Constructing Education: 1961-69

Kate Linzey, Interior Design, Massey University, Wellington

ABSTRACT: The 1960s were a time of great change and growth in New Zealand's tertiary eduction sector, and the university-based discipline of architecture was in no way exempt from this progress. In response to the Parry Report of 1959-1960, the New Zealand government passed the 1961 Universities Act, which dissolved the federated University of New Zealand. This Act opened the way for the independence of the four universities of Auckland, Victoria, Canterbury and Otago, and the two allied agricultural colleges of Massey and Lincoln. Under the federated university system, Auckland University College had been the centre of architectural training, and had delivered extramural course through colleges in the other centres. As the "disproportionate number" of extramural and part-time study had been criticisms levelled by the Parry Report, it was obvious that another School of Architecture would now be required, but where? Ever an argumentative association, members of the New Zealand Institute of Architects engaged in a lively debate on the choice, positing Victoria University in Wellington, and Canterbury University in Christchurch, as the major contenders. By the end of the decade university-based architectural training would expand at both Auckland and (the new) Wellington Schools, New Zealand's first PhD in Architecture would be conferred on Dr John Dickson, and many of the careers of architects and architectural academics who went on to construct the discipline as it is today, had begun.

> I was tempted, at one stage in preparing this paper, to ask whether, if the architectural profession had not existed today [1969], would anyone bother to invent it … Perhaps in some respects, that is just what we have to do.
>
> I. B. Reynolds[1]

Nineteen-sixties New Zealand architectural education suffered under the long white cloud of insecurity, caused by the combined effects of the post-war building boom, the 1924 Engineers Act, rapidly advancing building technologies and increasingly complex projects. Members of the New Zealand Institute of Architects (NZIA) were in a spin, leading many to question what role, if at all, architects would have in the future. The 1961 Universities Act and the 1963 Architects Act both instituted the end of the already fading office-based training of architects. University education suddenly became a significant component of an architect's training, leaving NZIA members with increasing fears of loss of control of the building industry.

Under the aegis of "education," members of the NZIA disputed the contemporary function of "Architecture," developing hypothetical syllabuses, producing dissertations on what they did as architects, and (often) expounding the value of generalist, rather than specialist, training. Being "able to design well"[2] was not considered to be enough to save the role of the architect, though suggestions for what students should learn ranged widely; from engineering to economics, and construction to anthropology. Typically, these suggestions responded to international trends in architectural thinking, however they were also reactions to local events, particularly the problem of where, and when, a second school of architecture would open in New Zealand.

The state of architecture and the problem of "change"

We live in revolutionary times. Is it any surprise that we hear of a revolutionary architecture and building in the 20th century?[3]

In 1961 the "Presidential Address" to the

[1] Reynolds "Changing Society and its Influence on Architects" p 162.

[2] Laurenson "Architectural Practice" pp 126-140.

[3] Salmond "Modern Architecture Reflects Our Way of Life" pp 21-25.

NZIA, given by Professor CR Knight[4] warned members, now that Modernism had popular appeal, architects ran the risk of their designs becoming clichéd, and Modernism becoming little more than a style.

> It is important to constantly remind ourselves of the principles upon which it is based. It began, you will remember, as a protest against the insincerity of Renaissance forms when applied to a post-Renaissance society… It protested against the over-decoration of the Victorian period being used for … the needs of democratic society: low cost housing, bridges, power stations, factories and commercial structures …
> Contemporary architecture is "functional." It is controlled by "economy" and its artistic quality is judged by "truth," the fundamental criterion of all art.[5]

Mr AL Salmond provided a similar image the following year in a paper titled "Modern Architecture Reflects Our Way of Life." For Salmond, the contemporary architect was a social realist who in turn "realised" society according to the Bauhaus idea of the *gestalt*. He defined Modernism by the maxim: forms follows function, and suggested that it was not that New Zealand architects had not liked Modernism before the 1960s, but that New Zealand clients had not had equal vision. In Salmond's discussion, though clearly associated with tight budgets and fast building techniques, Modern design was "economical" and "technologically advanced" rather than "cheap" or "expedient."

> The architect has always considered himself the leader of the building teams. Until now he has felt that this position was his by right… With the developments which have taken place over the last 20 years and the demands which have been and are being made by powerful organizations such as engineers, builders and government departments, the architect must not be content only with negotiating a working arrangement from a position of defence. The success of the future of our relatively small but important profession will be to show the public that we are in fact the leaders of the building industry. In order to do this we require more in our kit of tools than be able to design well.[6]

By the 1960s, the Modern movement, which demonised Victorian architecture as the mere application of decoration, and adored the crisp certainty of engineering, had become *de rigueur*, but this left architects in something of a quandary. Building production was booming, and buildings themselves were booming in size and complexity. The 1924 Engineers Registration Act, left architects dependant on engineers to signing off on structural details, and as a result the New Zealand Institute of Engineers (NZIE) had become far more powerful than the NZIA. Modern architects wouldn't be caught dead designing "decoration," but engineers were required to design all the structure, so what was there left for an architect to do, much less to train young architects to do?

The *NZIA Journal* took to publishing articles defining what architects do (though they had always been quite popular), and Graeme Laurenson's "Architectural Practice" was a comprehensive example of this. He listed the significant areas of practice as: design, construction and the supervision and administration of contracts. It is in these latter two areas that Laurenson was most concerned, suggesting that these were "aspects in which the graduate is by no means adequately served and these shortcomings which show themselves up, in practice and elsewhere."[7] Having a thorough grounding in construction technologies and business management would, he suggested, and most agreed, would secure a return of the architect to the head of the building industry.

[4] Head of School of Architecture at Auckland University College.

[5] Knight "Presidential Address" pp 27-32.

[6] Laurenson "Architectural Practice" pp 126-140.

[7] NZIA President 1963-1964

NZIA versus the "Parry Report" (1959) & the Universities Act (1961)

In the 1959 *Report of the Committee of New Zealand Universities*, otherwise known as the Parry Report, defined the function of universities in contemporary society:

> to generate the seeds of speculative thought and new knowledge; to stimulate as well as to inform the young; to hold up both the image of the past and as the possible shape of the future.[8]

and, through the University Extension Programmes, to provide courses that *in a rapidly developing society* allow that society to "keep itself abreast of change" and "to have the qualified personnel it requires to direct its development."[9] The report recorded the growth in post-war in student numbers (a 3,000 increase, approximately 30%, between 1947 and 1959) and more significantly, forecast numbers reaching 25 to 27, 000 by 1969. The report also revealed the poor state of university-based architectural study; compared to engineering, architecture student numbers were tiny (equivalent full-time students, 1955 104:12, 1956 94:3, 1957 94:10, 1958 118:7), and there were no post-graduate degrees at all. To make matters worse, a very high proportion of architecture students were studying part-time and extramurally. The report criticized professions, such as architecture[10] but also law, which benefited from cheap part-time students' labour, at the expense of those students' high failure rate. In conclusion, the report recommended: a) timetables should be rearranged to offer all courses during the day, b) degrees be remodeled to ensure integration of degree subjects, c) special regulations be formulated to address low-pass students, and d) for those student who cannot meet these new requirements, diploma courses be established.[11] The report suggested graduates from diploma courses would fill the role of "technician," in contrast to "technologists."

> A technologist has studied the fundamental principles of his chosen technology and should be able to use his knowledge and experience to initiate practical developments.[12]

"Technologists," such as architects, were to be graduates of technical professional disciplines, but with an "ability to use knowledge" and to "push forward the boundaries of knowledge." It was these features that differentiated a University professional degree programme, from a Technical College diploma.

The Report also recommended that, rather than *laissez-faire* expansion, the four universities of Auckland (AU), Victoria (VUW), Canterbury (Illam) and Otago (OU), should be encouraged to cultivate their existing strengths:

> Victoria University, located at the seat of Central Government, might be encouraged to foster post-graduate studies and research in economics and government as areas of special strength. Canterbury and Auckland universities need a special concentration of strength in the physical sciences and mathematics, to provide support for their schools of engineering. Otago needs strong departments in the biological and physical sciences, in support of its medical and dental faculties.[13]

In general, the Parry Report was well received. Its language and intent was ultimately empowering to the university academics and disciplines, it rated excellence

[8] Committee on New Zealand Universities *Report of the Committee on New Zealand Universities* p 10.

[9] Committee on New Zealand Universities *Report of the Committee on New Zealand Universities* p 11.

[10] Of the 297 architecture students counted, 118 were part-time.

[11] Committee on New Zealand Universities *Report of the Committee on New Zealand Universities* p 41.

[12] Committee on New Zealand Universities *Report of the Committee on New Zealand Universities* p 79.

[13] Committee on New Zealand Universities *Report of the Committee on New Zealand Universities* p 94.

above any other concern, and encouraged a large increase in funding for the universities for everything from buildings and staff salaries to library books. The professional disciplines, such as law and architecture did share the problem of being required to release their office juniors during working hours, resulting in accusations from both architecture and law of the universities' limited understanding of practice, and the naive state in which graduates would arrive in the office on completion of their professional degree. The NZIA was also put out by the finding that:[14]

> regarding a school of architecture, additional to that at Auckland. We do not think the Auckland School has been fully developed yet and we recommend that it be expanded to cater for all national needs in the immediate future. When further development is required, we suggest that consideration be given to siting it in conjunction with the engineering and fine arts schools in Canterbury.[15]

Within the NZIA however, the "not early" establishment of another architecture programme was declaimed:

> Auckland has an established attraction rate, of which the size of the school is no criterion. There has never been any limit placed on the number of entrants, consequently the size of Auckland is based upon the number it attracts.[16]

Of note is that the report found in favour of Ilam, rather than VUW, and thereby aligned Architecture with Engineering and Fine Art, its traditional bedfellows, rather than the human sciences: sociology, economics and politics, connections which were increasingly made by architectural theory. As the NZIA "Second School" debate emerged, this division becomes growing a point of contention. What was also buried beneath the divide, was VUW's desire for a School of Engineering. Engineering is a prestigious discipline, and the numbers of engineering students far exceed architecture students. The resources they required, at least in the early '60s, were similar, and later the Vice-Chancellor of VUW revealed that on gaining an architecture school, an engineering school would soon follow. The report's response to VUW's request for an engineering school, suggested:

> we … recommend against the early establishment of another School of Engineering … Victoria University should consult with the Department of Education regarding the present and future developments at the Central Technical College at Petone … with the view to assuming responsibility for technological programmes there as they are developed to a university diploma or degree level.[17]

From the Parry Report, in 1961 the Universities Act was passed, disestablishing the University Colleges of New Zealand, and replacing it with the four separate universities. AU became the "centre of architectural education in the Dominion," and the NZIA, officially located in Wellington, could only watch from afar to see what the programme was getting up to. To comply with the demand that architecture students spend more time on campus in full time study, the NZIA exams shifted into line with the university exams, of which Prof. Knight announced:

> This, in my opinion, was a wise decision. It raises the status of architecture as a learned profession in the

[14] Of note are those who made submissions to the Report Committee: the NZIA, NZIA Canterbury Branch, Dean of the Auckland College School of Architecture, and Professor of Architectural Design RH Toy.

[15] Committee on New Zealand Universities *Report of the Committee on New Zealand Universities* p 96.

[16] Marshall and Warren "The Case for a Second School of Architecture" pp 152-153.

[17] Committee on New Zealand Universities *Report of the Committee on New Zealand Universities* p 95. As it turns out, the proposed connection with the Wellington Polytechnic would later provide useful leverage in VUW's joust with Ilam.

University and will eventually do so in the public minds.[18]

The transition to a new syllabus was difficult, but he believed, was "to the advantage of all students as the "new course is so much better than the old one."" The removal of students from the office, amplified the existing staffing shortage, and through the "Technicians Certification Authority," a new architectural draughtsmen syllabus was developed[19] to be taught through the Dominion's Technical Colleges.

It is hoped that this new course will, within a short time, go a long way toward solving the acute shortage of staff in architect's offices through out the Dominion. It should attract an untouched group of valuable workers offering congenial employment with opportunities for promotion and a recognised status.[20]

When Prof. Knight, who obviously had an abiding interest in university education, moved out of the presidential chair, to be replaced by Salmond, anxiety over the ability of universities to "train" architects, quickly surfaced.

[18] Knight "Presidential Address" p 31.
[19] Technicians' Certificate Authority "Course for Building Technicians and Architectural Draughtsmen" pp 49-52.
[20] Knight "Presidential Address" p 30.

The new system to my mind, will also leave much to be desired in the training of future architects… A school training can provide only the foundation upon which a competent architect is built… The whole success of our new training rests on the adequacy of the school… the "down to earth" side of the architect's education – practical experience. Life today is based on cold hard facts. It is no use training architects in the design and construction of buildings only… We must give the public that feeling of confidence in us as businessmen; that the investment they are about to make is in good hands.[21]

The detached status of university staff, out of touch with the "down to earth" aspects of the industry became a common accusation. Possibly as a response, in September of 1962 the *NZIA Journal* was published as a special issue on "Architectural Education," providing a detailed description of the "new" course; the editorial justified this saying:

Partly because of its location in Auckland and possibly due to the tendency of any large centre of population to become self-centred, there has in the past been criticism of the school and a feeling that it is remote and out of touch. It is to our mutual benefit that we should have a clear knowledge of the aims of the school and the methods used to attain them.[22]

The special issue, prepared by staff and students at the school, began by defining the nature of the New Zealand building industry as that in which high labour costs needed to be economised by technically advanced and efficient techniques. By treating the industry as a whole, rather than a series of segmented specialist services, it was suggested, architects could manage the building process and control project expenses. To this end, the course aimed to encourage teamwork, to primarily develop generalist skills, but to allow for specialisation in the later stages of the degree. Areas cited as in need of extended study included the integration of services in to the design process, urban development, and forecasting the future accommodation needs of New Zealand society. For this the report suggested:

What is required is a post-graduate research team in which the town planner, sociologist, economist, building technologist, engineer and services engineer may be represented working on a specific community problem, examining its needs and producing a solution which is built and tested by use.[23]

Despite identifying the desirability of 1:1 "test projects," this description also sets architects in a field with sociologists and economists. If,

[21] Salmond "Presidential Address" pp 66-8.
[22] Mitchinson "Editorial" (1962) p 225.
[23] School of Architecture "Architectural Education" pp 227-257.

when considering the suggestion of the Parry Report, that Victoria University should build its strengths in areas relevant to central government, the defining of architectural research in this way, at least superficially, supports the argument for a second school in Wellington, rather than Canterbury.

The school programme is defined as essentially studio based, with supporting lectures and laboratory-based papers, suggesting that the creative act of architecture results from: "The difficult process of fusing knowledge with particular purposes and situations." Knowledge of the sciences, both technological and social, were "increasingly operative in all building situations" and their study and application "to environment and construction" should frame studio classes. "Change," in the organization of communities, population growth, use of transportation, development of communications and the technologies of construction, were highlighted: "all these changes together are factors in design and the determination of form which play a more important part now than in the past and will continue to do so in the future."[24]

[24] School of Architecture "Architectural Education" p 233.

After studio, "Materials, Structures, Services and Techniques" are explained, including samples of student balsa-and-cotton structural experiments and designs for "advanced structural forms made but not designed by the students." "Professional Practice" and "Colour Work" take a page each, while "History" covers two pages, in order to explain that:

> the School of Architecture abandoned the subject of History of Decoration … because the battle of the styles was over, and even architectural "decoration" was (seemingly) over … the History of Architecture course … [has given] enhanced emphasis on structural knowledge … and town planning … This follows very clearly the present preoccupations of the profession and shows that historical studies need not be a dead branch on the tree of present-day knowledge.[25]

[25] School of Architecture "Architectural Education" p 244. Speaking of trees, in the earlier 1959 Prospectus of the School of Architecture, the course is defined as the study of: society, history & economics, climate and geography, materials and labour, together with technology and professional practice. The first five attributes follow that of Sir Banister Fletcher's "Tree of Architecture": economics and professional practice replaces religion and geology a factor of technology. Banister Fletcher's *A History of Architecture* was a set text for the history papers at this time, while students studied Le Corbusier and Walter Gropius in theory. By 1970, Le Corbusier and Gropius had become history texts, while the phenomologist, Norberg-Schultz had become the primary theory text.

The 1962 special issue on architectural education ended with "A Student Comment." The style of writing changes dramatically into something that rings bells of the future hippie idealisms, foreshadow the tone of a future pedagogy as will not be heard in the journal again until 1967, and then Americans will voice it.

> Now is the time to do some original thinking, research … our most valuable moments are when we discover something for ourselves. It is not merely a problem of bringing in consultants to teach students what they ought to know – because few consultants can know themselves what students ought to know. Architecture cannot be taught, it must be learnt.[26]

Architects Act (1963) and the AERB

> Standards should be set with full appreciation of the impact of rapidly changing conditions. Education to degree standard … should introduce subjects such as the social sciences, management and the art of communication.[27]

The Act, which brought architecture into parity with engineering, also reaffirmed the trend toward formal university-based training for architects. It recognized graduation from the programme at AU as the only educational

[26] School of Architecture "Architectural Education" p 257.
[27] Mitchinson "Editorial" (1964) p 24.

standard by which a person could become a registered architect, and also established the Architects' Education and Registration Board [a parallel of the Engineers' Association Registration Board] to set out further practice-based examinations. As the editorial of the February 1964 *NZIA Journal* stated:

> The annual report of the Committee of Architectural Education will this year be studied with more than usual interest. There is a growing awareness that the education of the architect will determine the quality and status of the profession in the future. There is at present some concern and dissatisfaction with the … [failure rate] … of the architectural intermediate examination … It has been successful … in reducing wastage in the first and second professional years, though … [some complain that it has] … debarred some young men who would have been an asset to the profession …There is at present only one School of Architecture and some form of screen is necessary if its facilities are not to be hopelessly over taxed. [28]

The NZIA set its sights on full parity with the older, larger and more powerful Institute of Engineers (NZIE) stating:

> The architectural intermediate examination must ensure the standard of entry to the profession is at least no lower than that of comparable professions, and the subsequent training of the architect must recognize that his role in the modern world is the leader of a team, that design ability must be matched by competence in management, and that in some respects the sensitive designing engineer and the architect are moving closer to each other. [29]

Though perhaps read with "unusual interest," the report was not provided by the journal. Instead, the Committee on Education was asked to respond to worries raised "on the subject of the invasion of the architect's sphere by others" at the 1964 AGM of the Institute, by "carrying out … close scrutiny of architectural education."[30] What followed was a "Policy Statement on Education" covering the topics: General Architectural Education, Building Technology Courses, Post-Graduate and Refresher Studies and Draughting and Technicians' Courses. To construct the ideology behind this general statement, the committee looked to historical models: beginning with Sir Henry Wotton's (1624) citing the Vitruvian: commodity, firmness and delight, and ending with the Charter of I.U.A: "If he is to express the aspirations and minister to the needs of his age, he must have both knowledge and understanding of the human situation in its widest sense, while showing a constant regard for economic realities, and for all other relevant factors." From these extremes, the committee concluded that there were three major legs and one minor leg to architecture: "construction and materials" "art and imagination" and "business," with the addition "communications."[31] These legs became the four points of:

(a) Constructive skill and knowledge of building materials
(b) A developed skill and knowledge of building materials
(c) Business ability
(d) A knowledge of managemental skills to assist in the communication of ideas and information, and also in the establishment of design analyses and procedures.[32]

The policy affirmed the need for the basic architectural education to remain "generalist," but to allow for specialisation in later stages of education. In the following December issue of the journal, Senior Lecturer Peter Middleton published a proposed "Ideal Course,"[33] calling

[28] Mitchinson "Editorial" (1964) p 24.

[29] Mitchinson "Editorial" (1964) p 24.

[30] Committee on Architectural Education "Architectural Education" pp 181-183.

[31] Three-legged-stools are, after all, notoriously unstable!

[32] Vitruvian "commodity" has been interpreted in the economic sense, and "delight" has all but disappeared. Committee on Architectural Education "Architectural Education" p 182.

[33] Middleton "The Institute's Policy on the Education of

for an integrated yet differentiated School of Building:

> Such a course must be as much selective as instructive. It must be able to reject those with insufficient ability, but it must also direct those with varying types of ability into the appropriate channel. This latter should be done largely by educating students to make the most appropriate personal preferences.[34]

The assertion of hierarchy within the building industry by the Institute, and the conviction that a principal architect should be at the top of it, is a recurrent theme. One NZIA member commented: "Although a hierarchy exists in the profession in reality, the present education system sets out to make us all admirals, whereas most will be long service petty officers."[35] Middleton also goes some way to define the superior skills required by any wishing to become a principal architect:

> the special skills required by principals … These may be called management skill and business ability (or acumen) … Management skill … is based on theories of decision-making and communication, which might be [taught alone] … with systematic building as a preliminary or core subject … Business acumen is, on the other hand, an understanding of the market, which is largely a matter of will.[36]

For the Design Studio component of the course Middleton proposed: "a series of projects with the necessary theoretical underpinning (room planning, circulation etc)." The majority of papers focused on structures, pure sciences, building technology and services, and commercial practice. Those that did not, were based upon "Theory of Culture I & II," which he described as:

> concerned with anthropologist's "culture," not the vultures … Under Culture are subsumed such matters as social structure, economics, human behaviour, notions of time and space, methods of learning, play, belief systems, and epistemologies … The intention of these two highfalutin subjects is to provide a theoretical basis for the training of management skills and for the understanding of building owners' needs … Straight tuition would be supplemented by exercises, e.g. war games.[37]

The course outlined two years of intermediate study, at which point students could leave and become:

> useful building technologists, but they could not expect to rise to the higher ranks. It might be possible to admit some to a limited registration (say for domestic-type construction …).

Others could elect to complete two years of either a BBldgTech ("for builders") or a BArch. ("the predictive side"). These programmes flow seamlessly into Masters degrees. Within the Architecture Bachelor and Master degrees there are two streams: one stream maintains design studio, while the other picks up physics and mathematics. The candidates of these two streams are described as "designers, on the one hand, and elaborators and transmitters on the other…" but these definitions get no further elaboration.

The last activity of the NZIA Committee on Education was to produce a report on the Architects' Education and Registration Board (AERB). The report was from a survey mailed out to 188 architectural firms. The intention of the enquiry is not very clear, as the AERB itself is not investigated at all. The survey reports back with statistics of how many principles, partners, assistants and draughtsmen work in offices, though no clear pattern emerges except that the desired principle to draughtsmen ratio was 1:1.5. It is

Architects" pp 384-387.

[34] Middleton "The Institute's Policy on the Education of Architects" p 385.

[35] Anon. "Education Committee" p 192.

[36] Middleton "The Institute's Policy on the Education of Architects" p 385.

[37] "History and Geography of Architecture" and "Town Planning" were considered "special extensions of Theory of Culture."

noted that 46% of people working in offices had no architectural qualification at all. The only recommendations that KD Marshall, the convenor could make were the distribution of the statistics and the disbanding of the committee.

A Second School of Architecture

Ever since the establishment of a School of Architecture at Auckland, in 1919, Victoria University had been lobbying for its own school.[38] Due to the large number of part-time, extramural students studying architecture in Wellington in the early half of the century, the Architectural Centre was established (1946). Like the origins of the London Architecture Association, the Centre aimed to provide, among other things, a supportive community to assist office based students by providing lectures and studio critiques. The 1949, February/March issue of the *Design Review* included an educational supplement outlining a programme of study proposed by the Centre, based largely on the University College programme. The course was to take five years, concluding with students submitting "Testimonies of Study" to the national college for examination. The Head of School was listed as A Graham Kofoed, other staff included EV Dawson, E Plischke, G Dawson and Elizabeth Taylor (History II).

In 1957 the idea of a school in Wellington emerged again, perhaps as the Parry Report was initiated. The NZIA Wellington Branch made moves to promote the idea of a second school at Victoria College, to the then New Zealand University Senate. At an AGM in 1958 the Canterbury members proposed that the University Senate be left to decide where such a school might be located, however this motion failed. The University Senate took no effective action in response, and in 1961 the University Grants Committee (which allocated funding to the four separated Universities), replaced the Senate.

RW Taylor of Canterbury raised the issue of the "second school" again, this time at the 1964 AGM.[39] Taylor argued for a School at Ilam citing the Parry Report's recommendation based upon the special schools of fine art and engineering already existing on the site. He also stated that accommodation would be available after 1965, and that the great distance students have to travel from Southland to Auckland surely was an inhibition to southern students. EV Dawson,[40] of Wellington, replied that he was "talking to the Secretary of the Grants Committee" and it was an appropriate to apply to them for a new school at this time, including an indication of where the NZIA would prefer such a school to be located. Dawson added that he would prefer a school immediately in Wellington, than in 10 years time at Canterbury, which GF Dawson[41] of Auckland, seconded. Several members however, including past presidents AL Salmond,[42] DA Sayers of South Auckland and KD Marshall[43] of Christchurch, responded in favor of a Canterbury School. At which point J Lindsay Mair, chair of the Wellington branch, protested claiming that a previous proposal for a school in Wellington had been aired and supported by several members in the room. He argued that Wellington was still the best place, on the grounds that a greater proportion of the national population lived in the North Island, and that it was close to central government. P

[38] Barrowman *University of Victoria Wellington* pp 188-189.

[39] "Minutes of the N.Z.I.A. AGM" pp 71-76.

[40] NZIA President 1965-1966
[41] NZIA President 1967-1968
[42] NZIA President 1961-1962
[43] NZIA President 1969-1970

Pascoe responded by stating that it was best if the matter were decided by national, rather than provincial, needs. However, Mair went on to explain that the Canterbury Branch had already registered interest with their local University, at which FH Harris retorted: "it was essential and wrong for a Branch to go and carry on … for its own benefit without warning Council first … In effect, they had been using these circumstances to push their own barrow …" In the end, a motion was passed (18 to 6) to the effect that the NZIA would support an application to the University Grants Committee for a second school in Christchurch. A report called "The Case for a Second School of Architecture"[44] published in the following June issue of the *NZIA Journal* outlining the need for a second school to be located at Canterbury, and in the "Council Minutes" for October JL Mair reported that meetings with both Canterbury and Victoria Universities were immanent.

After a period of silence on the matter, a small notice in the July 1966 issue of the *NZIA Journal* announced that the University Grants Committee had agreed to the establishment of two new schools of architecture, the first to open in Wellington, at Victoria University.[45] There was nothing to explain the grounds of the choice, only a statement from the Victoria University Council regarding the need to develop an academic and physical programme, and that they were aiming to produce 40 graduates a year. For the University's Vice-Chancellor, the win was a means to the true end, of establishing an Engineering school on the site: "We are pinning our hopes for our first entry into the field of technology on the University Grants Committee giving us the "go-ahead" on the establishment of a School of Architecture."[46] The March 1965 NZIA policy on education, published during the silence, firmly aligned an architect's education with that of building technology. During the 1964 AGM debate, it was announced that the Master Builders Association desired to establish a new School of Building. Those on the Canterbury benches had stated that it was to open in Christchurch, and WD Wilson worried at what might happen if a discipline of building technology *sans* architecture might one day produce graduates to displace architects. Mair responded robustly by stating that he had been "told by the master builders … just ten days ago… that they favored the course being established at Auckland." After 1966, it was announced that the proposed VUW architecture programme would be "more practical and technological … [complimenting] Victoria's strength in terrestrial geophysics," this was opposed to Auckland's "beaux-arts" style.[47] While complaining there was still no school, one whole year later, the editorial of the March 1967 *NZIA Journal* noted "[t]he Institute had its own … stated policy on architectural education, which incidentally [was] in line with the Victoria proposal." When it did eventually open in 1975, the course, including a Bachelor of Building Science, followed the 2+2(+2) model that Middleton had proposed, but with the addition of a first intermediate year. VUW was to develop a close working relationship with the Wellington Polytechnic, and its building technologies programme, as had been suggested by the Parry Report.

[44] Marshall and Warren "The Case for a Second School of Architecture" pp 152-153.

[45] "News and Notices" p 218.

[46] [Vice-chancellor to Prof. A.M. Kennedy, 8 Aug. 1968, VC file 1088; Quinquennial submission, 1970–75, June 1968] Barrowman *University of Victoria Wellington* pp 188-189.

[47] Barrowman *University of Victoria Wellington* pp 188-189.

1967 and beyond: Voices from America and the first PhD (Architecture)

The essential problem faced by architects in the 1960s was the contradiction between the demands of the 1961 Universities Act and the 1963 Architects' Act, which required an increasing level of university-style rigor in the training of architects, and Modernism that refuted the status of the Beaux-arts – the only established tradition of university-based architectural study. Modern architects could not be asked to study the classical orders, nor to produce water-coloured proposals for garden follies, but the implicit desire to maintain the traditional "gentlemanly" status of architects at the head of the building industry (or to at least to hold parity with engineering), also required professional (technologist) training, rather than technical college training. As a result, New Zealand architecture had to look for other, more modern, disciplines, such as engineering, commerce, and sociology, to establish what, other than design, could be "useful" knowledge. At the same time, few of the practicing architects of the early 1960s had been required to study on campus at university. Few would have had an understanding of what is possible, and impossible, to do with students in such a setting, tending to result in prescriptive, rather than liberal, curricula. This however begins to change in 1967, when an essay titled "Architectural Education in the United States" appeared in the *NZIA Journal*.[48] The essay calls for a "new educational policy" to meet all the same concerns recognized by the NZIA, but for the first time, this new policy cites "design" as the basis of this new policy.

> A capability to effectively synthesise design data is the unique contribution of design-oriented professionals (architects, engineers an planners). Yet prevalent curricula show a blatant disregard for the proper nurturing on this vital quality in the education of environmental designers. [49]

The essay argued that the error up till this time had been a failure to treat new technologies in an architectural way, relying instead on engineering methods. At the College of Architecture at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Day Ding and Burchard claim, a "significantly novel curriculum" had been devised which overcomes this problem. Design studio has been transformed into "a free exploratory laboratory experience," where "searching" had more emphasis than "answering" design problems.

> responsibility is increasingly placed upon the student-architect to identify the resource persons… necessary to his development as a designer, to his identification, programming, and conceptualization of environmental need, and to his command of the process of design and the systems with which he constructs environments. [50]

It is a little hard to imagine how the practising fraternity would have responded to such an outpouring of idealist and egalitarian vision, not least of all, the title "student-architect." Subsequently, four essays were published from a symposium on "Architectural Education," convened by RAJ Smith (an engineer) but run under the auspices of the School of Architecture and University of Auckland Extension Programme. Papers were presented by the convenor, the president of the NZIA (G Dawson), two engineers (AL Titchener & F. Lu) and an educationalist (EW Braithwaite). The *NZIA Journal* however, refrained from reproducing Titchener's essay, which had perhaps begun to sound dated. He had suggested that architects required an engineer's training less the final year of specialisation, and that the current interest by

[48] Day Ding and Burchard "Architectural Education in the United States" pp 168-174.

[49] Day Ding and Burchard "Architectural Education in the United States" p 169.

[50] Day Ding and Burchard "Architectural Education in the United States" p 17.

architects in sociology was a load of tosh. That neither of the engineers seemed to understand why they had been invited to talk indicates the winds of change were blowing once again, but this time away from Modernism.

In June of 1968, the School of Architecture at Auckland published its "Post Graduate Research" programme, proudly stating that nine students were already enrolled in their PhDs. These were: WO Jaine, GM Tonks, RM Thompson, JD Dickson, G Smith, JF Halldane, IV Porsolt, and EC McClean.[51] Of these candidates six were full time staff, but only four ended up completing their PhDs at Auckland, the first being John Dickson, in 1967. In 1969, Alan Wild became Head of School at Auckland, and a new architecture building to replace the various brick, steel and wood buildings[52] the school occupied was on its way.[53] The students were revolting, the second school would not open for another five years, and the *NZIA Journal* was still worrying about change, though now accentuating terms like liberal, design and arts.

> The word "architecture" somehow suggests a concern about the brief, about what we should build, about function and delight, where as "engineering" suggests efficiency in fulfilling the brief. Both are needed, for what ever we build … [but where] the need for efficiency is accepted by everybody – the need for artistic control over what we build is not. Not until there is a public feeling against leaving litter about will we be successful in cleaning up our environment.[54]

[51] The extra PhD was AH Marshall, who was working at the School, but studying at the University of South Hampton.

[52] Many of which the Engineering School had been rescued from in 1967 by their tower.

[53] Though this wouldn't arrive for another 10 years.

[54] Ove Arup (1933) cited by Stephenson "Education for What?" pp 354-357.

REFERENCES

Anonymous "Education Committee" *NZIA Journal* (June 1969) 36(5):192.

Barrowman, R. *University of Victoria Wellington 1899-1999 A History* Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1999.

Committee on Architectural Education "Architectural Education" *NZIA Journal* (June 1965) 32(5):181-183.

Committee on New Zealand Universities, *Report of the Committee on New Zealand Universities, December 1959* Wellington, N.Z.: Government Printer, 1960.

Day Ding, G. and Burchard, C. "Architectural Education in the United States" *NZIA Journal* (June 1967) 34(5):168-74.

Knight, C. R. "Presidential Address" *NZIA Journal* (March, 1961) 28(2):27-32.

Laurenson, G. "Architectural Practice" *NZIA Journal* (June, 1962) 29(5):126-140.

Marshall, K.D. & Warren, F.M. "The Case for a Second School of Architecture" *NZIA Journal* (June 1964) 31(5):152-3.

Marshall, K.D. & Warren F.M. "The Case for a Second School of Architecture" *NZIA Journal* (June 1964) 31(5):152-3.

Middleton, P. "The Institute's Policy on the Education of Architects" *NZIA Journal* (December 1965) 32(11):384-387.

"Minutes of the N.Z.I.A. AGM" *NZIA Journal* Year Book 1964 (April 1964) 31(3):71-76.

Mitchinson, S. W. "Editorial" *NZIA Journal* (February 1964) 31(1):24.

Mitchinson, S. W. "Editorial" *NZIA Journal* (September, 1962) 29(8): 225.

"News and Notices" *NZIA Journal* (July 1966) 33(6):218.

Reynolds, I.B. "Changing Society and its Influence on Architects" *NZIA Journal* (May, 1969) 36(4):162.

Salmond, A. L. "Modern Architecture Reflects Our Way of Life" *NZIA Journal* (February, 1962) 29(1):21-25.

Salmond, A. L. "Presidential Address" *NZIA Journal* (April, 1962) 29(3):66-8.

School of Architecture "Architectural Education" *NZIA Journal* (September, 1962) 29(8):227-257.

Stephenson, Prof. G. "Education for What?" *NZIA Journal* (December, 1969) 36(11):354-357.

Technicians' Certificate Authority "Course for Building Technicians and Architectural Draughtsmen" *NZIA Journal* (March, 1961) 28(2):49-52.