwich (or composite) courses. To Patrick, one academic term represented the shortest conceivable 'sandwich' period. (Meeting of the Architectural Education Joint Committee, 22 May 1952, RIBA/ED 7.1.2.)

<sup>1028</sup> In March 1953 Patrick reminded the committee that 'his governing body would be glad to hear when consideration had been given to their evidence and particularly to their suggestion of an advanced level of qualification' (Meeting of the Architectural Education Joint Committee, 16 March 1953, *ibid.*), and two months later he informed the council that 'as far as he could see, in the foreseeable future there was no prospect of the AA's plan being implemented.' (Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 21 May 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 329.)

<sup>1029</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 16 Jan 1953, SCM 1951-63, p. 57-58. Patrick had clashed with the BAE over this question prior to the formation of the McMorran Committee, and he continued to do so throughout the decade. In January 1952 he had tabled a motion whereby schools would be left to act in their own responsibility in this matter, which was carried by the schools committee but rejected by the examination committee and the officers of the BAE and subsequently referred to the McMorran Committee. (Meeting of the School Committee, 6 Dec 1951, SCM 1951-63, pp. 18 (att.), 21; Meetings of the Schools Committee, 3 Jan 1952, 16 Oct 1952, RIBA/ED 7.1.3; see also e.g.: Meeting of the School Committee, 4 July 1957, SCM 1951-63, pp. 185, 187.)

<sup>1030</sup> External students were required to complete their intermediate and final examinations behind closed doors at the RIBA. The proposal to introduce similar examinations at recognised schools was carried by 5 votes to 3. It was included as a recommendation in the committee's interim report but later dropped. (Meeting of the Architectural Education Joint Committee, 25 Feb 1953, RIBA/ED 7.1.2; 'First Interim Report of the Architectural Education Joint Committee', May 1953, *ibid.*)



Somehow I found myself always in that minority who are listened to, often without question, but chiefly because there was no possibility of our proposals being taken up seriously. On some issues, after endless delay, I was getting slightly petulant, and I suspected that I was becoming the sort of person whose note of apology for absence brings a moment of happiness into the life of the chairman and secretary alike.<sup>1031</sup>

In light of this, Patrick welcomed the arrival of potential allies such as Robert Gardner-Medwin and Robert Matthew, who joined the schools committee in 1953 as the new heads of, respectively, Liverpool and Edinburgh. Both Michael Patrick and Douglas Jones were eager to get these modernisers a voice on the McMorran Committee. In October they orchestrated an attempt to increase it by two additional representatives of the schools committee, which foundered on the resistance of the examinations committee.<sup>1032</sup> They did, however, succeed in getting Gardner-Medwin appointed to the McMorran Committee in replacement for the retiring J. R. Tolson.<sup>1033</sup> Patrick and Gardner-Medwin held broadly the same views on architectural education and managed to muster sufficient support to force McMorran to redraft entire paragraphs of the final report before submitting it to the BAE.<sup>1034</sup> Most importantly, they managed to persuade the committee to express a firm commitment to full-time education by including a recommendation stating that a minimum of two years' full-time training in a recognised school should be made compulsory for all students of architecture.<sup>1035</sup>

---

<sup>1031</sup> Quoted in: 'Annual Prize Giving', *AAJ*, Sep/Oct 1958, vol. 74, no. 825, p. 58. Tellingly, throughout his altercations with the students in the early 1950s the insinuation that he willingly surrendered to – or even colluded with – the RIBA appears to have been the only issue which evoked an emotional response from Patrick, who appeared genuinely hurt by it: 'Do you really seriously believe this about students being left alone on the question of interference by the RIBA? Did nobody mention that the principal was left alone on the Board speaking on your behalf?' (Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 18 June 1953, *CSSCM* 1952-53, p. 11.) At a following meeting Patrick exclaimed: 'What I am trying to do is to get some co-operation with the major schools so that when it is eventually decided that there should be some parity in examination methods, then it shall be most like the AA examinations. To try and pretend that I did nothing about this is so unfair that it is unbelievable.' (Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 8 July 1953, *ibid.*, p. 16.)

<sup>1032</sup> Meeting of the Schools Committee, 15 Oct 1953, RIBA/ED 7.1.3.

<sup>1033</sup> *Ibid.* An earlier attempt in October 1952 had failed. (Meeting of the Schools Committee, 16 Oct 1952, RIBA/ED 7.1.3.)

<sup>1034</sup> Meeting of the Architectural Education Joint Committee, 11 Feb 1954, RIBA/ED 7.1.2; for a comparative list of statements on architectural education see: 'Architectural Education', *Architectural Design*, July 1955, pp. 222-224.

<sup>1035</sup> Meeting of the Architectural Education Joint Committee, 8 April 1954, RIBA/ED 7.1.2. Proposed by Gardner-Medwin and seconded by Patrick, the motion was carried by five votes to four.

The balance of power had clearly shifted, and as a result not only did it take almost a year to redraft the final report, but it also left experts profoundly unimpressed when it was finally published in February 1955.<sup>1036</sup> ‘What *could* it be that kept them arguing for nearly three years?’ wondered the *Architects’ Journal*, and the *Architectural Design* declared: ‘After several years of stormy backstage intrigue, the surprisingly mild McMorran report has emerged from the RIBA. Apart from a single prejudice (*part-time* study) it has contributed little.’<sup>1037</sup> On the whole, the work of the McMorran Committee was of little consequence to the recognised schools, which, given its initial part-time bias, was an altogether successful outcome. As far as the AA was concerned, apart from the ban on textbooks in examinations the final report contained only two relevant recommendations. One concerned a change in the RIBA’s policy on the recognition of schools, which in future would be based on efficiency rather than on geographical location (see page 228);<sup>1038</sup> the other was the announcement to lengthen the required practical experience period from one to two years, effective from January 1960.<sup>1039</sup>

By January 1955, when the RIBA council discussed the final report of the McMorran Committee, a majority agreed with Patrick that it had failed to address the most pressing issues, particularly the question of postgraduate training, and decided that a conference on architectural education should be held ‘to discuss points of principle not covered by the Report.’<sup>1040</sup> Originally scheduled for early 1956, this conference was postponed to await the findings of another (largely inconsequential) conference on building education in January 1956, organised by a joint consultative committee of architects, quantity surveyors and builders set up by the BAE and the newly formed Board of Building Education of the Institute of

---

<sup>1036</sup> ‘Report of the Architectural Education Joint Committee on the Training and Qualification for Associate Membership of the Royal Institute of British Architects’, *RIBAJ*, Feb 1955 (hereafter cited as McMorran Report), pp. 156-164.

<sup>1037</sup> *AJ*, 10 Feb 1955, p. 183 (see also: ‘The Innocuous McMorran Report’, *ibid.*, p. 187); ‘Architectural Education’, July 1955, *op. cit.*, p. 219. Only the *Builder*, traditionally critical of full-time schools, thought the RIBA council’s ‘bold acceptance’ of the committee’s recommendation to consider exemption for part-time courses ‘revolutionary’ and felt that ‘a new epoch in architectural education is heralded.’ (‘Educational Revolution’, *Builder*, 25 Nov 1955, p. 910.)

<sup>1038</sup> ‘Report of the Architectural Education Joint Committee’, *RIBAJ*, Dec 1955, p. 69.

<sup>1039</sup> McMorran Report, p. 157.

<sup>1040</sup> Meeting of the Board of Architectural Education, 14 Feb 1955, RIBA/ED 7.1.1.

Builders (IOB) following a recommendation of the McMorran Committee.<sup>1041</sup> A subsequent investigation into current systems of training in the building industry and the ongoing efforts of the BAE's examination committee to amend the RIBA's examination syllabus consequent upon the recommendations of the McMorran Committee caused further delay, and it was not until October 1956 that the BAE appointed a sub-committee to 'examine the possible scope of the conference' with a view to holding it in spring 1958.<sup>1042</sup>

Crinson and Lubbock argue that the idea for the conference 'was hatched at the Board of Architectural Education in 1955 by those modernists who had recently taken control'<sup>1043</sup> – a group which, according to the authors, included as 'key figures'<sup>1044</sup> Leslie Martin, Richard Llewelyn Davies, Percy Johnson-Marshall, William Allen, Richard Sheppard and Robert Matthew. Allen and Llewelyn Davies – along with McMorran, Cecil Handisyde, Philip Garforth Freeman and the five officers of the BAE, one of them Michael Patrick – did indeed serve on the organising committee and successfully defended the draft programme of the conference against considerable resistance within the BAE.<sup>1045</sup> Chaired by Leslie Martin, from 1956 professor at Cambridge, and with an attendance limited to fifty carefully selected participants, the three-day residential conference eventually took place in April 1958 at Magdalen College in Oxford<sup>1046</sup> and passed six momentous resolutions, viz.

- (1) that 'the present minimum standard of entry into training (five passes at 'O' level) is far too low and [...] should be raised to a minimum of two passes at 'A' level';
- (2) that 'courses based on Testimonies of Study and the RIBA External Examinations [...] should be progressively abolished';
- (3) that 'all schools capable of providing the high standard of training envisaged should be "recognised" and situated in universities or institutions where courses of comparable standard can be conducted';

---

<sup>1041</sup> Meeting of the Board of Architectural Education, 24 Oct 1955, *ibid.*; McMorran Report, p. 157; see also e.g.: 'Conference on Building Training', *op. cit.*, pp. 164-166; 'Interrelated Training for the Building Industry', *Builder*, 10 Feb 1956, pp. 214-216, 221-224. McMorran used the opportunity to launch an attack on full-time school training and was accused by a fellow member of the McMorran Committee, most likely Edwin Rice, of carrying out a 'private vendetta' against the recognised schools. (*AJ*, 16 Feb 1956, p. 199.)

<sup>1042</sup> Meeting of the Board of Architectural Education, 22 October 1956, RIBA/ED 7.1.1.

<sup>1043</sup> Crinson and Lubbock 1994, p. 138.

<sup>1044</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1045</sup> Meeting of the Board of Architectural Education, 11 Feb 1957, RIBA/ED 7.1.1.

<sup>1046</sup> Unfortunately, both copies of the verbatim report of the conference seem lost. For an edited account of the proceedings see: Leslie Martin, 'Conference on Architectural Education', *RIBAJ*, June 1958, pp. 279-282; for a discussion see: Crinson and Lubbock 1994, pp. 137-144.

- (4) that ‘courses [...] should be either full-time or, on an experimental basis, combined or sandwich courses in which periods of training in a school alternate with periods of training in an office’;
- (5) that ‘these raised standards of education [may] make desirable other forms of training not leading to an architectural qualification’;
- (6) that ‘it regards postgraduate work as an essential part of architectural education [and] endorses the policy of developing postgraduate courses [...]’.<sup>1047</sup>

Patrick, one of the speakers at the conference, rallied the AA council in support of these resolutions:

In my opinion it is vitally important that anyone connected with the training of architects should give the new regulations the fullest backing. It is the only significant move towards improving the status and training of the architect that has been made since the recognised schools were started fifty years ago.<sup>1048</sup>

Considering how closely the new outline policy of the RIBA resembled his own long-held views on architectural education, Patrick’s enthusiasm for the Oxford resolutions, which he saw – with some justification – as the culmination of years of campaigning on his part, is understandable.<sup>1049</sup> His 1953 report to the McMorran Committee, ignored at the time, had anticipated the need to acknowledge and cater to a two-tier profession and make provisions for postgraduate specialisation (resolutions 5 and 6, respectively). Patrick’s support for the introduction of A-level standards may at first seem more surprising as it contradicted the system in place at the AA at the time. Patrick considered the right selection of students to be his most difficult task and had been experimenting with different aptitude tests and examination methods for years. In 1956 he introduced a system of open entry, admitting almost all applicants subject to their possessing the minimal academic qualifications for RIBA probationership (i.e. O-levels in five subjects) and passing an entrance examination limited to written papers in English and general knowledge, but with a first year regarded as strictly probationary.<sup>1050</sup> Patrick was satisfied with

---

<sup>1047</sup> Martin 1958, op. cit., pp. 281-282.

<sup>1048</sup> ‘Principal’s Report’, att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 9 Oct 1958, SCM 1951-63, p. 233; see also: Meeting of the Council, 25 May 1959, CM 1955-61, p. 350: ‘The Principal [...] urged all AA council members to support the resolutions in every way possible, including lobbying members of the RIBA Council.’

<sup>1049</sup> See e.g.: Prize Giving 1958, op. cit., p. 58.

<sup>1050</sup> ‘School Committee: Report for the Session 1955/56’, att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 3 May 1956, SCM 1951-63, p. 147. The RIBA system was based on a three-year probationary period leading up to intermediate examinations, by which time students had spent sixty per cent of the total cost of tuition and taken eighty per cent of their technical instruction and were therefore reluctant to change their course of study – a system which Patrick considered ‘stupid, inefficient and cruel’ (quoted in: Prize Giving 1958,

the results of this system, and though he conceded that ‘whatever other qualities we may possess as a body of men, we certainly are not very brainy,’<sup>1051</sup> he generally did not believe academic qualifications to be a reliable guide for future architectural proficiency. As an isolated measure he would therefore likely have resisted the introduction of higher entry standards, but he, and with him most participants of the Oxford Conference, saw A-levels and the creation of a two-tier education as complementary measures.<sup>1052</sup> The AA council had, in late 1957 (i.e. prior to the Oxford Conference), not only reaffirmed its belief in a basic division of the profession into ‘architects’ on the one hand, and so-called ‘technicians’ and ‘technologists’ on the other, but also decided that it would only take responsibility for training the former.<sup>1053</sup> Evidently, to justify the higher status of this select group, their training would need to be of a correspondingly higher intellectual order, which in turn would necessitate higher academic qualifications. Remarkably, the fact that at the time less than ten per cent of applicants to the AA had the required A-levels seemed no cause for concern.<sup>1054</sup>

The remaining resolutions were all likely to strengthen the position of recognised full-time schools, including the AA. The fourth resolution concerned the type of course and reflected both the universities’ preference for full-time and the MOE’s preference for composite courses. Patrick’s 1953 memorandum had called for a closer integration of office and school training, and his office adoption scheme, currently running on a trial basis, was a tentative attempt to move the AA’s

---

op. cit., p. 59) and criticised throughout his principalship, both within the AA and on the BAE: ‘If we are to improve, both parents and teachers must allow the term “probationer” to have its proper meaning. Not all those who wish to take up architecture are really suited to it, and I can think of nothing worse than to go through life knowing oneself to be a bad architect.’ (Patrick, quoted in: Prize Giving 1955, op. cit., p. 50; see also: Patrick, proposals, Jan 1953.)

<sup>1051</sup> Quoted in: Prize Giving 1958, p. 59.

<sup>1052</sup> According to Patrick, ‘the most important matter to be decided was the type of courses to be arranged for students who had not obtained two “A” level subjects’ since he felt that ‘to neglect the second tier would be to defeat the aim of the Conference.’ (Meeting of the Committee on the Oxford Architectural Education Conference, 4 July 1958, RIBA/ED 7.1.2; see also: Special Meeting of the Council, 14 April 1958, CM 1955-61, p. 250; Meeting of the School Committee, 9 Oct 1958, SCM 1951-63, p. 230; Martin 1958, p. 280.)

<sup>1053</sup> Special Meetings of the Council, 17 Dec 1957, 10 Feb 1958, 19 March 1958, CM 1955-61, pp. 209-213, 228-231, 242. Patrick argued that ‘the AA School should concentrate on training architects; but that the Association as a whole should encourage the formation of a course elsewhere for the training of “Assistants”.’ (Ibid., p. 241.)

<sup>1054</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 23 June 1959, SCM 1951-63, p. 260. By October 1960 – one year before the introduction of the new entry standards – the number had risen to just under fifty per cent (Meeting of the School Committee, 13 Oct 1960, *ibid.*, p. 284).

educational model from full-time to ‘sandwich’ training.<sup>1055</sup> The third resolution, on the other hand, concerned the type of institution in which training ought to take place. The Oxford Conference was unambiguous in its preference for university education, but it conceded that an education of such nature might be provided in ‘institutions of a comparable character’ – essentially a concession to the AA, which had no reason to believe that its singular status as an independent school was in any doubt, not least because it had so clearly anticipated and shaped the new RIBA policy. Moreover, at the time of the Oxford Conference the AA was involved in negotiations with the MOE regarding the creation of a new educational establishment which was to be the exemplar of such an ‘institution of comparable character’, offering an alternative model of higher education outside the university system. It is this scheme which shall concern us in the following section.

### **Integrated Education: The Scheme for a College of Architecture and Building**

The call for a closer integration of the building team based on joint training schemes was a live issue in the postwar years, promoted by architects, builders and progressive educationalists alike. At the AA the idea fell on particularly fertile soil as the anti-Beaux-Arts line taken by the influential *Focus* generation had triggered an abiding interest in alternative, non-academic teaching methods, and the Lethabite ideal of integrating architecture and building training informed a series of experimental schemes from Douglas Jones’s Bauhaus-inspired live projects before the war to Brown’s practical training site and Jordan’s factory and site work ventures.

Michael Patrick was intent on continuing this tradition. When in September 1953 the AA finally had to abandon its Morwell Street site, he assigned Hilton Wright to approach all London schools with building departments and workshop facilities with a view to launching integrated training schemes, and as a result AA

---

<sup>1055</sup> The classification of composite courses shifted in the mid-1950s. The McMorran Committee had discussed it as a form of part-time training, whereas to the Oxford Conference it represented an experimental approach to full-time training, which was – and always had been – Patrick’s understanding (see: Martin 1958, p. 281).

undergraduates were allowed to attend practical demonstrations at the building schools of Brixton and Hammersmith.<sup>1056</sup> In addition to this, he approached Leslie Martin at the LCC with the idea to initiate a programme of live projects akin to that currently being pioneered by Douglas Jones at Birmingham, though despite Martin's support it eventually proved impossible to put it into operation.<sup>1057</sup>

It was against this backdrop that the AA, in June 1954, received a proposition from the building industry which offered an opportunity 'to translate into practical form the current theory that joint education of some kind is the next logical step forward in improving building in the country as a whole.'<sup>1058</sup> Presumably the brainchild of David Woodbine Parish, the influential past-president of the London Master Builders' Association, the designated 'Department of Building Management' (DBM) aimed at providing a course of high academic standing to attract more desirable candidates to the executive branches of the building industry.<sup>1059</sup> The AA appeared ideally placed for such an undertaking as the leading universities were disinclined to offer a degree course for builders whilst the technical colleges lacked the required academic status.<sup>1060</sup>

---

<sup>1056</sup> 'Integration of Architectural Students' Training with Building Crafts – Interim Report', att. to: Meeting of the Council/Staff/Students' Committee, 12 Nov 1953, CSSCM 1952-53, p. 20. Patrick also arranged for heating and ventilation engineers from the Borough Polytechnic and structural engineers from the City and Guilds College to cooperate in the studio work of AA students. ('Integration of Members and Students', Feb 1955, op. cit., p. 182.)

<sup>1057</sup> Patrick was one of the few who supported Douglas Jones's controversial scheme on the BAE and hoped to avoid its administrative difficulties by putting Hugh Morris, the LCC architect on the AA staff, in charge of the project. (Meeting of the School Committee, 9 Feb 1954, SCM 1951-63, p. 88; see also e.g.: Meeting of the Board of Architectural Education, 19 May 1952, RIBA/ED 7.1.1.)

<sup>1058</sup> Bryan Westwood, 'Joint Education of Architects and Builders: Memo of Meeting held at the Architectural Association on May 17<sup>th</sup> between President, AA, and President; Institute of Builders (Mr. Leslie Wallace [sic]), and at Ministry of Education on May 23<sup>rd</sup> between President, AA, and Mr. Anthony [sic] Part of the Ministry of Education', 25 May 1956, att. to: Meeting of the Council, 28 May 1956, CM 1955-61, p. 64. The correct spelling of the two names is Leslie Wallis and Antony Part.

<sup>1059</sup> Woodbine Parish repeatedly highlighted the problem of the industry in recruiting school-leavers with an interest in building, who were more likely to become architects or civil engineers: 'Our need in the industry is becoming much greater for the type of man with a broad, liberal outlook who can undertake the managerial function which I believe at the moment to be one of the weakest link in the industry.' (Woodbine Parish, 'The Trend of Education in the Building Industry', *AAJ*, March 1953, vol. 68, no. 770, p. 143; see also e.g.: Woodbine Parish, 'Management in the Building Industry', *Builder*, 11 Dec 1953, p. 938.)

<sup>1060</sup> Leslie Wallis, the president of the IOB, who chiefly carried out the negotiations on behalf of the building industry, agreed with AA President Westwood that 'it would appear self-evident that the boy with a really first-class brain at the top of his form in one of the major public schools would not be interested in the technical kind of education he could obtain at Hammersmith or Brixton, however well equipped they may be.' (Westwood, memo, op. cit.)

In July the council formed an ad-hoc committee to investigate the possibility of making provision for the department within the framework of the AA school, and over the coming months it met on several occasions with leading members of the building industry, including Woodbine Parish and IOB President Leslie Wallis.<sup>1061</sup> However, the parties failed to arrive at an agreement, not least because the builders themselves were divided over the precise nature of the scheme, with ideas ranging from a joint training arrangement for architecture and building students in their junior years to a postgraduate course limited to experienced building professionals. In light of this, the council came to the conclusion that the most promising way was for the AA itself to start the DBM off as a small pilot scheme, along the lines of the DTA and funded by the building industry.<sup>1062</sup> In December 1955 Patrick presented a draft syllabus for a combined first-year course for approximately twenty students, and both Wallis and Antony Part, Bray's successor as under-secretary for further education at the MOE, appeared supportive of the scheme.<sup>1063</sup> Even so, negotiations continued to stall as the parties found themselves in a conundrum: the MOE would not approve the scheme until the funding was secured, and the IOB would not endorse it until it had the MOE's approval.<sup>1064</sup>

Whilst the AA continued to seek the backing of the building industry for its DBM, Part himself began to pursue a much grander scheme. A government white paper, issued in February 1956, announced a substantial programme of capital development aimed at expanding and upgrading technical education by means of designated Colleges of Advanced Technology (CAT), and Part envisaged the creation

---

<sup>1061</sup> Meeting of the Council, 12 July 1954, *ibid.*, p. 424. The original members of the committee were Peter Shephard (president), Denis Clarke Hall (treasurer), Gontran Goulden (honorary secretary of the AA and deputy director of the Building Centre), Michael Austin-Smith and Michael Patrick.

<sup>1062</sup> Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 23 June 1955, *ibid.*, p. 6.

<sup>1063</sup> Westwood, memo. Patrick and the school committee preferred a three-year postgraduate course but felt that a less ambitious first-year scheme would offer a better prospect of success. (Meeting of the School Committee, 8 Dec 1955, SCM 1951-63, pp. 136, 138.)

<sup>1064</sup> Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 22 May 1957, CM 1955-61, p. 159. The records of the MOE suggest that – unbeknownst to the AA – the IOB's Board of Building Education had in fact no intention to support Patrick's scheme, mainly because it sought to launch its own investigation into the problem of joint education (see p. 215) but also because of reservations towards the AA. A. R. F. Anderson, who had been in talks with the builders for years, was under no illusion that they were 'suspicious of the AA, regarding us as long-haired aesthetic types with violent political views' (quoted in: Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 21 July 1954, CM 1949-55, p. 438), and Patrick, always prone to a certain lack of tact, did not endear himself to them by intimating that his suggestion for a combined first-year course was premised on the idea that AA students who showed no capacity in designing and would therefore be retired from the architectural course might make excellent builders. (J. Gibson (MOE), letter to Antony Part, 2 May 1956, TNA: ED 74/72; Part, letter to Bryan Westwood, 28 May 1956, *ibid.*)



of such a college in central London to provide advanced-level training for all major building trades centred upon a ‘strong architectural element’, i.e. a fully recognised school.<sup>1065</sup> Though not entirely convinced by the AA’s DBM proposal, he acknowledged it as a ‘genuine and [financially] disinterested attempt to make progress’<sup>1066</sup> and had little confidence in the builders’ ability to contribute to the question of integrated training:

Meanwhile the Architectural Association are potentially closer to the ground with a proposal than anybody else, and I think that, if necessary, we should have to take a bit of a chance on their being able to attract students of a kind who would not normally go to a HND [Higher National Diploma] course at, say, Brixton.<sup>1067</sup>

In January 1957 Part initiated informal talks with the AA council, and three months later he submitted his proposals, stressing that they were ‘still very much in a formative stage.’<sup>1068</sup> The council discussed these in a series of meetings and in June abandoned its negotiations with the building industry.<sup>1069</sup> Though sympathetic to the ideals which inspired Part’s scheme (and slightly concerned about the potential competition arising from a nearby college with considerable resources at its disposal), the question of financial – and therefore ultimate – control over the proposed college proved to be a major obstacle.<sup>1070</sup> Part doubted whether the universities (which were in any event outside his domain) were ‘likely to be prepared to initiate a project of this nature,’ and he was clear that the MOE itself would not be prepared to fund the new college directly.<sup>1071</sup> Since the AA had neither the space nor the financial means to establish the college by itself, the only practicable solution

---

<sup>1065</sup> Part, quoted in: ‘Note of an informal discussion between officers of the Ministry and of the LCC [...] to discuss the projected Advanced College of Architecture and Building Studies’, 17 Dec 1957, in: *London County Council / Education Officer’s Department: Higher and Further Education Branch*, London Metropolitan Archives, London (hereafter cited as LMA), LCC/EO/HFE/05/281. Part was the driving force behind the idea of CATs, which he established against considerable resistance from both local authorities and the MOE itself. (Shattock 2012, p. 28; for the white paper see: Richard A Butler, James Stuart, David Eccles, *Technical Education*, Feb 1956, CAB 129/79/40, The National Archives, Kew, <http://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/D7658010> [accessed 13 Jan 2016].)

<sup>1066</sup> Westwood, memo.

<sup>1067</sup> Part, letter to J. R. Newman Booth (senior inspector, MOE), 1 June 1956, TNA: ED 74/72.

<sup>1068</sup> Part, letter to Gontran Goulden, 12 April 1957, LMA, LCC/EO/HFE/05/281; see also: Special Meeting of the Council, 12 Feb 1957, CM 1955-61, pp. 123-126.

<sup>1069</sup> Meeting of the Council, 13 June 1957, *ibid.*, p. 178.

<sup>1070</sup> See e.g.: Special Meeting of the Council, 14 May 1957, *ibid.*, p. 145.

<sup>1071</sup> Part to Goulden, 12 April 1957, *op. cit.* The main reason for the MOE’s reluctance to fund the college directly was its policy not to add to the list of grant-aided schools, as discussed on page 207, fn. 1000. (Incidentally, the MOE did, in fact, expand its list of grant-aided educational institutions considerably in the postwar period – from ten in 1945 to twenty-eight in 1962; see: William Richardson, ‘In search of the further education of young people in post-war England’, *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, Sep 2007, vol. 59, no. 3, p. 387.)

seemed to be an alliance with the LCC, which, apart from being sufficiently funded, was the legitimate authority to be in charge of educational institutions on its territory and, through its powers of compulsory purchase, ideally suited to find and develop a site in central London. Moreover, a linkage with the LCC offered the additional advantage of allowing its Brixton School of Building, which suffered from severe overcrowding, to be moved and incorporated into the scheme. Part was confident that the AA would not only remain ‘substantially in control’ of its school but would also be able to exercise considerable influence on the governing body of the college as a whole.<sup>1072</sup> However, the council remained unconvinced by Part’s repeated assurances that the AA’s influence and independence would be adequately safeguarded and, with more than just a touch of class hauteur, deplored the idea of turning its school into a ‘better Brixton School of Building.’<sup>1073</sup>

In June 1957 the AA elected a new council, and headed by the new president, John Brandon-Jones, who was overtly dismissive of any scheme involving the LCC, the negotiating committee took an increasingly uncompromising stance. In September Brandon-Jones, without consulting his colleagues, addressed a letter to Part, in which he expressed his view that the MOE’s proposal indicated ‘a preoccupation with the training of foremen and craftsmen rather than with the designer and manager’ and was therefore unlikely to achieve the desired academic standard – a rather absurd contention given that the proposed entry level for the college was higher than that required by the AA at the time.<sup>1074</sup> Brandon-Jones’s chief reservation, however, concerned the fact that the AA would not have sufficient control over its school whilst the division into separate departments would prevent a proper integration of the college as a whole. Oblivious to the conflicting nature of these claims, the council after lengthy discussion adopted them as the official position of the AA.<sup>1075</sup>

---

<sup>1072</sup> Part, letter to John Brandon-Jones, 27 Aug 1957, LMA, LCC/EO/HFE/05/281; see also e.g.:

Part to Goulden, 12 April 1957, *op. cit.*

<sup>1073</sup> John Brandon-Jones, quoted in: Meeting of the Council, 28 Oct 1957, CM 1955-61, p. 192.

<sup>1074</sup> Brandon-Jones, letter to Part, 24 Sep 1957, *ibid.*, p. 202; see also: Special Meeting of the Council, 14 May 1957, *ibid.*, p. 147.

<sup>1075</sup> ‘AA Council’s Annual Report’, *AAJ*, July/Aug 1958, vol. 74, no. 824, p. 47. Though a majority aligned itself with Brandon-Jones, the support was far from unanimous. Anthony Cox, for instance, ‘could not but regret that the door had not been left open for further negotiations,’ and Colin Boyne regretted that ‘our letter seemed so very guarded and tough.’ (Meeting of the Council, 28 Oct 1957, CM 1955-61, p. 192.) Leo De Syllas, one of the main apologists of the scheme, who was absent from this meeting, had disputed that Part

A palpably irritated Part rejected Brandon-Jones's representation as inaccurate and, on 4 November, terminated negotiations with the AA.<sup>1076</sup> Only two weeks later the LCC approached Part with a request to revisit a proposal of the Brixton School, which had put itself forward for development into a CAT, as postulated in the government's white paper.<sup>1077</sup> Part had shelved this proposal in favour of his joint scheme with the AA, and at a meeting with officers of the LCC in December he reaffirmed his view that 'the present governing body and the present principal [of the Brixton School] were hardly of the calibre to carry the responsibility for the variety of advanced-level work which it was intended to locate in the new college.'<sup>1078</sup> This left either the Northern Polytechnic or the Regent Street Polytechnic – both fully recognised by the RIBA – as possible nucleus for the new college.<sup>1079</sup> Since this would have put the LCC in a 'politically impossible situation vis-à-vis the governors of the Brixton School,' the officers suggested 'that it would probably be wise [...], despite the disappointing results of the Ministry's approach, to make one final attempt to bring in the Architectural Association on acceptable terms.'<sup>1080</sup>

Part approached the AA anew in July 1958, and the council, now headed by Denis Clarke Hall, accepted his offer to re-open discussions as it considered itself in a stronger bargaining position – not only because Part's quest for an alternative partnering school had evidently failed but also because it felt that the resolutions passed at the recent Oxford Conference (which Part had attended) 'might have

---

'intended to have what had been referred to as a "glorified polytechnic"' and pointed out that 'it would not be integrated education if it was solely run by architects.' (Special Meeting of the Council, 14 May 1957, *ibid.*, p. 147.)

<sup>1076</sup> Part, letter to Brandon-Jones, 4 Nov 1957, LMA, LCC/EO/HFE/05/281.

<sup>1077</sup> G. Mavor (senior assistant education officer, LCC), letter to Part, 19 Nov 1957, LMA, LCC/EO/HFE/05/281; see also: Special Meeting of the Governors, LCC Brixton School of Building, 16 July 1956, *ibid.*

<sup>1078</sup> Part, quoted in: Discussion between Ministry and LCC, 17 Dec 1957, *op. cit.* In internal communications Part was rather more blunt: 'Nobody in the architectural world to whom I have yet spoken seems to be prepared to show any enthusiasm for Brixton. This attitude is based partly on the alleged inadequacy of the governing body, and partly on the (apparently) low quality of the architectural education given there [...].' (Part to Newman Booth, 1 June 1956, *op. cit.*)

<sup>1079</sup> The LCC-run Hammersmith School of Building was never seriously considered, and neither was the establishment of an entirely new and autonomous college, primarily because of the difficulty and uncertainty to attain RIBA recognition but also because it would inevitably enter into competition with the LCC's existing schools.

<sup>1080</sup> William Houghton (education officer, LCC), G. Mavor (senior assistant education officer, LCC), quoted in: Discussion between Ministry and LCC, 17 Dec 1957.

converted him more to the AA's point of view on architectural education.<sup>1081</sup> Clarke Hall drafted a memorandum as the basis for discussion, and although several comparably minor issues remained unresolved (including questions regarding an architectural competition for the new campus and the licence to provide alcoholic drinks on LCC premises, both of which the AA requested), by the beginning of 1959 there appeared to be broad agreement between the AA, the MOE and the LCC.<sup>1082</sup>

The main stumbling block was and remained the AA's fear of sacrificing its independence to a governing body on which it would – by a fixed proportion of eight out of 26 – constitute the single largest contingent but which was itself presumed to be at the financial mercy of the LCC.<sup>1083</sup> Patrick – at first critical, but now 'wholeheartedly in favour' of the scheme – argued that

the possibilities of improving our educational standards are far greater in a College of Advanced Technology than they could ever be by preserving a sort of haughty independence – an independence, incidentally, which is largely illusory, as there are few things more restricting than an acute lack of money.<sup>1084</sup>

Although resentment toward the LCC pervaded the deliberations of the AA council, it appeared that most members were inclined to agree with Patrick and support the scheme despite reservations. Clarke Hall at least was taken completely by surprise when, at the end of a lengthy meeting on 8 April 1959, James Richards moved – and a majority agreed – that 'the AA should not continue negotiations for a college of

---

<sup>1081</sup> Meeting of the Council, 9 July 1958, CM 1955-61, p. 274; see also: 'Note of Meeting Held on 1 July 1958', LMA, LCC/EO/HFE/05/281.

<sup>1082</sup> Antony Part, 'Administration of the Proposed College of Architecture and Building', 11 Dec 1958, LMA, LCC/EO/HFE/05/282. The document sets out the joint comments of the MOE and the LCC on Clarke Hall's memorandum. For the memorandum itself see: [Clarke Hall], 'The Ministry of Education & the Architectural Association', n.d., LMA, LCC/EO/HFE/05/281; see also: Part, letter to Houghton, 24 Oct 1959, *ibid.*

<sup>1083</sup> LCC education officer Houghton pressed this point repeatedly: 'I think it should be clearly understood that the school of architecture will, in fact, be absorbed into the new college, will form an integral part of it and cannot constitute an imperium in imperio. The AA will not, therefore, continue to direct the destinies of the school as if it still remained an independent entity. [...] I gather that in effect the AA would not dissent from this but I am sure that it is essential to be quite clear on the point.' (Houghton, letter to Part, 1 Dec 1958, LMA, LCC/EO/HFE/05/282; see also: Houghton, 'Note of a Meeting Held on 16 Jan 1959', 26 Jan 1959, *ibid.*) The AA council showed a surprising lack of appreciation for the fact that the LCC as a public authority had to insist on having ultimate control over a project involving the expenditure of a considerable amount of public funds.

<sup>1084</sup> Quoted in: Prize Giving 1959, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

architecture and building if this involved association with the LCC.<sup>1085</sup> Six weeks later the council called an informal meeting of members to report on the course and failure of its negotiations with the MOE and the LCC.<sup>1086</sup> The post-mortem left no doubt that the council's decision to abandon the talks did not reflect the general feeling of the membership as only Brandon-Jones defended his opposition to the scheme whilst many others (including the students' committee) supported it at least in principle. Encouraged by this, Clarke Hall at the first meeting of the following session two weeks later urged his colleagues to rescind the previous council's resolution to cancel all negotiations with the LCC.<sup>1087</sup> His motion passed with a comfortable majority, but the LCC rejected the AA's request to re-open the discussions for a third time and advised the council that it was now 'in the middle of investigating other methods of creating the college.'<sup>1088</sup> Half a year later, in February 1960, the LCC announced its intention to proceed in conjunction with the Regent Street Polytechnic.<sup>1089</sup>

### **Future Policy: The AA Working Party and the End of Patrick's Reign**

In the second half of the 1950s the AA exhibited a renewed sense of confidence, both in its dealings with the RIBA and particularly in its negotiations with the MOE and the LCC. This was helped by the fact that, contrary to expectation, the raise of

---

<sup>1085</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 10 April 1959, CM 1955-61, p. 338 et pass. The motion was passed by eight votes to five. Clarke Hall remembered the occasion with some bitterness: 'Although this course had been previously agreed, in my innocence I put it to a vote and lost it. I nearly resigned, and it was one of my biggest mistakes that I didn't. I had to go back to the Ministry telling them that the AA council didn't want to negotiate with them. From that moment on the AA never got any grants ever again. I was shattered about the whole thing.' ('Denis Clarke Hall interviewed by Louise Brodie', *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 18 Jan 2017], Track 11/12 (Oct 1997).

<sup>1086</sup> 'Report of the Proceedings at a Meeting of the Association', 25 May 1959, AAA, Box 2008:33.

<sup>1087</sup> Meeting of the Council, 8 June 1959, CM 1955-61, p. 354.

<sup>1088</sup> Meeting of the Council, 13 July 1959, *ibid.*, p. 358; see also: Meeting of the Council, 8 June 1959, *ibid.*, p. 354. Clarke Hall's motion, which was co-signed by Gabriel Epstein, Jim Cadbury-Brown, Anthony Cox, Leo De Syllas and Peter Newnham, was passed by ten votes to three. Oddly, James Richards supported the motion to overturn the resolution which he himself had proposed.

<sup>1089</sup> *RIBAJ*, May 1960, p. 228. The scheme involved the transformation of the polytechnic into a federal institution composed of a college of architecture and advanced building technologies, a college of engineering and science and a college of commerce, including a school of management studies. Ironically, local authority control over CATs was a short-lived affair. In 1962 they became direct-grant institutions, and from 1966 onward they were gradually transformed into universities, as was the case with the Regent Street Polytechnic, which is now part of Westminster University. (Richardson 2007, p. 388.)

student fees in 1955 had not led to a reduction in the number of candidates applying for admission to the school. In part this may have been the consequence of educational changes, specifically the introduction of the unit system, and the stimulus they gave to the school. It is worth pointing out that the council had approved the unit system, which was inevitably going to involve additional expenditure, in March 1954, at a time when the AA school was facing imminent insolvency. This may seem paradoxical, but the council felt strongly that the only way for the school to attract students in spite of its high and incessantly rising student fees was by continuing to provide a unique educational model:

If I were to try to put the council's feelings into words, I would say that the answer is not to cut one's coat according to one's cloth but to expand, to go on improving the AA's services and its education, adding postgraduate research to its commitments, and so try to make [...] what we have to sell worth buying.<sup>1090</sup>

It is impossible to assess whether or not this was indeed a contributing factor, but it seems likely that the main reason for the unexpected change of fortune was the fact that, owing to a ruling by the MOE, from late 1954 architecture schools had to levy higher fees to 'out-county scholars' (i.e. students holding a scholarship from a local authority other than the one where the school was located), who were now expected to cover 87 per cent of the total cost of their training rather than 70 per cent, as had previously been the case.<sup>1091</sup> The AA as an independent school was not bound by this directive, and though it remained comparably expensive for Londoners, the fees it charged to students from other parts of the country (which made up 70 per cent of the student body) were at least for the time being the same or even lower than in other schools, meaning that local education authorities (other than the LCC) were rather more inclined to grant awards to intending AA students.<sup>1092</sup> As a result, applications to enter the school for the 1955/56 session went up rather than down,

---

<sup>1090</sup> Peter Shephard, quoted in: 'A Policy for the AA', op. cit.

<sup>1091</sup> Meeting, 13 Dec 1954, op. cit.

<sup>1092</sup> For comparison, at that time the annual tuition fees at the AA amounted to £180 for all students regardless where they came from. At most other schools the fees for local students were in the region of £30; however, Birmingham, for instance, charged £208 to students from other counties and the London polytechnics up to £250 (Meeting of the School Committee, 17 Jan 1957, SCM 1951-63, p. 168; Peter Lord, circular letter, May 1958, AAA, Box 1991:21; for comparative numbers in 1961 see: Michael Patrick, Michael Tree, *A Career in Architecture*, London 1961, pp. 110-115.)

and the AA's financial situation improved considerably.<sup>1093</sup> The principal was pleased to announce that 'the uncertain outlook of twelve months ago has now changed into something much more cheerful.'<sup>1094</sup>

In this more optimistic climate Patrick revisited the recommendations he had outlined in his report to the McMorran Committee (see page 179) and which the council had at the time agreed would form the basis of future AA policy regardless of the RIBA's attitude towards them. Office adoption and the various ideas for postgraduate schemes have been discussed in the previous chapter. In addition to this, Patrick, in November 1955, issued a memorandum containing two separate and largely unrelated proposals for changes to the school policy.<sup>1095</sup> The first of these concerned the introduction of a strictly probationary first-year period (see page 216), which the council approved at once.<sup>1096</sup> The second proposal was more controversial and envisaged a shortened four-year course without thesis for the majority of students, followed by a part-time, postgraduate honours course for a select few of exceptional ability.<sup>1097</sup> Patrick was convinced that most students were able to reach the average standard of the RIBA final examination after four years' training and derived no benefit from their final year:

Rates of development vary, but for nearly all students it is very slow after the fourth year, and it is common knowledge in every school of architecture that the thesis in the fifth year is for quite a number nothing more than just another long design subject.<sup>1098</sup>

By extending the scope of the post-diploma work through additional lecture courses on advanced subjects and limiting it to a small number of students he hoped to

---

<sup>1093</sup> The AA also managed to mitigate the effect of higher fees on middle-class parents. An appeal to the membership to fund part-payment scholarships proved exceedingly successful, raising almost £5,000. Patrick himself financed a new entrance scholarship together with his year masters, and Arup donated his firm's lecture fees, which by themselves covered more than three of the new part-payment scholarships. (Meeting of the Council, 23 Nov 1953, CM 1949-55, p. 370; Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 21 July 1954, *ibid.*, pp. 432-433; Meeting of the School Committee, 13 Jan 1955, SCM 1951-63, p. 114; Lord 1958, *op. cit.*)

<sup>1094</sup> Patrick, quoted in: Prize Giving 1955, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

<sup>1095</sup> Michael Patrick, 'Memorandum for Special School Committee', 9 November 1955, att. to: Special Meeting of the School Committee, 14 Nov 1955, SCM 1951-63, p. 135.

<sup>1096</sup> Meeting of the Council, 28 Nov 1955, CM 1955-61, p. 32.

<sup>1097</sup> Patrick had been expressing similar ideas since June 1952, when the school committee considered, and disapproved, a proposal for a fifth-year honours course. (Meeting of the School Committee, 19 June 1952, SCM 1951-63, p. 47.)

<sup>1098</sup> Quoted in: Prize Giving 1955, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

establish a higher level of qualification, as stipulated in his 1953 report.<sup>1099</sup> Though generally in agreement with this, the school committee shied away from endorsing Patrick's scheme, not least because it was felt that such a drastic change to the school's educational model might induce the RIBA to reconsider, and possibly revoke, its recognition – an assessment with which Patrick did not concur.<sup>1100</sup>

It appears that these various activities within the AA left the council – albeit not Patrick himself – somewhat oblivious to outside events which had the potential to harm the school. The most significant amongst these was a change, resulting from the recommendations of the McMorran Committee, in the RIBA's policy on recognising schools, henceforth based solely on merit rather than on geographical location. Considering the AA drew a large proportion of its senior students from intermediate schools such as the University of Cambridge and, to a lesser extent, the Kingston School of Art and the Royal West of England Academy at Bristol, all of which were expected to attain full recognition for their five-year course, this was a development which threatened to cut off a significant source of revenue.<sup>1101</sup> This was all the more alarming as in March 1957 the AA, despite its relatively sound financial position, announced yet another raise of student fees (from £150 to £180 p. a.) in order to purchase a redemption policy to secure sufficient funds when the lease of the Bedford Square premises would come to an end in 1976.<sup>1102</sup> Patrick's concern that the newly-recognised schools would attract more students and that, in addition, LEAs would be less inclined to transfer grants from one school to another if they both offered the same qualification proved accurate.<sup>1103</sup> The consequences, however, were negligible as the government's decision in April 1957 to abolish compulsory national service for those born after July 1939 sparked off a large increase in the number of applications, which allowed Patrick to fill the school to – and beyond –

---

<sup>1099</sup> Patrick, proposals, Jan 1953. Patrick estimated that about twenty per cent of students had the competence to reach this higher level. (Patrick, memorandum, 9 Nov 1955, op. cit.)

<sup>1100</sup> Ibid.; see also: Special Meeting of the School Committee, 14 Nov 1955, SCM 1951-63, p. 134.

<sup>1101</sup> The potential damage was not merely pecuniary as the AA, which, according to Patrick, absorbed about five times more post-intermediate students than any of its competitors (Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 27 April 1954, CM 1949-55, p. 413), had a long tradition of 'creaming off' top students from other schools. Some of the most distinguished architects who emerged from the AA had started their education at Cambridge, including Bill Howell, Edward Cullinan, Cedric Price, Roger Cunliffe and Philip Dowson.

<sup>1102</sup> Meeting of the Council, 25 March 1957, CM 1955-61, pp. 143-144; Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 22 May 1957, *ibid.*, p. 156.

<sup>1103</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 20 March 1958, SCM 1951-63, p. 202.



capacity.<sup>1104</sup> In fact, at the beginning of the 1958/59 session the AA had to reinstate a system of limited entry, which it had abolished when introducing the probationary first-year period two years prior.<sup>1105</sup>

The prospective sea change in architectural education heralded by the Oxford Conference brought broader policy considerations back to the fore, particularly as a closer evaluation of the new A-level requirement indicated that it was likely to entail severe financial consequences for the AA. Patrick predicted a temporary slump in student numbers in 1961/62, when the new standard would first be applied, but took the view that after 1963/64 the effect on so-called 'facility' schools would be such that most of their potential students would instead apply to the AA or other recognised schools.<sup>1106</sup> The BAE did not share Patrick's assessment, and neither did his finance committee, which professed itself unable to produce accurate budgets for the three or four years following the introduction of the new entry standards.<sup>1107</sup> Anticipating a substantial loss of income, the committee warned that on top of an already agreed increase of student fees in September 1960 (from £180 to £225 p. a.) the AA would have to raise them once more in two to three years' time.<sup>1108</sup>

Changes in the RIBA's organisational setup were likely to put additional pressure on the AA. In October 1959 the RIBA council decided to reconstitute the somewhat cumbersome BAE as a much smaller executive committee consisting of twelve to fifteen members drawn from the, now purely advisory, predecessor body.<sup>1109</sup> Ironically, Patrick had been a driving force behind this, expecting perhaps that the AA would retain its traditional representation on the new BAE, which, however, was

---

<sup>1104</sup> Meeting of the Council, 30 May 1957, CM 1955-61, p. 168; see also: 'Defence Policy Approved: Conscription to End with 1939 Class', Times, 18 April 1957, p. 4; 'The AA School of Architecture: Information Notes 1958-59', AAA, Box 1991:31, p. 19.

<sup>1105</sup> Meeting of the Council, 24 March 1958, CM 1955-61, p. 246. The probationary first-year period was retained despite limited entry.

<sup>1106</sup> Meeting of the Council, 25 May 1959, *ibid.*, p. 351. In addition to the 26 recognised (final or intermediate) schools, there were at the time of the Oxford Conference nine so-called 'listed' schools offering full-time preparation for the RIBA examinations as well as 32 'facilities' schools, which gave part-time instruction to intending architects.

<sup>1107</sup> Meeting of the Council, 23 May 1960, *ibid.*, p. 415; see also: Meeting of the School Committee, 23 June 1959, SCM 1951-63, p. 260. Patrick's assessment was accurate; see p. 252.

<sup>1108</sup> Meeting of the Council, 13 July 1959, CM 1955-61, p. 363. The increase in September 1960 covered a massive deficit – the first shown on a budget since 1946 – resulting from a large increase in expenditure on salaries. ('AA Council's Annual Report for Session 1959-60', *AAJ*, July/Aug 1960, vol. 76, no. 844, p. 65.)

<sup>1109</sup> Meeting of the Board of Architectural Education, 19 Oct 1959, RIBA/ED 7.1.1.

only granted after President Cadbury-Brown intervened personally with the RIBA.<sup>1110</sup> Moreover, the democratisation of the RIBA itself cost the AA its seat on its council, which put an end to the privileged status it had enjoyed since its inception and was bound to significantly diminish its influence.<sup>1111</sup> ‘This is a sad blow,’ bemoaned the *Architects’ Journal*, ‘gradually, bit by bit, the AA seems to be losing its status in the profession.’<sup>1112</sup>

It was in this climate of change that the AA council, in November 1959, adopted a resolution from the students’ committee requesting the formation of a committee ‘to consider the future of the AA, with particular reference to the type of training it should provide.’<sup>1113</sup> The appointment of the so-called ‘AA working party’ – which was to be composed of an independent chairman, two ordinary members, one representative each from council and staff, two students and Patrick as a non-voting advisor – proved unexpectedly difficult as the council’s top three choices for both chair and ordinary membership, viz. Anthony Pott, Oliver Cox, and Cleve Barr (in the stated order), all refused to serve.<sup>1114</sup> Sir Alexander Killick, the director of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (and John Killick’s father), likewise rejected the offer, and the council eventually nominated Peter Chamberlin as chairman, and Neville Conder and Robert Furneaux Jordan as ordinary members.<sup>1115</sup>

It was amid the early consultations of the working party that, in February 1960, the final attempt to revive the negotiations with the LCC fell through. Maybe it was the

---

<sup>1110</sup> Meeting of the Council, 28 March 1960, CM 1955-61, p. 406. The council’s decision resulted from a recommendation of the so-called Oxford Conference Committee, which had been appointed to consider the conference resolutions and advise on ways of implementing them. Patrick, who pressed the point on the committee, faced opposition from McMorran, who rightly but in vain pointed out that the conference report made no reference to the constitution of the BAE. (Meeting of the Board of Architectural Education, 25 May 1959, RIBA/ED 7.1.1; see also: ‘Annual General Meeting’, *RIBAJ*, June 1960, pp. 297, 301)

<sup>1111</sup> See: ‘Final Report of the Constitutional Committee’, *RIBAJ*, July 1960, pp. 319, 321.

<sup>1112</sup> ‘The New RIBA Council’, *AJ*, 20 April 1961, p. 559.

<sup>1113</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 9 Nov 1959, CM 1955-61, pp. 374, 375. Roy Summers, the chairman of the students’ committee, had read the resolution to the meeting of members called to discuss the failed negotiations with the LCC. (Meeting of the Association, 25 May 1959, op. cit.; see Chapter 6, p. 225.)

<sup>1114</sup> Meeting of the Council, 23 Nov 1959, CM 1955-61, p. 376. Pott and Barr declined due to pressure of work; Cox was willing to serve on the condition that Patrick be excluded from the committee as ‘the students might find his presence inhibiting.’ (Meeting of the Council, 4 Jan 1960, *ibid.*, p. 383.)

<sup>1115</sup> Meeting of the Council, 25 Jan 1960, *ibid.*, p. 391. Chamberlin was number 5 on the council’s list of possible ordinary members; Conder and Jordan were numbers 4 and 6, respectively. Gabriel Epstein represented the council; Julian Mustoe and John Morgan represented the students; and Robert Maxwell represented the staff. (‘Annual Report 1959-60’, op. cit., p. 61.)

realisation that – at a critical time when the future of the AA was in the balance – it had effectively wasted two years on a futile educational endeavour, which prompted the council to take a sudden and far-reaching personnel decision. At an informal and unminuted discussion following its official meeting on 28 March 1960 the council decided not to renew Michael Pattrick’s appointment for another five-year term when it expired in November 1961.<sup>1116</sup> The subsequent minutes state no specific reason for this decision apart from the general view that ‘the post of principal was one which would [sic] be changed from time to time; probably the optimum length of tenure should be eight to ten years.’<sup>1117</sup> The fact that an outgoing council would, almost on its last day in office, make such a momentous decision, and the somewhat conspiratorial fashion in which it did it, does raise questions. Over the past few years many of Pattrick’s supporters had left the council, most notably Hugh Casson, Peter Shephard and John Brandon-Jones. Newer members included Furneaux Jordan’s long-time allies Leo De Syllas and Anthony Cox as well as their practice partner John Smith, a leading figure in the students’ committee of the early 1950s and Pattrick’s nemesis ever since.<sup>1118</sup> In a letter to the *AA Journal* in summer 1959, Smith had launched a barely concealed attack on the principal:

Right through our leadership the second-rate (call it the ‘B’ stream if you like) is tolerated either because no-one can think of an alternative or because we cannot afford anything better. [...] Sooner or later it must be realised that an element of sincerity coupled with a certain administrative efficiency are insufficient compensation for the conspicuous lack of imagination and ideas in those ultimately responsible for the direction of the Association and its School. [...] The future is far from black; it is the present that is not too rosy. Some basic rethinking may be necessary, and a certain amount of reshuffling in high places perhaps inevitable.<sup>1119</sup>

Edward Playne, one of the vice-presidents at the time, remembered ‘the subversive talk undermining [Pattrick’s] position,’<sup>1120</sup> and it is tempting to interpret Pattrick’s dismissal and Jordan’s appointment to a working party considering the future of the

---

<sup>1116</sup> Meeting of the Council, 23 May 1960, CM 1955-61, p. 412.

<sup>1117</sup> H. T. Cadbury-Brown, quoted in: Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 30 May 1960, *ibid.*, p. 420.

<sup>1118</sup> See e.g. p. 150, fn. 721; p. 154, fn. 747. According to Geoffrey Spyer, who worked for ACP in the early 1950s, Jordan regularly attended the weekly meetings of the practice (interview, *op. cit.*).

<sup>1119</sup> Smith, letter to the editor, *AAJ*, July/Aug 1959, vol. 75, no. 834, p. 55. Smith’s reference to the ‘B’ stream was a sneer at Pattrick, who had used the term to describe the group of ‘just adequate’ students who ‘scraped through their Intermediate’ and would benefit from a special ‘program of study attuned to their abilities.’ (Meeting of the School Committee, 5 March 1959, SCM 1951-63, pp. 250-251.)

<sup>1120</sup> Playne, letter to John Eastwick-Field, 1 Dec 1965, AAA/OK, Box 43.

AA as correlated events, masterminded by a younger generation of council members who were perhaps critical of the former and certainly sympathetic to the latter.

## Conclusion

Patrick's dismissal concluded a decade which was marked by largely unsuccessful attempts to readjust the AA's policy to the changing conditions of the time, much of it precipitated by financial problems. The fact that the school not only survived but in fact recovered during Patrick's tenure brought him great praise from those with intimate knowledge of its predicament. Bryan Westwood congratulated the retiring principal on 'his skill in restoring the economic position of the AA School,'<sup>1121</sup> and Peter Shephard expressed 'his great admiration for the way in which he had put the School on a steady and stable footing.'<sup>1122</sup>

Patrick's ten-year reign as the head of the school lasted longer than that of any other principal before him and, in fact, longer than those of his four predecessors combined. However, in spite of his success there can be little doubt that Patrick, though respected, remained a divisive figure and never attained a level of popularity comparable to, say, Jordan's. Writing in 1972, Archie McNab submitted that 'Patrick perhaps has been underestimated as a principal, possibly denigrated unduly as someone rather indifferent to design education and whose true role was that of administrator.'<sup>1123</sup> Indeed, apart from instituting the parallel unit system and, linked with it, a sophisticated and highly successful staffing policy, Patrick was chiefly responsible for the creation of the DTA and the driving force behind numerous other educational schemes which, to no fault of his own, did not come to fruition.

The main reason why so many of Patrick's plans remained unfulfilled was the AA's lack of money but also the ineptitude of an annually changing council to formulate and implement a coherent long-term strategy for the school. Never was this more evident than in the council's erratic negotiations with the MOE and the LCC, which

---

<sup>1121</sup> Quoted in: Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 30 May 1960, CM 1955-61, p. 421.

<sup>1122</sup> Quoted *ibid.*

<sup>1123</sup> McNab 1972, p. 74.

were cancelled and resumed no fewer than three times and made, as one member complained, ‘the AA appear [...] to be a pack of fools.’<sup>1124</sup> Looking at it with the benefit of hindsight, it is easy to dismiss the proposal for an integrated college of architecture and building as just another in a series of ambitious AA projects which, for one reason or the other, did not quite make it over the finish line. Yet at the time students, members and observers alike regretted it as a unique opportunity to change the nature of architectural education along the lines predicted by the Bauhaus. An editorial in the *Architects’ Journal* expressed the general sentiment:

The present AA Council has behaved with an irresponsibility which must shake everyone’s confidence in the leadership of this once progressive institution. For four years the AA Council has formally been considering integrated training with other members of the building industry, and during the last two years it has twice been discussing such a venture with the LCC. [...] No one can pretend that the LCC is the perfect partner for such an educational venture (one might ask: is the AA?) but it is only through local government that this integrated school is possible, and as a local authority the LCC is second to none. [...] The LCC has the material resources and the enterprise to make a success of integrated training – the training which has been wanted so long now by forward-thinking members of the building industry. [...] It is sadly ironical that the AA, which has pioneered so much in the past, has now, apparently, lost its nerve.<sup>1125</sup>

Beyond the confines of the AA, Patrick’s impact on architectural education in this country was profound, if so far entirely unacknowledged. He was a member of all three committees which in the 1950s shaped the educational framework on behalf the BAE, viz. the McMorrin Committee, the organising committee of the Oxford Conference and the influential Oxford Conference Committee tasked with recommending ways of implementing the conference resolutions. In these capacities he promoted, with remarkable consistency and initially against considerable opposition, a view of architectural education – based on higher entry standards and carried out exclusively in recognised full-time schools at university level – which by the end of the decade became the official policy of the RIBA. According to Crinson and Lubbock, who do not discuss Patrick’s contribution in their book on British architectural education, this new policy was the result of a campaign orchestrated by a group of public architects in the mid-1950s and they consequently term it the ‘Official System’ – it could with some justification be called the ‘Patrick System’.

---

<sup>1124</sup> Kenneth Campbell, quoted in: Meeting of the Association, 25 May 1959.

<sup>1125</sup> ‘AA: Experiment or Expire’, *AJ*, 14 May 1959, p. 717-718.



## CHAPTER 7

### WILLIAM ALLEN AND THE 'ART/SCIENCE TENSION' (1961-1965)

Failed negotiations with the LCC and the RIBA's drive for a uniform model of architectural education made it imperative for the AA council to develop a long-term strategy for the survival of its school. The first section of this chapter discusses the considerations which led to the appointment of a dual leadership consisting of William Allen (1914-1998) and Edward Carter (1902-1982), both well connected in RIBA circles. The second section illuminates the broader educational and political context within which the AA sought to reposition itself and traces the protracted process aimed at merging the school with the Imperial College of Science of Technology. The third section turns its focus to Allen's pedagogical vision, which centred upon the strengthening of the students' formal education and the provision of postgraduate facilities. Allen's aim was to foster a closer integration between 'education' (i.e. lecture courses) and 'training' (i.e. studio teaching), and the implementation of his vision had, as the fourth section shows, profound consequences for the nature of the course. In October 1963 the RIBA's visiting board inspected the AA and delivered a damning indictment, which raised serious doubts about Allen's direction of the school. It was the watershed moment in Allen's principalship, for without the full backing of the council he found it impossible to keep a lid on the tensions which were building up in the school, particularly between specialists and studio staff. The final section explains the root cause for the latter's dissatisfaction with Allen's educational model and follows the events which culminated in his dismissal at the end of the 1964/65 academic year.

#### **A New Order: The Appointment of William Allen and Edward Carter**

Michael Patrick's departure and the forthcoming retirement of senior administrative staff, notably H. J. W. Alexander, the association's secretary since 1937, offered the

opportunity for a reorganisation of the AA's executive structure.<sup>1126</sup> This involved the creation of the new post of director of the association (in addition to the principal of the school). The AA had in the past experimented with the combination of director and principal – successfully with Robert Atkinson and Howard Robertson in the 1920s, less so with Harry Goodhart-Rendel and E. A. A. Rowse in the 1930s. However, both Atkinson and Goodhart-Rendel had served as directors of studies, concerned with the school rather than the association, whereas the chief task of the new director would be to 'increase the closeness of the link'<sup>1127</sup> between the two, tenuous ever since the abolition of the student vote in 1939 and the resulting formation of a two-tier membership.

The council had no difficulties finding the right man for this assignment and appointed Edward ('Bobby') Carter, from 1930 to 1946 librarian of the RIBA and subsequently for eleven years head of the UNESCO's libraries division in Paris. Carter's first assignment was to reconsider the AA's unwieldy committee structure, and in a move which echoed the transformation of the RIBA's Board of Architectural Education (BAE) two years prior the AA council decided to limit its scope to policy matters and delegate the responsibility for day-to-day decisions to an executive committee consisting of the seven officers and the past-president.<sup>1128</sup>

A rather more difficult matter was the selection of a new principal. Discussing suggestions for possible candidates at the end of the 1960/61 session, the council was unable to agree whether or not to consider the appointment of an architect 'with a very strong individual design attitude' – generally referred to as a 'prima

---

<sup>1126</sup> H. T. Cadbury-Brown, 'Officers meetings 1959-60', att. to: Meeting of the Council, 11 July 1960, CM 1955-61, pp. 432-433. In addition to Alexander, who was replaced by his long-serving assistant George Wiltshire, both Enid Caldicott and Marjorie Morrison, librarian and slide librarian, respectively, were expected to retire in 1961, though they eventually continued for two more years. Michael Tree, Patrick's administrative assistant, resigned.

<sup>1127</sup> 'Director of the AA – Secretary of the AA – Principal of the AA', *AAJ*, March 1961, vol. 76, no. 850, p. 239.

<sup>1128</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee, 22 March 1961, *Minutes of the Executive Committee 1961-1966*, AAA, Box 1991:3 (hereafter cited as ECM 1961-66), p. 4; Meeting of the Officers of Council, 5 June 1961, *ibid.*, p.13. As was the case with the BAE, the distinction between policy and non-policy matters proved contentious, and in October 1963 the ordinary members of council complained about 'a certain amount of Executive "rigging" of matters before them.' (Meeting of the Executive Committee, 14 Oct 1963, *ibid.*, p. 127.)



donna'.<sup>1129</sup> Most members of council rejected the idea and wished to keep to the AA's tradition of choosing a practising but not overly eminent or busy architect with a background in teaching. Denys Lasdun, for instance, felt that rather than a single-minded 'prima donna' the AA required a respected 'father figure' with a 'liberal, but serious attitude to architecture' – a trait he saw in Arthur Korn, Ernö Goldfinger or Ove Arup.<sup>1130</sup> However, there were exceptions: James Cubitt took the view that the 'primadonna system' should be tried as an experiment and favoured Anthony Cox or Peter Smithson, possibly in tandem.<sup>1131</sup>

Divided over the issue, the council advertised the position in October 1960, and though the number of applicants was perhaps lower than expected, along with one current (Robert Maxwell) and two recent members of staff (John Dennys and Herbert Morel) it comprised several proven educators, including Douglas Jones, Frederic Lasserre and former fifth-year master Henry Elder, now a professor at Cornell.<sup>1132</sup> Remarkably, apart from (presumably) Douglas Jones none of these applicants was seriously considered.<sup>1133</sup> Instead, the council on 20 February 1961

---

<sup>1129</sup> Anthony Cox, quoted in: 'Notes for President's private use re Council Meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> October, 1960, on Principalship of the AA', n.d., AAA, Box 2003:37c; see also e.g.: Edward Playne, J. M. Austin-Smith, Anthony Cox, 'Memorandum on Principalship by the President and the two Vice-Presidents', n.d., *ibid.* The term 'prima donna' architect likely derived from Gropius, who used it repeatedly in his writings (see e.g.: Walter Gropius, 'Architecture in a Scientific Age', *Listener*, 23 Aug 1951, p. 297).

<sup>1130</sup> Denys Lasdun, letter to George Wiltshire, 2 Sep 1960, AAA, Box 2003:37c. James Richards supported the choice of Goldfinger or – preferably – Arup, the latter because 'the appointment of an engineer would be exciting proof of the AA's intention to initiate a new deal.' (Richards, letter to Edward Playne, 26 July 1960, *ibid.*)

<sup>1131</sup> Cubitt, letter to H. J. W. Alexander, 6 Sep 1960, *ibid.* Lasdun approved of Smithson and suggested as another representative of the 'younger generation' Peter Chamberlin, both of whom he obviously did not regard as prima donnas (Lasdun to Wiltshire, *op. cit.*). Suggestions by other members included, amongst others, Peter Shepherd and Bill Howell (for a summary of the positions see: 'The Future Principalship & Administration of the AA', n.d., *ibid.*)

<sup>1132</sup> Lasserre, the director of the school of architecture at the University of British Columbia and formerly with Tecton, provided references from Peter Moro, Denys Lasdun, Cleeve Barr and William Allen. In addition to Douglas Jones, principal at Birmingham, several other heads of British schools applied, viz. Evelyn Freeth (Bristol), Arthur Arschavir (Hull) and Chessor Matthew (Dundee). Notable applicants from abroad included Rolf Jensen, the dean of the architectural faculty at Adelaide University and former borough architect for Paddington, and Jock Sturrock, who had both applied for the position in 1951, as had Elder (see e.g. 'Applications for Principalship', Dec 1960, *ibid.*).

<sup>1133</sup> 'When the principalship was open in 1961, there were about 15 candidates, only two were considered to be worth interview; one did not think it worth returning from America. The other only applied because his marriage had broken up.' (Edward Carter, 'Memo on the Principal's contract', 29 Oct 1964, private collection.) It is unknown who the latter candidate was, but the former was most likely Douglas Jones, who was with Elder at Cornell at the time.

appointed a man who was neither an educator nor in fact a practising architect – ‘prima donna’ or otherwise.<sup>1134</sup>

William Allen was born in Winnipeg in 1914 and qualified as an architect in 1936. ‘Exposed to serious family infection with science,’ he left Canada in the same year to pursue postgraduate studies in Britain.<sup>1135</sup> As no university in the country offered any such programme, Allen, after a stint with Louis de Soissons, joined the government’s Building Research Station (BRS) at Watford – at the time the only establishment of its kind in the world.<sup>1136</sup> During the war, when the AA school was based in nearby Barnet, Allen lectured regularly to students and organised visits to the BRS. Gibberd and Summerson were anxious to appoint him to the teaching staff,<sup>1137</sup> and in the late 1940s the council put him forward for election on three different occasions. In 1953 Allen became the founding director of the architectural division of the BRS – ‘a one-man postgraduate course for the profession’<sup>1138</sup> – and one year later he was elected to the RIBA council, on which he served continuously until 1971 (and again from 1982 to 1989). According to Crinson and Lubbock, Allen belonged to the ‘breed of younger, public authority modernists’<sup>1139</sup> who came to dominate the RIBA, and as a member of several influential committees of the BAE, including the ones entrusted with organising the Oxford Conference and implementing its resolutions, he was instrumental in shaping the policies which were to guide architectural education in the 1960s.

The technical press was full of praise for the AA’s new setup. According to the *Architectural Review*, ‘speculations about a new order at the Architectural Association [...] have been answered in a more drastic manner than had been

---

<sup>1134</sup> At the time of his appointment William Allen was supervising the erection of seven houses at Wade, Hatfield, as demonstration objects for the modular studies of the BRS. The only building he had himself designed was his own house in Welwyn Garden City, built in 1948 and extended in 1953, which featured the first floor heating system in Britain. In 1962 he set up an interdisciplinary consultancy, Associated Architects and Consultants (now Bickerdike Allen Partners), with former colleagues from the BRS.

<sup>1135</sup> William Allen, ‘Convocation Address’, n.d., private collection. Allen’s forebears had been co-founders of Yale University. His father was the first professor of physics at the University of Manitoba; his sister was an associate professor at Manitoba; and his older brother held the chair of natural philosophy at St Andrews.

<sup>1136</sup> The BRS was founded in 1921 by the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research; for an account of its early history see: Mark Swenarton, *Building the New Jerusalem*, Bracknell 2008, pp. 167-186.

<sup>1137</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 4 Dec 1944, SCM 1944-51, pp. 15, 16.

<sup>1138</sup> Jack Napper, quoted in: William Allen, ‘The Training and Education of Architects’, inaugural lecture, *AAJ*, April 1962, vol. 77, no. 861, p. 238.

<sup>1139</sup> Crinson and Lubbock 1994, p. 131.

expected, and a more promising one,<sup>1140</sup> and the *Architects' Journal* thought the council had shown 'considerable wisdom in its choice for its appointments.'<sup>1141</sup> The key figure in this was Leo De Syllas, who had worked at the BRS during the war and who – supported by like-minded colleagues such as Anthony Cox and President Edward Playne – lobbied the council to offer the principalship to William Allen.<sup>1142</sup> Allen, who was 46 at the time, at first rejected the offer as the usual incumbency of AA principals was likely to leave him 'out of my main job at an awkward age.'<sup>1143</sup> The council only managed to persuade him by giving him the verbal assurance of tenure until the age of sixty, subject to his appointment being confirmed after an initial trial period of three years – an arrangement which would give cause for controversy.<sup>1144</sup>

### Proposed Merger with the Imperial College of Science and Technology

In May 1961, three months after the council had appointed the school's new leadership, Peter Chamberlin finally issued the report of his working party on the future of the AA (see page 230).<sup>1145</sup> The so-called Chamberlin Report, fifteen months

---

<sup>1140</sup> *Architectural Review*, April 1960, vol. 129, no. 770, p. 225.

<sup>1141</sup> 'Brains in Bedford Square', *AJ*, 2 March 1961, p. 307.

<sup>1142</sup> 'I feel strongly that the character of the architectural principal [...] should be that of a scientist more than "the imaginative artist". I believe the school can attract a reasonable number of young, imaginative designers to its senior teaching positions. It is far more difficult to get senior men who are deeply experienced in the scientific and social aspects of our work, and such an attitude appears to me to be essential in the policy direction of the school. Though I do not have any knowledge of his interest, let alone his availability, I can best illustrate my argument by suggesting that a man such as William Allen of BRS in many ways would fulfil these requirements [...].' (De Syllas, letter to H. J. W. Alexander, 30 Aug 1960, AAA, Box 2003:37c; see also: Edward Playne, letter to William Allen, 30 Aug 1960, *ibid.*)

<sup>1143</sup> Allen, letter to H. J. W. Alexander, 1 Jan 1961, MS, *ibid.*

<sup>1144</sup> See: Allen, letter to Edward Carter, 1 Nov 1965, MS, *ibid.*; see also p. 270. Allen had been approached as possible head of the LCC's College of Architecture and Building discussed in the previous chapter, and he turned down the position of director for building research for the New Zealand government as well as two chairs at British universities (one of them York) to take over the AA (see: Allen, letter to Leo Beranek, 29 July 1960, private collection; John West-Taylor, letter to Allen, 20 Feb 1961, *ibid.*; Allen, letter to Elizabeth Layton, 31 May 1965, *ibid.*; Roy Herbert, 'Keeping a human scale', *New Scientist*, 5 Feb 1976, p. 292).

<sup>1145</sup> Meeting of the Council, 29 May 1961, CM 1955-61, pp. 474-475. An edited and annotated version of the report was published as an insert with the July/August 1961 issue of the *AA Journal*: Michael Austin-Smith, 'Report of the Working Party on the Future of the Architectural Association', Aug 1961, att. to: Meeting of the Executive Committee, 31 July 1961, ECM 1961-66, p. 22; for the original report see: Peter Chamberlin (chairman), Neville Conder, Gabriel Epstein, Robert Maxwell, John Morgan, Julian Mustoe, Michael Pattrick, 'Report of the Working Party on the Future of the Architectural Association', 23 May 1961, AAA, Box 2006:S34 (hereafter cited as Chamberlin Report). According to the report, Robert Furneaux Jordan, one of the original members of the working party, had resigned in September 1960 'owing to the pressure of his other activities' (*ibid.*, p. 3).

in the making, was a comprehensive survey of the AA school, with particular emphasis on its precarious reliance on continually rising student fees and – to justify these – the corresponding need for a unique form of architectural education (‘unique in the sense of being experimental and adventurous’<sup>1146</sup>). It summarised its findings in the form of thirteen recommendations concerning, amongst other things, governance and the role of the principal, the desirability of an office training scheme, and possible alternative sources of funding, most of which had been under consideration for many years.

Perhaps because of the breadth of its approach, the report remained vague in detail and engendered little response from either members or the press.<sup>1147</sup> Only the *Builder* commented, and though it considered the arguments to be ‘well reasoned and lucidly presented’, it doubted whether the report would ‘shake the earth’ and expressed disappointment that no attempt had been made to ‘translate vague aspirations into the framework of a new syllabus.’<sup>1148</sup> Nonetheless, there were two important points amongst the recommendations (all of which the council adopted as official AA policy).<sup>1149</sup> First, the report called on the council to forcefully pursue the expansion of postgraduate facilities, not least because at a time of growing control of school curricula through the RIBA it was the one field where ‘being experimental and adventurous’ was in fact still possible and where consequently the AA could still distinguish itself from its competitors.<sup>1150</sup> Secondly, and more importantly, the working party, which mourned the lost opportunity of collaborating with the LCC, urged the council to seek affiliation with another institution, preferably one which would offer both academic and financial advantages to the AA.<sup>1151</sup>

The council supported this view not least because the RIBA – now a ‘kind of crypto-government department’<sup>1152</sup> – exerted pressure on schools to conform to its policy of promoting full-time university education. In 1963 the Royal West of England Academy (RWA), the only other independent school in the country, would be

---

<sup>1146</sup> Chamberlin Report, p. 4.

<sup>1147</sup> Meeting of the Council, 23 Oct 1961, CM 1955-61, p. 494.

<sup>1148</sup> ‘Architectural Education and the AA’, *Builder*, 18 Aug 1961, p. 281.

<sup>1149</sup> Meeting of the Council, 17 July 1961, CM 1955-61, pp. 488-491.

<sup>1150</sup> Chamberlin Report, p. 8.

<sup>1151</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 9, 10. The report named the universities of Oxford and Reading as possible partner institutions.

<sup>1152</sup> Crinson and Lubbock 1994, p. 131.

absorbed by Bristol University, and one year later the school of architecture in Nottingham's art college would become a university department.<sup>1153</sup> Broader political developments corroborated and accelerated this trend. In February 1961 Prime Minister Macmillan appointed a committee under Lord Robbins to advise on the future pattern of higher education in Britain. The committee advanced the principle that 'all who are qualified to pursue full-time higher education should have the opportunity of doing so'<sup>1154</sup> and recommended the granting of university status to Colleges of Advanced Technology as well as the development of three existing colleges – one of them the Imperial College of Science and Technology (ICST) – into 'Special Institutions for Scientific and Technological Education and Research' (SISTERS) comparable to the 'great technological institutions of the United States of America and the Continent'.<sup>1155</sup>

Though the Robbins Committee did not publish its report until October 1963, one would suspect that its members – notably Patrick Linstead, the rector of ICST – had a clear idea of the line it might be taking. In 1953 ICST had initiated a vast expansion programme aimed at establishing it as a 'London Institute of Technology' (i.e. a SISTER *ante litteram*), severed from London University and modelled on highly regarded international institutions such as MIT, ETH Zurich and TU Delft.<sup>1156</sup> All of these centred upon thriving schools of architecture, which explains why, in April 1961, Linstead informed the AA of his interest to attach its school as a

---

<sup>1153</sup> The RWA was loosely affiliated with the AA, whose students' committee had advised local students in the founding of their school after the First World War, and many members of its staff were AA graduates, including the founding principal Gordon Hake, his successor and current incumbent Evelyn Freeth and tutors Richard Towning Hill, Stephen Macfarlane, Denzil Nield, John Ollis and Norman Whicheloe. (Stephen Macfarlane, email to the author, 28 June 2016.) The school shared the AA's ethos, specifically a belief in student participation and a close connection to a professional body of architects (in its case the Bristol and Somerset Society of Architects), both of which it forfeited at once when joining the university: 'We gave the school assistance in practice training as and when requested, we give the library, the workshop and all the studio equipment and for the future in return we manage to negotiate not one concession [...]. We went like lambs to the slaughter [...].' (Stephen Macfarlane, letter to John Smith, 13 Aug 1963, private collection; see also: [Stephen Macfarlane], 'The Royal West of England Academy School of Architecture', *RIBA J*, Dec 1963, p. 514.)

<sup>1154</sup> *Higher Education: Report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins*, London 1963, <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/cabinetpapers/themes/robbins-committee-open-university.htm> [accessed 25 July 2016], p. 70.

<sup>1155</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 271. In total, the report envisaged five SISTERS – three evolved from existing colleges (ICST, Manchester College of Science and Technology, Royal College of Science and Technology at Glasgow), one from a selected CAT, and one an entirely new foundation (*ibid.*, p. 129).

<sup>1156</sup> Meeting of the Council, 15 Jan 1962, CM 1961-65, p. 17; Special Meeting of the Council, 10 Dec 1962, *ibid.*, p. 77.

constituent college to ICST – much to the council’s surprise as Chamberlin’s working party, whose final report was issued almost simultaneously, ruled out any possibility of affiliating with London University.<sup>1157</sup>

The council welcomed the unexpected opportunity to make amends for its poor handling of the LCC proceedings and following a series of exploratory talks authorised President Michael Austin-Smith in December to enter formal negotiations.<sup>1158</sup> A key figure in these was Bobby Carter, who beyond his immediate task of coordinating and integrating the activities of school and association initiated a long-term policy of broadening and diversifying the latter’s activities in order to sustain its status at a time when it would lose its chief purpose of running a school of architecture. At the core of this policy was the reconceptualisation of the AA as a ‘learned society’<sup>1159</sup>, which involved a substantive expansion of its programme of events and engagements. The AA increased the number of guest lectures and organised a series of successful conferences and seminars on, amongst other things, system building, university planning and Hook New Town.<sup>1160</sup> Another major field of activity was ‘mid-career education’, a term Carter coined to encapsulate a number of courses aimed at practising architects, including annually repeated management courses, refresher courses for women and the first-ever computer course in Britain.<sup>1161</sup> Finally, Carter was acutely aware of the value of publicity: he fostered press relations, interfered directly with the editorial policy of the *AA Journal* (which led to the resignation of editor John Killick in July 1961),<sup>1162</sup> and in 1964

---

<sup>1157</sup> Chamberlin Report, p. 9; also: Meetings of the Executive Committee, 19 April 1961, 30 Oct 1961, ECM 1961-66, pp. 8, 28. Part of the University of London, the ICST was itself composed of three different colleges: the Royal College of Science, the Royal School of Mines, and the City and Guilds College.

<sup>1158</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 11 Dec 1961, CM 1961-65, p. 10.

<sup>1159</sup> Carter, letter to Otto Koenigsberger, 10 April 1962, AAA, Box 2003:45b.

<sup>1160</sup> From 1960 to 1964 attendance at AA events rose from 800 to 4,000. (‘AA & ICST Merger Plan: Any Questions?’, op. cit., p. 126.)

<sup>1161</sup> Edward Carter, ‘The AA’s Programme of Mid-Career Education’, 24 Nov 1966, AAA, Box 2006:S16b. The RIBA’s Conference on Postgraduate Training in 1961, a follow-up to the Oxford Conference, had emphasised the need for refresher courses to keep architects ‘up to date with technical advances and with new approaches to the solution of architectural problems.’ ([Richard Llewelyn Davies], ‘Postgraduate Training’, *RIBAJ*, March 1962, p. 121.) The AA’s events were covered in the *AA Journal* as well as the technical press. For the seminar on system building see e.g.: ‘AA Seminar on Industrialization’, *ABN*, 13 Feb 1963, p. 224 (continued *ibid.*, 20 Feb 1963, p. 263); ‘Architecture and System Building’, *Builder*, 29 March 1963, pp. 651-657; for the computer course see e.g. ‘AA: Computer course at Oxford’, *AJ*, 17 July 1963, pp. 121-122; Peter Barefoot, ‘Computers and the Architect’, *ABN*, 24 July 1963, p. 132.

<sup>1162</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee, 31 July 1961, ECM 1961-66, p. 20.

established *AA Papers* as an outlet for the growing body of research produced at the AA.<sup>1163</sup>

Besides Carter senior council members Austin-Smith, Cox and De Syllas (all three supporters of the previous LCC scheme) emerged as the chief promoters of the merger plan, though it should be pointed out that the council as a whole was unanimous in its enthusiasm and intent to bring the negotiations to a successful conclusion.<sup>1164</sup> In the substantial body of records documenting the initial stages of the plan there is not a hint of doubt that it would eventually materialise. The question, in the eyes of the council, was not if but when. Accordingly, it exhibited a rare sense of purpose in its dealings with ICST, treating controversial issues such as the necessary relocation from Bloomsbury to South Kensington or the inevitable loss of control over the school – a deal-breaker only a couple of years prior – as matters of detail rather than principle.<sup>1165</sup> The process was facilitated by the fact that Linstead in particular appeared genuinely eager to preserve the AA's 'peculiar flavour'<sup>1166</sup>, as did one of his chief advisors Alec Skempton, a former colleague of Allen's at the BRS, lecturer at the AA under both Jordan and Patrick and now a professor of civil engineering at ICST. As a result, negotiations proceeded smoothly: by May 1962 AA and ICST had established a constitutional committee tasked with drawing up a 'treaty' between the two schools;<sup>1167</sup> by December this treaty had been finalised and approved by both governing bodies;<sup>1168</sup> and by May 1963 both senate and court of London University had formally accepted it as the basis for further negotiations and an approach to the University Grants Committee.<sup>1169</sup>

---

<sup>1163</sup> Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Committee, 14 Dec 1964, CM 1961-65, p. 264; see also: Meetings of the Executive Committee, 2 April 1962, 21 May 1962, ECM 1961-66, pp. 46, 50.

<sup>1164</sup> Austin-Smith was the president in 1961/62, Cox succeeded him in 1962/63, and De Syllas was the president-designate at the time of his death in January 1964. Gabriel Epstein, who was president in 1963/64, supported the scheme but was not a driving force behind it.

<sup>1165</sup> The council's determination is illustrated by the fact that on two occasions it used its powers of co-option (which required unanimity and was therefore rare) specifically to advance the ICST scheme: in 1962 it co-opted Stanley Meyrick, a member of the University Grants Committee, to advise on matters of finance, and two years later it invited past-president Cox to stay on for an additional year to guarantee continuity. (Meetings of the Executive Committee, 5 Nov 1962, 20 July 1964, *ibid.*, pp. 75-76, 170.)

<sup>1166</sup> Linstead, quoted in: Carter, 'The Architectural Association – Imperial College Project', *op. cit.*

<sup>1167</sup> Meeting of the Council, 28 May 1962, CM 1961-65, pp. 36-37 *et pass.*

<sup>1168</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee, 31 Dec 1962, ECM 1961-66, p. 85; for the 'treaty' see: "'The Working Paper': Plan for the Incorporation of the School of the Architectural Association in the Imperial College of Science and Technology', [27 Nov 1962], att. to: Edward Carter, 'The AA and the Imperial College', 25 Sep 1963, AAA, Box 2003:29c.

<sup>1169</sup> 'Application to the University Grants Committee', second draft, [1965], AAA/OK, Box 43.

Though legally entitled to authorise the merger without their consent, the council felt a ‘moral obligation’ to consult the members of the association about the proceedings.<sup>1170</sup> From the beginning it pursued its plan with the utmost transparency, organising a series of ‘information meetings’ to avoid provoking allegations of secrecy such as had been levelled against it in the wake of the LCC negotiations.<sup>1171</sup> In March 1964, in preparation for a referendum on the matter, the council issued the so-called ‘Grey Book’, a 44-page pamphlet setting out its arguments in favour of the merger.<sup>1172</sup> Chief amongst these was, of course, the prospect of UGC funding; yet the council was eager to highlight the perceived educational merits of the merger, notably the benefits derived from the expected cross-fertilisation with other fields of study.

At the outset, the general membership appears to have been supportive of the scheme. Diana Lee-Smith and Christopher Cross, respectively the secretary and chairman of the 1962/63 students’ committee, were amongst the first who voiced their objection to the merger, and this became the default position of the overwhelming majority of student leaders during the remainder of the decade, most forcefully expressed by Cross’ successor Michael Glickman.<sup>1173</sup> These students believed in the school’s ‘independent governance as an ideal principle we weren’t going to go back on,’<sup>1174</sup> and they strongly objected to the plan’s provision of tenured studio faculty, the lack of which they considered to be a prerequisite for the AA’s openness to experiment and changing trends. Allen and the majority of council shared this latter view and raised the point repeatedly with their negotiating

---

<sup>1170</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee, 5 Nov 1962, ECM 1961-66, p. 76; also: Special Meeting of the Council, 10 Dec 1962, CM 1961-65, p. 76.

<sup>1171</sup> The council first informed members and students about the negotiations in March 1962: Michael Austin-Smith, letter to members, 23 March 1962, AAA, Box 2003:29c; published in: ‘The Future of the AA’, *AAJ*, June/July 1962, vol. 78, no. 863, pp. 10-11. The first information meeting took place on 9 May 1962 (*ibid.*, pp. 12-23).

<sup>1172</sup> The Grey Book was included as a loose insert with the March 1964 issue of the *AA Journal*: ‘The AA and the Imperial College of Science and Technology’, 1964, AAA, Box 1991:7.

<sup>1173</sup> The *Architects’ Journal* referred to Glickman as ‘the appropriate firebrand [...], a manifesto-writing second year student’ (25 April 1962, p. 874), and Peter Cook recalled him as a ‘Christ-like figure rallying virtually the whole student body to state in no uncertain terms their attitude to the IC merger.’ (Cook, ‘Responses’, p. 143.) Of the ten chairmen and secretaries of the students’ committee between 1962 and 1967 only one – David Osborne, chairman in 1964/65 – supported the merger, and only for lack of alternatives: ‘My attitude [...] is one of qualified approval, Glickman’s is one of unqualified disapproval.’ (Osborne, letter to the editor, *AAJ*, Jan 1965, vol. 80, no. 888, p. 186; see also: Glickman et al., letter to the editor, *Times*, 6 March 1967, p. 11.)

<sup>1174</sup> Diana Lee-Smith, interview with the author, 5 May 2016.



partners.<sup>1175</sup> However, ultimately it was, as Carter pointed out in the confidential setting of a council meeting, ‘probably hopeless to pretend that the AA could compel the ICST to depart from the accepted custom of appointments in all British universities,’ and Austin-Smith warned that ‘if the AA was quite unable to reconcile itself to this practice of the university system, it might be forced to “bail out.”’<sup>1176</sup>

In the course of the early 1960s opposition to the merger scheme gained momentum amongst students and sections of the staff, driven by a growing sense of dissatisfaction with developments in the school (see page 256), and in March 1964 James Gowan, a member of council, withdrew his candidature for the forthcoming election in protest and resigned his membership of the AA.<sup>1177</sup> General meetings became increasingly contentious, not least because the council’s unreserved advocacy of the scheme raised suspicions: ‘In selling the scheme so vigorously they have sown seeds of doubt in the minds of many of us.’<sup>1178</sup> On 15 May, five days prior to the final pre-referendum meeting, the students held a ballot on five resolutions, each critical of the council’s policy and each carried (overwhelmingly so with regards to permanent staff appointments), and the meeting itself revealed considerable dissent within the membership.<sup>1179</sup>

---

<sup>1175</sup> See e.g.: Meeting of the Council, 15 Jan 1962, CM 1961-65, p. 18. Shortly after his arrival at the AA, Allen had speculated that it might, in part, be the ‘transience of staff’ which made it ‘such a lively place’ and stressed that it was ‘important to preserve and not stultify its uniqueness.’ (Quoted in: Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Committee, 14 Nov 1961, *ibid.*, p. 4.) Returning from a reconnaissance mission in the United States in spring 1963, Allen circulated a confidential document to members of council and senior staff in which he reported: ‘Everywhere I went the staff with permanent appointments were regarded as blocking progress and having a deadening effect.’ ([William Allen], ‘Five Weeks in Canada and the USA’, [April 1963], AAA/OK, Box 17; see also: William Allen, ‘Observations in America’, *AAJ*, Sep/Oct 1963, vol. 79, no. 875, p. 70.)

<sup>1176</sup> Meeting of the Council, 28 May 1962, CM 1961-65, p. 41; also: Gabriel Epstein, quoted in: ‘Architectural Association – Imperial College: Report of discussion 20 May 1964’, AAA, Box 2007:50, p. 3: ‘The Council share what they believe to be the general opinion on this matter but they are not prepared to place the whole future of the AA in peril by making this point an absolute condition of acceptance.’

<sup>1177</sup> Meetings of the Council, 16 March 1964, 27 July 1964, CM 1961-65, pp. 166, 200. Another consistently critical voice was John Smith, between 1963 and 1965 the editor of the *AA Journal*. The staff itself did not arrive at a unified position over the ICST merger except on the subject of permanent tenure, which was ‘not to our liking.’ (‘The Senior Staff Meeting on ICST/AA Negotiations’, 8 June 1964, Alvin Boyarsky Archive, London (hereafter cited as ABA); also: Anthony Eardley (1<sup>st</sup>-year master), Hermann Senkowsky (2<sup>nd</sup>-year master), Roy Landau (3<sup>rd</sup>-year master), John Winter (4<sup>th</sup>-year master), Alvin Boyarsky (4<sup>th</sup>-year master, elect), George Balcombe (5<sup>th</sup>-year master), letter to the editor, *AAJ*, June 1964, vol. 80, no. 883, p. 3.)

<sup>1178</sup> Michael Glickman, letter to the editor, *AAJ*, May 1964, vol. 79, no. 882, p. 328.

<sup>1179</sup> Discussion, 20 May 1964, *op. cit.*; for the students’ resolutions see: Michael Glickman, quoted *ibid.*, pp. 5-6. One particularly distasteful intervention came from James Gowan, who made an ad hominem attack on Justin De Syllas, one of the few students who had spoken in favour of the ICST merger: ‘If I thought that Justin De Syllas’ view represented the student body, I should be extremely worried and I should be the first one to ship the whole lot off to Imperial College right away. I have never heard a young chap talking like an

Thus, by the time it took place on 27 July 1964 the AA council had lost much of its confidence in a positive outcome of the referendum, indicated by the fact that it was deliberately vague as to what precisely it would consider to be such an outcome.<sup>1180</sup> In the event, the referendum delivered a comfortable majority, with 691 members voting in favour and 422 against.<sup>1181</sup> A closer analysis of the figures, however, exposed two major issues which boded ill for the future of the scheme. For one, there was a sharp discrepancy between ordinary and probationary members: whilst the former supported the plan with a two-thirds majority, the students opposed it with an even greater one. Equally alarmingly, less than a third of the total membership had voted at all, implying a widespread lack of interest in a question of vital importance to the future of the AA. In spite of this, the council concluded that the result gave it a mandate to proceed with its plan of transferring the school to ICST.<sup>1182</sup> The students' committee grudgingly accepted this verdict – at least for the time being.<sup>1183</sup>

### **'Growth Points' – Allen's Vision for the AA School**

Contrary to a popular myth in AA circles,<sup>1184</sup> Allen was not appointed to prepare the school for the ICST merger. His arrival preceded the initial contact between the two institutions, and whilst broadly supportive of the scheme and intimately involved in the negotiations, he was neither its originator nor does he emerge from the records as a driving force behind it. Evidently, though, Allen's appointment and the ICST scheme were orchestrated by the same influential group of council members

---

old man before.' De Syllas had previously opposed the scheme but performed a volte-face following the tragic death of his father in a car accident in January 1964. Gowan's remarks left Manasseh 'extremely angry, in fact speechless.' (Ibid. pp. 10, 16; also: Michael Glickman, interview with the author, 28 May 2016.)

<sup>1180</sup> 'The Council very carefully refrained from giving any exact definition of what it expected, either in the size of the vote, or the proportion of approvals, and, I am sure wisely, refused to give any actual figure of what it would regard as a clear mandate.' (Edward Carter, letter to Graham Dawbarn, 5 Aug 1964, AAA, Box 2003:45c.)

<sup>1181</sup> Meeting of the Council, 27 July 1964, CM 1961-65, p. 197; for the scrutineers' report see: 'The AA/Imperial College Project', 29 July 1964, AAA, Box 2007:50.

<sup>1182</sup> Meeting of the Council, 27 July 1964, CM 1961-65, p. 198. Pressed on this point by a student, the president expressed the view that 'at least they had *not* got a mandate not to go on.' (Epstein, quoted in: 'The AA & ICST Merger Plan: Any Questions?', *AAJ*, Nov 1964, vol. 80, no. 886, p. 118.)

<sup>1183</sup> Meeting of the Council, 26 Oct 1964, CM 1961-65, p. 220.

<sup>1184</sup> See e.g.: McNab 1972, p. 75.

and inspired by the same technocratic worldview. The previous chapter traced the events leading up to the Oxford Conference, which rejected the traditional notion of architectural education as a primarily vocational field of study and, with its twin drive for higher entry standards and postgraduate research, effectively turned this worldview into official RIBA policy. Represented by Michael Patrick (and Anthony Cox, who served alongside him on the Oxford Conference Committee), the AA had participated in framing the Oxford resolutions, yet with the exception of the DTA (which had been founded prior to the conference) all attempts to establish postgraduate schemes at the school proved abortive. In 1958 the students themselves offered to contribute to the funding of a postgraduate scholarship,<sup>1185</sup> whilst in the following year the council set up a largely ineffectual ‘study groups committee’ under Beak Adams to identify common fields of research between members and students.<sup>1186</sup>

Whilst the AA was addressing the implications of the Oxford resolutions with characteristic ad-hoc amateurism, many of those who had brought them about had taken up, or were in the process of taking up, key positions in the leading university schools, intent on transforming them into centres of architectural research and thus supplanting (or at least complementing) the development groups which many of them had previously headed – a strategic move first suggested by William Allen in 1953.<sup>1187</sup> For instance, in 1955 Liverpool’s Robert Gardner-Medwin established the

---

<sup>1185</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 3 Dec 1958, SCM 1951-63, p. 241.

<sup>1186</sup> Meeting of the Study Groups Committee, 10 Dec 1958, in: *Minutes of the Study Groups Committee 1958-59*, pp. 1-2, AAA, Box 2006:15a; see also: [John Killick], ‘Study Groups’, *AAJ*, Feb 1959, vol. 74, no. 829, pp. 215-216. The idea of study groups had originally been suggested in the students’ report of 1953, and the one successful study group which did emerge from the idea was likewise the result of student initiative: In summer 1961 three officers of the students’ committee (Martyn Haxworth, Peter de Brant, James Hodges) proposed the formation of a postgraduate study group on community design, and when Allen became principal he brought them in touch with Colin Buchanan, who appointed a group of fifteen fifth-year students and recent graduates (supervised by Leslie Ginsburg) to assist him in the London section of his study *Traffic in Towns*. Ironically, the success of the group was its downfall as the Ministry of Transport offered full-time appointments to four of its members, and the group, unable to replace them, fell apart. (Meeting of the Council, 23 Oct 1961, CM 1955-61, p. 497; Meetings of the School Committee, 30 Nov 1961, 18 Jan 1962, 27 Sep 1962, SCM 1951-63, pp. 318, 322, 344; see also: ‘Annual Prize Giving’, *AAJ*, Sep/Oct 1961, vol. 77, no. 855, p. 65; William Allen, memorandum to George Wiltshire, 18 Oct 1961, AAA, Box 2003:45b; ‘Notes on Meetings of the Architectural Association Postgraduate Study Group’, n.d., *ibid.*; for the relevant section in Buchanan’s report: Colin Buchanan, *Traffic in Towns*, Harmondsworth 1963, pp. 155-200.

<sup>1187</sup> William Allen, ‘Science in Schools of Architecture’, *RIBAJ*, Aug 1953, pp. 409-411. Allen argued that the success in implementing the ‘scientific method’ in the teaching of architecture would depend ‘on the rate at which architects who have direct experience of scientific research enter the teaching field.’ (*Ibid.*, p. 410). Richard Llewelyn Davies made the same point in two papers in, respectively, 1955 (‘On the Frontier of

first research fellowship at a British school of architecture, followed two years later by the first chair of building science (which he offered to Allen).<sup>1188</sup> In 1956 Leslie Martin left the LCC to take over the chair at Cambridge, where he strengthened postgraduate studies in history and urban reconstruction, the latter providing the framework for the design programmes of students in the senior years. Most importantly, in 1960 Richard Llewelyn Davies, since 1954 director of architectural studies at the Nuffield Foundation, took over the Bartlett, replacing its diploma course and Beaux-Arts methods with a science-based curriculum divided into a three-years degree and a two-year postgraduate course.<sup>1189</sup> These developments challenged the AA's standing as a pacesetter in British architectural education, and William Allen – ‘a kind of high priest of technology’<sup>1190</sup> – seemed the right person to restore its tarnished reputation.

The new principal expounded his pedagogical vision in his inaugural lecture on 28 February 1962, half a year after taking office.<sup>1191</sup> To Allen, the key obstacle impeding the progress of the profession was its inherent ‘art/science tension’.<sup>1192</sup> Architects, he observed, were prepared to acknowledge the practical usefulness of science for their work but struggled to grasp the fundamental nature of its outlook, and the only way to overcome this was by making it an integral part of their training. Allen argued that this scientific outlook would neither replace nor limit the students’ creativity but would instead improve it since the quality of intuitive acts, including the creation of architecture, was predetermined by a person’s prior knowledge, which in turn was best acquired through scientific methods.<sup>1193</sup> More importantly, it would enable them to fulfil their obligation to society, which, in Allen’s view, exceeded their traditional role as designers and required them as strategists and

---

Knowledge’, *AJ*, 14 April 1955, p. 510) and 1957 (‘Deeper Knowledge: Better Design’, *Architectural Record*, April 1957, p. 191), the latter part of the proceedings at the Oxford Conference, and together they reiterated it in a memorandum on postgraduate work, which inspired an RIBA conference on the topic in October 1961 (William Allen, Richard Llewelyn Davies, ‘Post-graduate Training and Research’, Committee on the Oxford Architectural Education Conference, 16 April 1959, Inset G, RIBA/ED 7.1.2.; see also p. 242, fn. 1161.)

<sup>1188</sup> Gardner-Medwin, letter to Allen, 15 Nov 1955, private collection.

<sup>1189</sup> ‘Bartlett School of Architecture, UCL’, *Builder*, 19 Jan 1962, p. 75.

<sup>1190</sup> McNab 1972, p. 75.

<sup>1191</sup> Allen, Inaugural, op. cit., pp. 223-238.

<sup>1192</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 223.

<sup>1193</sup> ‘We depend upon our imagination to do design, but imagination itself depends upon the terms of reference we give to it, and these are largely developed in our formal education.’ (*Ibid.*, p. 227; see also: Allen, *Science in Schools*, op. cit., p. 409.)

policy-makers to assume responsibility for the physical environment as a whole: 'Our concern must be not only for individual buildings but for the nation's building.'<sup>1194</sup>

According to Allen, training for any profession involved the acquisition of knowledge and the necessary skill in applying this knowledge, i.e. both 'education' and 'training'. In this he agreed with Llewelyn Davies, who had anticipated much of Allen's argument in his own inaugural lecture, delivered in November 1960.<sup>1195</sup> However, they differed fundamentally in their approach to this problem. Llewelyn Davies advocated a clear distinction between the two pillars of the course, with the degree course covering the period of 'education' and the postgraduate course intended for professional 'training', the latter allowing specialisation and movement between schools.<sup>1196</sup> In sharp contrast, Allen considered the traditional setup of British schools of architecture with its parallel arrangement of education (in the form of lecture courses) and training (in the form of studio work) 'absolutely sound'<sup>1197</sup> and called for more, not less, integration between the two:

As a matter of principle it seems to me that professional education generally should be viewed as a category in which the cultivation of skill is a part of the system, to be carried out in an integrated manner alongside formal education.<sup>1198</sup>

The question was how to modify the elements of the course to accomplish this closer integration. The *Architect and Building News*, though impressed with Allen's 'lucid and comprehensive view of the training and education of the architect in general terms,' nevertheless expressed some disappointment: 'The trouble was, he gave

---

<sup>1194</sup> William Allen, 'The Profession in Contemporary Society', *RIBA J*, May 1960, p. 253.

<sup>1195</sup> Richard Llewelyn Davies, 'The Education of an Architect', *ibid.*, Jan 1961, pp. 118-120.

<sup>1196</sup> In 1963 Cambridge, Durham and the Bartlett were the first three schools which recognised each others' three-year course and thus facilitated the free movement of students in the senior years. Combined with the RIBA's new practical training requirements (two years, one of them postgraduate; see p. 214), this established the 3-1-2-1 pattern of architectural education in operation today. (Richard Llewelyn Davies, Leslie Martin, Jack Napper, 'Interchange of Students Between Schools of Architecture After First Degrees Obtained at the End of Three Years' Study', Meeting of the RIBA Schools Committee, 20 June 1963, Inset D, RIBA/ED 7.1.3; see also: Leslie Martin, 'A Note on Education and Training', Meeting of the Board of Architectural Education, 12 April 1961, Inset D, RIBA/ED 7.1.1.)

<sup>1197</sup> Quoted in: 'School of Architecture: Annual Prize Giving', *AAJ*, Oct 1962, vol. 78, no. 865, p. 119.

Patrick had made the same point in his final address to the school (Prize Giving 1961, *op. cit.*, p. 63).

<sup>1198</sup> Allen, Inaugural, p. 225. Accordingly, Allen was not prepared to break the integrity of the five-year course, and the AA never awarded three-year degrees. On the contrary, Allen considered the AA's teaching method as a possible model for other professions and, looking ahead to the merger with ICST, 'a good prototype for other faculties to follow.' (Quoted in: Joint Meeting of Council and Advisory Council, 14 Nov 1961, CM 1961-65, p. 4; see also: Prize Giving 1962, *op. cit.*, p. 119.)

tantalisingly little idea of how he was going to implement his proposals at the AA [...].<sup>1199</sup> Allen was particularly vague with respect to the studio teaching, which he more or less bypassed as ‘a big subject on its own [...] which must at some time be tackled.’<sup>1200</sup> In contrast, his ideas on the intellectual content of the course were rather more developed. Allen’s concept – outlined in his inaugural lecture and further elaborated in his revised 1962 prospectus and the accompanying information booklet for students (commonly referred to as the ‘Red Book’) – involved a division of the lecture programme into eight different branches.<sup>1201</sup> Six of these (history, art, town planning, structural design, materials and construction, and ‘professional studies’) were pre-existing, whilst the other two resulted from the reinterpretation and regrouping of established subjects. One of these – ‘Sensation, Perception and Environment’ – dealt with the environment as registered through the human sensory system and mind; the other one – ‘Flow and Movement Systems’ – covered services as well as traffic planning, based on the assertion that the principles involved were broadly analogous.<sup>1202</sup>

Faced with the fact that (with the possible exception of history) none of the specialist subjects in the architectural course was ‘an academic discipline in itself which we can lift “straight” from somewhere else,’<sup>1203</sup> Allen considered it to be the school’s ‘biggest task’ to combine the ‘borrowings’ and process them for its specific use.<sup>1204</sup> To achieve this, he hoped to consolidate the various technical subjects into a

---

<sup>1199</sup> *ABN*, 7 March 1962, p. 332. Hiding behind the portmanteau pseudonym ABNER, the writer was presumably John Smith, who had made a similar comment in the discussion following Allen’s lecture (see: Allen, Inaugural, p. 236).

<sup>1200</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 238.

<sup>1201</sup> *The Architectural Association School of Architecture Prospectus 1963*, London 1963, AAA, pp. 11-15; for the Red Book see: ‘The AA School of Architecture: Information Notes 1962-63’, AAA, Box 1991:31.

<sup>1202</sup> This is the taxonomy used in the prospectus (op. cit). Confusingly, the concurrent Red Book (op. cit., pp. 2-3) uses a different one: ‘Sensation, Perception and Environment’ is called ‘The Study of the Individual’; ‘Town Planning’ is called ‘The Study of the Group’; and ‘Art’ is only mentioned as a minor part of ‘History’. The Red Book of 1964 (AAA, Box 1991:31, pp. 3-4) is identical, but the ‘Principal’s Notes for Studio Staff and Lecturers’ of 1964 (AAA, Box 1991:31, p. 4) combine ‘The Study of the Individual’ and ‘The Study of the Group’ into the ‘Studies of Man’, whilst ‘Structures and Construction’ become the ‘Study of the Building Fabric’. In the prospectus of 1965 (AAA, pp. 17-19) the ‘Studies of Man’ are called ‘Human Needs’; ‘Flow and Movement Systems’ are called ‘Communications and Services’; and history, art and philosophy are called ‘General Studies’.

<sup>1203</sup> Allen, Inaugural, pp. 228-230.

<sup>1204</sup> *Ibid.*; see also: William Allen, ‘The AA School Today’, notes prepared for the RIBA Visiting Board, [ca. May 1963], *AAJ*, Feb 1964, vol. 79, no. 879, p. 213: ‘I do not believe in importing sectors of various sciences intact with their accompanying scientists. They have important roles to play, but the subjects must be *our* professional subjects, and I think we have largely to formulate them ourselves [...].’

comprehensive technology department, which, staffed with highly qualified personnel on long-term contracts and equipped with state-of-the-art facilities, would advance them from a specifically architectural viewpoint and provide opportunities for postgraduate research. Eventually, Allen envisaged the school to be departmentalised into four ‘major areas of advanced study’: the ‘general practice of architecture’ (i.e. studio-based design teaching), tropical studies, science and technology, and – as an additional ‘growth point’ requiring immediate attention – urban design.<sup>1205</sup>

The prototype for these new departments was the DTA, which – renamed the Department of Tropical Studies (DTS) – continued to flourish and expand under Allen.<sup>1206</sup> In 1961 Koenigsberger managed to obtain the first of several research fellowships,<sup>1207</sup> and in 1963 he instituted an additional, government-funded course on educational buildings under the direction of Barbara Price as well as a series of seminars catering to teachers of tropical architecture.<sup>1208</sup> School programmes in the regular course were often linked to the sought-after consultancy service which the DTS provided to governments and organisations in the developing world.<sup>1209</sup> It was due to the high reputation of the DTS that in September 1962 representatives of the Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST) at Kumasi in Ghana approached Allen with a request to advise the university on the

---

<sup>1205</sup> Ibid., p. 212; see also: Meeting of the Council, CM 1955-61, p. 497. The motivation behind Allen’s departmentalisation was pedagogical, but it seems important to point out that the council supported it not least to avoid the inherent weakness of a single-department college within the ICST framework.

(Special Meeting of the Council, 10 Dec 1962, CM 1961-65, p. 79.)

<sup>1206</sup> Meeting of the Council, 23 Oct 1961, CM 1955-61, p. 494. For an overview of the activities of the DTS from the early 1960s onward see: ‘Department of Tropical Studies: A Cross-Section of Recent Work and Teaching Methods’, *AAJ*, April 1963, vol. 78, no. 871, pp. 302-313; ‘The Architectural School of Architecture Department of Tropical Studies’, prospectus, 1965, AAA; for a discussion see: Wakely 1983, pp. 340-346; Chang 2009, pp. 330-333 et pass.

<sup>1207</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 16 March 1961, SCM 1951-63, p. 302. The first holder of the scholarship, donated by the Aluminium Development Association, was Robert Lynn, whose research was published as the inaugural issue of *AA Papers*: Otto Koenigsberger, Robert Lynn, *Roofs in the Warm Humid Tropics*, London 1965.

<sup>1208</sup> ‘AA Department of Tropical Studies: Educational Building Course’, *AAJ*, April 1965, vol. 80, no. 891, pp. 286-288.

<sup>1209</sup> For instance, in 1962 the DTS was invited to prepare a draft scheme for a new town in Bechuanaland (now Botswana) (*Builder*, 16 March 1962, p. 644; Alan Craig, ‘Architecture in the Tropics’, *ibid.*, 6 April 1962, p. 716); between 1963 and 1964 it carried out a reconnaissance survey for the government of Northern Rhodesia (now Zambia) (‘The AA and Northern Rhodesia’, *ibid.*, 10 July 1964, p. 70; for the report and additional records see: AAA/OK, Box 38); and in 1965 it was commissioned to advise on the design of British High Commission buildings in Islamabad (Meeting of the Executive Committee, 12 April 1965, ECM 1961-66, p. 206).

reorganisation of its faculty for architecture, planning and building, to appoint a temporary head and to take over its quality control.<sup>1210</sup> The council ratified the agreement with KNUST in April 1963 and, at Allen's suggestion, nominated former first-year master John Lloyd as the dean of the faculty.<sup>1211</sup>

The establishment of additional DTS-inspired departments involved considerable expenditure, which in turn necessitated an increase in student numbers. With full employment in the building industry and a sharp rise in the number of school leavers gaining two or more A-levels,<sup>1212</sup> Patrick's prediction that the recognised schools would remain largely unaffected by the introduction of higher entry standards proved accurate. In fact, at all major schools the number of applications was far in excess of the number of available places, and any expansion of the AA school was therefore limited solely by administrative considerations and a lack of space.<sup>1213</sup> Between 1961 and 1963 the number of students rose from 296 to 361;<sup>1214</sup> yet despite the fact that the school was filled to capacity at any given time in the early 1960s, finances remained tight, and as early as June 1962 the council urged the principal to 'look closely at the budget to see if any savings could be made.'<sup>1215</sup>

Allen, who was not prepared to 'cut back on sections where there was a special need for development,'<sup>1216</sup> received help from two different sources. First, the government, in passing the 1962 Education Act, made it compulsory for local education

---

<sup>1210</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 27 Sep 1962, SCM 1951-63, pp. 344, 347.

<sup>1211</sup> Meeting of the Council, 22 April 1963, CM 1961-65, p. 99; 'Statement of cooperation between the Architectural Association and the Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana in development of the KNUST Faculty of Architecture', April 1963, AAA, Box 2006:S33); Meeting of the School Committee, 2 May 1963, SCM 1951-63, p. 361. Similar 'special relationships' between the University of London and colonial colleges were common, and the engineering faculty of KNUST had, in fact, a parallel arrangement with ICST. (Chang 2009, p. 293; 'Kumasi University, Ghana', att. to: Meeting of the School Committee, 27 Sep 1962, SCM 1951-63, p. 347.) For an account of the AA-KNUST project see: William Allen, 'Background to Kumasi', *AAJ*, July/Aug 1963, vol. 79, no. 874, pp. 27-29; *Arena*, July/Aug 1966, vol. 82, no. 904 (special issue); for a discussion see: Crinson 2003, pp. 129-132.

<sup>1212</sup> Between the mid-1950s and 1964 this number rose from 25,000 to 60,000. (Lowe 1988, p. 171.)

<sup>1213</sup> The AA, which offered between seventy and eighty first-year places, received 180 applications in 1962, over two hundred in 1963, and 344 in 1964. (Meeting of the School Committee, 3 May 1962, SCM 1951-63, p. 336; Meetings of the Executive Committee, 31 Dec 1962, 3 Feb 1964, ECM 1961-66, pp. 81, 143). For comparison, Liverpool, which had 35 available places (and required three A-levels), received 175 applications in 1961 and 250 in the following year. (Robert Gardner-Medwin, letter to Everard Haynes, Meeting of the RIBA Schools Committee, 9 Jan 1962, RIBA/ED 7.1.3.)

<sup>1214</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 28 Sep 1961, SCM 1951-63, p. 316; Meeting of the Executive Committee, 13 May 1964, ECM 1961-66, p. 163.

<sup>1215</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 28 June 1962, SCM 1951-63, p. 339.

<sup>1216</sup> *Ibid.*



authorities to fund all full-time students in higher education, which meant that, unlike in previous years, the AA could set the level of its fees uninhibited by the fear of losing their goodwill.<sup>1217</sup> Having recently effected a modest increase (from £225 to £250 p. a.),<sup>1218</sup> the council in January 1964 decided to raise the school fees by another £75, specifically to cover the anticipated deficit resulting from Allen's development programme.<sup>1219</sup> Secondly, manufacturers and educational trusts took a growing interest in sponsoring research facilities in schools of architecture. Pilkington, which had for the past decade endowed a lecture series at the AA, funded the purchase of lighting demonstration equipment (notably an artificial sky), and Marley Tile paid the salary of Peter Matthews, the senior construction lecturer.<sup>1220</sup>

Most importantly, the Leverhulme Trust, which cancelled its coveted but now redundant scholarship, offered to finance both of Allen's two 'growth points'.<sup>1221</sup> The first – the so-called Department of Science and Technology (DST) – was headed by Peter Burberry, the senior services lecturer and inventor of the 'flow and movement' course, who was given the overriding responsibility for *all* technical lecture courses and thus emerged as a powerful figure at the school.<sup>1222</sup> The second – the Department of Urban and Regional Design (DURD) – fulfilled a long-held ambition to fill a perceived void in planning education left by the closure of Rowse's SPRND in 1953 and the desire to secure architects a foothold in their 'turf wars' with other professions vying for control over planning matters.<sup>1223</sup> In 1957 Graham Shankland had presented a scheme for an urban design department at the AA,

---

<sup>1217</sup> Meeting of the Council, 16 March 1964, CM 1961-65, p. 167; see also: Lowe 1988, pp. 171-172.

<sup>1218</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 11 Dec 1961, CM 1961-65, p. 7.

<sup>1219</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee, 6 Jan 1964, ECM 1961-66, pp. 138; Meeting of the Council, 16 March 1964, CM 1961-65, p. 167. This was followed by another increase from £325 to £415 less than two years later. (Special Meeting of the Council, 13 Dec 1965, CM 1965-70, p. 15.)

<sup>1220</sup> Meeting of the School Committee, 30 Nov 1961, SCM 1951-63, p. 320; Meeting of the Council, 15 Jan 1962, CM 1961-65, p. 14.

<sup>1221</sup> Meeting of the Council, 27 May 1963, *ibid.*, p. 111. The Leverhulme, an all-inclusive scholarship worth £2,000, had been awarded in an annual nationwide competition. The last beneficiary was Simon Pepper, later a professor at Liverpool; previous recipients included John Godwin, Robert Maguire, Nigel Grimwade, Andrew Anderson and Frank Duffy.

<sup>1222</sup> 'Architectural Association School of Architecture: Notes for Staff. Session 1962-1963', AAA, Box 2003:37c, p. 1; Red Book, 1964, *op. cit.* The centrepiece of the DST was the 'Yerbury Laboratory', which housed demonstration equipment such as the aforementioned artificial sky and a low-speed wind tunnel. It was named after former AA secretary and long-time benefactor Frank Yerbury, whose eponymous foundation, set up in 1957 to channel donations for special educational projects into the school, co-financed the facility. (Meeting of the Council, 25 Jan 1960, CM 1955-61, p. 393; Meeting of the Council, 8 June 1964, CM 1961-65, p. 190.)

<sup>1223</sup> For a discussion see: Gold 2007, pp. 67-76; quote p. 71.

which the council left it in abeyance to focus its efforts on the proposed Department of Building Management (see page 186).<sup>1224</sup> The Chamberlin Report revived the idea of a postgraduate school in urban design as a logical extension of the ‘environmental framework of the curriculum’,<sup>1225</sup> and when in May 1963 the Leverhulme Trust announced its grant Arthur Korn, who embodied the planning bias of the postwar AA, set up a one-year pilot scheme to prepare a group of fifth-year students for the final examinations of both the RIBA and the Town Planning Institute (TPI).<sup>1226</sup> In December the council appointed Hugh Wilson, the current chairman of the BAE, as the head of the DURD, which was formally inaugurated in September 1964.<sup>1227</sup> Wilson resigned one year later to take up a government appointment and was succeeded by Leslie Ginsburg, an AA and SPRND graduate and since 1957 head of the planning school at Birmingham, who ran the, now renamed, Department of Planning and Urban Design successfully for the remainder of the decade.<sup>1228</sup>

## Problems of Implementation

Allen dismissed the idea of architectural education as a ‘studio activity with lecture courses as a kind of running commentary’ and was intent on readjusting the balance

---

<sup>1224</sup> Meeting of the Council, 6 Jan 1958, CM 1955-61, p. 217; see also: ‘Proposal for a Post Graduate Course in Urban Design – Report of the Ad-hoc Committee’, June 1957, AAA, Box 1991:8.

<sup>1225</sup> Chamberlin Report, p. 5.

<sup>1226</sup> Meeting of the Council, 22 July 1963, CM 1961-65, p. 131; Arthur Korn, ‘Town Planning at the AA’, *AAJ*, Nov 1963, vol. 79, no. 876, p. 113. In 1946, when more than half of all AA students took an additional planning degree, Korn had proposed the integration of planning in the regular five-year course. Encouraged by Brown, Korn organised a pilot scheme to prepare ten fifth-year students simultaneously for the AA diploma and the final examination of the TPI. The scheme proved successful, but its long-term implementation failed for lack of funding. (Meetings of the School Committee, 14 Jan 1946, 9 Dec 1946, 20 Jan 1947, SCM 1944-51, pp. 42-43, 72, 78-79; Brown, ‘Architectural Education’, p. 100.) As second-in-command to Brandon-Jones Arthur Korn was likely the inventor of the second-year village scheme, which was to provide the core concept of the 1958 curriculum. Throughout the postwar period Korn was the undisputed planning expert at the AA and actively involved in every large-scale student scheme produced in the school, most notably the Zone project. For the contents of Korn’s planning lectures at the AA see: Arthur Korn, *History Builds the Town*, London 1953; see also: Percy Johnson-Marshall, ‘Arthur Korn: Planner’, in: Sharp 1967, pp. 129-130; Sharp, ‘Arthur Korn’, op. cit., pp. 49-53.

<sup>1227</sup> Meeting of the Council, 9 Dec 1963, CM 1961-65, p. 148; see also: ‘AA Department of Urban and Regional Design’, *AAJ*, Jan 1964, vol. 79, no. 878, p. 172; Hugh Wilson, ‘Impressions of the Planning Scene’, *ibid.*, Feb 1965, vol. 80, no. 889, pp. 195-201. Wilson had been the chief architect and planning officer of Canterbury (1946-1956) and Cumbernauld (1956-1962) and was currently preparing the master plan for Skelmersdale.

<sup>1228</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee, 1 March 1965, ECM 1961-66, p. 199; Meeting of the Council, 26 April 1965, CM 1961-65, p. 253; see also: Leslie Ginsburg, ‘Changing Strategies in Planning’, *Arena*, Sep/Oct 1966, vol. 82, no. 905, pp. 71-75.

between education and training.<sup>1229</sup> His attempts at strengthening the former by combining the technical subjects into a separate, fully funded department implied a certain neglect of the studio teaching and effectively, if unintentionally, reversed the traditional hierarchy underpinning the AA's educational system.<sup>1230</sup>

As mentioned previously, Allen barely commented on the nature and succession of studio programmes, around which much of the debates in previous years had revolved. He was content with 'the excellent working mechanism'<sup>1231</sup> he had inherited from his predecessor, and though disdainful of the existing curriculum, whose gradation of scales and succession of material studies he thought 'pretty superficial'<sup>1232</sup> and 'somewhat naïve'<sup>1233</sup>, he considered it to be of minor importance within his broader educational vision and retained it. The only substantive changes occurred in the lower years: The final term of the (probationary) first year was devoted to the first major architectural project, a small housing cluster, which served to assess the aptitude of students for architecture and weed out those who were perceived to have none;<sup>1234</sup> the second-year village scheme was felt to be too demanding at this stage of the course and was replaced by the design of a small and closed community such as a marina or a holiday resort, which removed the complexity of the previous scheme without altering the general progression of the curriculum.<sup>1235</sup>

---

<sup>1229</sup> William Allen, 'Policies for Architectural Education', *Arena*, March 1966, vol. 81, no. 900, p. 223; see also: Notes for Staff 1962/63, op. cit., p. 1: 'Some people still visualise architectural education as a studio training supplemented by lectures. This is what it used to be but today it is a curriculum of two equally important and inter-dependent parts.'

<sup>1230</sup> Allen's quest for balance was genuine, as exemplified by his handling of the new A-level requirements. Unlike other schools such as Cambridge, Liverpool and the Bartlett, which prioritised (and de facto stipulated) A-levels in mathematics and science subjects, the AA deliberately refrained from doing so in order to attract candidates with the broadest possible educational background. Allen's own ideal would have been a variety of subjects 'all brought to similar levels somewhere between current "O" and "A" standards' (William Allen, 'The Education of Architects', *RIBAJ*, May 1964, p. 211), and John Partridge recalls Allen telling him: 'All this new stuff that Martin's brought in, A-levels in maths and science ... I don't care how well they've been educated – if they've got fire in the belly I'm having them.' (Partridge, interview, op. cit.) For the situation in other schools see: Richard Llewelyn Davies, letter to Everard Haynes, 8 June 1961, Meeting of the Board of Architectural Education, 19 June 1961, Inset A, RIBA/ED 7.1.1; 'New educational level for entry into architectural training to come into operation in 1961: Conditions for entry laid down by Recognised Schools', Meeting of the Board of Architectural Education, 19 July 1961, Inset B, *ibid.*

<sup>1231</sup> Allen, quoted in: Joint Meeting of the Council and Advisory Council, 14 Nov 1961, CM 1961-65, p. 4.

<sup>1232</sup> William Allen, memorandum to council, 3 Nov 1965, private collection.

<sup>1233</sup> William Allen, 'Curriculum Review', memorandum to staff, 25 May 1965, ABA.

<sup>1234</sup> Prospectus 1963, p. 18; see also: Notes for Staff 1962/63, p. 2.

<sup>1235</sup> *Ibid.* The 'closed community programme' was the brainchild of Patrick de Saulles, the second-year master in 1962/63 (Patrick de Saulles, 'The Middle Years', *AAJ*, Feb 1964, vol. 79, no. 879, p. 214). De Saulles was responsible for another major change to the course as he abolished measured drawings in favour of the so-called

Although the curricular framework remained thus intact, the nature of the course changed profoundly. Allen's evident lack of interest in (and supervision of) the studio curriculum invited isolated modifications through the studio staff.<sup>1236</sup> More importantly, true to his intention of integrating education and training, Allen encouraged his specialists to 'use the studio as an effective demonstration room or laboratory for the lecture programme,'<sup>1237</sup> which caused irritation amongst the studio staff:

Burberry was a thorn in everybody's flesh. He was everywhere at once and interfering all the time, imposing little technical problems on everybody's studio problem. The outcome was always a disaster.<sup>1238</sup>

The cumulative effect of these piecemeal and uncoordinated interventions was a gradual loss of coherence in the overall course. This had an impact on the morale of staff and students alike, in the latter case aggravated by the fact that the changeover to the new lecture courses was poorly managed. Specialist staff had trouble translating Allen's vision of a specifically architectural approach to their subjects into action, and the structures course, for instance, saw a change in leadership – and method – on an almost annual basis.<sup>1239</sup> Likewise, the reconstruction of the history course, precipitated by the retirement of both Summerson and Jordan in 1963, remained fragmentary until the late 1960s.<sup>1240</sup> Moreover, the rearrangement of lecture courses evidently necessitated an accordingly modified examination system. The phased transition from the old system to the new one was not completed until

---

'summer survey', which involved groups of students conducting a study of a particular, often non-British (or even non-European) community and its architectural manifestation (see e.g. 'Summer Survey', *RIBAJ*, Feb 1965, pp. 75-82). According to art master Paul Oliver, the summer survey and the first-year primitive hut programme, which he himself reintroduced in 1963, were instrumental in turning a new generation of students towards vernacular traditions and thus away from the idea of the formally trained architect as the indispensable provider of the built environment. (Paul Oliver, 'The Houses in Between', in: Gowan 1975, pp. 80-81; see also: 'The Architectural Association School of Architecture Curriculum Table 1963/64', AAA, Box 1991:31; Oliver 2006, p. 414.)

<sup>1236</sup> See e.g. previous footnote.

<sup>1237</sup> Principal's Notes 1964, op. cit., p. 12.

<sup>1238</sup> Anthony Eardley, interview with the author, 4 April 2016.

<sup>1239</sup> Officially, the senior structures lecturers were Derrick Beckett (1960-62), Walter Redlich (1962-64) and Richard Hobin (1964-66). However, a statement of the students' committee suggests that changes occurred much more frequently than this (David Usborne, statement of the students' committee, 5 July 1965, AAA, Box 2006:S34; see also: p. 27).

<sup>1240</sup> Between 1963 and 1965 Royston Summers was in charge of the course, assisted by Martin Caroe and Alvin Boyarsky. In 1965 Sam Stevens, a regular lecturer in the first year, took over. However, according to Simon Pepper, both Summerson and Jordan continued to lecture at the AA after they retired, as did Joseph Rykwert, who later supervised Pepper's doctoral research (interview with the author, 31 March 2016).

March 1966, and in the meantime some students had to sit exams in subjects in which they had not yet been taught (and in some cases would never be taught at all) – with the corresponding rate of failures.<sup>1241</sup>

At the end of Allen's inaugural year in summer 1962, a dozen members of the studio staff left the AA, amongst them year masters John Lloyd (first year), Peter Prangnell (second year) and Robert Maxwell (fifth year).<sup>1242</sup> The students' reaction to the emerging problems in the school was even more immediate. In February 1962 the students' committee circulated a critical report on the school, which prompted the school committee to hold a series of special (and regrettably unminuted) meetings to question Allen on the current curriculum and teaching methods.<sup>1243</sup> Allen himself felt that the report was 'unfortunately a little crude but had brought up some useful points for discussion,' and he incorporated some of these in his inaugural lecture later in the same month.<sup>1244</sup> Reassured by this, Jack Morgan, the chairman of the students' committee, rejoiced that 'at last there was someone in the AA who was willing to accept a number of points made by students, who was willing to turn towards them and to whom the students themselves could turn,'<sup>1245</sup> and four weeks later he congratulated Allen 'upon the help he had given in establishing a new

---

<sup>1241</sup> For third-year students at the end of session 1963/64 the situation was such that their history course had halted after the first term of the second year, whilst the published third-year course had not been given at all. Simon Pepper, one of the students concerned, complained that they had 'missed out on both old and new', and fellow student Alistair Robertson asked that 'when their Intermediate pass or fail was being discussed, their lack of history teaching should be taken into account.' (Meeting of the Staff/Student Committee, 6 May 1964, ABA.) One year later the situation was unchanged as 'many 4<sup>th</sup>-year students are expected to take examinations for which they have not had courses.' (Students' Committee, 5 July 1965, op. cit.) For the general sense of confusion see also p. 250, fn. 1202.

<sup>1242</sup> Lloyd went to Norway, where he had previously taught; Prangnell took up an appointment at Harvard; and Maxwell joined the Bartlett. Maxwell's departure had nothing to do with Allen or the state of affairs at the AA (email to the author, 10 Feb 2017). It is unknown if any of the others' did, but the 'extraordinary turnover of staff' (Meeting of the School Committee, 28 June 1962, SCM 1951-63, p. 341) at the end of the 1961/62 session compared unfavourably with the previous year, when all year masters and all except two unit masters had been willing to continue.

<sup>1243</sup> Meeting of the Council, 19 Feb 1962, CM 1961-65, p. 28; Meetings of the School Committee, 22 March 1962, 28 June 1962, 27 Sep 1962, SCM 1951-63, pp. 330-331, 339, 342. The report itself seems lost, but the minutes indicate that the council (and presumably the students) were in doubt whether the 'village, town, city' curriculum was in fact still in operation. The students simultaneously launched a campaign to get their full voting rights reinstated but found no support on the council. (John Morgan, letter to the President of the AA, 29 May 1962, AAA, Box 2006:S57; Meeting of the Executive Committee, 25 Feb 1963, ECM 1961-66, p. 90.)

<sup>1244</sup> Meetings of the School Committee, 22 March 1962, SCM 1951-63, p. 330; see also an exchange between Allen and a student called Wilson in the discussion following Allen's inaugural lecture (Allen, Inaugural, p. 235).

<sup>1245</sup> Morgan, quoted *ibid.*, p. 236.

educational outlook for the school.<sup>1246</sup> Yet within a matter of months this enthusiasm vanished, and in July 1962 Morgan announced that as far as education was concerned the students had ‘stopped admiring Mr Allen’s comprehension of this subject.’<sup>1247</sup>

With the school in difficulties, the time was particularly inopportune for the RIBA’s visiting board to announce its first inspection since 1950.<sup>1248</sup> Over the past four years the reconstituted BAE had developed its visiting board into the main instrument with which it exerted its influence on the schools.<sup>1249</sup> Although the board’s visit in October 1963 was therefore anything but a formality, there seemed to be little cause for worry. Unlike Jordan, who had run the school with conscious disregard for the prevailing educational orthodoxies, the current principal was eager to align it with the RIBA’s ‘Official System’, which he was – and remained – instrumental in shaping. (For instance, Elizabeth Layton’s seminal report on practical training, published in 1962, was based on a preliminary study by William Allen.)<sup>1250</sup> The AA council had therefore every reason to believe that the visiting board would see the development of the school in a favourable light.

Indeed, the board welcomed the thinking which inspired the changes to the lecture syllabus and the expansion of research facilities and was particularly impressed with Burberry’s remodelling of the services course, which ‘should remove the dullness and

---

<sup>1246</sup> Quoted in: ‘The Future of the AA’, op. cit., p. 15.

<sup>1247</sup> Quoted in: Prize Giving 1962, op. cit., p. 121.

<sup>1248</sup> Meeting of the Council, 22 April 1963, CM 1961-65, p. 104.

<sup>1249</sup> Crinson and Lubbock 1994, pp. 146-147.

<sup>1250</sup> William Allen, ‘Practical Training for Architects: A Report for the Board of Architectural Education’, Meeting of the Board of Architectural Education, 15 Nov 1961, Enclosure B, RIBA/ED 7.1.1; see also: Meeting of the Board of Architectural Education, 7 Dec 1961, *ibid.* Allen was invited to review the question of practical training after he had criticised the BAE for its refusal to accept postgraduate research work as part of the newly required two years’ practical training period – a point the AA also raised in its submission to the Robbins Committee in October 1961. (Allen, letter to Everard Haynes, 22 June 1960, Meeting of the Board of Architectural Education, 12 July 1960, Inset K, *ibid.*; Meeting of the Board of Architectural Education, 15 Nov 1961, *ibid.*; ‘The AA and the Robbins Committee’, *AAJ*, Dec 1961, vol. 77, no. 857, p. 121.) Elizabeth Layton, who was appointed to assist Allen in drawing up a full report for the BAE and subsequently took it over from him, adopted his suggestion for postgraduate work to count towards the practical training requirements, and she also incorporated his idea of introducing American-type log books to keep a check on students’ practical experience, which briefly caused upset amongst AA students. (Allen, *Practical Training*, op. cit.; Elizabeth Layton, *The Practical Training of Architects*, London 1962, pp. 52-53, 59; see also: Meetings of the Council, 28 Oct 1963, 13 Jan 1964, CM 1961-65, pp. 145, 154.)

apathy usually associated with the subject.<sup>1251</sup> On the other hand, it was ‘very disturbed’ by the high rate of failures in examinations and criticised both the system itself and the ‘lackadaisical attitude’ of staff and students towards it.<sup>1252</sup> The members of the board were equally disappointed with the quality of studio work, in which a ‘logical progression of projects in terms of size and content’ was lacking and ‘the clear policy of integration with the lecture course [...] not apparent.’<sup>1253</sup> Though the visiting board appreciated that the school was in a transitional phase and recommended that the recognition for exemption be continued, its overall verdict was damning: ‘If the school was assessed on “promise” it would rate very highly but on present performance the school falls short in a number of ways.’<sup>1254</sup>

Allen and the council were clearly taken aback by the findings of the board.<sup>1255</sup> Though the students’ report of February 1962 had highlighted a number of problems at the school, the council, apart from organising a series of noncommittal meetings with the principal, largely ignored them. In November 1963 Anthony Cox was still under the impression that the school was ‘thriving under [Allen’s] influence,’<sup>1256</sup> and James Cubitt, another of Allen’s loyal supporters, later conceded that the council may have given him ‘undue adulation’.<sup>1257</sup> The report of the visiting board, issued in March 1964, put an immediate end to this. At a council meeting on 16 March, Tim Tinker expressed ‘strong doubts’ about the order of priorities (i.e. the emphasis on technology) implicit in the development plan which Allen had prepared to show the allocation of funds following the forthcoming increase of tuition fees (see page 253).<sup>1258</sup> Two weeks later, the council called a special meeting to question Allen on his educational policy,<sup>1259</sup> and at the following meeting of the executive committee some members expressed ‘unease [...] with regard to the

---

<sup>1251</sup> ‘Report of the RIBA Visiting Board on the Architectural Association School of Architecture’, March 1964; encl. in: Meeting of the Council, 26 Oct 1964, *ibid.*, p. 221. The visiting board comprised Denis Clarke Hall (chairman), Elizabeth Layton, Douglas Jones, Richard Llewelyn Davies, Philip Groves and C. S. White.

<sup>1252</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1253</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1254</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1255</sup> Allen had expected the visiting board to ‘look at the AA for some good ideas and work.’ (William Allen, ‘Visiting Board’, memorandum to staff, n.d., AAA, Box 2003:29c.)

<sup>1256</sup> Joint Meeting of the Council and the Advisory Council, 16 Nov 1963, CM 1961-65, p. 138.

<sup>1257</sup> James Cubitt, ‘Critical State of the School and the Principal’s employment’, memorandum to members of council, 9 July 1965, AAA, Box 2006:S34.

<sup>1258</sup> Meeting of the Council, 16 March 1964, CM 1961-65, p. 167.

<sup>1259</sup> Meeting of the Council, 2 April 1964, *ibid.*, pp. 172-174.

“image” being presented of the school and the balance of teaching.’<sup>1260</sup> At a council meeting on 20 April, at a time when Allen’s initial three-year contract period had still almost five months to run and when therefore no immediate action could have been taken, a group of members took the initiative to trigger a discussion on his suitability as principal – to the complete astonishment of Allen himself, who was asked to leave the meeting and whose confidence was, as Cubitt recalled, ‘deeply shaken’.<sup>1261</sup> The council’s deliberations continued for several months, and it was not until November that it eventually renewed Allen’s contract, expressing its ‘warmest appreciation’ of his work for the school, but adding the caveat that, with the enlargement of the technical departments, there was a ‘special need for a new initiative to strengthen and clarify the teaching of architectural design in the school.’<sup>1262</sup>

### **The System Boys vs the One-off Boys: Allen’s Isolation and Failure as AA Principal**

By 1964 opposition to Allen’s direction of the school was building up both within the council and, exacerbated by the outcome of the ICST referendum, the student body. Worse still, Allen’s undeterred pursuit of his development plan with its implicit technological bias increased tensions between himself and his studio staff. To understand the root cause of the latter’s discontent we need to consider their traditional position within the AA’s educational system. As we saw in previous chapters, studio staff lacked job security and were (and remained) grossly underpaid, which on the face of it made teaching at the AA a relatively unappealing prospect, particularly in times of full employment.<sup>1263</sup> On the other hand, shielded from outside interference by the principal, studio masters had wide-ranging liberties in devising their programmes, which throughout the AA’s history – and never more so than under Allen’s predecessor – enticed enterprising young members of the profession to its teaching staff. The incremental loss of their authority over the

---

<sup>1260</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee, 6 April 1964, ECM 1961-66, p. 152.

<sup>1261</sup> Cubitt, *Critical State*; see also: Meeting of the Council, 20 April 1964, CM 1961-65, p. 179. The members were Tim Tinker, Jane Drew and Francis Baden-Powell, most likely supported by president Gabriel Epstein (see: James Cubitt, letter to William Allen, 4 Nov 1964, private collection).

<sup>1262</sup> Meeting of the Council, 30 Nov 1964, CM 1961-65, p. 229.

<sup>1263</sup> In 1963 the salaries of AA teaching staff were about 25 per cent lower than those in comparable schools of architecture. (Chamberlin Report, p. 4.)



design process to the specialist teachers (see page 256) not only curbed their enthusiasm, it also seemed to give them a glimpse of their future working conditions in a university setup marked by departmental infighting.<sup>1264</sup>

Indeed, opposition to the ICST merger was the common denominator of an astonishingly diverse group of staff who began to take a stand against their principal, whom they saw – understandably, if unfairly – as the spearhead of this undesirable undertaking. To Michael Pearson, a third-year unit master, the removal of Allen was a prerequisite to stopping a plan he rejected as running counter to the AA's teaching philosophy, even though he was not on principle opposed to the scientific outlook which Allen sought to inject into the school.<sup>1265</sup> Fellow members of the third-year staff such as Cedric Price and year master Roy Landau took a similar view.<sup>1266</sup> To others, however, the developments at the AA raised architectural as much as educational concerns. Though their curriculum survived into the mid-1960s, stylistically the brutalists' spell at the AA had been a short-lived affair. Student work in the early 1960s was, according to Edward Jones, characterised by a 'distrust of the private will to form [and a] general neutrality of expression.'<sup>1267</sup> Its lack of formal bravado betrayed the influence of major American practices such as SOM and Gropius's TAC, where many AA tutors (including year masters Roy Landau and John Winter) had previously worked;<sup>1268</sup> yet it also recalled student work under Jordan and, like then, was the product of an educational system which prioritised social purpose over self-expression, technology over design. It was a

---

<sup>1264</sup> Eardley, interview.

<sup>1265</sup> Michael Pearson, interview with the author, 14 May 2016. Pearson recalls being a member of the so-called 'AA guerrilla', a cell of activists who plotted actively against the merger and everyone involved in it. The existence of the AA guerrilla from about 1964 onward is undisputed, though sources vary as regards its composition. According to Pearson, in addition to himself it originally included as core members Richard Hobin (see p. 264), John Voelcker (see p. 268) and Pearson's then wife Marie-Josée, the chairwoman of the 1965/66 students' committee (see p. 269). Michael Glickman, on the other hand, claims that the guerrillas were a group which met regularly at Cedric Price's office and included, in addition to himself and Price, David Allford, Martin Pawley and Christopher Woodward. (Glickman, interview.)

<sup>1266</sup> Price was one of the most vocal opponents of the ICST merger and briefly resigned from the staff in 1965. Landau included himself amongst the 'advocates of the use of a scientific approach to architecture', but he rejected Allen's particular method. (Royston Landau, 'Towards a Structure for Architectural Ideas', *Arena*, June 1965, vol. 81, no. 893, p. 11; see also: Landau, letter to John Eastwick-Field, 5 Dec 1965, AAA/OK, Box 43.)

<sup>1267</sup> Quoted in: Gowan 1973, p. 63. Jones's source was: Alan Colquhoun, 'Exhibition of AA Thesis Designs', *AAJ*, Sep/Oct 1963, vol. 79, no. 875, p. 43.

<sup>1268</sup> For the impact of British architects returning from the United States see: Murray Fraser with Joe Kerr, *Architecture and the 'Special Relationship'*, Abingdon 2007, pp. 277, 278-282 et pass.

dichotomy to which AA President Leonard Manasseh memorably referred as the schism between the ‘system boys’ and the ‘one-off boys’.<sup>1269</sup>

‘How had the early sixties become so grey?’ wondered Peter Cook, and along with his allies he sought to recapture the daring, if not the style or social pretensions, of the brutalists.<sup>1270</sup> Archigram’s particular brand of design subculture soon began to leave its mark on AA student work, even though its full impact did not manifest itself until the second half of the decade, when all its members taught at the school.<sup>1271</sup> For the time being, the strongest opposition to Allen’s course arose from a group who looked to Colin Rowe as their spiritus rector. Rowe’s formalism, exemplified by his seminal paper ‘The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa’ of 1947, had been a major source of inspiration for the early brutalists, and as a member of the so-called Texas Rangers at the University of Texas at Austin in the mid-1950s he had pioneered a curriculum which emphasised precedent and reflected his profound scepticism regarding the a-historical outlook and scientific determinism of modern architecture.<sup>1272</sup> After a brief stint at the Cooper Union and at Cornell, Rowe had returned to England in 1958 to take up a dispiriting teaching appointment at Cambridge, where Martin championed the very ‘scientism’ he abhorred<sup>1273</sup>. In 1962 Allen intended to appoint Rowe as history lecturer but was apparently vetoed by Cox and De Syllas:

The Marxist establishment is quite opposed to having me around the place. [...] The ACP is a very powerful little group. Allen wants me. The ACP does not. Allen doesn’t want to offend the ACP.’<sup>1274</sup>

---

<sup>1269</sup> Leonard Manasseh, ‘The Moment of Truth’, presidential address, *AAJ*, Nov 1964, vol. 80, no. 886, p. 96.

<sup>1270</sup> Cook, ‘Electric Decade’, p. 138. According to Cook, ‘Archigram was an outburst against the crap going up in London, against the attitude of a continuing European tradition of well-mannered but gutless architecture that had absorbed the label “modern” [...]’ (‘Amazing Archigram: A Supplement’, *Perspecta*, vol. 11 (1967), p. 133.) See also: Sadler 2005, pp. 24-25 et pass.

<sup>1271</sup> Cook, Chalk and Webb joined in 1964, Herron and Crompton in 1965, and Greene in 1967.

<sup>1272</sup> See: Caragone 1995, pp. 136-138 et pass. For Rowe’s 1947 paper see: Colin Rowe, ‘The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa’, *Architectural Review*, March 1947, vol. 101, no. 603, pp. 101-104; see also: Caragone 1995, pp. 123-128.

<sup>1273</sup> The term ‘scientism’, originally coined by Friedrich Hayek in 1942, was something of a (pejorative) buzzword in the architectural debate of the 1960s. Rowe himself used it repeatedly. (See e.g.: Rowe, letter to Edward Carter, 24 Feb 1966, AAA/OK, Box 43; see also e.g.: Landau, *Towards a Structure*, op. cit., p. 7; John Musgrove, ‘Dangers of Scientism’, *Architectural Review*, July 1966, vol. 140, no. 833, pp. 9-11.)

<sup>1274</sup> Colin Rowe, letter to Alvin and Elizabeth Boyarsky, 24 May 1962, ABA. A few months prior, when considering alternatives to Cambridge, Rowe had concluded: ‘I am not exactly, I think, persona grata, in Bedford Square. The powers are still a little too empirical and a little too welfare state in their orientation to be willing to tolerate what they surely regard as a subversive formalist line.’ (Rowe, letter to Alvin and Elizabeth Boyarsky, 25 Sep 1961, *ibid.*)

Though himself *persona non grata*, Rowe had a significant following on the AA staff, including Thomas ('Sam') Stevens, who distributed Rowe's writings to his first-year history students,<sup>1275</sup> and Alan Colquhoun, a fifth-year tutor, who from the late 1950s introduced the notion of type forms at the AA.<sup>1276</sup> For first-year master Anthony Eardley the acquaintance with Colin Rowe whilst teaching at Cambridge had been a life-changing event which laid the foundation for his future academic career.<sup>1277</sup> The key figure amongst Rowe's disciples, however, was his former student and close friend Alvin Boyarsky, who joined the fourth-year unit staff in 1963 and one year later succeeded Winter as year master. Boyarsky, who also lectured in history, soon exhibited his exceptional networking skills as he took charge of the AA's end of the so-called Kocimsky scheme, a complex exchange programme with various American and Scandinavian schools.<sup>1278</sup> As fourth-year master Boyarsky devised a programme involving the design of a new Royal Courts of Justice, for which he enlisted the support of leading legal experts, and with Allen's consent he cunningly reduced the required attendance of his unit masters from two days to one day per week, which even at a time of frenetic building activity enabled him to assemble an extraordinarily distinguished staff comprising, amongst others, David Allford, David Gray, Hal Higgins, David Shalev and Warren Chalk.<sup>1279</sup> Due to the breadth of his activities and creative strength of his course Boyarsky – who had a 'very thinly disguised contempt for Allen'<sup>1280</sup> – soon emerged as an influential figure at the AA.

In the course of the 1964/65 academic year discontent turned into active resistance. In October 1964, three weeks into the session, Allen dismissed Richard Hobin, the

---

<sup>1275</sup> Grahame Shane, email to the author, 26 Apr 2016.

<sup>1276</sup> BLSA/Jones.

<sup>1277</sup> Eardley, interview. Eardley was a tutor at Cambridge from 1958 to 1961. He joined the AA first-year staff in 1961 and in the following year succeeded John Lloyd as year master. From 1964 onward he taught at various American schools, concluding his career as dean at Kentucky.

<sup>1278</sup> The brainchild of Karol Kocimsky, a professor at Iowa State University, the scheme had been inaugurated in the previous year and administered by Winter on behalf of the AA. Under Boyarsky it was extended to include students from other British as well as Scandinavian schools, and the total number of participants more than doubled from 24 to 52, only seven of whom were from the AA (see e.g.: Meeting of the Council, 28 Oct 1963, CM 1961-65, p. 142; Meeting of the Executive Committee, 12 March 1964, ECM 1961-66, p. 150; Meeting of the Council, 8 June 1965, CM 1961-65, p. 269; see also: AAA, Boxes 2003:45a and 2003:45b).

<sup>1279</sup> 'This year is really very strong now, by far the strongest I have ever seen in the School.' (Allen, letter to Boyarsky, 11 Aug 1964, ABA. For an interpretation of Boyarsky's fourth-year programme see: Sunwoo 2013, pp. 68-69.

<sup>1280</sup> Eardley, interview.

new structures lecturer (and previously a popular second-year unit master), who was not prepared to tailor his course to the wishes of his immediate superior Peter Burberry. The year masters voiced their objection, and the students' committee, according to Eardley, hired Hobin back as an evening lecturer and doubled his salary – to the embarrassment of the school committee, which felt compelled to reappoint him.<sup>1281</sup> In the same month, the students' committee together with sympathetic members of staff set up the so-called 'principal's advisory board' consisting of four members each from the staff and student body – a parallel organisation to the council's academic working party and the still existing staff-students committee, but significantly excluding Allen himself from its membership.<sup>1282</sup>

Meanwhile, relations between Boyarsky and both Allen and Burberry were taking a turn for the worse. Early in 1965 Allen suggested that the housing scheme in the forthcoming summer term, a project which was explicitly about 'design-values'<sup>1283</sup>, be used as a vehicle for research into the application of a particular building system, which Boyarsky rejected 'on educational grounds'.<sup>1284</sup> At the same time 'Alvin's war

---

<sup>1281</sup> All Year Masters, memorandum to the Principal, 20 Oct 1964, ABA; Eardley, interview. Hobin was a colourful character even when judged by AA standards. Born in New Zealand in 1929, he graduated as an architect in 1950 and three years later moved to London, where he joined the practice of Felix Samuely and within merely six months (rather than the standard four years) qualified as a structural engineer. He joined the AA as a second-year unit master in 1962 and, according to Michael Pearson, became a core member of the AA guerrilla opposing the ICST merger (see p. 261, fn. 1265). The title applied quite literally to Hobin, who allegedly supplied structural calculations for the Vietcong's tunnel system and emerged as a leader of the anti-Vietnam war movement. Pressurised to desist from the protests, he resigned from the AA in 1966 but was reappointed as unit master in 1971. (Harry Hobin, email to the author, 13 May 2016; Pearson, interview; Greg Smith, 'Richard Hobin', <http://www.lostproperty.org.nz/architects/hobin> [accessed 26 July 2016].)

<sup>1282</sup> Meetings of the Council, 26 Oct 1964, 30 Nov 1964, CM 1961-65, pp. 220, 232. The academic working party was one of three working parties set up to consider specific aspects of the ICST merger and headed successively by John Dennys and Patrick de Saulles (who both opposed the scheme). Reviewing the AA's committee structure in May 1965, council members John Eastwick-Field and Francis Baden-Powell noted with dismay that there were no fewer than nine bodies with powers to exert influence on the school – a fact they thought 'particularly absurd because the AA tradition is clearly one that allows and expects the principal to run the school in his own way [...]. (John Eastwick-Field, Francis Baden-Powell), 'First Outline of Comments to Council on the Present AA Committee Structure and Procedure', AAA/OK, Box 43; see also: James Cubitt, 'Definition of the Roles of AA Committees Concerned With School Work', memorandum for the school committee, 25 Feb 1965, AAA, Box 2006:S51.) Allen, needless to say, 'did not consider [the principal's advisory body] to be a necessary group, and if it were he should be the chairman.' (Meeting of the Executive Committee, 5 July 1965, ECM 1961-66, p. 216.)

<sup>1283</sup> Principal's Notes 1964, p. 2.

<sup>1284</sup> Alvin Boyarsky, memorandum to William Allen, 1 July 1965, ABA. The fourth-year course comprised three major design tasks, viz. an isolated office building, a public assembly building (in Boyarsky's case the Royal Courts of Justice) and a housing scheme, the latter two set against an urban renewal scheme for central London. Boyarsky invited building contractors Laing to introduce their system to the students, none of whom decided to use it. Leaving aside his understandable irritation about Allen's interference with his course and

on Peter' (likely a mutual affair) reached a point where all communication between the two ceased – to the detriment of fourth-year students, who thus missed out on all but the most basic technical advice.<sup>1285</sup>

Allen felt that Boyarsky and other studio staff actively obstructed the work of the specialist teachers and in April 1965, in consultation with Burberry, introduced 'block teaching', which bundled individual lecture courses into several blocks lasting between two and ten weeks during which time no studio work was permitted to take place.<sup>1286</sup> Though Allen continued to emphasise that he expected 'integration [of lectures and studio teaching] to be practised as intensively as possible,<sup>1287</sup> the block course was effectively an admission that this integration had failed and further infuriated the studio staff, whose programmes were curtailed at very short notice.<sup>1288</sup>

Oddly, it was not until the end of the 1964/65 academic year that the full extent of the studio teachers' 'frustration'<sup>1289</sup> and the corresponding need to 're-study and re-construct our curriculum'<sup>1290</sup> became evident to Allen. On 25 May 1965 he issued an 11-page memorandum to his staff in which he itemised numerous problems of the 'confused and fragmented' course without, however, suggesting any concrete solutions.<sup>1291</sup> The paper – written in an uncharacteristically vague, almost platitudinous manner – reflects a sense of helplessness in the face of overwhelming difficulties, and Boyarsky's annotations on his personal copy ('CRAP [...] MORE CRAP')<sup>1292</sup> indicate how much support Allen could at this stage expect from his alienated staff.

The controversy reached its climax during the summer break. Bypassing both principal and liaison officers, the students' committee on 29 June approached James

---

his principle dislike of the idea itself, Boyarsky's 'educational' argument had merit in so far as the first term of the fifth year, too, was devoted to an investigation into system building. (Prospectus 1963, op. cit., p. 21; Principal's Notes 1964, p. 2.)

<sup>1285</sup> Allen, letter to Boyarsky, 11 June 1965, ABA; see also: Boyarsky to Allen, 1 July 1965, op. cit.

<sup>1286</sup> Allen, memorandum, 3 Nov 1965.

<sup>1287</sup> Allen, 'Curriculum Review'.

<sup>1288</sup> See e.g.: Boyarsky to Allen, 1 July 1965, op. cit.; for a critique of block teaching see: Alan Colquhoun, 'Some Ideas About Technical Training', *Arena*, Nov 1965, vol. 81, no. 895, pp. 101-102.

<sup>1289</sup> Allen, 'Curriculum Review'.

<sup>1290</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1291</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1292</sup> Ibid.

Cubitt, the new president, with a written statement deploring the ‘prevailing atmosphere of aimless confusion’ in the school and concluding that ‘the running of a school of architecture of the AA’s size and potential requires qualities of its principal which Mr. Allen, unfortunately, does not have.’<sup>1293</sup> On 5 July nineteen unit masters followed suit by submitting a memorandum expressing their ‘feeling of deep concern with the present educational policy of the school’.<sup>1294</sup> Discussing the state of the school on the same day, the executive committee agreed that the following academic year should be regarded as an ‘interregnum’ and that a deputy principal should be appointed with special responsibilities for studio work; however, it was divided as to whether Allen’s contract should at the same time be terminated with a year’s notice or whether his position should, for the time being, remain ‘undisturbed’.<sup>1295</sup> It was a decision for the council to make, and Cubitt made it clear that he personally preferred the latter course as he put much of the blame for the sorry state of the school on himself and his colleagues, who had neglected their oversight responsibilities and whose liaison machinery with the school had failed completely: ‘It is we, the Council, who have done this. No one else has.’<sup>1296</sup> Stressing that neither the students nor the staff had asked for the *immediate* replacement of the principal, Cubitt urged the council ‘not to take a drastic decision which does not serve the short-term, immediate need.’<sup>1297</sup>

Cubitt’s attempt to protect Allen was futile. Over the past two years, Allen’s powerbase on the council had gradually eroded as the majority of those who had supported his appointment in 1961 had meanwhile left, including the then president

---

<sup>1293</sup> Students’ Committee, 5 July 1965, op cit. This is the edited version of the original statement of 29 June, which Cubitt had rejected due to its being ‘offensively worded’. (Cubitt, Critical State.)

<sup>1294</sup> Unit Masters, memorandum to the president, 5 July 1965, *ibid.* The signatories were Graham Gibberd, Peter Phippen, Aristidis Romanos, John Bunney, John Elliott, [James Madge?] (first year); David Bernstein, Elias Zenghelis, Brian Young (second year); Richard Eve, Michael Pearson, Allen Penney (third year); David Allford, Warren Chalk, Christopher Dean, David Gray, Hal Higgins, Brian Richards, David Shalev (fourth year); see also: Cubitt, Critical State.

<sup>1295</sup> *Ibid.*; see also: Meeting of the Executive Committee, 5 July 1965, ECM 1961-66, p. 219.

<sup>1296</sup> Cubitt, Critical State. Cubitt’s memorandum was the edited version of a first draft written by Carter, who attached a personal note to Cubitt: ‘I am appalled by the dangers of Alternative 1. I think it irrational, impolitic, cutting-off-one’s-nose-to-spite-one’s-face-ish: in fact MAD.’ Carter warned that Allen had ‘loyal supporters who might quite possibly resign’ and, referring almost certainly to Koenigsberger and Burberry, could ‘think of at least two persons of critical importance whose continued employment could not be assured.’ Carter was explicit in his criticism of liaison officers Patrick de Saulles and Peter Rich: ‘A whole year has passed with no effective reporting on this matter from the liaison officers, who could have called Council’s attention to this business at any time.’ (Edward Carter, memorandum to James Cubitt, 6 July 1965, AAA/OK, Box 43).

<sup>1297</sup> Cubitt, Critical State.

Edward Playne, Michael Austin-Smith, Anthony Cox and, most importantly perhaps, Allen's proposer and president-designate Leo De Syllas, who died in 1964. Many of those who filled the vacant positions – mostly postwar graduates such as Tim Tinker, Peter Ahrends, Patrick de Saulles and John Dennys (the latter three former staff under Allen) – were critical of the direction in which the school was steering. Thus, on 13 July the council decided to terminate Allen's appointment:

The President was requested to convey to Mr. Allen the Council's wish that he should offer his resignation from the Principalship; the effective date of resignation to be at a time to be agreed with Mr. Allen. The President should convey to Mr. Allen the Council's hope that he would be able to continue his membership of the senior academic staff of the School in some role more closely related to his interest in the scientific and technological aspects of architecture.<sup>1298</sup>

Allen acceded to the council's wish on the following day, and he agreed to continue until a successor could be found, which it was presumed would happen towards the end of the 1965/66 session.<sup>1299</sup> On 22 July 1965 the AA issued a press release stating the council had 'accepted a request from Mr Allen to be released from his office [...] so that among other things he may be able to devote more time to his practice.'<sup>1300</sup>

Allen was evidently in no doubt as to who had triggered the chain of events leading to his dismissal and on 15 July, one day after submitting his resignation, enlisted the support of some of his remaining allies on the council – Cubitt and his two vice-presidents Hugh Morris and John Eastwick-Field – to terminate the appointments of year masters George Balcombe and Alvin Boyarsky.<sup>1301</sup> Elizabeth Boyarsky, who replied on behalf of her husband, did not conceal her bitterness about Allen's action, 'which can only be construed as yet another example of your weakness, your

---

<sup>1298</sup> Meeting of the Council, 19 July 1965, CM 1961-65, p. 275.

<sup>1299</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1300</sup> 'Press Notice', 22 July 1965, AAA, Box 2003:37c.

<sup>1301</sup> Meeting of the Council, 19 July 1965, CM 1961-65, p. 275; see also: Allen, letter to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 16 July 1965, ABA; Cubitt, letter to Alvin Boyarsky, 23 July 1965, *ibid.* In an oral history interview with the British Library, David Gray claimed that Boyarsky's unit masters were sacked along with him. This is demonstrably untrue. David Allford and Brian Richards had resigned in the previous month, and whilst the appointment of the others was delayed to give the incoming year master a say in choosing his staff, most of them were subsequently offered a new contract, though admittedly not Gray himself. ('David Gray interviewed by Niamh Dillon', *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 11/11 (2 March 2010), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 22 Jan 2017]; see also: Alvin Boyarsky, letter to Allen, 23 June 1965, ABA; Allen, letter to David Gray, 28 Sep 1965, AAA, Box 2012:13.)

disastrous insensitivity and your lack of good judgment'.<sup>1302</sup> Many members of council, to whom she forwarded her letter, were equally irritated and questioned 'the quality of the decision to terminate Mr. Boyarsky's appointment' – not least because, with Eardley not having returned from a sabbatical in the United States, three of five senior studio staff positions were vacant only two months prior to the start of the academic year.<sup>1303</sup> However, since the senior officers (rather than Allen by himself) had taken 'executive action' in dismissing Balcombe and Boyarsky, the council was not entitled to challenge the decision.<sup>1304</sup>

It was the last initiative Allen was allowed to take as he was increasingly sidelined in the decision-making process. On 19 July the council appointed John Voelcker as senior master with overriding responsibility for the fourth and fifth years (i.e. as deputy principal in anything but name), and though Allen supported the idea of a 'senior school', he presumably did not approve of the council's personnel choice.<sup>1305</sup> Voelcker, one of Boyarsky's designated unit masters,<sup>1306</sup> was the quintessential 'one-off' architect – he deplored specialisation and ran his architectural practice in rural Kent as the equivalent of a country doctor's surgery.<sup>1307</sup> In July 1964 he had

---

<sup>1302</sup> Elizabeth Boyarsky, letter to Allen, 17 July 1965, ABA. Boyarsky himself was on, what was (rightly) believed to be, a job-seeking trip in the United States at the time and probably not altogether surprised by his dismissal. Allen had for months delayed offering Boyarsky a new contract and, in a letter of 11 June, asked him to either accept his, Allen's, authority or leave the AA. (Allen, letter to Alvin Boyarsky, 11 June 1965, ABA.) The course of events which preceded Boyarsky's dismissal explodes another popular myth, whereby Boyarsky was sacked because of his 'vocal opposition' to the ICST merger (see e.g.: Irene Sunwoo, 'Pedagogy's Progress: Alvin Boyarsky's International Institute of Design', *Grey Room*, no. 34 (2009), p. 33.). Many studio teachers rejected the merger, and some of them took a much more public stance against it – without any repercussions whatsoever. Unlike, for instance, Price, Boyarsky did not contribute to the debate taking place in the correspondence columns of the *AA Journal*, and no intervention of his at any AA meeting was recorded – indeed, many of those who were intimately involved in the controversy remember Boyarsky's part in it barely (Glickman, interview) or not at all (Lee-Smith, interview). Whilst Boyarsky was doubtlessly opposed to the merger, it was his opposition to Allen which cost him his job.

<sup>1303</sup> Meeting of the Council, 19 July 1965, CM 1961-65, p. 276. Eardley's decision to stay in the United States after a one-term stint at St Louis (arranged by Rowe) was unrelated to the events at the AA as Peter Eisenman, whom he had befriended at Cambridge, lured him to Princeton. Nonetheless, it put the AA in a difficult position, and the executive committee agreed that 'Mr. Eardley's action appeared shabby, and that the Principal should write to him expressing this as [their] opinion.' (Meeting of the Executive Committee, 5 July 1965, ECM 1961-66, p. 217; also: Eardley, interview). The circumstances surrounding Balcombe's dismissal remain obscure, though it is clear that he, too, was critical of Allen's general approach (see e.g.: George Balcombe, 'Technological Determinism Is Out', *AAJ*, Dec 1964, vol. 80, no. 887, pp. 138-140).

<sup>1304</sup> Meeting of the Council, 19 July 1965, CM 1961-65, p. 275; see also: Cubitt to Boyarsky, 23 July 1965, op. cit.

<sup>1305</sup> Meeting of the Council, 19 July 1965, CM 1961-65, p. 277; see also: Red Book 1964, op. cit., p. 5: 'Increasingly we should visualise years four and five as a single education programme [...]'. The new year-masters were Elias Zenghelis (first year), Hal Higgins (fourth year) and Peter Cook (fifth year).

<sup>1306</sup> Boyarsky to Allen, 1 July 1965.

<sup>1307</sup> John Voelcker, 'Technics of Architecture', *Arena*, May 1966, vol. 81, no. 902, p. 281.



resigned from the editorial board of the *AA Journal* in protest to the council's plan of transferring the school to ICST, not least because he rejected the idea of technology as being anything other than a useful tool at the service of the creative designer: 'I do not want architecture, which should be an act determined by a formal language, to be submerged by a technological deluge.'<sup>1308</sup> In other words, he was the antithesis to Allen, and the collaboration between the two appears to have been anything but cordial.<sup>1309</sup>

The council itself formed a so-called 'vacation committee' consisting of Cubitt, Morris and Eastwick-Field, who, in consultation with students and staff, assisted Allen in planning the curriculum for the forthcoming session.<sup>1310</sup> In spite (or perhaps because) of the shortage of time, Allen and the committee managed to arrive at a compromise which retained the existing lecture syllabus but gave greater powers to the studio staff and had the general support of specialists and design teachers.<sup>1311</sup> Its implementation, however, foundered on the resistance of the students' committee, and after a meeting with its new chairwoman, Jo Pearson, the council on 25 October 1965 unanimously agreed to terminate the principal's appointment<sup>1312</sup> – to the bitter disappointment of a startled and disillusioned Allen:

When the terms of my contract were devised I was asked if I wanted a ten-year run, rather like Patrick. I said this would put me out at 57 when it might be difficult to pick up other significant work. It was agreed therefore that we would have a 3-year trial – my suggestion – and if I was then confirmed my contract would be assumed to run 10 years to age 60. This was the only basis on which I was willing to move from BRS. [...] I have always presumed this was made clear to Council when I was confirmed in my appointment, and I went ahead on this basis; but was it? You see, now we have a position in which even 12 months is not envisaged, and not a soul has hinted at a sign of the slightest regret that the whole original intention of the contract has been set aside as if it never existed. [...] I have worked harder for the AA than ever before in my life, and harder I think than most previous Principals; and I have been pretty reasonable to the Council over this business, I hope. People seem to think so. I'm only sorry therefore that it seems to have been somewhat inconsiderate [?] on this other matter, and I am not very impressed.<sup>1313</sup>

---

<sup>1308</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 285; see also: [John Smith], 'Editor's Viewpoint', *AAJ*, Jan 1965, vol. 80, no. 888, p. 158.

<sup>1309</sup> See e.g.: Voelcker, letter to the editor, in: *Arena*, July/Aug 1966, vol. 82, no. 904, p. 34.

<sup>1310</sup> Meeting of the Council, 19 July 1965, CM 1961-65, p. 275; see also: James Cubitt, 'President's Report 1965-66', *Arena*, July/Aug 1966, vol. 82, no. 904, p. 35.

<sup>1311</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee, 18 Oct 1965, ECM 1961-66, p. 221.

<sup>1312</sup> Meeting of the Council, 25 Oct 1965, CM 1965-70, pp. 6-7.

<sup>1313</sup> Allen, letter to Edward Carter, 1 Nov 1965, MS, AAA, Box 2003:37c. On a rather unpleasant side note, the council was eager to avoid having to pay Allen's salary until the end of the academic year (to which he

On 4 November the AA made public that Allen would be leaving the school at the end of the current term ‘in fulfilment of [his] previously announced retirement [...] during the present session.’<sup>1314</sup> Allen’s headship ended on 17 December 1965, and he never taught at the AA again.

## Conclusion

Allen’s principalship was not without its successes. It was under his watch in the early 1960s that the Department of Tropical Studies through its expanded research activities and consultancy services established its global reputation, and he built up two additional departments which could offer his students a degree of postgraduate specialisation. The Department of Urban and Regional Design, set up in response to the growing demand for urban planners in the 1960s, reflected a long-held aspiration of the AA, manifest in Rowse’s School of Planning of the late 1930s and the ‘environmental framework’ of the postwar school, to extend the competence of its students to large-scale matters. The Department of Science and Technology bundled hitherto isolated specialisms into a comprehensively remodelled lecture and examination system which, its protracted transitional period notwithstanding, eventually produced ‘spectacular improvements’ in test results.<sup>1315</sup>

These achievements, however, cannot compensate for the fact that Allen’s ill-fated attempt at merging formal education and design training – science and art – left the school in disarray. Perhaps a ‘noble failure’, as Andrew Derbyshire thought, but a failure nonetheless.<sup>1316</sup> In part, the reason for Allen’s troubles lay in his background. He was the first principal since Gibberd who had not studied at the school, and the AA’s self-perpetuating cliquishness with its peculiar council-staff-students dynamic

---

was clearly entitled), and secretary Wiltshire went so far as to seek legal advice ‘about the definition of “neglect of duty”.’ (George Wiltshire, letter to J. C. Medley, 26 Oct 1965, *ibid.*)

<sup>1314</sup> ‘Press Notice’, 4 Nov 1965, AAA, Box 2003:37c.

<sup>1315</sup> Meeting of the Council, 17 Jan 1966, CM 1966-70, p. 25.

<sup>1316</sup> ‘Andrew Derbyshire interviewed by Catherine Croft’, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects’ Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 6/23 (2003), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 11 Feb 2017].

remained impenetrable to him.<sup>1317</sup> This was most apparent in his well-intended but disastrously misguided staffing policy, which reinforced the divisions between specialists and studio tutors Allen had hoped to eradicate and left him isolated amongst people who rejected what he stood for.

A more fundamental issue affecting Allen's principalship was generational. He belonged to a group of pre-war modernists to whom the postwar welfare state offered the long-awaited opportunity to realise their ideal of a social-minded, science-based and state-run architectural profession. Those who set the agenda at the AA at the beginning of the decade embodied this vision, which found its expression in the Oxford resolutions and the drive to fully integrate the AA into the higher education system. Robert Furneaux Jordan noted with delight that 'in Bobby Carter, Bill Allen and Anthony Cox, we have a group of people who represent that continuity of the AA back into the past [...] in whose hands the future is absolutely secure.'<sup>1318</sup> This 'continuity into the past', however, held little appeal with a new generation of students and staff whose worldview was not conditioned by the anxieties of the pre-war, war and immediate postwar years, but by the relative carefreeness and affluence of the more recent past and present. As Michael Glickman wrote at the height of the ICST controversy:

Before the war a group of rebellious students [...] fought to have their views recognised. [...] They are now the Architectural Establishment, although they still feel themselves to be the Avant-Garde. The president of the AA [...], with his generation, cannot accept that history, as always, has passed them by; that their particular battle was fought and (thank heavens!) won in the fifties and that it is the job of another generation (ours) to carry on as we see fit.<sup>1319</sup>

---

<sup>1317</sup> 'I myself find the AA still a difficult place to understand – truly understand – at times [...]' (Allen, 'The AA School Today', p. 211.)

<sup>1318</sup> Quoted in: 'Annual General Meeting', Dec 1962, op. cit., p. 198.

<sup>1319</sup> Glickman, letter to the editor, *AAJ*, Dec 1964, vol. 80, no. 887, pp. 147-148. Glickman remains convinced that Allen was 'fundamentally browbeaten by more driven beings' on the council: 'Bobby Carter was a piece of work; he was an operator. Cox, I think, was also a sinister figure in that respect. This band of doctrinaire postwar leftists – they were decent men. I admired and respected these people, but while I sympathised broadly with where they stood on the map, I was very upset with the absolute blinkered certainty of their position. Their absolutism affronted me. I never saw Bill Allen as part of this group. Absolutely not. We spent quite a long time together, and I always found him ready to question things.' (Glickman, interview.) Grahame Shane, who had similarly close dealings with the school authorities, concurs that Allen was 'the instrument of the old guard of the AA council modernists.' (Shane, email.)

Allen's departure did not put an immediate end to the pursuit of this modernist vision at the AA, but it did signal that it had lost its support amongst a succeeding generation of students and staff and that the initiative for implementing it had passed to other schools. In his final memorandum to the council Allen himself warned that 'a great deal of thinking which is far more fundamental and radical and experimental than ours is going on in other British schools, and our conservatism is putting us in real danger of being outpaced,'<sup>1320</sup> and he later looked back on his principalship as 'a struggle for modernisation in which he was eventually defeated.'<sup>1321</sup>

---

<sup>1320</sup> William Allen, 'The Principal's Position', memorandum to the council, 29 Nov 1965, private collection.

<sup>1321</sup> Herbert 1976, p. 292.

## EPILOGUE: The AA in the Second Half of the 1960s (1965-1971)

Allen's departure did not resolve the tensions within the school as the council continued to pursue its existing policies and the student body continued to oppose them. The council put Otto Koenigsberger, who had deputised for Allen during his absences abroad and was popular with students, in charge of the school whilst considering the appointment of a new principal.<sup>1322</sup> In conjunction with Carter, Koenigsberger managed to 'pilot the ship of the AA through stormy and difficult waters,'<sup>1323</sup> but criticism from staff and students concerning the curriculum and particularly the block course arrangements persisted.<sup>1324</sup>

The council, divided as ever, had difficulties agreeing on the selection criteria for the new principal, and though its job advertisement, in response to Allen's perceived shortcomings, stipulated 'a positive theory and knowledge of architecture', 'an awareness of the ideas and working of the AA' and 'assured academic ability' as the desired qualifications,<sup>1325</sup> it seemed as though the council was, as Simon Pepper wrote, 'reduced to waiting for inspiration through the letter box.'<sup>1326</sup> Indeed, only one of those who were seriously considered – John Lloyd – could claim to tick all the boxes, and the fact that the group also included applicants of as varied a persuasion as Colin Rowe, Dutch architect and Team 10 member Aldo van Eyck, and Peter Manning, an AA graduate and since 1959 director of the Pilkington Research Unit at the University of Liverpool's Department of Building Science, indicates a certain lack of conviction underlying the selection process.

---

<sup>1322</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 3 Nov 1965, CM 1965-70, pp. 10-11. Koenigsberger had reservations about accepting the post of 'caretaker principal', feeling he might be 'too much Bill's friend for council and students.' (Koenigsberger, draft letter to Edward Carter, MS, 8 Oct 1965, AAA/OK, Box 43.)

<sup>1323</sup> Otto Koenigsberger, 'The School's Work', *Arena*, Sep/Oct 1966, vol. 82, no. 905, p. 65.

<sup>1324</sup> See e.g.: John Voelcker, Thomas Stevens, Richard Hobin, Hal Higgins, Archie McNab, memorandum to Otto Koenigsberger, n.d. [ca. 22 Feb 1966], AAA/OK, Box 43; Peter Cook, memorandum to Otto Koenigsberger, 23 Feb 1966, *ibid.*; Meeting of the Council, 26 Feb 1966, CM 1965-70, p. 33; Jo Pearson, Tim Drewitt, letter to the editor, *Arena*, March 1966, vol. 81, no. 900, p. 222; Meeting of the Council, 2 May 1966, CM 1965-70, p. 51.

<sup>1325</sup> 'Selection of Principal', att. to: Special Meeting of the Council, 13 Dec 1965, *ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>1326</sup> Pepper, letter to the editor, *Arena*, Jan 1966, vol. 81, no. 898, p. 148.

Manning's bid for the principalship apparently failed due to a poor reference from his colleague and quasi-superior Robert Gardner-Medwin.<sup>1327</sup> Rowe, meanwhile at Cornell again, gathered a sixty-strong 'lobby' to back his candidature, yet Koenigsberger's interview notes leave little doubt that he remained a persona non grata at the AA.<sup>1328</sup> Both remaining candidates had strong support on the council, and the records suggest that van Eyck would likely have won the race; he was, however, not prepared to give up his practice in Holland and withdrew his application despite repeated attempts to persuade him otherwise.<sup>1329</sup>

This left only John Lloyd, the candidate of the council's selection committee.<sup>1330</sup> According to Grahame Shane, then a member of the students' committee, 'Lloyd had the backing of the old AA dynasty [but] presented a softer face [and was] seen as more design-oriented and less technocratic than Allen. It was a gesture to the students.'<sup>1331</sup> Indeed, John Lloyd, who was only 38 years old, had been a popular first-year master and was known to be in sympathy with the students' desire to control their own education – 'a man who reflects, faithfully and pleasantly, the AA's ethos', as the *Architects' Journal* found.<sup>1332</sup> On the other hand, he was a close friend of William Allen's and fiercely supportive of the council's merger plans, having successfully headed his architectural faculty at KNUST in a setup similar to the proposed ICST scheme.<sup>1333</sup> The council's decision to appoint him was thus far from

---

<sup>1327</sup> Otto Koenigsberger, letter to Robert Gardner-Medwin, 11 March 1966, AAA/OK, Box 43.

<sup>1328</sup> Otto Koenigsberger, interview notes, n.d., *ibid.* Koenigsberger's impressions of Rowe include the following: 'trembling, very nervous – does he drink – syphilis nose'; 'thinks of himself as a "great Rebel", but is a little man who once had one idea'; 'an art historian and critic – if he was cured of his verbal diarrhoea he might make quite a contribution to architectural thinking – not at all qualified to run the AA – would make it into a talking shop. No thanks.' The so-called 'Rowe lobby' was a Who is Who of international architecture and included Peter Eisenman, Kenneth Frampton, John Hejduk, Richard Meier, Cedric Price, James Richards, Richard Rogers, Joseph Rykwert, Vincent Scully, O. M. Ungers, John Voelcker – and Aldo van Eyck. His actual sponsors were Leslie Martin and James Stirling. (Colin Rowe – Lobby, letter to the AA President, Dec 1965, *ibid.*)

<sup>1329</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 12 April 1966, CM 1965-70, pp. 41-42; see also: Bernard Gouveia, letter to James Cubitt, 13 April 1966, AAA/OK, Box 43; Aldo van Eyck, letter to Edward Carter, n.d., MS, *ibid.*

<sup>1330</sup> The selection committee consisted of James Cubitt, John Eastwick-Field, Stirling Craig, Otto Koenigsberger, Peter Ahrends, ICST professor Alec Skempton, and – a first in AA history – Bernard Gouveia as the students' representative. (Meeting of the Council, 17 Jan 1966, CM 1965-70, p. 27.) The committee's recommendation for Lloyd was not unanimous: Ahrends dissented.

<sup>1331</sup> Shane, email, 26 April 2016.

<sup>1332</sup> *AJ*, 4 May 1966, p. 1168.

<sup>1333</sup> When in July 1965 the executive committee discussed the appointment of a deputy principal for Allen (see p. 266), Carter suggested John Lloyd as a possible candidate, provided the council chose to retain Allen as principal (which it did not): 'John Lloyd – this opens a prospect which must be studied. John probably wouldn't come as a replacement for WA. WA found John his Ghana job, has supported him in it magnificently and they are good friends. It is most unlikely that JL would assist at WA's destruction. [...]

unanimous: four members abstained and two of them – Tim Tinker and Peter Rich – resigned in protest.<sup>1334</sup>

Lloyd's principalship was marked by this ambiguity, and he was therefore a transitional figure – though not, as Irene Sunwoo points out, an inconsequential one.<sup>1335</sup> Two features of his novel approach anticipated the system which was to spread globally from the 1970s onward, both heavily indebted to Robert Furneaux Jordan, under whom he had trained.<sup>1336</sup> Like Jordan, Lloyd devised a tripartite framework of three separate 'schools' – in his case by combining the second, third and fourth years into a 'middle school' bookended by the first and fifth years – and like Jordan he rejected the idea of a unified curriculum and wished to allow each student 'a personal course of development'.<sup>1337</sup> On entering the middle school, students were asked to draft a 'statement of intent' and outline the contents of individual programmes throughout the three-year period, whilst in the fifth year they opted for one of several parallel topical streams without having to produce a final thesis.<sup>1338</sup>

Lloyd's most significant intervention occurred in the middle school, which from autumn 1967 was organised into nine units, each containing students from the second, third and fourth years – a departure from both Patrick's 'parallel unit system', in operation since 1954, and Rowse's original unit system of 1936. Sunwoo credits Lloyd (rather than Boyarsky, as is often mistakenly claimed) with inventing this so-called 'vertical unit system'<sup>1339</sup>, though it is worth mentioning that the first

---

John could be approached now and (with Allen's support) offered the job of Professor of Architecture. WA, in these two years hence IC conditions would be Professor of Building Science.' (Carter, letter to James Cubitt, 6 July 1965, AAA/OK, Box 43.)

<sup>1334</sup> Special Meeting of the Council, 18 April 1966, CM 1965-70, p. 44. The other two abstentions came from Patrick de Saulles and Peter Ahrends, who had been van Eyck's chief supporter on the council. (Otto Koenigsberger, notes of council meeting, MS, 18 April 1966, AAA/OK, Box 43; Ahrends, interview, 4 July 2013.)

<sup>1335</sup> Sunwoo 2013, p. 175.

<sup>1336</sup> For Lloyd's pedagogical approach see: John Lloyd, 'The Quality of Architectural Education', inaugural address, *Arena*, May 1967, vol. 82, no. 912, pp. 275-278; 'School Handbook', Sep 1967, AAA, Box 2007:50.

<sup>1337</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1.0-1.2, quote p. 1.0.

<sup>1338</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1.2-1.3. In 1967/68, the students had the choice between 'general design of buildings', 'organisation, management and industry', 'London networks', and 'survival'. The idea of diversifying studies in the senior years was one of the recommendations of the RIBA Office Survey of 1962. It had a forerunner at the AA, where the tropical department was (and remained) open to fifth-year students, but the first who fully implemented it was Gardner-Medwin at Liverpool from 1963 onward. (*AJ*, 5 Dec 1962, p. 1254.)

<sup>1339</sup> Sunwoo 2013, pp. 178-179.

who suggested a system of this kind was arguably John Smith in September 1960.<sup>1340</sup> The vertical unit system, the renewed curricular permissiveness and the corresponding return of a design-centred educational approach with studio staff ‘served by the Departments, outside specialists and lecturers’<sup>1341</sup> appealed to the architectural avant-garde of the day, notably Cedric Price and Archigram, who ushered in what Peter Cook would later term the ‘Electric Decade’.<sup>1342</sup>

All the while negotiations between the AA and ICST continued, even though the initial momentum seemed gone. With the death of Patrick Linstead in September 1966 and the retirement of Bobby Carter two months later the scheme lost two of its driving forces, and the UCG’s reluctance to finance the scheme stalled its progress for months. It was not until July 1967 that the UCG agreed to make recurrent grants available, provided that the AA itself would contribute £500,000 for a new building in South Kensington.<sup>1343</sup> Although an appeal for funds launched by President Francis Baden-Powell raised little more than £150,000<sup>1344</sup>, the AA advertised a two-stage competition for its new headquarters, and at the beginning of 1970 Baden-Powell’s successor Jane Drew embarked on an extensive fund-raising trip to the United States.

In the meantime, resistance against the merger within the AA grew and, echoing tumultuous student unrest and anti-war manifestations in the wider world, turned increasingly combative. In a statement to a general meeting of the association in autumn 1969 David Allford went so far as to liken the council’s immobility in the matter of the ICST merger to the stubbornness of the US government in its handling of the situation in Vietnam:

---

<sup>1340</sup> John Smith, ‘Architecture in School’, *ABN*, 14 Sep 1960, p. 336. Smith suggested that ‘the established structure of courses will need to be overhauled; the horizontal watertight year pattern may need to be replaced by vertical groupings,’ and he elaborated upon this in the discussion following Allen’s inaugural address in February 1962 (Allen, Inaugural, pp. 237-238). Incidentally, Smith was the AA president in 1972, when Boyarsky introduced his unit system.

<sup>1341</sup> School Handbook 1967, p. 1.2.

<sup>1342</sup> Cook, ‘Electric Decade’, *op. cit.*

<sup>1343</sup> Meeting of the Council, 18 Sep 1967, CM 1965-70, p. 140.

<sup>1344</sup> Francis Baden-Powell, letter to members, 3 March 1969, AAA, Box 2007:50.



If the merger goes through it is sheer self-delusion to pretend that after anything but a very short time it will become anything other than yet another school of architecture – what the AA has stood for will crumble under the inevitable weight of the university statutes, rules, degrees, forms, structure, to say nothing of the UGC and, ultimately, the Treasury. The very weight of IC will sink the AA without trace. [...] I can see that the sincerely motivated but, I believe, misguided people on the platform and elsewhere have so committed themselves that withdrawal is unthinkable. But bad positions are never unthinkable, especially among the lumpen proletariat – which is well represented here tonight, I see. I give you Vietnam. Johnson was committed to bad positions. Nixon is committed to bad positions, and meanwhile the positions get worse, more and more entrenched, dishonest and remote, and meanwhile unrest abounds and the texture of American society degenerates sadly and fast. This, I see, is the position. For heaven's sake let us re-think it.<sup>1345</sup>

In December 1969 a number of students and sympathetic members of staff set up the so-called 'school community' to take a last-ditch stand against the impending merger. At a meeting on 11 December the school community – a body without legal standing within the AA – passed resolutions asserting their 'right to determine their education, now and in future', rejecting the reinforcement of any 'power structure within the School [...] to the extent that it cannot be changed within a short period of time by the School Community', and demanding 'the responsibility of laying down the terms on which [the] negotiations [with ICST] shall be conducted.'<sup>1346</sup>

Linstead's successor Lord William Penney and his governors watched these developments with growing unease and gathered for an emergency meeting on 2 February 1970. On the following day Penney advised the AA council that in the eyes of the ICST 'the basis for a merger no longer existed and [...] the negotiations should therefore be terminated.'<sup>1347</sup> Coming at a time when joint AA-ICST working parties were in the process of finalising the merger, the move startled a completely unsuspecting AA council, which expressed 'amazement that such a distinguished body should have behaved so irresponsibly,'<sup>1348</sup> and sent shockwaves through the architectural press. The *Architects' Journal* was bewildered by the governors'

---

<sup>1345</sup> Quoted in minutes of a meeting, verbatim, n.d. [Nov 1969?], pp. 60-61, ABA. The minutes are undated but were most likely taken at a members' information meeting on 6 November 1969.

<sup>1346</sup> Quoted in: Lord Penney, letter to John Dennys (acting president), 3 Feb 1970, AAA, Box 2006:S34.

<sup>1347</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1348</sup> John Dennys, letter to Lord Penney, 4 Feb 1970, *ibid.* Dennys himself had originally voted against the merger but changed his views when joining the council in 1965, as did many others. At that time Peter Ahrends was the only council member who openly opposed the ICST scheme. ('Views in the Arena', *Arena*, June 1965, vol. 81, no. 893, pp. 27-30.)

‘uncivilised behaviour’<sup>1349</sup>, and the *RIBA Journal* expressed its consternation in no uncertain terms:

There really has not been anything since Pearl Harbour quite like Imperial College’s letter breaking off negotiations with the Architectural Association. The Japanese kept up talks in Washington while they were preparing their attack. Imperial College kept up the talks with the AA while they were summoning an emergency meeting of the governors [and] struck at the moment when [...] time for the AA to produce an alternative scheme for survival had almost run out.<sup>1350</sup>

The AA council briefly tried to salvage the negotiations with ICST, but within a month it entered talks with half a dozen other institutions which had expressed an interest in amalgamating with the AA school, amongst them the Central School of Arts, now headed by Michael Pattrick.<sup>1351</sup> On 13 April 1970 the council agreed to restore full membership rights to students, effective immediately,<sup>1352</sup> and the elections in June delivered, according to Sunwoo, ‘a new and more radical Council [...] led by a “Guerrilla group” intent to maintain the AA’s independent status.’<sup>1353</sup> Not surprisingly, the council’s negotiations with potential partnering schools ended in failure. With no alternative funding in sight, John Lloyd in December 1970 announced the closure of the AA school within two years’ time, and the *Architects’ Journal* published its obituary:<sup>1354</sup>

All that is left for the AA now is a miracle – and they just don’t happen anymore. It is time the council faced facts and the members and the school were told the truth: the last independent school is closing, the comedy is ended.<sup>1355</sup>

The comedy, however, was not ended. Unwilling to share Lloyd’s defeatism, the school community pressured him to resign and took charge of the school. In the first half of 1971 staff and students ran the AA on an ad-hoc basis, drafted a new constitution and at the end of the academic year elected Alvin Boyarsky to the newly created and more powerful post of chairman.<sup>1356</sup> By transforming it into a ‘perpetual

---

<sup>1349</sup> ‘Uncivilised Behaviour’, *AJ*, 11 Feb 1970, p. 331.

<sup>1350</sup> *RIBAJ*, March 1970, p. 93.

<sup>1351</sup> *Times*, 23 March 1970, p. 10; *Times*, 17 July 1970, p. 3.

<sup>1352</sup> Meeting of the Council, 13 April 1970, SCM 1965-70, p. 324.

<sup>1353</sup> Sunwoo 2013, p. 181.

<sup>1354</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 181-182.

<sup>1355</sup> *AJ*, 23/30 Dec 1970, p. 1472.

<sup>1356</sup> For a detailed discussion of these events see: Sunwoo 2013, pp. 182-192; see also: Charles Jencks, ‘125 Years of Quasi Democracy’, in: Gowan 1975, pp. 149-159.

summer session<sup>1357</sup> aimed almost exclusively at international students, Boyarsky managed to secure the survival of the school. In doing so, he deliberately ‘drew a wedge between the institution and its British context,<sup>1358</sup> the shaping of which had preoccupied it ever since its foundation in 1847 and never more so than in the postwar period. It was a development which caused regret amongst many members but which, in its obstinacy and perseverance, was altogether in keeping with the AA’s mantra ‘to fend for ourselves in proud isolation.’<sup>1359</sup>

---

<sup>1357</sup> Grahame Shane, ‘Alvin Boyarsky (1928-1990)’, *Journal of Architectural Education*, May 1992, vol. 45, no. 3, p. 189.

<sup>1358</sup> Higgott 2007, p. 159.

<sup>1359</sup> Michael Patrick, quoted in: Prize Giving 1961, op. cit., p. 64.



## CONCLUSION

The AA was founded in 1847 as an independent school – today, 170 years later, it is still an independent school. Through much of the postwar period this seemed an unlikely proposition as the push of both the government and the RIBA towards a more uniform and tightly regulated educational framework darkened the outlook for, what Howard Robertson proudly proclaimed, ‘one of the outstanding remaining vestiges of free enterprise in the field of technical education.’<sup>1360</sup> Infused by a Victorian spirit of self-initiative and self-reliance, the AA school began to look like a relic of a bygone era – anachronistic and in the long run unaffordable.

To be clear, the AA’s financial predicament was by no means a postwar phenomenon. Throughout its history the school had incurred deficits and required financial assistance from the association, itself a body without significant income or reserves. However, the government’s policy to increasingly subsidise and thus ultimately control higher education establishments through the agency of the University Grants Committee and the Ministry of Education came at a considerable disadvantage to the AA, which in the postwar period did not benefit from direct public funding. Even though the AA, mainly due to low staff wages, voluntary services from its members and a favourable lease on its premises, managed to provide its training at a lower cost than any other school in the country, the tuition fees it charged to its students were significantly higher and the gap was widening.

This development raised doubts as to the AA’s prospects of preserving its autonomy, and it is noteworthy that successive councils and principals were virtually unanimous in their view that in its traditional form this autonomy would soon be a thing of the past. Brown envisaged a permanent liaison with the Royal College of Art, and Jordan hoped to transform the AA itself into a government-funded national college. From the early 1950s onward the council was perpetually involved in negotiations with potential partner institutions, and President A. R. F. Anderson was only half-joking when he called on potential donors to ‘endow a lectureship or a

---

<sup>1360</sup> Quoted in: ‘Opening of the Centenary Exhibition’, Jan 1948, op. cit., p. 102.

chair or the whole place, if you like!’<sup>1361</sup> Pattrick strongly supported a plan to transfer the AA school into an integrated college of architecture and building, and even those on the council who eventually thwarted the scheme would have welcomed affiliation with some outside body – just not with the LCC. In the first half of the 1960s, Principal Allen, Director Carter and the entire governing body of the AA backed a proposal to merge the school with Imperial College.

The reason for this widespread willingness to abandon one of the founding principles of the AA has emerged clearly from the preceding pages: in financial terms at least the school’s independence was ultimately a myth. From 1920, when the AA was incorporated, the MOE provided a substantial annual grant, and it was only in 1946, when the AA relinquished this grant, that it became, in theory, a truly independent institution. The AA council took this momentous step anticipating that the school would be able to attract and accommodate roughly twice as many students as in the pre-war years – almost all of them ex-service personnel whose tuition fees would be covered through the government’s Further Education and Training (FET) scheme. In other words, the AA financed its ‘independence’ by replacing one form of government subsidy with another, temporarily more lucrative one. When the FET scheme ended in 1951, the school slid into serious financial difficulties and only managed to survive by repeatedly raising its fees – much to the dismay of local education authorities, which sponsored sixty per cent of students at the AA and became increasingly reluctant to continue their support. Luckily for the AA, the Education Act of 1962 compelled LEAs to fund all full-time students in higher education, allowing the school to set the level of its fees without the risk of cutting off its single most important source of revenue. Ultimately, though, the AA was and remained at the mercy of government policy. Those who were in charge of the school and its finances were fully aware that this policy was subject to change and motivated by the sensible objective to put the long-term financing of the school on a more secure footing.

The RIBA, like the government, sought a more active role in guiding architectural education, implementing measures which aimed at greater conformity in training and

---

<sup>1361</sup> Quoted in: Prize-Giving 1952, op. cit., p. 47.

examination methods. However, their impact on the AA was less immediate and less one-sided. In the immediate postwar years the RIBA's Board of Architectural Education struggled to agree on a coherent policy and define universally binding pedagogical standards – standards which would in any way have been difficult to impose at a time when the primary concern of all schools in the country was to tackle the difficulties arising from the inflow of hundreds of architectural students returning from the war. With its flexible organisational setup the AA proved ideally suited to take advantage of this unsettled state of affairs. In addition to its normal course, the school organised refresher courses for British and American service personnel, created emergency accommodation and at a time of dramatic material and labour shortages managed to install a practical training site adjacent to the main studio block.

Gordon Brown adapted the school course to the aspirations and abilities of his more mature students by giving them a say in the formulation of their design tasks and allowing them to work in largely self-directed groups, and his successor Robert Furneaux Jordan put such experimental features at the core of his educational model. By the end of the 1940s, the two postwar principals had reasserted the AA's international reputation as one of the truly progressive schools of the time. The AA served as the blueprint for an unrealised CIAM-run postgraduate school, and it incorporated many of the pedagogical principles and methods stipulated at consecutive CIAM meetings, including group working, site and factory work for students and the involvement of practising architects in the teaching process. As Andrew Derbyshire concluded of the report on educational reform drafted at the seventh congress in Bergamo in 1949: 'It is a report on the basis of which the AA would get high marks – but not, I'm afraid, many other schools anywhere in the world.'<sup>1362</sup>

If the AA had few equals in the wider world, in Britain itself it was unique, and Jordan was conscious of – and indifferent to – the fact that under his direction the school had distanced itself from the mainstream of thought in architectural education. By the time he resigned in July 1951, the BAE was showing its intent to

---

<sup>1362</sup> Quoted in: 'The School Abroad', op. cit., p. 126.

enforce this mainstream in the schools, and his successor Michael Patrick came under pressure to modify the AA's approach in response to criticism from the RIBA's visiting board. Yet this was merely a temporary setback as in the mid-1950s Patrick's views on architectural education began to have majority appeal on the BAE, and the resolutions of the landmark Oxford Conference of 1958 reflected a pedagogical vision which Patrick had been promoting since the beginning of the decade – a finding which contradicts Crinson and Lubbock's account whereby the RIBA's new so-called 'Official System' was effectively the creation of a small group of public sector architects infiltrating its leadership ranks. William Allen, who took over as AA principal in 1961, was a member of this group, and his attempt to fully align the AA with the RIBA's educational policy eventually foundered on the resistance of students and staff.

The AA council was alive to the challenges facing the school through the interventionist policies of both the RIBA and the government, but due to its exceptional structural setup, specifically the annual changeover of its membership, it was singularly ill-equipped to counter them through a long-term strategy of its own. Incoming councils often set themselves different priorities, rescinding resolutions agreed by their predecessor bodies or disregarding the terms of reference of ongoing negotiations – a wasteful and inefficient process. The development sub-committee, established for the exact purpose of developing a strategy for the long-term survival of the school, deliberated for two years without any meaningful outcome. The prime example for the council's inability to agree and maintain a consistent position, however, was its erratic negotiation with the LCC regarding the creation of a combined college for architecture and building students, which it cancelled and resumed three times.

The same volatility affected the governance of the school itself. Paradoxically, the principal as the only person who entered into a long-term contractual commitment with the school answered to a short-term governing body deciding upon its broader policy, including the distribution of funds. The annual permutation of the council undermined the position of the principal, whose powerbase inevitably eroded as after two or three years few of the members who had originally appointed him were



still present to give him their backing. Those who replaced them often did not agree with the principal's ideas and accepted nomination to the council to influence the direction of the school. It was chiefly by lobbying such members of council and bypassing the principal that the students' committee, a body without constitutional standing, managed to exert its profound influence on the school. On two occasions in the postwar period the students' committee orchestrated a rebellion against their principal: In the early 1950s this eventually led to the partial restoration of their voting rights, though it missed its main objective of removing Patrick from office; ten years later the students' agitation achieved the desired outcome as the council forced Allen into resignation. Brown had been fully aware of the erosive processes inherent in the AA's system and resigned after three and a half years. Of the other postwar principals, only Michael Patrick managed to resist them over an extended period of time and he, too, eventually became their victim.

The AA system was geared to continuous change and renewal. Whilst this complicated the position of the principal, it also enabled him to effect modifications to the course and the respective staff changes almost instantaneously, and the AA throughout the postwar period remained an inexhaustible source of educational novelty. Even though financial constraints prevented the implementation of several ambitious schemes, particularly under Patrick, one reason for the AA's continuing thirst for experimentation was precisely its lack of money as the council felt, probably rightly, that only by offering a unique type of education would the school be able to attract a sufficient number of students willing to pay its higher fees. More important was the genuine desire, shared by all principals and councils and often inspired by criticism from practising members, to adapt the AA's school model to the changing demands of the profession. Brown's practical training site was a means to convey to students an understanding of building processes at a time when building licensing severely limited their opportunities to gain practical experience outside the school; Jordan's various pedagogical measures, most notably group working, sought to prepare his students for their future role as leaders of integrated building teams in a profession dominated by the public sector; Patrick's office adoption scheme was to provide the groundwork for a new composite course which aimed at eradicating the practical shortcomings of school-trained architects and

anticipated the prevailing system in British architectural education today; the Department of Tropical Architecture was part of Patrick's equally prescient policy to enhance the job prospects of his students by offering them opportunities for postgraduate specialisation; Allen's planning department was an attempt to emulate the success of the DTA and stake a claim for architects in the turf wars between the various professions vying for influence over planning matters.

Most of these schemes were short-lived ventures, and much the same applies to the school course itself. It is an astonishing fact that over the two decades discussed in this thesis only two curricula – Patrick's 'new curriculum' of 1953 and its successor of 1958 – were ever allowed to complete their full five-year cycle, and neither was repeated from one year to the next without any modifications. Needless to say, the AA school never imposed any aesthetic doctrine on its students. On the contrary, it purposely fostered an inclusive and permissive studio environment able to accommodate niche interests and singularly responsive to changing trends, some of them homemade. The distinctive feature of the work produced at the AA in the postwar period was thus its pronounced eclecticism. 'The AA,' wrote the *Builder*, 'is something of an enigma; its breadth of policy is so wide that the policy itself is frequently difficult to locate.'<sup>1363</sup>

Whilst there may have been no discernable 'AA style', there was a certain ethos which permeated the school, manifest in a number of fundamental precepts common to all incarnations of the postwar curriculum. There was, first of all, a constant effort to overcome the artificiality of school work by infusing it with the utmost sense of 'realism'. The various practical training schemes mentioned earlier exemplify this convention, as does the Lethabite ideal of integrating the training of architects and builders, which the AA pursued over much of the postwar period, even if it failed to seize the chance to put it into action when it actually presented itself. The same quest for realism characterised the curriculum itself, which comprised a succession of studio programmes taught, singularly at the time, by practising architects and set to resemble real-life practice – an approach encapsulated in the formula 'real problems, real sites, real clients'.

---

<sup>1363</sup> Passmore, 'Exhibitions of Students' Work', op. cit., p. 91.

A second characteristic of the school course was its ‘broad social perspective’, the instillation of which the *Architects’ Journal* considered to be ‘the AA’s main contribution to architectural thinking and practice over the years.’<sup>1364</sup> This was most evident under Jordan, whose vision of a nationalised building service catering to the greater good appealed to a generation of students eager to build a New Jerusalem. Yet even when in the mid-1950s the resurgence of private practice rendered the idea of an encompassing public sector obsolete, the underlying ‘social perspective’, shed of its overtly political connotations, persisted. Group working, introduced to approximate the collaborative working methods of public offices, remained a feature throughout the 1950s and early 1960s, and it is worth pointing out that the most exuberant formal excesses of the late 1950s occurred in John Killick’s fourth-year course, whose programmes were linked to current LCC projects. Allen considered the AA’s promoting ‘parity of esteem between the private and official sectors of the profession’ to be one of its chief achievements since the war,<sup>1365</sup> and his entire course with its intellectual bias aimed at removing his students from the narrowness of private practice and equipping them to play their part in policy decisions at government and industry level. It is not without irony that the only school which embraced the rise of the public sector in the postwar period and tried to adapt its curriculum to its demands happened to be the one which operated outside its jurisdiction.

A third distinct feature of the postwar school was its ‘emphasis on the architect as the creator of total environment’, as Bobby Carter put it.<sup>1366</sup> The AA had pioneered the training of architect-planners in Rowse’s postgraduate department in the late 1930s, and a concern for regional planning aspects remained a constant preoccupation of AA thesis students throughout the postwar period. A key figure in this was Arthur Korn, who encouraged such efforts and who, along with John Brandon-Jones, effectively invented the contextual framework within which the AA school operated. In 1946 Korn and Brandon-Jones introduced their seminal second-year village scheme, which successive principals retained against considerable resistance from the RIBA. In 1958 the village scheme became the core concept of a

---

<sup>1364</sup> *AJ*, 4 May 1966, p. 1168.

<sup>1365</sup> Allen, *Inaugural*, p. 227.

<sup>1366</sup> Carter, 21 Nov 1966, *op. cit.*

new curriculum based on a progressive order of architectural scale – from the village to the town to the metropolis. Allen’s postgraduate planning department, established in 1964 on the basis of a one-year pilot scheme by Korn, was a logical extension of this curriculum.

The sum total of these features allowed the AA to take up a singular position in the formation and dissemination of modern architecture in Britain, providing an intergenerational platform for pre-war pioneers serving on staff and council and the students, many of whom would become the leaders of the profession in the second half of the twentieth century. The AA’s faith in the value of students’ contributions and the corresponding lack of hierarchy and formality ensured that the exchange between these groups was not a one-way process. A point in case was the emergence of brutalism as a reaction of the postwar generation of architects against the deprecated style of the Festival of Britain – a process anticipated by student work at the AA, where both camps were prominently represented. The AA was thus a ‘site of campaign’ as much as a ‘site of encounter’, to borrow Darling’s terminology.<sup>1367</sup> Moreover, the sheer quality of the students’ work and their self-confidence in selling it to prospective clients – honed in years of defending their ideas in open crits and reflecting a broadly-held (and carefully nurtured) conviction of their being in the vanguard of the architectural profession in this country – enabled many of them to leave their mark from a young age. They did so by winning a competition, by being headhunted by one of the major practices or, as Jeremy Dixon suggested, by making their case particularly persuasively as members of the LCC and other public offices:

[The crit] is a very dramatic moment because you have to stand up and describe your scheme to your fellow students, to visiting critics, to people who come from other years. Sometimes, if it’s a high-profile project, there might be fifty people in a semi-circle around you. You feel very nervous and it’s quite difficult to do, and of course it’s a brilliant vehicle for teaching advocacy, absolutely brilliant, and I have a theory that it’s one of the really dangerous things that happened in that very active postwar period is that somewhere like the AA taught young people brilliant advocacy. They went into local authorities and got all the big housing schemes, so a lot of the very troublesome work, which is nearly always done by rather good people, [...] I think [was] done quite often by young people who had the art of persuasion, which they learned through this process of advocacy in the crit system. [...] All these things they’d done in schemes at the AA, successfully and been praised for, suddenly [became] potentially real projects, but too quickly and without the lessons of experience. [...] It has always absolutely fascinated me: How did this

---

<sup>1367</sup> Darling, *Re-forming Britain*, p. 10.

housing programme happen? [...] I think it's a product of those factors working together: the idea of a monumental social programme [...] and this supply of people who would do it and who were very persuasive. [...] It really illustrates what a high standard of work the AA people [were doing] – they were the top people in the country, no question.<sup>1368</sup>

Given the perpetually rejuvenating mechanisms inherent in the AA's setup, it was perhaps inevitable that it was also the place where dissatisfaction with modernist doctrines first manifested itself. It seems noteworthy that the school's four postwar principals were born in a nine-year bracket prior to the outbreak of the First World War and belonged to an extended circle of pre-war British modernists captivated by the promise of a new architecture grounded in scientific methods and ambitious in scope and social purpose. After the end of the Second World War they were amongst the first who considered the educational implications of this vision in postwar conditions, and it was not until the Oxford Conference in 1958 that it became the basis for official RIBA policy. Michael Patrick was realistic about the consequences this would likely have on the position of the AA:

Looking, say, five years ahead, we can see a time when the School might find itself in a position of rather greater competition. [...] The point is that for twenty years the AA was in the forefront of the battle, not only of modern architecture, but in the break-away from the educational tyranny left by the Beaux-Arts. This battle was a long one, and the new approach and new methods of teaching were still being contested less than ten years ago. But now the conflict is over, and many of the things which we once cherished as being our own progressive ideas have now become part of the accepted paraphernalia of many other schools of architecture. So in this respect our position must diminish.<sup>1369</sup>

Indeed, in the early 1960s other schools rose to prominence, challenging the 'unique and rather lofty position'<sup>1370</sup> which the AA had enjoyed in the past. Cambridge and the Bartlett became 'the two flagships of the Official System'<sup>1371</sup>, and by the middle of the decade all other schools in the country were following suit by aligning their curricula to the RIBA's modernist-technocratic vision. Allen's failure signalled that at the AA this vision had run its course.

---

<sup>1368</sup> 'Jeremy Dixon interviewed by Niamh Dillon', *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 3/18 (21 Oct 2009), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 22 April 2017].

<sup>1369</sup> Quoted in: Prize Giving 1960, op. cit., p. 76.

<sup>1370</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1371</sup> Crinson and Lubbock 1994, p. 148.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Institutional Archives

#### Architectural Association Archives, London

Council minutes, committee minutes and other catalogued holdings:

1991:3, 2003:12D, 2003:12E, 2006:S13b, 2006:S15a, 2007:36, 2007:64, 2007:65, 2007:66, 2007:67, 2007:68, 2011:24, 2011:29, 2011:33, C105, C302, C303, C304, C402a, C402b, C403

Uncatalogued holdings:

D501, D504, 1991:7, 1991:8, 1991:9, 1991:21, 1991:25, 1991:26, 1991:31, 1991:48, 2003:6b, 2003:19a, 2003:19b, 2003:25c, 2003:29c, 2003:37c, 2003:45a, 2003:45b, 2003:45c, 2006:S16b, 2006:S22, 2006:S28, 2006:S30, 2006:S33, 2006:S34, 2006:S51, 2006:S57, 2007:50, 2008:33, 2008:60, 2011:14, 2012:13, 2012:P12

Otto Koenigsberger Archive:

8, 15, 17, 27, 38, 43

Schoolwork and images: various files

#### Architectural Association Library, London

MARS Group File: 72.036(42) MARS

#### Architectural Association Photo Library, London

Schoolwork and images: various files

#### The National Archives, Kew

Records created or inherited by the Department of Education and Science, and of related bodies:

Holborn: The Architectural Association School of Architecture (1936-43): ED 90/422

Holborn: The Architectural Association School of Architecture (1945-66): ED 74/72

#### Royal Institute of British Architects Drawings and Archives Collection, Victoria and Albert Museum, London

RIBA Archive:

Board of Architectural Education Minutes, 1907-1967: RIBA/ED 7.1.1

Board of Architectural Education Committees Minutes, 1910-1962: RIBA/ED 7.1.2

Schools Committee Minutes, 1926-1973: RIBA/ED 7.1.3

Lasdun Archive: LaD/234/8

## London Metropolitan Archives, London

London County Council / Education Officer's Department: Higher and Further Education Branch:

Regent Street Polytechnic – College of Architecture and Building (1956-58):  
LCC/EO/HFE/05/281

Regent Street Polytechnic – College of Architecture and Building (1959):  
LCC/EO/HFE/05/282

## Modern Records Centre, University of Warwick, Coventry

Records of the Association of Building Technicians: MSS.78/BT

## People's History Museum, Manchester

Communist Party of Great Britain Archive: CP/CENT/CULT/5/1

## Special Collections & Archives, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool

Minutes of the Board of Studies in Architecture and Civic Design: S3161

## Centre for Research Collections, University of Edinburgh

Records of the University of Edinburgh: EUA IN1/ADS/SEC/1/7

## gta Archives, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich

CIAM Archive:

Arthur Roth papers: 42-AR

Jaqueline Tyrwhitt papers: 42-JT

Jose Luis Sert papers: 42-JLS

Siegfried Giedion papers: 42-SG

## Private Collections

Alvin Boyarsky Archive, London

The Archive of Stephen and Jean Macfarlane, Bristol

William Allen papers, York

Chris Whittaker papers, Bedford

Author's archive, Liverpool



## Online Archival Documents

'Report on National Union of Students Congress (Interim Report)', 17 May 1940, *Mass Observation Online*, <http://www.massobservation.amdigital.co.uk/Documents/Details/FileReport-115> [accessed 7 Oct 2014]

'National Union of Students' Congress', 8 April 1941, *Mass Observation Online*, <http://www.massobservation.amdigital.co.uk/Documents/Details/FileReport-115> [accessed 7 Oct 2014]

*House of Commons Hansard*, 12 March 1951, vol. 485, c114W, [http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/written\\_answers/1951/mar/12/architectural-journal-article](http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/written_answers/1951/mar/12/architectural-journal-article) [accessed 10 Sep 2016]

Butler, Richard A., James Stuart, David Eccles, *Technical Education*, Feb 1956, CAB 129/79/40, The National Archives, Kew, <http://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/D7658010> [accessed 13 Jan 2016]

*Higher Education: Report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins*, London 1963, <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/cabinetpapers/themes/robbins-committee-open-university.htm> [accessed 25 July 2016]

## Oral History: Existing Recordings

Brandon-Jones, John, interviewed by Jill Lever, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Tape 5, Side A (May/June 1999)

Cadbury-Brown, H. T., interviewed by Jill Lever, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Tape 2, Side A (July 1999)

Clarke Hall, Denis, interviewed by Louise Brodie, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 11/12 (Oct 1997), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 18 Jan 2017]

Conder, Neville, interviewed by Alan Powers, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 3/13 (1999), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 10 Dec 2016]

Cordwell, John Donald, interviewed by Betty J. Blum, *Chicago Architects Oral History Project*, Ryerson and Burnham Libraries, Art Institute of Chicago, 1993 (rev. 2004), <http://digital-libraries.saic.edu/cdm/compoundobject/collection/caohp/id/2502/rec/1> [accessed 25 Jan 2014]

Cox, Oliver, interviewed by Neil Bingham, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 5/14 (23 Nov 1999), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 2 Jan 2017]

Cullinan, Edward, interviewed by Niamh Dillon, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 4/15 (16 March 2010), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 18 Jan 2017]

Derbyshire, Andrew, interviewed by Catherine Croft, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 6/23 (2003), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 11 Feb 2017]

Dixon, Jeremy, interviewed by Niamh Dillon, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 3/18 (21 Oct 2009), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 22 April 2017]

Epstein, Gabriel, interviewed by Niamh Dillon, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Tracks 1/7 (24 Sep 2009) and 3/7 (25 Sep 2009).

- Gray, David, interviewed by Niamh Dillon, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 11/11 (2 March 2010), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 22 Jan 2017]
- Horsbrugh, Patrick, interviewed by Yona R. Owens, 13 Jan 2009, *Lewis Clarke Oral Histories*, NCSU Libraries; [https://www.lib.ncsu.edu/documents/src/lewisclarke/content/oh/docs/horsbrugh\\_patrick\\_transcript\\_1.pdf](https://www.lib.ncsu.edu/documents/src/lewisclarke/content/oh/docs/horsbrugh_patrick_transcript_1.pdf) [accessed 28 Dec 2016]
- Jones, Edward, interviewed by Niamh Dillon, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 3/11 (9 March 2012), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 15 Jan 2017]
- Maguire, Robert, interviewed by Linda Sandino, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Tape 4, Side A (2004)
- Outram, John, interviewed by Niamh Dillon, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 8/27 (27 November 2007), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 15 Jan 2017]
- Powell, Philip, interviewed by Louise Brody, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 8/20 (1997), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 10 Dec 2016]
- Salmon, Geoffrey, interviewed by Sandy Yin Lee and Svetlana Demchenko, 27 Nov 2013, AA Archives, London
- Scott Brown, Denise, interviewed by Peter Reed, *Oral History Interviews*, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, 25 Oct 1990 – 9 Nov 1991, <http://www.aaa.si.edu/collections/interviews/oral-history-interview-denise-scott-brown-13059> [accessed 10 July 2014]
- Scott Brown, Denise, and Robert Venturi, *Web of Stories*, n.d., <http://www.webofstories.com/play/robert.venturi.and.denise.scott.brown/29> [accessed 25 Nov 2016]
- Whittaker, Chris, interviewed by Kevin Morgan, n.d., *Communist Party of Great Britain Biographical Project*, British Library Sound Archive, London
- Wilson, Colin St John, interviewed by Jill Lever, *National Life Stories Collection: Architects' Lives*, British Library Sound Archive, London, Track 5/27 (24 Sep 1996), <http://sounds.bl.uk/Oral-history/Architects-Lives> [accessed 25 Nov 2016]

## Oral History: Interviews Conducted by the Author

- Ahrends, Peter, London, 4 July 2013
- Derbyshire, Andrew, phone, 17 Oct 2013
- Eardley, Anthony, skype, 4 April 2016
- Glickman, Michael, phone, 28 May 2016
- Haxworth, Martyn, Charlbury, 24 Aug 2013
- Higgs, Malcolm, phone, 19 Aug 2016
- Lee-Smith, Diana, skype, 5 May 2016
- Macfarlane, Stephen, Bristol, 23 Aug 2013
- Maguire, Robert, Ettrickbridge, 10 Sep 2013
- Miller, John, London, 17 June 2013
- Montefiore, Derek, London, 5 July 2013

Mullins, Bill, London, 16 March 2016  
Partridge, John, Sevenoaks, 23 April 2013  
Pearson, Michael, London, 14 May 2016  
Pepper, Simon, Liverpool, 31 March 2016  
Rich, Peter, phone, 3 Aug 2016  
Spyer, Geoffrey, London, 24 July 2014  
Sturgis, Tim, Kentmere, 9 Aug 2014  
Tinker, Tim, London, 15 March 2016  
Whittaker, Chris, Bedford, 11 Jan 2014

### **Author's Correspondence**

Buttars, Grant, email to the author, 17 Jan 2014  
Gatje, Bob, email to the author, 23 March 2015  
Hallen, Hans Heyerdahl, letter to the author, 2 April 2015  
Hobin, Harry, email to the author, 13 May 2016  
Livock, Alec, letter to the author, 27 August 2015  
Macfarlane, Stephen, email to the author, 28 June 2016  
Maguire, Robert, email to the author, 2 Sep 2013  
Maxwell, Robert, email to the author, 10 Feb 2017  
Rykwert, Joseph, email to the author, 5 Feb 2014  
Rykwert, Joseph, email to the author, 6 Feb 2014  
Shane, Grahame, email to the author, 26 Apr 2016

### **News and Notices in Historical Periodicals**

*AA Journal*, Sep/Oct 1944, vol. 59, no. 689, p. 102  
*AA Journal*, March 1946, p. 62  
*AA Journal*, Jan 1949, vol. 64, no. 728, p. 115  
*Architect and Building News*, 18 Feb 1944, pp. 123, 127  
*Architect and Building News*, 4 April 1947, p. 3  
*Architect and Building News*, 25 July 1947, p. 63  
*Architect and Building News*, 1 Aug 1947, p. 90  
*Architect and Building News*, 20 May 1949, p. 441  
*Architect and Building News*, 17 June 1949, pp. 523-524  
*Architect and Building News*, 15 July 1949, p. 48  
*Architect and Building News*, 11 Nov 1949, p. 466  
*Architect and Building News*, 19 July 1951, p. 55  
*Architect and Building News*, 26 July 1951, p. 83  
*Architect and Building News*, 12 Aug 1954, p. 175  
*Architect and Building News*, 7 March 1962, p. 332  
*Architect and Building News*, 28 March 1962, p. 441

*Architects' Journal*, 2 June 1938, p. 930  
*Architects' Journal*, 9 June 1938, p. 972  
*Architects' Journal*, 14 Feb 1946, p. 135  
*Architects' Journal*, 17 April 1947, p. 313  
*Architects' Journal*, 24 July 1947, pp. 81-82  
*Architects' Journal*, 15 April 1948, pp. 344-345  
*Architects' Journal*, 17 June 1948, p. 550  
*Architects' Journal*, 2 Dec 1948, p. 504  
*Architects' Journal*, 16 June 1949, pp. 538-539  
*Architects' Journal*, 8 Sep 1949, p. 244  
*Architects' Journal*, 20 July 1950, p. 51  
*Architects' Journal*, 7 Dec 1950, p. 469  
*Architects' Journal*, 14 June 1951, p. 760  
*Architects' Journal*, 19 July 1951, p. 65  
*Architects' Journal*, 25 Oct 1951, p. 487  
*Architects' Journal*, 17 July 1952, p. 63  
*Architects' Journal*, 3 Dec 1953, p. 679  
*Architects' Journal*, 4 March 1954, p. 267  
*Architects' Journal*, 10 Feb 1955, p. 183  
*Architects' Journal*, 27 Oct 1955, p. 547  
*Architects' Journal*, 16 Feb 1956, p. 199  
*Architects' Journal*, 12 April 1956, p. 339  
*Architects' Journal*, 1 Aug 1957, p. 165  
*Architects' Journal*, 25 April 1962, p. 874  
*Architects' Journal*, 5 Dec 1962, p. 1254  
*Architects' Journal*, 4 May 1966, p. 1168  
*Architects' Journal*, 23/30 Dec 1970, p. 1472

*Architectural Review*, April 1960, vol. 129, no. 770, p. 225

*Builder*, 8 March 1946, p. 231  
*Builder*, 25 July 1947, p. 87  
*Builder*, 1 July 1949, pp. 2-3  
*Builder*, 23 Sep 1949, pp. 392-393  
*Builder*, 29 Dec 1950, p. 685  
*Builder*, 18 Dec 1959, p. 899  
*Builder*, 16 March 1962, p. 644

*Focus*, no. 3 (1939), pp. 7-9

*Guardian*, 13 July 1951, p. 6

*Keystone*, Jan 1946, p. 6  
*Keystone*, Nov 1948, p. 184

*PLAN*, no. 2 (1943), p. 21  
*PLAN*, no. 6 (1949), p. 2  
*PLAN*, no. 6 (1949), p. 29

*RIBA Journal*, Nov 1945, pp. 1-2  
*RIBA Journal*, May 1949, p. 298  
*RIBA Journal*, May 1960, p. 228  
*RIBA Journal*, March 1970, p. 93

*Times*, 23 March 1970, p. 10  
*Times*, 17 July 1970, p. 3

## Editorials and Other Unsigned Articles in Historical Periodicals

- 'A Policy for the AA', *AA Journal*, July/Aug 1954, vol. 70, no. 784, pp. 50-57
- 'AA Centenary Celebrations', *Builder*, 26 Dec 1947, pp. 726-729
- 'AA Council's Annual Report', *AA Journal*, July/Aug 1958, vol. 74, no. 824, pp. 46-52
- 'AA Council's Annual Report for Session 1959-60', *AA Journal*, July/Aug 1960, vol. 76, no. 844, pp. 61-66
- 'AA Department of Tropical Studies: Educational Building Course', *AA Journal*, April 1965, vol. 80, no. 891, pp. 286-288
- 'AA Department of Urban and Regional Design', *AA Journal*, Jan 1964, vol. 79, no. 878, p. 172
- 'AA Reports', *PLAN*, no. 1 (1946), pp. 17-18
- 'AA School Annual Prize Giving', *AA Journal*, Aug/Sep 1946, vol. 62, no. 705, pp. 21-23
- 'AA School Annual Prize-Giving', *AA Journal*, Aug/Sep 1948, vol. 64, no. 724, pp. 29-34
- 'AA School Appointment', *AA Journal*, Jan 1949, vol. 64, no. 728, p. 129
- 'AA Seminar on Industrialization', *Architect and Building News*, 13 Feb 1963, p. 224
- 'AA Seminar on Industrialization', *Architect and Building News*, 20 Feb 1963, p. 263
- 'AA Students Exhibition', *Architect and Building News*, 29 July 1949, pp. 100-103
- 'AA: Computer course at Oxford', *Architects' Journal*, 17 July 1963, pp. 121-122
- 'AA: Experiment or Expire', *Architects' Journal*, 14 May 1959, p. 717-718
- 'AA: M. Le Corbusier', *Architects' Journal*, 8 Jan 1948, pp. 35-36
- 'Amazing Archigram: A Supplement', *Perspecta*, vol. 11 (1967), pp. 131-133, 135, 137, 139-141, 143-154
- 'An Interesting Entry', *Architect and Building News*, 14 March 1957, pp. 352-355
- 'Announcements and Centre News', *PLAN*, no. 4 (1943), p. 13
- 'Annual General Meeting', *AA Journal*, Dec 1962, vol. 78, no. 867, pp. 196-198
- 'Annual General Meeting', *RIBA Journal*, June 1960, pp. 296-305
- 'Annual Prize-Giving', *AA Journal*, Aug/Sep 1949, vol. 65, no. 734, pp. 30-35
- 'Annual Prize-Giving', *AA Journal*, Aug/Sep 1950, vol. 66, no. 744, pp. 32-37
- 'Annual Prize Giving', *AA Journal*, July/Aug 1951, vol. 67, no. 754, pp. 55-57
- 'Annual Prize-Giving', *AA Journal*, Sep/Oct 1952, vol. 68, no. 765, pp. 43-48
- 'Annual Prize-Giving', *AA Journal*, Sep/Oct 1954, vol. 70, no. 785, pp. 64-71
- 'Annual Prize Giving', *AA Journal*, July/Aug 1955, vol. 71, no. 794, pp. 48-55
- 'Annual Prize Giving', *AA Journal*, Sep/Oct 1957, vol. 73, no. 815, pp. 62-65
- 'Annual Prize Giving', *AA Journal*, Sep/Oct 1958, vol. 74, no. 825, pp. 58-63
- 'Annual Prize Giving', *AA Journal*, Sep/Oct 1959, vol. 75, no. 835, pp. 58-60
- 'Annual Prize Giving', *AA Journal*, Sep/Oct 1960, vol. 76, no. 845, pp. 74-78
- 'Annual Prize Giving', *AA Journal*, Sep/Oct 1961, vol. 77, no. 855, pp. 62-65
- 'Architects and Communism – A London Meeting', *Builder*, 26 March 1948, pp. 368-369
- 'Architects and Politics', *Builder*, 26 March 1948, p. 356
- 'Architectural Education and the AA', *Builder*, 18 Aug 1961, pp. 281-282

‘Architectural Education: Numbers under training’, *RIBA Journal*, Jan 1949, pp. 131-132

‘Architectural Education’, *Architectural Design*, July 1955, pp. 219-224

‘Architectural Education’, *Builder*, 29 Oct 1948, pp. 491-492

‘Architectural Education’, *Focus*, no. 4 (1939), pp. 83-84

‘Architectural Students’ Association’, *PLAN*, no. 7 (1950), p. 28

‘Architecture and Politics’, *Builder*, 24 Nov 1950, pp. 521-522

‘Architecture and System Building’, *Builder*, 29 March 1963, pp. 651-657

‘Architecture in the Tropics’, *Guardian*, 7 April 1958, p. 7

‘ArchSA News’, *PLAN*, no. 1 (1947), pp. 20-23

‘ArchSA News’, *PLAN*, no. 2 (1947), pp. 15-16

‘ArchSA News’, *PLAN*, no. 4 (1949), p. 29

‘Bartlett School of Architecture, UCL’, *Builder*, 19 Jan 1962, pp. 75-78

‘Brains in Bedford Square’, *Architects’ Journal*, 2 March 1961, pp. 307-308

‘Building Experience’, *Focus*, no. 4 (1939), pp. 85-86

‘Conference on Building Training’, *RIBA Journal*, Feb 1956, pp. 164-166

‘Corsham Summer School’, *AA Journal*, March 1950, vol. 65, no. 740, pp. 173-174

‘Council’s Report for Session 1946-1947’, *AA Journal*, June/July 1947, vol. 63, no. 713, pp. 9-10

‘Debate – That Architecture in England is Dead’, *AA Journal*, April 1946, vol. 61, no. 702, pp. 63-67

‘Debate – That in the opinion of this House the AA is a defunct and apathetic body and has as yet to justify its existence’, *AA Journal*, April 1951, vol. 66, no. 751, pp. 194-200

‘Defence Policy Approved: Conscripted to End with 1939 Class’, *Times*, 18 April 1957, p. 4

‘Department of Tropical Studies: A Cross-Section of Recent Work and Teaching Methods’, *AA Journal*, April 1963, vol. 78, no. 871, pp. 302-313

‘Designs for a Theatre’, *Times*, 10 June 1949, p. 7

‘Director of the AA – Secretary of the AA – Principal of the AA’, *AA Journal*, March 1961, vol. 76, no. 850, p. 239

‘Directory for 1944’, *PLAN*, no. 4 (1943), p. 18

‘Editorial’, *Focus*, no. 2 (1938), pp. 3-11

‘Editorial’, *Focus*, no. 3 (1939), pp. 5-12

‘Editorial’, *PLAN*, no. 8 (1950), p. 1

‘Educational Revolution’, *Builder*, 25 Nov 1955, p. 910

‘Final Report of the Constitutional Committee’, *RIBA Journal*, July 1960, pp. 319-326

‘Integration of Members and Students’, *AA Journal*, Feb 1955, vol. 70, no. 789, pp. 176-186

‘International Architectural Students’ Congress’, *Keystone*, July/Aug 1948, p. 119

‘International Exhibition’, *Architects’ Journal*, 1 May 1947, pp. 356, 360

‘International Students’ Congress’, *Architects’ Journal*, 21 April 1949, pp. 357-358

‘Interrelated Training for the Building Industry’, *Builder*, 10 Feb 1956, pp. 214-216, 221-224

‘LCC Housing’, *Architects’ Journal*, 26 May 1949, pp. 474-476

'Living in Cities', *AA Journal*, July/Aug 1953, vol. 69, no. 774, pp. 52-62  
 'Modern Trends in Education', *AA Journal*, Jan 1947, vol. 62, no. 709, pp. 79-87  
 'Mount House Notes', *AA Journal*, Aug 1943, vol. 59, no. 677, pp. 15-16  
 'New Bylaws', *AA Journal*, Feb 1939, vol. 54, no. 624, p. 187  
 'New Techniques and Traditions – Prof. Gordon Brown's Inaugural Address at Edinburgh', *Builder*, 25 March 1949, p. 373  
 'Notes and Notices', *RIBA Journal*, July 1952, pp. 348-349  
 'Notes and Notices', *RIBA Journal*, Nov 1949, p. 29  
 'Opening of the Centenary Exhibition', *AA Journal*, Jan 1948, vol. 63, no. 718, pp. 102-105  
 'Progress Report', *PLAN*, no. 7 (1950), pp. 2-4  
 'Public Architecture', *AA Journal*, Dec 1949, vol. 65, no. 737, pp. 94-102  
 'Quo Vadis, Architectural Association', *AA Journal*, March 1952, vol. 67, no. 760, pp. 206-217  
 'Refresher Course', *AA Journal*, Feb/March 1947, vol. 62, no. 710, pp. 105-106  
 'Release of Students', *AA Journal*, April 1946, vol. 61, no. 702, p. 72  
 'Report of Students' Sub-committee on the School System', June 1937, rpt. in: *Focus*, no. 3 (1939), pp. 87-96  
 'Report of the Architectural Education Joint Committee on the Training and Qualification for Associate Membership of the Royal Institute of British Architects', *RIBA Journal*, Feb 1955, pp. 156-164  
 'Report of the Architectural Education Joint Committee', *RIBA Journal*, Dec 1955, p. 69  
 'Research and Development in Public Offices', *AA Journal*, March 1951, vol. 66, no. 750, pp. 166-176  
 'Royal Institute of British Architects: The Annual Report of the Council for the Official Year 1951-52', *RIBA Journal*, March 1952, pp. 1-13  
 'School Notes', *AA Journal*, March 1945, vol. 60, no. 693, p. 139  
 'School Notes – Contributed by the Students' Committee', *AA Journal*, Jan 1947, vol. 62, no. 709, p. 89  
 'School Notes', *AA Journal*, Nov 1949, vol. 65, no. 736, p. 86  
 'School of Architecture: Annual Prize Giving', *AA Journal*, Oct 1962, vol. 78, no. 865, pp. 118-121  
 'Schools and Students', *RIBA Journal*, June 1947, p. 428  
 'Schools and Students', *RIBA Journal*, March 1947, pp. 278-279  
 'Statement of Policy for ABT Education Committee', *Keystone*, Feb 1949, p. 33  
 'Students Complaint Against RIBA', *Architects' Journal*, 5 June 1952, p. 685  
 'Students of Architecture', *Guardian*, 18 July 1947, p. 4  
 'Students' Centenary Celebrations', *AA Journal*, Jan 1948, v. 63, n. 718, pp. 140-148  
 'Summer Survey', *RIBA Journal*, Feb 1965, pp. 75-82  
 'Symbolism and Architecture', *AA Journal*, Nov 1953, vol. 69, no. 776, pp. 100-106  
 'Talk by Mr Lewis Mumford', *AA Journal*, July/Aug 1953, vol. 69, no. 774, pp. 48-51  
 'Technical Training and New Scholarships at the AA School of Architecture', *AA Journal*, May 1945, vol. 60, no. 695, p. 156

- 'Tendencies in Post-War Housing: A Discussion Requested by Russian Architects', *Builder*, 31 March 1950, pp. 430-431
- 'The AA and Northern Rhodesia', *Builder*, 10 July 1964, p. 70
- 'The AA and the Robbins Committee', *AA Journal*, Dec 1961, vol. 77, no. 857, p. 121
- 'The AA Centenary', *Architects' Journal*, 11 Dec 1947, pp. 511-512
- 'The AA School: "Desert Island" Design', *Builder*, 4 Nov 1949, p. 575
- 'The AA Story, 1936-1939', *Focus*, no. 3 (Spring 1939), pp. 79-111
- 'The Annual Report of the Council for the Official Year 1945-46', *RIBA Journal*, April 1946, pp. 207-219, 252
- 'The Audited Accounts. Session 1949-1950', *AA Journal*, Jan 1951, vol. 66, no. 748, pp. 134-135
- 'The Centenary of the AA', *Architectural Review*, Dec 1947, vol. 102, no. 612, pp. 183-184
- 'The Centenary of the Architectural Association', *AA Journal*, Dec 1947, vol. 63, no. 717, pp. 73-75
- 'The Future for Students', *Architects' Journal*, 18 Nov 1948, pp. 459-460
- 'The Future of Private Practice / RIBA Report on Private Practice', *Architects' Journal*, 23 Nov 1950, pp. 414-417
- 'The Future of the AA', *AA Journal*, June/July 1962, vol. 78, no. 863, pp. 10-23
- 'The Innocuous McMorran Report', *Architects' Journal*, 10 Feb 1955, p. 187
- 'The Interim Report of the MARS/ArchSA Committee on Architectural Education', *Architect and Building News*, 15 Oct 1948, p. 308
- 'The New RIBA Council', *Architects' Journal*, 20 April 1961, p. 559
- 'The School Abroad', *AA Journal*, Jan 1950, vol. 65, no. 738, pp. 114-127
- 'The Training of Architects: Interim Survey', *Architectural Review*, June 1950, vol. 107, no. 642, pp. 367-373
- 'Uncivilised Behaviour', *Architects' Journal*, 11 Feb 1970, p. 331
- 'Views in the Arena', *Arena*, June 1965, vol. 81, no. 893, pp. 26-30
- 'What Kind of Architecture Do We Want', *Architect and Building News*, 1 April 1949, pp. 299-300
- [Carter, Edward], 'The AA & ICST Merger Plan: Any Questions?', *AA Journal*, Nov 1964, vol. 80, no. 886, pp. 117-126
- [Davies, Richard Llewelyn], 'Postgraduate Training', *RIBA Journal*, March 1962, pp. 118-121
- [Derbyshire, Andrew], 'New Feelings, New Techniques', *PLAN*, no. 8 (1950), pp. 12-23
- [Derbyshire, Andrew, John Killick, Stephen Macfarlane, Michael Willis], 'PLAN in Transition', *PLAN*, no. 5 (1949), p. 2
- [Howell, Bill, John Killick, Stephen Macfarlane, Hugh Morris, Gill Sarson], 'Stevenage', *PLAN*, no. 8 (1950), pp. 24-31
- [Killick, John], 'Study Groups', *AA Journal*, Feb 1959, vol. 74, no. 829, pp. 215-216
- [Lasdun, Denys, and J. H. V. Davies], 'Thoughts in Progress: the New Brutalism', *ibid.*, April 1957, pp. 111-112
- [Macfarlane, Stephen], 'Peckham', *PLAN*, no. 7 (1950), pp. 22-27
- [Macfarlane, Stephen], 'RT3', *PLAN*, no. 5 (1949), pp. 5-16



[Macfarlane, Stephen], 'The Royal West of England Academy School of Architecture', *RIBA Journal*, Dec 1963, p. 514

[Smith, John], 'Editor's Viewpoint', *AA Journal*, Jan 1965, vol. 80, no. 888, p. 158

[Smithson, Alison], 'House in Soho, London', *Architectural Design*, Dec 1953, p. 342

[Turner, John], 'Military Service', *PLAN*, no. 8 (1950), p. 32

## Signed Articles in Historical Periodicals

Allen, William, 'The AA School Today', *AA Journal*, Feb 1964, vol. 79, no. 879, pp. 211-213

Allen, William, 'Background to Kumasi', *AA Journal*, July/Aug 1963, vol. 79, no. 874, pp. 27-29

Allen, William, 'The Education of Architects', *RIBA Journal*, May 1964, pp. 210-219

Allen, William, 'Observations in America', *AA Journal*, Sep/Oct 1963, vol. 79, no. 875, pp. 68-77

Allen, William, 'Policies for Architectural Education', *Arena*, March 1966, vol. 81, no. 900, p. 223

Allen, William, 'The Profession in Contemporary Society', *RIBA Journal*, May 1960, pp. 251-264

Allen, William, 'Science in Schools of Architecture', *RIBA Journal*, Aug 1953, pp. 409-411

Allen, William, 'The Training and Education of Architects', inaugural lecture, *AA Journal*, April 1962, vol. 77, no. 861, pp. 223-238

Atkinson, G. Anthony, 'British Architects in the Tropics', *AA Journal*, June 1953, vol. 68, no. 773, pp. 7-21

Baker, Jeremy, 'A Smithson File', *Arena*, Feb 1966, vol. 81, no. 899, pp. 177-220

Balcombe, George, 'Technological Determinism Is Out', *AA Journal*, Dec 1964, vol. 80, no. 887, pp. 138-140

Banham, Reyner, 'Futurism and Modern Architecture', *RIBA Journal*, Feb 1957, pp. 129-139

Banham, Reyner, 'The history of the immediate future', *RIBA Journal*, May 1961, pp. 252-260, 269

Banham, Reyner, 'Howard Robertson', *Architectural Review*, Sep 1953, vol. 114, no. 681, pp. 161-168

Banham, Reyner, 'The New Brutalism', *Architectural Review*, Dec 1955, vol. 118, no. 708, pp. 354-361

Barefoot, Peter, 'Computers and the Architect', *Architect and Building News*, 24 July 1963, p. 132

Beaty-Pownall, D. H., 'Presentation to E. R. Jarrett', *AA Journal*, Sep 1950, vol. 66, no. 744, p. 43

Bernal, J. D., 'Building Construction in the USSR', *Keystone*, Feb 1950, pp. 30-33

Bernal, J. D., 'Building Construction in the USSR', *Keystone*, March 1950, pp. 53-61

Braddock, Henry, 'The Future of the AA', *AA Journal*, May 1950, vol. 65, no. 742, pp. 207-208

Brandon-Jones, John, 'Architecture Without Prejudice', *Architect and Building News*, 7 Oct 1949, pp. 358-359

Brandon-Jones, John, 'The Education of Architects II', *Architect and Building News*, 24 April 1952, p. 490

Brown, R. Gordon, 'A New Form of Architectural Education', *AA Journal*, Dec 1948, vol. 64, no. 727, pp. 94-107

- Budden, L. B., 'The Future of Architectural Education', *RIBA Journal*, July 1945, pp. 249-256
- C., J. C., 'Students in World Politics: The Role of the IUS', *The World Today*, Aug 1951, vol. 7, no. 8, pp. 346-356
- Chisholm, John, 'Obituary: John Killick', *Design*, no. 265 (1971), p. 85
- Colborne-Brown, Michael, 'Corsham International Summer School', *AA Journal*, Nov 1950, vol. 66, no. 746, pp. 76-80
- Colquhoun, Alan, 'Exhibition of AA Thesis Designs', *AA Journal*, Sep/Oct 1963, vol. 79, no. 875, pp. 43-46
- Colquhoun, Alan, 'Some Ideas About Technical Training', *Arena*, Nov 1965, vol. 81, no. 895, pp. 101-102
- Cook, Peter, 'Responses', *Arena*, Dec 1966, vol. 82, no. 907, pp. 137-144
- Cox, Anthony, 'Public and Private Architecture', *AA Journal*, April 1948, vol. 63, no. 721, pp. 205-213
- Cox, Anthony, 'The Training of an Architect. An Open Letter to H. S. Goodhart-Rendel', *Focus*, no. 1 (1938), pp. 24-32
- Cox, Anthony, and Leo De Syllas, 'CIAM Congress, 1947', *PLAN*, no. 1 (1948), pp. 13-16
- Cox, Oliver, 'Method in Design', *PLAN*, no. 5 (1949), pp. 17-20
- Craig, Alan, 'Architecture in the Tropics', *Builder*, 6 April 1962, p. 716
- Cubitt, James, 'President's Report 1965-66', *Arena*, July/Aug 1966, vol. 82, no. 904, p. 35
- Cusdin, S. E. T., 'The Annual General Meeting', *AA Journal*, Jan 1951, vol. 66, no. 748, p. 131
- Cusdin, S. E. T., 'Fumbling in the Quiver', presidential address, *AA Journal*, Nov 1950, vol. 66, no. 746, pp. 70-75
- Davies, Richard Llewelyn, 'Deeper Knowledge: Better Design', *Architectural Record*, April 1957, pp. 185-191
- Davies, Richard Llewelyn, 'The Education of an Architect', *RIBA Journal*, Jan 1961, pp. 118-120
- Davies, Richard Llewelyn, 'On the Frontier of Knowledge', *Architects' Journal*, 14 April 1955, pp. 505, 507, 508, 510
- de Saulles, Patrick, 'The Middle Years', *AA Journal*, Feb 1964, vol. 79, no. 879, pp. 214-216
- Derbyshire, Andrew, 'Interim Report of MARS/ArchSA Committee on Architectural Education', *PLAN*, no. 3 (1948), pp. 19-22
- Duncan, R. A., 'Summer School at Corsham', *Official Architect*, Dec 1950, pp. 690-691
- Enthoven, Roderick, 'Presidential Address', *AA Journal*, Nov 1948, vol. 64, no. 726, pp. 74-83
- Foyle, Arthur, 'Tropical Architecture', *Builder*, 10 April 1953, pp. 558-560
- Funke, Hermann, 'Wortmagie und vor allem viele Architekten', *Die Zeit*, 26 April 1963, p. 18
- Ginsburg, Leslie, 'Changing Strategies in Planning', *Arena*, Sep/Oct 1966, vol. 82, no. 905, pp. 71-75
- Glennie, Colin, 'Architecture – a Personal Point of View', *AA Journal*, April 1954, vol. 69, no. 781, pp. 236-240
- Goodhart-Rendel, H. S., 'Architectural Education', *AA Journal*, March 1937, vol. 52, no. 601, pp. 381-384
- Goodhart-Rendel, H. S., 'The Training of an Architect', *AA Journal*, March 1938, vol. 53, no. 613, pp. 403-416
- Gowan, James, 'AA 125: A Decade of AA Architecture', *AA quarterly*, vol. 5, no. 1 (1973), pp. 4-39

- Gowan, James, 'Annual Exhibition of Schoolwork 1956-1961', *AA Journal*, Sep/Oct 1961, vol. 77, no. 855, pp. 66-67
- Gowan, James, 'Curriculum', *Architectural Review*, Dec 1959, vol. 126, no. 754, pp. 315-323
- Gropius, Walter, 'Architecture in a Scientific Age', *Listener*, 23 Aug 1951, p. 297
- Halter, Roman, 'Students in Moscow, 1957', *AA Journal*, March 1958, vol. 73, no. 820, pp. 198-202
- Henderson, A. Graham, 'Report of the Committee on Private Architectural Practice – A Message from the President', *RIBA Journal*, October 1950, p. 430
- Hunt, Anthony, Wiliam Holford, G. A. Jellicoe, Arthur Ling, 'National Planning', *PLAN*, no. 5 (1949), pp. 22-27
- J., M. P., 'Comments', *PLAN*, no. 4 (1943), pp. 8-9
- Jellicoe, Geoffrey, 'The Principal's Address to the School', *AA Journal*, March 1939, vol. 54, no. 625, pp. 209-211
- Jones, A. Douglas, 'Mars/ArchSA Interim Report on Architectural Education', *Architect and Building News*, 24 Dec 1948, pp. 532-533
- Jordan, R. Furneaux, 'The Architectural Significance of 1851', *RIBA Journal*, July 1951, pp. 340-348
- Jordan, R. Furneaux, 'Competitive Education', *Focus*, no. 4 (1939), pp. 58-61
- Jordan, R. Furneaux, 'An Inaugural Address', *AA Journal*, Feb 1949, vol. 64, no. 729, pp. 136-146
- Jordan, R. Furneaux, 'Lisle March Phillipps', *ibid.*, Oct 1949, vol. 65, no. 735, pp. 61-63
- Jordan, R. Furneaux, 'The Significance of History', *AA Journal*, June 1963, vol. 79, no. 873, pp. 360-370
- Jordan, R. Furneaux, 'The Situation in Architecture', *Keystone*, Oct 1950, pp. 36-37
- Jordan, R. Furneaux, 'The Teaching of Architectural History', *PLAN*, no. 4 (1949), pp. 4-8
- Jordan, R. Furneaux, 'What Kind of Architecture Do We Want in Britain?', *Architect and Building News*, 25 March 1949, pp. 264-266
- Jordan, Robert Furneaux, paper read to the CID Furniture Design Conference at the RIBA in July 1949, *Architects' Journal*, 4 Aug 1949, pp. 128-129
- Kennington, Martin, 'Architectural Education in Britain', *Architects' Year Book*, no. 4 (1951), pp. 80-89
- K[night], C[hristopher], 'The Foundation Society', *AA Journal*, March 1948, vol. 63, no. 720, pp. 190-191
- Koenigsberger, Otto, 'The School's Work', *Arena*, Sep/Oct 1966, vol. 82, no. 905, p. 65
- Korn, Arthur, 'Town Planning at the AA', *AA Journal*, Nov 1963, vol. 79, no. 876, p. 113
- Landau, Royston, 'Towards a Structure for Architectural Ideas', *Arena*, June 1965, vol. 81, no. 893, pp. 7-11
- Lloyd, John, 'The Quality of Architectural Education', inaugural address, *Arena*, May 1967, vol. 82, no. 912, pp. 275-278
- Macfarlane, Stephen, 'Unité d'Habitation', *PLAN*, no. 4 (1949), pp. 23-27
- Manasseh, Leonard, 'The Moment of Truth', presidential address, *AA Journal*, Nov 1964, vol. 80, no. 886, pp. 95-102
- Martin, Leslie, 'Conference on Architectural Education', *RIBA Journal*, June 1958, pp. 279-282
- McNab, Archie, 'The Architectural Association since the war', *Building*, 29 Oct 1972, pp. 71-78

- Middleton, Robin, 'The New Brutalism or a clean, well-lighted place', *Architectural Design*, Jan 1967, p. 7
- Mills, Edna, 'Students Have a Part', *Keystone*, Dec 1948, p. 203
- Musgrove, John, 'Dangers of Scientism', *Architectural Review*, July 1966, vol. 140, no. 833, pp. 9-11
- Oakes, Cecil St Clair, 'Obituary: Mr. Gordon Brown', *AA Journal*, May 1962, vol. 77, no. 862, p. 279
- Parish, Woodbine, 'Management in the Building Industry', *Builder*, 11 Dec 1953, pp. 938-939
- Parish, Woodbine, 'The Trend of Education in the Building Industry', *AA Journal*, March 1953, vol. 68, no. 770, pp. 141-149
- Passmore, Edward, 'The Earnest Forties', *Builder*, 22 July 1949, pp. 101-102
- Passmore, Edward, 'Exhibitions of Students' Work', *Builder*, 20 July 1951, p. 91
- Patrick, Michael, 'AA Policy', *AA Journal*, April 1956, vol. 71, no. 801, pp. 242-246
- Patrick, Michael, 'Architectural Aspirations', *AA Journal*, Jan 1958, vol. 73, no. 818, pp. 147-161
- Patrick, Michael, and John Killick, 'The Decaying Neighbourhood', *Architectural Design*, Oct 1956, pp. 318-326
- Pevsner, Nikolaus, 'The AA', *Architectural Review*, March 1948, vol. 103, no. 615, p. 121
- Plumstead, Derek, 'Report of the Conference on Tropical Architecture', *Architect and Building News*, 16 April 1953, pp. 455-456
- Rees, V. O., 'Vers une architecture', *AA Journal*, vol. 40, no. 451, pp. 64-67
- Richards, James, 'Architecture and the Common Man', *AA Journal*, Feb 1948, vol. 63, no. 719, pp. 153-161
- Robertson, Howard, 'Quality in Architecture', presidential address, *AA Journal*, Nov 1947, vol. 63, no. 716, pp. 51-59
- R[oth], A[lfred], '100 Jahre AA-School in London', *Das Werk*, Feb 1948, vol. 35, no. 2, p. 23
- Rowe, Colin, 'The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa', *Architectural Review*, March 1947, vol. 101, no. 603, pp. 101-104
- Shepherd, Peter, 'The Importance of Being Earnest', presidential address, *AA Journal*, Nov 1954, vol. 70, no. 786, pp. 88-94
- Smith, John, 'Architecture in School', *Architect and Building News*, 14 Sep 1960, pp. 327-336
- Smith, John, 'The Schools', *Architecture and Building*, Feb 1958, pp. 42-73
- Smithson, Alison and Peter, 'The New Brutalism', *Architectural Design*, Jan 1955, p. 1
- Smithson, Alison and Peter, 'Statement', *Architectural Review*, April 1954, p. 274-275
- Smithson, Alison, Peter Smithson, Jane Drew, E. Maxwell Fry, 'Conversation on Brutalism', *Zodiac*, April 1959, pp. 73-81
- Smithson, Peter, 'Education for Town Building: An Outline of the Intention of the Architectural Association School Curriculum', *AA Journal*, Jan 1961, vol. 76, no. 848, p. 191
- Spence, James McKay, 'The New Role of the Architect in the Tropics', *AA Journal*, July/Aug 1955, vol. 71, no. 794, pp. 56-61
- Spyer, Geoffrey, 'AA Students' Club', *AA Journal*, Sep/Oct 1951, vol. 67, no. 755, p. 91
- Steedman, Neil, 'Student magazines in British architectural schools', *AA quarterly*, July/Sep 1971, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 36-40
- Stirling, James, 'An architect's approach to architecture', *RIBA Journal*, May 1965, pp. 231-240

- Stirling, James, 'Regionalism in Architecture', *Architects' Year Book*, no. 8 (1957), pp. 62-68
- Summerson, John, 'The Case for a Theory of Modern Architecture', *RIBA Journal*, June 1957, pp. 307-313
- Ventris, Michael, 'Function and Arabesque', *PLAN*, no. 1 (1948), pp. 6-12
- Ventris, Michael (ed.), 'Group Working', *PLAN*, no. 2 (1948), pp. 6-22
- Voelcker, John, 'Technics of Architecture', *Arena*, May 1966, vol. 81, no. 902, pp. 281-286
- Voelcker, John, and Ruth Olitsky, 'Form and Mathematics', *Architectural Design*, Oct 1954, pp. 306-307
- Wilson, Hugh, 'Impressions of the Planning Scene', *AA Journal*, Feb 1965, vol. 80, no. 889, pp. 195-201
- Yerbury, F. R., 'Some AA Reminiscences – 2', *Builder*, 2 Jan 1948, pp. 6-7

## Correspondence in Historical Periodicals

- Briggs, C. J., letter to the editor, *Architect and Building News*, 2 Dec 1949, p. 573
- Brown, Gordon, letter to the editor, *Architect and Building News*, 4 May 1951, p. 508
- Brown, Gordon, letter to the editor, *AA Journal*, June 1952, vol. 68, no. 763, p. 20
- Bucknell, L. H., letter to the editor, *AA Journal*, April 1950, vol. 65, no. 741, p. 195
- Carter, Bertram, Anthony Cox, Susan Cox, Leo De Syllas, Jane Drew, Maxwell Fry, D. E. E. Gibson, Erno Goldfinger, H. J. Whitfield Lewis, Berthold Lubetkin, Paul V. Mauger, John Pinkheard, letter to the editor, *PLAN*, no. 8 (1950), p. 34
- Cave, L. F., letter to the editor, *Architects' Journal*, 7 Nov 1946, p. 330
- Cox, Anthony, letter to the editor, *AA Journal*, Sep 1942, vol. 58, no. 667, p. 23
- Crooke, Pat, letter to the editor, *Builder*, 5 Jan 1951, p. 6
- Cusdin, S. E. T., letter to the editor, *Builder*, 1 Dec 1950, p. 571
- Darwin, Robin, letter to the editor, *Architects' Journal*, 13 May 1948, p. 434
- De Syllas, Leo, letter to the editor, *Architects' Journal*, 16 June 1949, p. 540
- Derbyshire, Andrew, Stephen Macfarlane, A. A. Burton, J. H. Firth, Hugh Morris, Michael Cain, Beak Adams, letter to the editor, *Architect and Building News*, 20 May 1949, pp. 440-441
- Eardley, Anthony, Hermann Senkowsky, Roy Landau, John Winter, Alvin Boyarsky, George Balcombe, letter to the editor, *AA Journal*, June 1964, vol. 80, no. 883, p. 3
- Glickman, Michael, letter to the editor, *AA Journal*, May 1964, vol. 79, no. 882, p. 328
- Glickman, Michael, letter to the editor, *AA Journal*, Dec 1964, vol. 80, no. 887, pp. 147-148
- Glickman, Michael, Diana Lee Smith, Rodney Mace, Nicholas Weaver, Tim Drewitt, David Hyams, Christopher Cross, Jo Pearson, R. Maxwell Comfort, letter to the editor, *Times*, 6 March 1967, p. 11
- Ham, Roderick, letter to the editor, *Architect and Building News*, 3 June 1949, p. 500
- Jordan, R. Furneaux, letter to the editor, *PLAN*, no. 5 (1949), p. 3
- Jordan, R. Furneaux, letter to the editor, *Builder*, 1 Dec 1950, p. 571
- Kay, John, letter to the editor, *Architects' Journal*, 26 May 1949, p. 472
- Kay, John, letter to the editor, *Architects' Journal*, 16 June 1949, p. 540

Kay, John, letter to the editor, *AA Journal*, July/Aug 1952, vol. 68, no. 764, p. 37

Kenyon, Arthur, letter to the editor, *Builder*, 8 Dec 1950, p. 592

Maxwell, Robert, letter to the editor, *ibid.*, 24 Dec 1953, p. 776

Moore, Tony, letter to the editor, *Architects' Journal*, 6 March 1952, p. 296

Morris, Hugh, letter to the editor, *AA Journal*, July/Aug 1952, vol. 68, no. 764, p. 37

Patrick, Michael, letter to the editor, *AA Journal*, June 1954, vol. 69, no. 783, p. 28

Pearson, Jo, and Tim Drewitt, letter to the editor, *Arena*, March 1966, vol. 81, no. 900, p. 222

Penn, Colin, letter to the editor, *Architect and Building News*, 21 June 1946, p. 185

Penn, E. V., letter to the editor, *Architect and Building News*, 31 May 1946, p. 148

Penn, E. V., letter to the editor, *Architect and Building News*, 21 June 1946, p. 185

Pepper, Simon, letter to the editor, *Arena*, Jan 1966, vol. 81, no. 898, p. 148

Pope, Hugh, letter to the editor, *Architectural Review*, June 1954, vol. 115, no. 690, p. 364

Shrosbree, F. E., letter to the editor, *Builder*, 9 April 1948, p. 431

Smith, John, letter to the editor, *AA Journal*, July/Aug 1959, vol. 75, no. 834, p. 55

Spyer, Geoffrey, letter to the editor, *Builder*, 5 Oct 1951, p. 454

Swann, Margaret, letter to the editor, *AA Journal*, May 1949, vol. 64, no. 732, p. 225

Swann, Margaret, letter to the editor, *Architect and Building News*, 20 May 1949, p. 440

Swann, Margaret, letter to the editor, *Architectural Review*, June 1949, vol. 105, no. 630, pp. 310, 312

Swann, Margaret, letter to the editor, *RIBA Journal*, June 1949, p. 373

Usborne, David, letter to the editor, *AA Journal*, Jan 1965, vol. 80, no. 888, p. 186

Voelcker, John, letter to the editor, *RIBA Journal*, Feb 1952, pp. 140-141

Voelcker, John, letter to the editor, *Architects' Journal*, 14 Oct 1954, p. 456

Voelcker, John, letter to the editor, *Architectural Design*, June 1957, p. 184

Voelcker, John, letter to the editor, in: *Arena*, July/Aug 1966, vol. 82, no. 904, p. 34

Walker, Winston, letter to the editor, *Architect and Building News*, 7 June 1946, pp. 152, 165

Walker, Winston, letter to the editor, *Architect and Building News*, 14 June 1946, p. 169

Walker, Winston, letter to the editor, *Builder*, 14 May 1948, p. 584

Walker, Winston, letter to the editor, *Builder*, 24 Nov 1950, p. 537

Walker, Winston, letter to the editor, *Builder*, 8 Dec 1950, p. 592

Whittaker, Chris, letter to the editor, *Builder*, 5 Jan 1951, p. 6

Williams, Thurston, and Peter Cocke, letter to the editor, *RIBA Journal*, Feb 1949, p. 180

Williams, Thurston, and Howard Walker, letter to the editor, *Architects' Journal*, 16 June 1949, p. 540

## Dissertations and Theses

- Baweja, Vandana, 'A Pre-history of Green Architecture: Otto Koenigsberger and Tropical Architecture, from Princely Mysore to Post-colonial London', unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, April 2008
- Brook, David Louis Sterrett, 'Henry Leveke Kampfhoefer, The Modernist, Dean of the North Carolina State University School of Design 1948-1972', unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, 2005
- Brown, James Benedict, 'A critique of the live project', unpublished doctoral dissertation, Queen's University Belfast, 2012, <https://learningarchitecture.wordpress.com/2013/01/10/download-the-full-text-of-my-phd-a-critique-of-the-live-project> [accessed 1 Dec 2016]
- Carpenter, William J., 'Design and Construction in Architectural Education 1963-2003', unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Central England in Birmingham, Dec 2004
- Chang, Jiat-Hwee, 'A Genealogy of Tropical Architecture: Singapore in the British (Post)Colonial Networks of Nature, Technoscience and Governmentality, 1830s to 1960s', unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, Spring 2009
- Erten, Erdem, 'Shaping "The Second Half Century": *The Architectural Review* 1947-1971', unpublished doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2004
- Harriss, Harriet E., 'Architecture Live Projects acquiring and applying missing practice-ready skills', unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oxford Brookes University, June 2014
- Keller, Sean Blair, 'Systems Aesthetics: Architectural Theory at the University of Cambridge, 1960-75', unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 2005
- Mardell, Joshua, 'The CIAM Charter of Habitat: "Inter-relationships" and "scales of association" in the work of British architects, 1950-1970', unpublished master's thesis, Cambridge University, Nov 2012
- Parnell, Steve, 'Architectural Design, 1954-1972', unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Sheffield, 2011
- Parsons, Stephen R., 'Communism in the Professions: The Organisation of the British Communist Party among Professional Workers, 1933-1956', unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Warwick, 1990
- Peacock, Donald M., 'Charles Reilly and architectural education in Britain', unpublished doctoral dissertation, Keele University, May 1999
- Powers, Alan, 'Architectural Education in Britain 1880-1914', unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cambridge University, 1982
- Sara, Rachel, 'Between studio and street: the role of the live project in architectural education', unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Sheffield, 2004
- Sunwoo, Irene, 'Between the "Well-Laid Table" and the "Marketplace": Alvin Boyarsky's Experiments in Architectural Pedagogy', unpublished doctoral dissertation, Princeton University, Nov 2013

## Authored Books

- Allport, Alan, *Demobbed*, New Haven 2009
- Alofsin, Anthony, *The Struggle for Modernism*, New York / London 2002
- Banham, Reyner, *Megastructure*, London 1976
- Banham, Reyner, *The New Brutalism*, London 1966

- Banham, Reyner, *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age*, London 1960
- Blundell-Jones, Peter, *Ahrends, Burton and Koralek*, London 1991
- Blundell-Jones, Peter, *University of Sheffield School of Architecture 1908-2008*, Sheffield 2008
- Buchanan, Colin, *Traffic in Towns*, Harmondsworth 1963
- Bullock, Nicholas, *Building the Post-War World: Modern Architecture and Reconstruction in Britain*, London 2002
- Calder, Barnabas, *Raw Concrete*, London 2016
- Caragonne, Alexander, *The Texas Rangers: notes from an architectural underground*, Cambridge MA 1995
- Carr-Saunders, A. M., and P. A. Wilson, *The Professions*, Oxford 1933
- Caryl, Christian, *Building the Dragon City*, Hong Kong 2012
- Childs, David, *Britain Since 1945*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed., London 2006
- Colvin, Howard, *A Biographical Dictionary of British Architects 1600-1840*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London 1978 (first publ. 1954)
- Craig, Nares, *Memoirs of a Thirties Dissident*, [2008], <http://narescraig.co.uk/memoirs> [accessed 25 June 2014]
- Crinson, Mark, *Modern Architecture and the End of Empire*, Aldershot 2003
- Crinson, Mark, *Stirling and Gowan*, New Haven / London 2012
- Crinson, Mark, and Jules Lubbock, *Architecture – art or profession?*, Manchester 1994
- Crouch, Christopher, *Design Culture in Liverpool 1880-1914*, Liverpool 2002
- Dannatt, Trevor, *Modern Architecture in Britain*, London 1959
- Darling, Elizabeth, *Re-forming Britain*, New York 2007
- Dunne, Jack, and Peter Richmond, *The World in One School. The History and Influence of the Liverpool School of Architecture 1894-2008*, Liverpool 2008
- Esher, Lionel, *A Broken Wave: The Rebuilding of England 1940-1980*, London 1981
- Frampton, Kenneth, *Modern Architecture: A Critical History*, London 1980
- Fraser, Murray, with Joe Kerr, *Architecture and the 'Special Relationship'*, Abingdon 2007
- Giedion, Sigfried, *Space, Time and Architecture*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., Cambridge MA 1962 (first publ. 1941)
- Gold, John R., *The Experience of Modernism: Modern Architects and the Future City, 1928-1953*, London 1997
- Gold, John R., *The Practice of Modernism: Modern Architects and Urban Transformation, 1954-1972*, London 2007
- Gowan, James, *Style and Configuration*, London 1994
- Harwood, Elain, *Space, Hope and Brutalism*, New Haven 2014
- Higgott, Andrew, *Mediating Modernism*, London 2007
- Jackson, Anthony, *The Politics of Architecture*, London 1970
- Jackson, Iain, and Jessica Holland, *The Architecture of Edwin Maxwell Fry and Jane Drew*, Aldershot 2014
- Jenkins, Frank, *Architect and Patron*, London 1961
- Jordan, R. Furneaux, *Victorian Architecture*, Harmondsworth 1966
- Jordan, R. Furneaux, *Western Architecture*, London 1969



Kaye, Barrington, *The Development of the Architectural Profession in Britain*, London 1960

Koenigsberger, Otto, and Robert Lynn, *Roofs in the Warm Humid Tropics*, London 1965

Korn, Arthur, *History Builds the Town*, London 1953

Layton, Elizabeth, *The Practical Training of Architects*, London 1962

Lowe, Roy, *Education in the Post-War Years: a Social History*, London 1988

Mathews, Stanley, *From Agit-Prop to Free Space: The Architecture of Cedric Price*, London 2007

Maxwell, Robert, *New British Architecture*, London 1972

Menin, Sarah, and Stephen Kite, *An Architecture of Invitation: Colin St John Wilson*, Aldershot 2005

Mills, Edward D., *The New Architecture in Great Britain, 1946–1953*, London 1953

Moholy-Nagy, Laszlo, *Vision in Motion*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed., Chicago 1965

Mumford, Eric, *The CIAM Discourse on Urbanism, 1928-1960*, 1<sup>st</sup> pb. ed., London / Cambridge MA 2002

Oliver, Paul, *Built to Meet Needs: Cultural Issues in Vernacular Architecture*, Oxford 2006

Otway, T. B. H., *The Second World War 1939-1945. Army: Airborne Forces*, London 1990

Patrick, Michael, and Michael Tree, *A Career in Architecture*, London 1961

Pearlman, Jill, *Inventing American Modernism: Joseph Hudnut, Walter Gropius, and the Bauhaus Legacy at Harvard*, Charlottesville 2007

Pevsner, Nikolaus, *Pioneers of the Modern Movement*, London 1936

Powell, Christopher, *The Welsh School of Architecture. 1920-2008: a History*, Cardiff 2009

Powell, Kenneth, *Abrends, Burton and Koralek*, London 2012

Powers, Alan, *Britain: Modern Architectures in History*, London 2007

Richards, James, *An Introduction to Modern Architecture*, rev. ed., Harmondsworth 1956 (first publ. 1940)

Richards, James, *Memoirs of an Unjust Fella*, London 1980

Sadler, Simon, *Archigram: Architecture without Architecture*, Cambridge MA 2005

Saint, Andrew, *The Image of the Architect*, New Haven 1983

Saint, Andrew, *Towards a Social Architecture*, New Haven 1987

Scott Brown, Denise, *Having Words*, London 2009

Sharp, Thomas, *The Anatomy of the Village*, Harmondsworth 1946

Sharples, Joseph, Alan Powers, Michael Shippbottom, *Charles Reilly & The Liverpool School of Architecture 1904-1933*, ex. cat., Liverpool 1996

Shattock, Michael, *Making Policy in British Higher Education 1945-2011*, Maidenhead 2012

Smorczewski, Ralph, *Bridging the Gap*, Leicester 2007

Summerson, John, *The Architectural Association 1847-1947*, London 1947

Swenarton, Mark, *Artisans and Architects*, Basingstoke 1989

Swenarton, Mark, *Building the New Jerusalem*, Bracknell 2008

Watkin, David, *The Rise of Architectural History*, London 1980

Woodman, Ellis, *Modernity and Reinvention: The Architecture of James Gowan*, London 2008

[NUS], *NUS Congress, Liverpool, April 1947*, Liverpool 1947

## Edited Books

- Backemeyer, Sylvia, and Theresa Gronberg (eds.), *W R Lethaby*, London 1984
- Boyd, Andrew, and Colin Penn (eds.), *Homes for the People*, London 1946
- Davies, Paul, and Thorsten Schmiedeknecht (eds.), *An Architect's Guide to Fame*, Amsterdam/Oxford 2005
- Dutta, Arindam (ed.), *A Second Modernism: MIT, Architecture and the 'Techno-Social' Moment*, Cambridge MA 2013
- Foyle, Arthur (ed.), *Conference on Tropical Architecture 1953*, London 1954
- Goldhagen, Sarah Williams, and Réjean Legault (eds.), *Anxious Modernisms*, Cambridge MA 2000
- Gowan, James (ed.), *A Continuing Experiment*, London 1975
- Gowan, James (ed.), *Projects: Architectural Association 1946-1971*, London 1973
- Harwood, Elaine, and Alan Powers (eds.), *The Sixties*, London 2002
- Lawrence, Ranald, and Daniel Godoy-Shimizu (eds.), *Prospect: 100 Years Research + Practice*, Cambridge 2012, <http://www.arct.cam.ac.uk/news/100years-research-practice> [accessed 1 Dec 2016]
- Lu, Duanfang (ed.), *Third World Modernism: Architecture, Development and Identity*, Abingdon 2010
- Miller, John (ed.), *Custom and Innovation: John Miller + Partners*, London 2009
- Risselada, Max, and Dirk van Heuvel (eds.), *Team 10 1953-81. In Search of a Utopia of the Present*, Rotterdam 2005
- Robbins, David (ed.), *The Independent Group: Postwar Britain and the Aesthetics of Plenty*, Cambridge MA 1990
- Rogers, E. N., J. Tyrwhitt, J. L. Sert (eds.), *The Heart of the City*, London 1952
- Salmon, Frank (ed.), *Summerson and Hitchcock: Centenary Essays on Architectural Historiography*, London / New Haven 2006
- Sharp, Dennis (ed.), *Planning and Architecture*, London 1967
- Sharp, Dennis (ed.), *Architectural Association 125<sup>th</sup> Anniversary*, London 1973
- Spellman, Catherine, and Karl Unglaub (eds.), *Peter Smithson: Conversations with Students*, New York 2005
- Swenarton, Mark, Tom Avermaete, Dirk van den Heuvel (eds.), *Architecture and the Welfare State*, London / New York 2015
- von Damm, Tile, Anne-Katrin Fenk, Rachel Lee (eds.), *Otto Koenigsberger: Architecture and Urban Visions in India*, Bengaluru/Berlin 2015
- Whyte, Iain Boyd (ed.), *Man-Made Future*, London 2007

## Chapters in Books

- Cantacuzino, Sherban, 'Sir James Richards Interview', in: James Gowan (ed.), *A Continuing Experiment*, London 1975, pp. 45-54
- Carolin, Peter, 'An Outsider's Reflections', in: Ranald Lawrence, Daniel Godoy-Shimizu (eds.), *Prospect: 100 Years Research + Practice*, pp. 17-29, Cambridge 2012, <http://www.arct.cam.ac.uk/news/100years-research-practice> [accessed 1 Dec 2016]

- Chang, Jiat-Hwee, 'Building a Colonial Technoscientific Network: tropical architecture, building science and the politics of decolonization', in: Duanfang Lu (ed.), *Third World Modernism: Architecture, Development and Identity*, Abingdon 2010, pp. 211-235
- Cook, Peter, 'The Electric Decade: An Atmosphere at the AA School 1963-73', in: James Gowan (ed.), *A Continuing Experiment*, London 1975, pp. 137-146
- Darling, Elizabeth, '"Into the world of Conscious Expression": Modernist revolutionaries at the Architectural Association, 1933-39', in: Iain Boyd Whyte (ed.), *Man-Made Future*, Abingdon 2007, pp. 157-173
- Derbyshire, Andrew, and Hugh Morris, 'Arthur Korn: Man and Teacher', in: Dennis Sharp (ed.), *Planning and Architecture*, London 1967, pp. 125-126
- Dunster, David, 'Boyarksy and the Architectural Association', in: Paul Davies, Thorsten Schmiedeknecht (eds.), *An Architect's Guide to Fame*, Amsterdam/Oxford 2005, pp. 33-47
- Fenton, Clive B., '*PLAN*: A student journal of ambition and anxiety', in: Iain Boyd Whyte (ed.), *Man-Made Future*, London 2007, pp. 174-190
- Goldhagen, Sarah Williams, and Réjean Legault, 'Introduction', in: Sarah Williams Goldhagen, Réjean Legault (eds.), *Anxious Modernisms*, Cambridge MA 2000, pp. 11-23
- Gowan, James, 'Arthur Korn Interview', in: James Gowan (ed.), *A Continuing Experiment*, London 1975, pp. 101-106
- Gronberg, Theresa, 'William Richard Lethaby and the Central School of Arts and Crafts', in: Sylvia Backemeyer, Theresa Gronberg (eds.), *W R Lethaby*, London 1984, pp. 14-23
- Jackson, Neil, 'John Summerson and the View From the Outside', in: Frank Salmon (ed.), *Summerson and Hitchcock: Centenary Essays on Architectural Historiography*, London / New Haven 2006, pp. 263-280
- Jencks, Charles, '125 Years of Quasi Democracy', in: James Gowan (ed.), *A Continuing Experiment*, London 1975, pp. 149-159
- Johnson-Marshall, Percy, 'Arthur Korn: Planner', in: Dennis Sharp (ed.), *Planning and Architecture*, London 1967, pp. 129-130
- Lee, Rachel, 'Education', in: Tile von Damm, Anne-Katrin Fenk, Rachel Lee (eds.), *Otto Koenigsberger: Architecture and Urban Visions in India*, Bengaluru/Berlin 2015, pp. 94-103
- Oliver, Paul, 'The Houses in Between', in: James Gowan (ed.), *A Continuing Experiment*, London 1975, pp. 79-88
- Pepper, Simon, 'The beginnings of high-rise social housing in the long 1940s: the case of the LCC and the Woodberry Down estate', in: Mark Swenarton, Tom Avermaete, Dirk van den Heuvel (eds.), *Architecture and the Welfare State*, London / New York 2015, pp. 68-91
- Sadler, Simon, 'The Brutal Birth of Archigram', in: Elain Harwood, Alan Powers (eds.), *The Sixties*, London 2002, pp. 119-128
- Scott Brown, Denise, 'Learning from Brutalism', in: David Robbins (ed.), *The Independent Group: Postwar Britain and the Aesthetics of Plenty*, Cambridge MA 1990, pp. 203-206
- Sudjic, Deyan, 'John Miller: Biographical Notes', in: John Miller (ed.), *Custom and Innovation: John Miller + Partners*, London 2009, pp. 8-23
- Summerson, John, 'Introduction', in: Trevor Dannatt, *Modern Architecture in Britain*, London 1959, pp. 11-28

## Journal Papers and Magazine Articles

- Anderson, Stanford, 'Architectural History in Schools of Architecture', *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, Sep 1999, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 282-290
- Baweja, Vandana, 'Otto Koenigsberger and Modernist Historiography', *Fabrications*, vol. 26 (2016), no. 2, pp. 202-226
- Brandon-Jones, John, 'Architects and the Art Workers' Guild', *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, March 1973, vol. 121, no. 5200, pp. 192-206
- Chang, Jiat-Hwee, 'Thermal comfort and climatic design in the tropics: an historical critique', *Journal of Architecture*, vol. 21, no. 8 (2016), pp. 1171-1202
- Cook, Peter, 'Regarding the Smithsons', *Architectural Review*, July 1982, vol. 172, no. 1025, pp. 36-43
- Darling, Elizabeth, 'Focus: a Little Magazine and Architectural Modernism in 1930s Britain', *Journal of Modern Periodical Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1 (2012), pp. 39-63
- Forty, Adrian, and Thomas Weaver, 'In Conversation with John Winter', *AA Files*, no. 63 (2011), pp. 19-31
- Gold, John R., "'A Very Serious Responsibility'? The MARS Group, Internationality and Relations with CIAM, 1933-39', *Architectural History*, no. 56 (2013), pp. 249-275
- Herbert, Roy, 'Keeping a human scale', *New Scientist*, 5 Feb 1976, pp. 290-292
- Keller, Sean, 'Fenland Tech: Architectural Science in Postwar Cambridge', *Grey Room*, no. 23 (Spring 2006), pp. 40-65
- Le Roux, Hannah, 'The networks of tropical architecture', *Journal of Architecture*, vol. 8 (Autumn 2003), pp. 337-354
- Mardell, Joshua, 'Far From the Madding Crowd', *AA Files*, no. 66 (2013), pp. 87-99
- Maxwell, Robert, 'Education for the creative act', *Architectural Research Quarterly*, vol. 4, no. 1 (March 2000), pp. 55-66
- Neumann, Eva-Marie, 'Architectural Proportion in Britain, 1945-1957', *Architectural History*, vol. 39 (1996), pp. 197-221
- Powers, Alan, 'Architectural Education and the Arts and Crafts Movement in Britain', *Architectural Education*, no. 3 (1983), pp. 42-70
- Powers, Alan, 'Edwardian Architectural Education: A Study of Three Schools of Architecture', *AA Files*, no. 5 (1984), pp. 48-59
- Powers, Alan, 'Flying Angels and Solid Walls', *AA Files*, no. 64 (2012), pp. 48-58
- Powers, Alan, 'Goodhart-Rendel: The Appropriateness of Style', *Architectural Design*, Oct/Nov 1979, pp. 44-51
- Proctor, Robert, 'The Architect's Intention: Interpreting Post-War Modernism through the Architect Interview', *Journal of Design History*, vol. 19, no. 4 (Winter 2006), pp. 295-307
- Richardson, William, 'In search of the further education of young people in post-war England', *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, Sep 2007, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 385-418
- Sadler, Simon, 'Archigram's invisible university', *Architectural Research Quarterly*, vol. 6, no. 3 (2002), pp. 247-255
- Scalbert, Irénée, 'Leben und Kunst als Parallelen', *Daidalos*, no. 75 (2000), pp. 53-65
- Shane, Grahame, 'Alvin Boyarsky (1928-1990)', *Journal of Architectural Education*, May 1992, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 189-190
- Sharp, Dennis, 'Obituary: Paul Hamilton - Modernist architect specialising in transport buildings', *Independent*, 20 April 2004, p. 35

- Sharp, Dennis (ed.), 'Arthur Korn (1891-1978) in memoriam', *AA quarterly*, vol. 11, no. 3 (1979), pp. 49-53
- Stalder, Laurent, "New Brutalism", "Topology" and "Image": Some remarks on the architectural debates in England around 1950', *Journal of Architecture*, vol. 13, no. 3 (2008), pp. 263-281
- [Stamp, Gavin], 'An interview with John Brandon-Jones: "Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive"', *Architectural Design*, Oct/Nov 1979, pp. 96-101
- Steadman, Philip, 'Research in architecture and urban studies at Cambridge in the 1960s and 1970s: what really happened', *Journal of Architecture*, vol. 21, no. 2 (2016), pp. 291-306
- Stevens, Garry, 'Angst in Academia: Universities, the Architecture Schools and the Profession', *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, vol. 15, no. 2 (Summer 1998), pp. 152-169
- Sunwoo, Irene, 'From the "Well-Laid Table" to the "Market Place:" The Architectural Association Unit System', *Journal of Architectural Education*, March 2012, pp. 24-41
- Sunwoo, Irene, 'Pedagogy's Progress: Alvin Boyarsky's International Institute of Design', *Grey Room*, no. 34 (2009), pp. 28-57
- Swenarton, Mark, 'The Role of History in Architectural Education', *Architectural History*, 1989, pp. 201-215
- Swenarton, Mark, and Thomas Weaver, 'In Conversation with John Miller', *AA Files*, no. 70 (2015), pp. 124-137
- Toppin, David, 'Koenigsberger: Early Days Abroad', *Architects' Journal*, 7 July 1982, pp. 36-37
- Wakely, Patrick, 'The Development of a School: An Account of the Department of Development and Tropical Studies of the Architectural Association', *Habitat International*, vol. 7, no. 5/6 (1983), pp. 337-346
- Ward, Stephen V., 'Soviet communism and the British planning movement: rational learning or Utopian imagining?', *Planning Perspectives*, Oct 2012, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 499-524
- Whiteley, Nigel, 'Modern Architecture, Heritage and Englishness', *Architectural History*, vol. 38 (1995), pp. 220-237
- Whyte, William, 'The Englishness of English Architecture: Modernism and the Making of a National International Style, 1927-1957', *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 48 (2009), pp. 441-465

## Online Articles

- Bottoms, Edward, 'Jordan, (John) Robert Furneaux (1905-1978)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford 2011, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/63137> [accessed 21 June 2014]
- Sheppard, Richard (rev. Alan Powers), 'Yorke, Francis Reginald Stevens (1906-1962)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford 2004 (online ed., 2011), <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37067> [accessed 21 June 2014]
- Smith, Greg, 'Richard Hobin', <http://www.lostproperty.org.nz/architects/hobin> [accessed 26 July 2016]
- Stevenson, Graham, 'Graeme Shankland', <http://www.grahamstevenson.me.uk> [accessed 25 June 2014]
- van Heuvel, Dirk, 'Team 10 and its Topicalities', conference paper, TU Delft, 5-6 June 2003, <http://www.team10online.org/research/papers/delft2/heuvel.pdf> [accessed 26 Feb 2012]
- Welter, Volker, 'Talking Squares - Grids and Grilles as architectural analytical and communicative tools', conference paper, TU Delft, 5-6 June 2003, <http://www.team10online.org/research/papers/delft2/welter.pdf> [accessed 10 Sep 2015]



## APPENDICES

