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ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines the pedagogical theories and work of the Canadian-born architectural educator Alvin Boyarsky (1928-1990), who is best known for his chairmanship at the Architectural Association (AA) in London between 1971 and 1990. Under Boyarsky’s direction, the school operated as the nexus of an international network of avant-garde architects, historians and theorists who reclaimed pedagogy as a medium for architectural experiment.

Focusing on an understudied yet absolutely central figure in late twentieth century architectural culture, the dissertation traces the development of Boyarsky’s educational methods and ambitions across different institutional contexts and episodes in his career: from his education and teaching in the American university system during the late 1950s and 1960s, to his founding of an international summer school during the early 1970s, to his transformation of design pedagogy and media practices at the AA during his chairmanship. It investigates how Boyarsky promoted the educational models of the “well-laid table” and the “marketplace” as critical alternatives to professionalized architectural curricula. While the “well-laid table” encouraged students to sample from a constantly updated menu of divergent theoretical investigations, the “marketplace” asserted the onus of teachers to continually produce innovative architectural positions. The dissertation does not treat the convivial promise of the former and the economic rationale of the latter as symmetrical or diametrically opposed. Instead, it approaches them as coterminous, symbiotic strategies for grappling with a deeper anxiety over architecture’s viability in the wake of heroic modernism’s demise and under the forces
of late capitalism.

The dissertation therefore bridges its historical research on Boyarsky with a theoretical questioning of the agency of education and its institutions in shaping the emerging contours of architectural postmodernism. By demonstrating how Boyarsky’s pedagogy developed and operated within a transatlantic network of individuals, discourses, and events, it identifies a broader shift in the relationship between architectural education and architectural production: from a modern system of professional training that codified the architect’s responsibility to design and build for the needs of society, to a postmodern system of education that positioned architecture as a critical and intellectual practice that interrogated the very limits of the discipline.
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INTRODUCTION | BETWEEN TRADITION AND OBLIVION

One may define the area of historical reality, like that of photographic reality, as an anteroom area. Both realities are of a kind which does not lend itself to being dealt with in a definite way. The peculiar material in these areas eludes the grasp of systematic thought; nor can it be shaped in the form of a work of art. Like the statements we make about physical reality with the aid of the camera, those which result from our preoccupation with historical reality may certainly attain to a level above mere opinion; but they do not convey, or reach out for, ultimate truths, as do philosophy and art proper. They share their inherently provisional character with the material they record, explore, and penetrate.

- Sigfried Kracauer¹

By way of a photograph, taken in 1983, we enter the office of the chairman at the Architectural Association School of Architecture (AA) in London [fig. 0.1]. There, within the heart of a series of Georgian townhouses located at 36 Bedford Square in Bloomsbury, we encounter the Canadian-born architectural educator Alvin Boyarsky (1928-1990), head of the school from 1971 until 1990. Flanked by busts of Christopher Wren and Inigo Jones, and with plans of Gothic cathedrals hanging on the wall behind him, Boyarsky appears, at first glance, steeped in tradition. Indeed, the AA is Britain’s oldest school of architecture. Established in 1847 by two young students as an educational alternative to the apprenticeship system, it has since maintained its progressive ethos and its institutional independence [fig. 0.2]. Yet Boyarsky—who here

impishly welcomes the intrusion into his office—also appears comfortably, even gleefully submerged within the exigencies of the present. Slide boxes, postcards, mountains of paperwork, and multiple telephones crawl across every available surface of his workspace. The setting rather aptly evokes his concept of the “well-laid table,” a model of architectural education in which students were encouraged to sample from a constantly updated menu of divergent theoretical investigations. Yet, with its manic array of items (some purchased at flea markets and antique shops) the scene also recalls the alter ego of this model: the “marketplace,” a metaphor that asserted the onus of AA tutors to continually produce innovative architectural positions. Poised at the juncture of these two models, where vestiges of architecture’s historical past were interspersed within a mosaic of contemporary messages, in this purview of architectural education what was at stake was the very historicity of architecture. It is a matter that a muted Wren, playfully donning one of the chairman’s hats, coyly invites us to explore further.

This dissertation focuses on Boyarsky’s pedagogical theories and work. It traces the development of his educational methods and ambitions across different institutional contexts and episodes in his career: from his education and teaching in the American university system during the late 1950s and 1960s, to his founding of an independent and international architecture school during the early 1970s, to his most well-known role as AA chairman. By demonstrating how Boyarsky’s pedagogy developed and operated within a transatlantic network of individuals, discourses, and events, I identify a broader shift in the relationship between architectural education and architectural production that unfolded during the late twentieth century: from a modern system of
professional training that codified the architect’s responsibility to design and build for the needs of society, to a postmodern system of architectural education that positioned architecture as a critical and intellectual practice that questioned the very limits of the discipline. Accordingly, I argue that throughout his educational practices his continued recourse to both the “well-laid table” and the “marketplace” was motivated by disciplinary concerns specific to the period under investigation. The dissertation does not treat the convivial, cultural promise of the former and the economic rationale of the latter as symmetrical or diametrically opposed; nor do I suggest that one evolved from the other. Instead I approach them as coterminous, symbiotic strategies for grappling with a deeper anxiety over architecture’s viability in the wake of heroic modernism’s demise and under the forces of late capitalism. The dissertation therefore bridges its historical research on Boyarsky with a theoretical questioning of the agency of education and its institutions in shaping the emerging contours of architectural postmodernism.

Without question, Boyarsky is today best known for his role as AA impresario. As chairman during the early 1970s, he instigated a radical departure from the professionalized modernist curriculum that for nearly two decades had aligned the school’s educational agenda with the building methods and social programs of postwar British reconstruction. Alternatively, under his direction the AA began to operate as the nexus for an international network of avant-garde architects, theorists, and historians who reclaimed pedagogy as a medium for experimentation. Among many others, tutors during his chairmanship included: Nigel Coates, Robin Evans, Charles Jencks, Zaha Hadid, Rem Koolhaas, Léon Krier, Daniel Libeskind, Robin Middleton, Bernard
Tschumi, Dalibor Vesely, and Archigram members Peter Cook, Dennis Crompton, David Greene, and Ron Herron. Yielding a myriad of teaching pursuits—whether engaging with conceptual art or sustainability, politics or the pre-industrial city—in addition to books, magazines, videos, exhibitions, and conferences, its institutional program catalyzed a body of discourses and practices that indelibly informed architectural culture well beyond the bounds of the AA.

In fact, it was one of the school’s own tutors, Charles Jencks, who during the late 1970s argued for a “Post-Modern” architecture that jettisoned the muted forms and abstract elitism of the International Style, and that instead reactivated architecture’s communicative potential by engaging with popular culture, historicist pastiche, and semiotic play.\(^2\) In architecture the term “postmodern” and its derivations have long borne the burden of such stylistic connotations, upheld as a means of formal liberation by some and dismissed by others as self-indulgent idleness. (As the dissertation establishes, Boyarsky and the majority of his AA tutors unequivocally belonged to the latter camp, despite institutional affiliation with Jencks.) Yet more recent scholarship by K. Michael Hays, Reinhold Martin, Jorge Otero-Pailos, and Felicity Scott, among others, have productively complicated this rather narrowly defined periodization of “Post-Modern Architecture” and its emphasis on matters of representation.\(^3\) By also


interrogating architecture’s imbrication in biopolitics, globalization, and new media, and by theorizing its reengagement with history, such studies have outlined a matrix of narrative and theoretical approaches for discussing the historical, intellectual, and material conditions of postmodern architecture. Importantly, such analyses have also prompted a critical reevaluation of architecture’s broader context in cultural and political discourses on postmodernism, in which it had imparted a syntax for articulating a crisis of historical authenticity, whether discussed through the lens of the “cultural logic of late capitalism,” the hegemony of “metanarratives,” or the institutionalization of the avant-garde. As Martin has suggested, “to retheorize postmodern architecture is to retheorize postmodernism as such, to the extent that architecture functioned as its avatar.”

With its focus on architectural education, the dissertation contributes to this expanding field of inquiry. Its exploration of the “well-laid table” and the “marketplace” investigates how such models of consumption emerged as critical strategies for overturning modernism’s stronghold in the academy. A preliminary consideration of the implications of each term is therefore essential to understanding how their convergence mobilized Boyarsky’s critiques and reform of architectural pedagogy.


Martin, Utopia’s Ghost, xii.
The notion of the “well-laid table” conjures a sumptuous meal with many courses and delicacies elaborately spread over an expansive surface. It suggests a consumptive space that is festive and social, yet intimate, private and inherently domestic. For modern architects, the domestic sphere was a highly charged site. Ripe for innovation, as industrialized building methods and the “free plan” attest, the home also served as the stage for debates on issues of ornamentation and standardization. In the context of the 1960s and 1970s, to situate architectural education within—or rather, to conceptualize it as such a lavish setting was therefore hardly a neutral proposition. For if Le Corbusier’s axiom that the house was “a machine for living” had supplied a mantra for the modern movement, in turn critics would subsequently charge that the modern movement had “debased the substance of domesticity.” To return to the home after its cultural, social and material evisceration under functionalism, and to redefine the terms of its occupation by advocating an educational model based on excess, pluralism and personal taste was therefore emblematic of a broader critical reclamation of architecture’s inherent complexity and a repudiation of universalized formulas.

In an argument that draws upon a similar scalar framework of analysis—that is, from the table to the domestic to architecture at large—Aldo Rossi offers an analogy that harmonizes fortuitously with Boyarsky’s “well-laid table” and helps us to distill even further the nature of its instrumentality. For Rossi, the table is an “apparatus” (apparecchio), an interpretation that he draws from the Italian phrase “apparecchiare la tavola, meaning to set the table, to prepare it, to arrange it.” Not only did the table possess inherent organizational principles, but so too were the objects that it organized.

---

(for Rossi, coffeepots especially) endowed with architectonic qualities. In turn, these parallels prompted the architect “to regard architecture as the instrument which permits the unfolding of a thing,” that is, as “vehicles for events.”

Architecture, then, like the table, prepares, organizes and mobilizes the conditions that crystallize relationships and phenomena. Therefore, Rossi concludes, “the dimensions of a table or a house are very important—not, as the functionalists thought, because they carry out a determined function, but because they permit other functions.”

The resistance to teleological schema implied in the “apparatus” of the “well-laid table,” as it is understood by both Rossi and Boyarsky, reflects a direct engagement with productive constraints imposed by its lateral surface. Along similar lines, Mary Douglas argues that the meal derives meaning through its deviations from an implied “system of repeated analogies,” discernible in the placement and sequence of objects and dishes. The surface, therefore, harbors a system. A favorite subject of modern painters, from Le Corbusier to Oskar Schlemmer, the table and its affiliated objects abandoned the horizontality of such operations and relationships upon entry into the

---

8 Rossi, *Scientific Autobiography*, 3. “I have always had a strong interest in objects, instruments, apparatus[es], tools. Without intending to I used to linger for hours in the large kitchen at S., on Lake Como, drawing the coffeepots, the pans, the bottles. I particularly loved the strange shapes of the coffeepots enameled blue, green, red; they were miniatures of the fantastic architectures that I would encounter later. Today I still love to draw these large coffeepots, which I liken to brick walls, and which I think of as structures that can be entered.” Ibid., 2.  
9 As Douglas suggests in her structuralist analysis: “Each meal carries something of the meaning of the other meals; each meal is a structured social event which structures others in its own image. The upper limit of its meaning is set by the range incorporated in the most important member of its series. The recognition which allows each member to be classed and graded with the others depends upon the structure common to them all.” Mary Douglas, “Deciphering a Meal” in *Implicit Meanings* (London: Routledge, 1975), 260.
vertical field of the canvas. While the dynamism of the resulting visual and spatial compressions found a rapt audience in modern architects and architectural historians, in the “well-laid table” the lateral surface critically retains its intrinsic and equally dynamic mode of composition: one that preserves the autonomy and clarity of objects, necessitates their movement and recomposition, and perhaps most importantly, centralizes the interactions of its participants.

In the dissertation we encounter a multitude of tables over which meals are prepared, images are juxtaposed, events are coordinated, messages are written, and telephone calls are made and received. The “well-laid table,” then, is an “apparatus” for consumption and production. It follows that the domestic space in which it operates is also the space of work—a reunion that undoes modern architecture and urbanism’s adamant segregation of the private realm of the home from the public realm of labor, yet which also anticipates the homogenization of house and office that telecommunication networks have made possible. As insinuated in our reading of the photograph of Boyarsky in his office at the AA, and as corroborated by his predilection for conducting meetings with AA teaching staff at his home and in restaurants near the school, the table becomes indistinguishable from the desk. With the elimination of pigeonholes and roll-tops, the evolution of the latter during the twentieth century reflects a fundamental change in the nature of labor that, Adrian Forty contends, is inscribed on its newly unobstructed surface. The “desk is no longer a storage place—
nor even ornamental—but a tool for making the quickest possible turnover of business papers.”

Therefore, while the “well-laid table” promotes education as a matter of intellectual nourishment and conviviality, its surface betrays its common ground with the somewhat less genteel metaphor of the “marketplace.” The latter conjures a frenetic culture of consumption based on competition and risk, and in which economic exchange unfolds in an unrestricted public domain. Though he invoked it in various contexts, Boyarsky’s most explicit and well-known application of the “marketplace” was in his transformation of the AA’s horizontal studio curriculum into a competitive framework of vertical design studios. His appropriation of the term, derived from the “free market” of late capitalism, was certainly timely. During the early 1970s the economic concept of the “free market” was thrust center stage in British political discourse in the midst of the United Kingdom’s entry into the European Economic Union in 1973, as well as a Conservative rise to power that was solidified by the ascent of Margaret Thatcher (from Minister of Education) to Prime Minister in 1979. Certainly, this is not to suggest that either Boyarsky or the AA expressed allegiance to the Conservative party or Thatcher (whose direct and continued efforts to cut funding to the AA, on the contrary, secured her status as an adversary to the school). Rather, the appropriation of the “marketplace” as a pedagogical model was symptomatic of a widespread disillusionment with the

---

10 Adrian Forty, Objects of Desire: Design and Society since 1750 (New York: Thames & Hudson, 1986), 126. Forty also observes how, even during the nineteenth century, the office began to mimic the interior design of the home. His assessment of the effects certainly resonates with the photographic portrait of Boyarsky. “The tastefully furnished director’s office in the early twentieth century said, ‘this is a place in which personal relationships and gentlemanly behavior matter more than purely commercial ones,’ with the implication, ‘I am a man of culture and good taste with whom you may be proud to do business.’” Forty, 144.
idealistic social reforms of the Welfare State, which had pervaded postwar education, culture and indeed architecture. To state the matter differently, the concept of the “market” is “at one and the same time an ideology and a set of practical institutional problems.”

What Boyarsky’s “marketplace” at the AA presented was the first and arguably, to this date only example of a model of architectural education that so unambiguously aligned its operations and objectives with the logic of late capitalism. The implications of economic forces had certainly figured in architectural pedagogy previously. The Bauhaus (particularly under Hannes Meyer) and the Hochschule für Gestaltung at Ulm, for example, had critically questioned the methods and implications of modern industrial production, while Marxist critiques had entered French architectural education during the late 1960s via emerging theoretical work in sociological studies.

By positioning the regenerative surplus of the “marketplace” as a critical alternative to the intellectual and cultural strictures of postwar professional training, as well as to the unfulfilled utopian aspirations of modernism, Boyarsky’s version of educational reform introduced a wholly different attitude towards the relationship between architecture and economic forces. As its simple yet brash choice of jargon announced, this reform

---

11 For Jameson, if “Thatcherism and its cultural counterrevolution were founded fully as much on the delegitimation of welfare-state or social-democratic (we used to call it liberal) ideology as on the inherent structural problems of the welfare state itself,” then this serves as evidence of his broader thesis that “the rhetoric of the market has been a fundamental and central component of this ideological struggle, this struggle for the legitimation or delegitimation of left discourse.” Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism, or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (New York: Duke University Press, 1991), 263. In this way Boyarsky’s continued emphasis on individual choice in architectural education vis-à-vis the “market place” shares the same subversive tone as the “non-plan” theories put forward by Reyner Banham, Paul Barker, Peter Hall and Cedric Price, as outlined in *The New Society* in 1969. “Non-Plan” special issue, edited by Paul Barker, *New Society* (20 March 1969).
situated architecture firmly in the multi-national arena of late capitalism, transparently identifying the discipline as an instrument of cultural production.

It is in these ways that Boyarsky’s pedagogy, as an interface between the “well-laid table” and the “marketplace,” offers a particularly rich point of entry for discussing architectural education within the historical and theoretical ambit of postmodernism. As the dissertation progresses from his early career to his AA chairmanship, its cast expands to include students, teachers, architects, administrators, historians, and editors whose synchronic yet divergent circulation within Boyarsky’s new educational program at the AA constitutes a network of routes that, however dissonant or complementary, collectively inscribed his educational philosophy within 36 Bedford Square. Therein lies the paradox that is the crux of this dissertation. Within the first decade of his chairmanship Boyarsky institutionalized a new model of architectural education. Resolutely anti-academic and anti-institutional, and launched as an antithesis to traditional schools of architecture that were, by his account, hermetic, subordinate to the profession, and parochial, at the AA his alternative model would ultimately become a highly regulated system of teaching and learning. Furthermore, it is a system that today remains largely unchanged at the AA and that has also been widely emulated at other schools of architecture worldwide. The underlying concern of the dissertation, then, is how pedagogical experiment gave way to pedagogical system.

As a prologue to its study of the development and effects of Boyarsky’s educational philosophy, the remainder of this introduction first furnishes the reader with certain historical and institutional specifics about the AA that will be pertinent throughout the dissertation, including those chapters that concentrate on earlier
moments in his career that precede his chairmanship. In conjunction, I then briefly address the critical reception of his institutional transformation of the AA in order to map out some of the historical stakes and theoretical issues that will arise as the subsequent sections of the dissertation retrace his path to Bedford Square. Final remarks are reserved for the dissertation’s methodology and general organization.

*  

From its inception, the AA has pledged to accommodate a multiplicity of voices and to provide a platform for architectural experimentation. In 1846 Charles Gray, an eighteen-year-old pupil articled within an architect’s office, published a letter in the journal The Builder. Lamenting the absence of an educational alternative to the apprenticeship system in Britain, Gray provocatively suggested that perhaps students should start a school of their own.\(^{12}\) Robert Kerr, aged twenty-three and then also an apprentice, responded to the call. A year later the two young men established the AA, the first school in Britain dedicated to the study of architecture, and which began as a series of fortnightly evening meetings devoted to debate and the critique of drawings. Founded “by students, and for students,” and mobilized by the printed press, the AA heralded the modernization of architectural education in Britain, cultivating a “public sphere” that engaged with, yet operated outside of the governance of professional

\(^{12}\) See The Builder 4 (September 1846): 464-5.
standards and practices. Following its original nineteenth century system of “mutual study,” by the early 1920s the AA had matured into a full-time day school and settled into premises at 36 Bedford Square. Along the way, its pedagogical focus had also evolved, and would continue to do so. While its late nineteenth century history was marked by a shift in emphasis from Gothic revival to Arts and Crafts vernacular, the adoption of the French Beaux-Arts teaching model followed suit as the school entered the twentieth century [fig. 03]. During the mid-1930s, however, an internal revolution inaugurated the AA’s modernist era, as the school’s increasing investment in town planning, sociology and continental architectural modernism extinguished its Beaux-Arts tradition [fig. 0.4, 0.5]. Regrouping after the Second World War, the school began to tailor its postwar curriculum to the exigencies and methods of contemporary professional practice, as projects and exercises drew upon Welfare State reconstruction programs (housing, schools, hospitals) and contemporary building technologies (prefabrication, building systems, concrete) [fig. 0.6]. At the onset of the 1960s, the AA’s postwar professionalized objectives were challenged by the technological fervor of teaching staff, then populated by experimental architects from the London avant-garde—including, notably, members of Archigram and Cedric Price [fig. 0.7]. However, this “electric decade,” as Archigrammer and AA tutor Peter Cook deemed it in retrospect, coincided with a period of institutional crisis and financial instability that nearly

---

13 Jürgen Habermas, The Structural Transformations of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society, translated by Thomas Burger with the assistance of Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1989), 27.

concluded with the closure of the school, but instead culminated in Boyarsky’s arrival as chairman in 1971.

Along with its Victorian origins and its modernist revolution during the 1930s, Boyarsky’s appointment as head of school (the circumstances of which are detailed later in this dissertation) has become an historical marker that has fortified the school’s identity as a democratic and progressive center of architectural teaching and learning. But there are a number of distinctive institutional features that further reinforce this identity and set the AA apart from other schools of architecture. Formalized by the early twentieth century and still intact today, its binary institutional structure has proved fundamental (and, to be sure, at times detrimental) to its operations. A private, charitable company\textsuperscript{15} since 1920, the AA comprises: (1) an Association of members that is governed by an elected Council, whose primary responsibility is the supervision and maintenance of (2) the AA School of Architecture.\textsuperscript{16} As members of the Architectural Association, students enrolled at the School of Architecture may be elected to Council, and therefore are entitled to participate in administrative decisions concerning its educational program and institutional administration.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{15} Unlike the chartered professional body of the Royal Institute of British Architects, founded in 1837.

\textsuperscript{16} Formalization of this structure began at the start of the twentieth century when four divisions took shape: an elected Council, a voting school, a voting membership, and an academic board of teaching staff. Charles Jencks, “125 Years of Quasi Democracy,” in James Gowan, \textit{A Continuing Experiment: Teaching and Learning at the Architectural Association} (London: Architectural Press, 1975), 150. Unless noted otherwise, my use of the “AA” refers to the School of Architecture.

\textsuperscript{17} With the exception of a period bookmarked by the late 1930s, when these rights were taken away, and 1955, when students successfully appealed for the restoration of their voting rights. In his “brief history of self-government at the AA,” Jencks, who taught at the AA from the late 1960s and through the 1970s, outlines and critiques the various
Complementing this sustained ethos of self-governance and transparency is the school’s longstanding refusal to adopt a tenure-based system of academic staffing. Instead it opts for a system of annual teaching appointments—tacit acknowledgment that the interests and energies of teachers and students, and moreover, the profession, will continue to fluctuate. Since the nineteenth century, then, the AA has viewed the discipline at large through a distinctly modern lens: like architectural practice, architectural pedagogy, too, should be equipped to respond to social, technological, and aesthetic developments. As James Gowan suggested in the title of his 1975 compendium of essays on the school’s history, at the AA teaching and learning was a “continuing experiment.” Supported primarily by student fees, the school to this day has maintained its autonomy from the British university system, and it is the AA’s institutional independence that has made it possible to maintain this “continuing experiment”—a precarious balance of unwavering democratic code and ideological instability.

* 

Such were the complex institutional conditions and history that confronted Boyarsky as he commenced his chairmanship at the AA in 1971. Nevertheless, after a decade of refurbishing its infrastructure and educational program his peers outside of the school began to take notice of how he had utterly transformed its identity.

---

phases of “quasi democracy” at the AA. Jencks, “125 Years of Quasi Democracy,” 149-59.
The extraordinary burst of institutional energy that unfurled on the heels of his arrival at Bedford Square was the subject of an extensive feature article published in the October 1983 issue of *The Architectural Review* (*AR*)—the occasion, in fact, for the enigmatic photographic portrait with which this dissertation began. The magazine offered an abbreviated but dense history of the chairman’s first decade at the helm of the AA. Historiographical impulse was hardly the impetus for this journalistic effort, however; nor was it prompted by pedagogical innovation alone. Rather, the true catalyst for this spout of publicity was the recent success of former and incumbent AA tutors in major international competitions. The Swiss architect Bernard Tschumi, a tutor at the AA throughout the 1970s, had just secured the commission for the Parc de la Villette, what would prove to be one of the most significant twentieth-century urban renewal projects in Paris [fig. 08]. The Office of Metropolitan Architecture, whose founding principals Rem Koolhaas and Elia Zenghelis had taught together at the AA during the late 1970s, had placed as runners-up in the same competition [fig. 09]. Koolhaas and Zenghelis’ most gifted pupil at the AA (and subsequent co-tutor and design partner), Zaha Hadid, had submitted the winning entry for the Hong Kong Peak. Though never realized, the young Iraqi architect’s proposal for the residential and recreational complex would jumpstart a career soon to acquire international acclaim

---


19 After studying in Paris, Tschumi arrived in London in 1969. He began teaching at the AA in 1970, one year prior to Boyarsky’s arrival. Tschumi remained on the AA teaching staff until 1980, though by the late 1970s he was dividing his time between London and New York. Zenghelis, a Greek émigré who graduated from the AA in 1961, taught at the school between 1964 and 1980. During this period Zenghelis had mentored
Alongside the motley preoccupations of their fellow tutors at Bedford Square, during the 1970s Tschumi’s explorations in the “politics of space,” Koolhaas and Zenghelis’ theorization of a “culture of congestion” intrinsic to the modern metropolis, and Hadid’s painterly forays into the formal language of Suprematism had collectively situated the AA’s activities on the margins of architectural culture in Britain. Self-willed, such marginalization, however idiosyncratic its manifestations may have been, ultimately shared with practicing architects and critics a widespread disenchantedment with the profession at large. In Britain, the deflated optimism of postwar reconstruction was perhaps reified in the devastating collapse of Ronan Point in 1968, challenging unchecked faith in building systems, as well as the tower block as the appropriate typology for housing. Meanwhile, the Brutalist braggadocio of Centre Point, left unoccupied for several years after its completion in 1966 on a speculative real estate gamble, monumentalized architecture’s complicity in market forces.

The AA’s experimental attitude, *AR* proposed, offered a welcome exit strategy from a “crisis in architecture,” as Malcolm McEwan in 1974 would baldly diagnose the aftermath of the profession’s profligate consumption of economic and energy

---

Koolhaas, a student at the AA from 1968 to 1972. The two taught together at the AA between 1975 and 1980. After completing a five-year course at the AA, concluding under the supervision of Zenghelis and Koolhaas, in 1977 Hadid joined her tutors as an associate at the Office of Metropolitan Architecture and as a co-tutor at the AA. In 1980 she established her own practice. Hadid continued teaching independently at the AA until 1987.

resources.\textsuperscript{21} And as \textit{AR} argued, this crisis also encompassed the atavistic stylizations of so-called “postmodern architecture,” whose historicist reveries had since the late seventies been frequenting the pages of the journal \textit{Architectural Design} (once an institution for avant-garde architects during the sixties and ally of the AA during the beginning of Boyarsky’s chairmanship).\textsuperscript{22} For its resistance to such tendencies, \textit{AR} commended the AA.

Thus, after a decade of institutional incubation, the AA’s spectrum of experiments was celebrated for transcending architecture’s professional boundaries, yet was also repositioned dead center by \textit{AR}—a magazine that was no less than the very mouthpiece of the British architectural establishment. For “no matter how \textit{avant-garde} and irrelevant the antics at the AA seem at any time,” the magazine observed, “they have a habit of inflecting the mainstream within the next decade.”\textsuperscript{23} With the newfound visibility and stature of the school’s tutors in the early 1980s, \textit{AR} implied, the “antics” that had characterized Boyarsky’s first decade as chairman were destined to become a model for the utmost architectural decorum. Here was a forecast, then, that unwittingly overlaid the fateful institutionalization of the historical avant-gardes onto a contemporary generation of architectural innovators.\textsuperscript{24} In conjunction, equally significant and substantially pertinent to this dissertation is the magazine’s recognition

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{23} “AR Reviews AA,” 23.
\textsuperscript{24} On the institutionalization of the historical avant-gardes, see Matei Calinescu, \textit{Five Faces of Modernity: Modernism, Avant-garde, Decadence, Kitsch, Postmodernism} (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1987); Hal Foster, “What’s Neo about the Neo-Avant-Garde?” \textit{October} 70 (Autumn 1994): 5-32; and Huyssen, \textit{After the Great Divide}.
\end{flushleft}
of the very expanse of the reach that the school had begun to wield. “No other architectural school in Europe can even remotely claim the prestige and pervasive importance of London’s Architectural Association,” *AR* immoderately declared. It was an international and implicitly trans-historical distinction that historians, educators, and architects had previously reserved—and arguably, today might still reserve—only for the École des Beaux-Arts and the Bauhaus.

With the import and role of the AA and Boyarsky within the broader history of architectural education called into question, the historical framework of the dissertation’s central concerns is redrawn. Certainly, the École des Beaux-Arts and the Bauhaus have become synecdoches for two dominant trajectories in the history of architectural education. Originating in nineteenth century France, the hierarchical academic system of the former emphasized historical precedent, draftsmanship, and a culture of competition. Attracting foreign students throughout its long history and widely adopted abroad, in its various incarnations Beaux-Arts education thrived internationally, and well into the twentieth century. In contrast, the multi-media curriculum developed at the German Bauhaus in the early twentieth century sought a confluence of aesthetic and social objectives, awarding architecture a privileged
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25 “*AR Reviews AA,*” 23.

position as the ideological and material circumscription of the arts. Though short-lived as an institution, the modernist pedagogy of the Bauhaus would reverberate internationally across schools of architecture by the mid-twentieth century, from the appearance of Vorkus-inspired foundational studies to an emphasis on interdisciplinary teamwork in the decades following the Second World War. Both its original institutional identity and its postwar legacy—notably, at the Hochschule für Gestaltung, as well as via the pivotal role of its émigrés at American schools of architecture—continue to stimulate new scholarship.27

Perhaps the quintessential conceptualization of post-Bauhaus, modernist architectural education is Walter Gropius’s “blueprint for an architect’s education,” outlined in the Bauhaus founder and subsequent Harvard pedagogue’s 1955 book, *Scope of Total Architecture*. Rearticulating the principles of Bauhaus pedagogy from within the postwar context of American society and institutions, Gropius mapped the development of individual creativity from the nursery to the architectural office. Advocating a generalized, “concentric” (rather than a vocational, “sectional”) educational process that encompassed a “whole range of knowledge and experience,” such a “totalizing” approach invested in individual creative vision an expansive social
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responsibility that was to be galvanized upon entry into professional practice.\textsuperscript{28}

Appropriating a tool of the profession, the blueprint, Gropius thus teleologically defined architectural education as an intermediary stage preceding construction.\textsuperscript{29}

Having absorbed and expelled the pedagogical traditions of both the École des Beaux-Arts and the Bauhaus, the AA presents a veritable document of the history of architectural education, and as such facilitates a discussion of critical departures from modernist teaching traditions.\textsuperscript{30} Indeed, in 1983 AR’s review of the AA—published precisely half a century after the collapse of the Bauhaus under the political pressures of Nazi Germany, and fifteen years after the dismantling of the École des Beaux-Arts’ architectural program following the events of May ’68 in France—suggested that a new trajectory in architectural education was not only fully operative, but had seemingly crystallized in the institutional matter of the AA under Boyarsky’s leadership. This dissertation furthers such a hypothesis. It identifies Boyarsky’s efforts to reformulate the ways architecture is taught and learned as an attempt to rethink the discipline at large: its methods, objectives, repercussions, and its history—and in particular, its modernist narratives and its postmodernist anxieties. During the 1960s and 1970s the leverage of modernism’s aesthetic codes and utopian veneers was taken to task with immediacy and urgency in schools of architecture—with more immediacy and urgency than, for example, a reading public privately tuned in to the polemics of Robert


\textsuperscript{30} In addition to its Beaux-Arts and modernist phases, the AA historical pedigree also includes a School of Planning, founded in 1936 by E.A.A. Rowse, and its Tropical School (Department of Tropical Architecture), founded in 1955 by Maxwell Fry.
Venturi’s *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture* and Aldo Rossi’s *The Architecture of the City*, both published in 1966 and both recognized as pivotal stimulants for postmodernist discourses in architecture. Politicized student movements and protests, demands for curricular overhauls, exposure of professional inflation and overpopulation of universities, and, in the most extreme cases, institutional closures: the precipitously shifting landscape of architectural education created a porous arena for scrutinizing and disarticulating the ideological equilibrium and historical vacuum that modern architecture had sustained at both a professional and cultural level.

In a related gesture, the history of architectural education was called upon to launch one of the period’s most contentious debates on architecture’s postmodern outlook. The source of controversy was *The Architecture of the École des Beaux-Arts*, an exhibition curated by Arthur Drexler and staged at the Museum of Modern Art in New York in 1975. Hardly a promotion of stylistic eclecticism by Drexler, the exhibition’s spectacular resurrection of nineteenth century student drawings was intended instead as a jarring provocation to interrogate architecture’s imminent departure from the dominant formal and aesthetic codes of modernism. As the curator
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31 Though each differing in their political contexts, motives, and methods, the wave of student uprisings during the 1960s had in common a “struggle against technocracy,” suggests Andrew Feenberg. For Feenberg, “the university resembles a technocracy in that it too is divided into the trained and the untrained, the knowledgeable and the ignorant. There is thus a metaphoric equivalence between society, which professes to be based on knowledge, and the university, which actually is so based.” Andrew Feenberg, *Questioning Technology* (London: Routledge, 1999), 22-4. This point of view echoes Derrida’s challenge, “How not to speak, today, of the university?” Jacques Derrida, “The Principle of Reason: The University in the Eyes of Its Pupils,” *Eyes of the University, Right to Philosophy* 2, translated by Jan Plug et al (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), 129.

32 Codes that the museum had itself once so aggressively, and successfully, promoted. On Drexler’s motives and the exhibition’s reception, see Felicity D. Scott, “When
lamented, if the modernist mission of the Bauhaus had once eclipsed the anachronistic principles of the École des Beaux-Arts, and had subsequently “flourished as a doctrine” across schools of architecture, then “within the lifetimes of its protagonists” that doctrine had “subsided without having generated its own succession.” Drexler’s remarks implicitly recognized that, historically, pedagogy had provided a potent form of dissemination, and as such had functioned as the ideological lifeblood of architecture.

Architecture’s fate in the wake of modernism’s purportedly stunted pedagogical lineage, however, was open to other less melancholic interpretations by Drexler’s contemporaries. A special issue of the Italian journal Lotus published in 1978 took as its theme “Architecture in the University: Europe,” acknowledging a myriad of vital signs in several schools of architecture. Its survey of contemporary pedagogy included Maurice Culot’s urban studio at La Cambre, and its critical reengagement with the historic fabric of Brussels as a mode of “anti-industrial resistance,” as well as Bernard Huet’s teaching in France at (the post-École des Beaux-Arts) Unité Pédagogique 8, which was then pursuing a politicized notion of craft as a means to subvert the bureaucracy of professional practice. Comparisons of courses at Italian universities in Rome, Milan, Naples and Palermo, in addition to two different AA design studios (or “units,” one taught by Mike Gold, the other by Koolhaas and Zenghelis) further juxtaposed teaching approaches that had developed independently within different schools during the 1970s. A companion special issue of Lotus, co-edited by Kenneth Frampton and Alessandra Latour and published in 1980, expanded the editorial project Systems Fail,” in Architecture or Techno-Utopia: Politics after Modernism (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2007), 60-62.

by highlighting architecture programs at North American schools since the late 1960s.\textsuperscript{34} Pride of place was given to the Cooper Union curriculum, redesigned by John Hejduk and the painter Robert Slutzky, and which excavated the formal vocabulary of early twentieth century artistic avant-gardes, and to Colin Rowe’s Gestalt-inflected urban studios at Cornell, which had provided the testing ground for the theoretical arguments outlined in his seminal text \textit{Collage City} (1978), co-authored with Fred Koetter. Indeed, at the University of Texas in Austin, Hejduk, Slutzky, and Rowe, along with others—a group retrospectively christened the “Texas Rangers”—had already by the mid-1950s attempted to shape a new pedagogical model distinct from, yet inevitably indebted to, both Beaux-Arts and Bauhaus teaching.\textsuperscript{35}

Modernist pedagogy’s heir apparent, as the pair of reports on contemporary architectural education in \textit{Lotus} seemed intent to demonstrate, had not manifest as a coherent model or movement wed to a particular ideology or style. What was discernible instead was a collective immunity to the regulated methods and institutionalized foundations of architectural production. As \textit{Lotus} editor Pierluigi Nicolin concluded, “architectural work done in universities appears as a particular area of design research, having established its own rules and conditioning factors, which do not correspond to those of professional practice or of work done for a purchaser or for a market.”\textsuperscript{36} We have already addressed the multivalent significance of the term “market” and the implications of Boyarsky’s appropriation of it. What warrants attention here is

\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Lotus International}, no. 27 (1980). Guest edited by Kenneth Frampton and Alessandra Latour.
Nicolin’s utilization of the term “research.” A watchword among postwar modern architects and educators alike, the scientific undertones of “research” acquired multiple interpretations, particularly during the 1950s in the United States and Britain, when it became increasingly ubiquitous within schools of architecture. Denoting a range of methods and subjects of inquiry—from building sciences to behavioral sciences, from “environmental design” to interdisciplinary collaboration—“research,” nebulously defined as it often was, nevertheless offered a critical retreat from formalism. As Avigail Sachs has suggested, what the differing manifestations and uses of the term shared was “the positivist assumption that the knowledge produced in research was objective and widely applicable and therefore superior to knowledge derived from other pursuits.”

In contrast to this modernist stance, the “research” invoked by Nicolin takes on a different set of implications. His introduction of the term is understood here not as an extension of its postwar usages. Instead, its resurgence is significant in terms of its resonance with the contemporary institutionalization of architectural history and theory via the establishment of PhD programs, with the first at MIT in 1976, as well as government-funded historical research initiatives, as was the case in France during the 1970s. Indeed, neither application nor material production was the overarching
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objective of “design research,” posited Nicolin at the close of the decade. In parallel to
building and designing, he implied, “research” constituted an equally valid “cultural
practice” for interrogating the forms, meanings, and repercussions of the physical
environment.39 Put differently, in various ways history and theory moved to the
foreground of architectural education.

Perhaps the exemplar of a history/theory-driven mobilization of “research” in
architectural pedagogy is the urban studio taught by Steven Izenour, Denise Scott
Brown, and Robert Venturi at the Yale School of Architecture in 1968. The studio’s
documentation and analysis of the urban and architectural forms of the Las Vegas strip
culminated with the publication of Learning from Las Vegas (1972), a seminal text that
“did double duty as analytical research and design theory.”40 Pointedly refocusing
attention away from the monuments and tenets of the International Style and onto those
of urban sprawl and popular culture, the studio and its published counterpart explored
the untapped repositories of the “forgotten symbolism of architectural form.” If
Gropius’s “blueprint” posed an atemporal schematization of pedagogy, spatializing an
epistemological “totality” that emanated from the individual to modern society at large,
and thus conflating the biological and the social, then the “learning” model put forward

Wright and Janet Parks, eds., The History of History in American Schools of
Architecture 1865-1975, Buell Center Books in American Architectural History, no. 1
40 Brendan Moran, “Research,” 390. The Yale studio, subtitled “Form Analysis as
Design Research,” the publication Learning from Las Vegas, and its role in
postmodernist discourses have been the subject of a number of recent volumes: Michael
Golec and Aron Vinegar, eds., Relearning from Las Vegas (Minneapolis: University of
Minnesota Press, 2009); Hilar Stadler and Martino Stierli, eds., Las Vegas Studio:
Images from the Archive of Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown (Zürich: Verlag
Scheidegger & Spiess, 2008); Aron Vinegar, I AM A MONUMENT: On Learning from
by Izenour, Scott Brown, and Venturi was resolutely steeped in historical consciousness, as pedagogy became the vehicle for an allegorical departure from high modernism.⁴¹

To press this matter further, the dissertation moves beyond the realm of allegory. Though disparate in scope and technique, and shaped by heterogeneous institutional and cultural circumstances, teaching innovations launched at schools of architecture during the 1960s and 1970s recognized and reclaimed education’s capacity for polemic: for reevaluating, withdrawing from, and indeed critically returning to the ideals, tropes, and practices of modernism. The dissertation situates its investigation of architectural education within this particular historical moment, and considers how the perceived historicity of architecture’s present fueled reassessments of the relationship between architectural education and architectural production.⁴² It works within this temporal window with the understanding that all its contents do not conform to a singular intellectual project or ideology, but rather, following Jameson’s methodological argument on periodization, that they share “an objective situation, to which a whole range of varied responses and creative innovations is then possible, but always within that situation’s structural limits.” Such limits, Jameson maintains, therefore might
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⁴¹ Golec and Vinegar, “Introduction: Instruction as Provocation,” Relearning from Las Vegas, 3.
⁴² “Historicity is, in fact, neither a representation of the past nor a representation of the future (although its various forms use such representations): it can first and foremost be defined as a perception of the present as history; that is, as a relationship to the present which somehow defamiliarizes it and allows us that distance from immediacy which is at length characterized as a historical perspective. It is appropriate, in other words, also to insist on the historicity of the operation itself, which is our way of conceiving of historicity in this particular society and mode of production; appropriate also to observe that what is at stake is essentially a process of reification whereby we draw back from our immersion in the here and now (not yet identified as a ‘present’) that can be dated and called the eighties or the fifties.” Jameson, Postmodernism, 284.
provoke a “hypothesis about the rhythm and dynamics of the fundamental situation in which those very different levels develop according to their own internal laws.”

Through its analysis of Boyarsky’s unique accomplishments during this period of widespread educational reform, the dissertation therefore seeks to uncover some of the “rhythm and dynamics” of a “postmodern era” in architecture. Indeed, he presents an ideally complex subject for the task at hand. As an educator Boyarsky strove to operate at an extra-curricular and extra-institutional scale. Rather than promote an overarching agenda or instill an established method, he viewed teaching as the opportunity to formulate new forms of inquiry, and reciprocally, positioned learning as a process of selection, rather than prescription; such were the underlying and intertwined objectives of both the “well-laid table” and the “marketplace.” Moreover, under his direction, the fluctuating and divergent work of tutors and students were produced and consumed not only within localized, institutional communities, but also by an international architectural public constituted by new technologies, from offset lithography to video, to the introduction of the Boeing 747. Underpinning his pedagogical outlook was a totalizing perspective on architecture, one that far exceeded Gropius’ line of vision by calling for the international convergence of its institutions and practices with mass media and technology. In this way, and as already noted above, the dialectical relationship between the economic space of the “marketplace” and the domestic space of the “well-laid table” are fundamental in a postmodern system of architectural education, in which architecture is understood as an “immaterial”

enterprise whose historicity hinges upon its interrelated processes of its production, consumption and also, importantly, reproduction.44

* 

Although Boyarsky is widely recognized for orchestrating an incredibly vibrant and productive era in the AA’s history, neither his chairmanship at the school nor the broader scope of his career have been the subject of a major scholarly study. A figure who wrote little and built even less, he has been relegated to the peripheries of histories of British architecture.45 Until recently, literature on Boyarsky has been largely limited to brief and nostalgic overviews of his AA chairmanship, authored primarily by his peers or eyewitnesses.46 Meanwhile, the AA’s attempts to document its own past have

45 See, for example, Alan Powers, Britain (London: Reaktion, 2006); and Murray Fraser, Architecture and the ‘Special Relationship’: the American Influence on Post-War British Architecture (London: Routledge, 2007).  
consistently resulted in only fragmentary narratives, which for the most part wholly
neglect one of the most significant figures (if not the most significant figure) in its
institutional history. While one of the aims of this dissertation is to address this double
historiographical gap—occupied, that is, by Boyarsky, as well as the AA—its
overarching approach is not monographic. Such has been the tendency of more recent
articles and essays, which have judiciously offered detailed vignettes illuminating
important aspects of his career, both before and during his chairmanship. Nevertheless,
in such accounts a number of issues, projects, primary sources, events and contexts
remain unexplored, thereby leaving ample room for a rigorous analysis of the critical
import of his intellectual and pedagogical contribution to the discipline, and in
particular his standing in the history of architectural education.

Examining the full range of Boyarsky’s teaching experiences—from the scale of
a lecture to that of an institution, and from the design studio to the space of media—the

Robin Middleton, ed. Architectural Associations: The Idea of the City (London:

47 Though brief, John Summerson’s history of the AA, written on the occasion of its
centenary, remains the most thorough account of the AA’s origins and its early history. 
efforts by the school have been few, and in general have opted for the format of
anthology rather than historical narrative. Two examples published by the AA during
Boyarsky’s chairmanship include: James Gowan, ed., A Continuing Éxperiment:
Teaching and Learning at the Architectural Association (London: Architectural Press,
Association, 1974).

48 See in particular Igor Marjonovic’s writing on Boyarsky: “Alvin Boyarsky’s
190–9; “Alvin Boyarsky’s Chicago: An Architectural Critic in the City of Strangers,”
AA Files 60 (2010): 45-52; “Wish You Were Here,” in Chicago Architecture: Histories,
Revisions, Alternatives, ed. Charles Waldheim and Katerina Ruedi Ray (Chicago:
University of Chicago Press, 2005), 207–225; and “Lines and Words on Display: Alvin
Boyarsky as a Collector, Curator and Publisher,” Architectural Research Quarterly 14
dissertation considers his pedagogical methods and objectives within the historical framework of the institutional and curricular upheavals of the late 1960s and subsequent post-1968 educational reform. Notably, this is a period (and with it, Boyarsky’s AA chairmanship) that receives minimal attention in Mark Crinson and Jules Lubbock’s historical survey of architectural education in Britain. Yet the dissertation finds common ground in a growing body of literature on the history of architectural education during the late twentieth century. Books, articles, and doctoral theses and dissertations on institutions (e.g. Cambridge University, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, French Unités Pédagogiques) and on the teaching of individual figures (e.g. Manfredo Tafuri, Charles Moore, Bernard Huet) have provided fresh perspectives on the vital role of pedagogy in launching theoretical debates and new modes of architectural production. As the dissertation demonstrates, during the 1960s and 1970s architectural education supplied the discursive infrastructures and institutional foundations for cross-examining the aesthetic, social, and political legacy of the modern movement. In turn,

49 Mark Crinson and Jules Lubbock, *Architecture—Art or Profession?: Three Hundred Years of Architectural Education in Britain* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994). Crinson and Lubbock identify (and dismiss) Boyarsky and the AA as somewhat inconsequential anomalies in their chronicle of the hegemony of modernism in British architectural education.

schools provided an arena for testing alternative design methods, as well as critical approaches to the history of architecture.

The dissertation’s own critical approach to the history of architectural education is deeply informed by its richly varied body of archival sources. Here, a brief excursion into personal reflection on the unique nature of these sources illuminates some of the distinctive methodological nuances that this study required. In parallel to the dissertation’s exploration of the path between the “well-laid table” and the “marketplace,” the research unfolded within two primary sites located within walking distance of each other: Boyarsky’s London home on Oakley Square in Mornington Crescent, currently occupied by his son Nicholas and his family, which is just a short journey on foot to the AA’s premises on Bedford Square in Bloomsbury.

Boyarsky’s personal archive is rather seamlessly integrated into the space of his home; more accurately, the home itself is an archive. While during his lifetime Boyarsky seems to have loosely organized some of his papers, especially those pertaining to his activities prior to the AA, other documents were ordered posthumously by his children, prompted in large part by an unpublished book project compiled by his peers and relatives in the mid-1990s. This unrealized volume was to make available meditations on his career authored by colleagues, selections from his small body of writing, and detailed interviews conducted during the late 1970s and in which Boyarsky expounded on his education, his early career, his views on architecture, and his ambitions as an educator and for the AA.\footnote{I will refer to this incomplete manuscript throughout the dissertation as “unpublished Boyarsky monograph.”} This manuscript, along with the modest outlines of a classification system, was certainly crucial in the dissertation’s earliest
stages. But with each visit, the house itself seemed to open up (with some strategic prodding by Nicholas), revealing, or one could say producing an endless supply of material of every kind imaginable and from every corner of its being. There was, of course, Boyarsky’s formidable collection of books (monolithic, and therefore not always forthcoming) and drawings [figs. 0.11, 0.12]. However, letters and photographs began to emerge from folders and envelopes. Audio recordings announced themselves from behind closet doors [fig. 0.13]. Postcards spilled out of cigar boxes, and slides from shelves on the landing of the stairs [fig. 0.14]. Magazines, correspondence and other documents floated down from storeys of the house that to this day I have never seen or entered. With no recognizable overarching order organizing these contents, research required acquiescence to the natural flow of the house. In other words, it became necessary to inhabit the archive, a domiciliation—in fact a state of “house arrest” true to the etymological origin of “archive”: the arkheion, the dwelling of the archon, the political figure whose authority derived from the state documents that it housed and interpreted.52

It is uncanny that research that took place at the AA (notably, also once a domestic setting) also demanded a “house arrest,” though under a disparate set of circumstances and with a quite different end result. As the dissertation later points out, since its founding in the nineteenth century the school has copiously documented its
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52 As Derrida explains: “the meaning of ‘archive,’ its only meaning, comes to it from the Greek arkheion: initially a house, a domicile, an address, the residence of the superior magistrates, the archons, those who commanded. The citizens who thus held and signified political power were considered to possess the right to make or to represent the law. On account of their publicly recognized authority, it is at their home, in that place which is their house (private house, family house, or employee’s house), that official documents are filed.” Jacques Derrida, Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression, trans. Eric Prenowitz (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 2.
every move, from its curricular and staffing changes to lectures and exhibitions, from protests to parties. Sources such as prospectuses, diaries, yearbooks, and innumerable in-house journals and brochures, which were all accessible in the school’s library, supplied a comprehensive record of events. At the outset of this project, however, the AA’s official institutional archive—what might be considered its more private holdings of internal administrative records—was predominantly uncatalogued, stored off-site, and unstaffed. Yet over the course of the dissertation’s development the AA Archive, like Boyarsky’s house, became quite animated (now, as the result of strategic prodding by the institution and its staff) [fig 0.15]. It acquired a full-time archivist and on-site facilities. Its contents, after meticulously cataloguing, began to come out of the woodwork, so to speak: meeting minutes, press releases, audio recordings, brochures, job applications, news clippings, contracts, ephemera and, importantly, student portfolios and projects, which since the archive’s official public “opening” in 2010 has steadily expanded through donations. And at the same time, the AA’s Video Archive and Photo Archive were similarly refurbished. Though these separate collections were already located on-site, they still proved somewhat opaque and monolithic; with cataloguing and digitization, they became more transparent and their contents more accessible [figs. 0.16, 0.17]. Nevertheless, in these various archives of the AA was the arkheion under a different guise, which through the systematic and technological ordering of documents sought to assert all dimensions of its institutional authority.

53 Quite literally, in fact. During one visit, I recall being informed by a staff member that some video and audio recordings had once been discovered inside of one of the school’s walls.
All this exposes a simple fact about the dissertation: it could not quite keep up with its archives. Yet such a Sisyphean task was always squarely outside the scope of its intentions. Accordingly, what follows is neither a biography nor an institutional history. In fact, if Boyarsky’s chairmanship so profoundly transformed the institutional identity of the AA to the extent that the institution and the individual have become synonymous, then the dissertation has excavated, juxtaposed and synthesized a breadth of textual, visual, and aural sources in order to disarticulate this ambiguous conflation. To be sure, it makes a pointed effort to emphasize and outline the sequence and specificity of certain events, statements, projects, phenomena and relationships that existing literature has overlooked (or mythologized). To do so, it capitalizes on both Boyarsky’s and the AA’s compulsion to record—whether via audio, video, itineraries, bulletins or magazines. In its presentation of such details, the dissertation thus displays certain characteristics of a “chronicle,” as interpreted by Benedetto Croce: a “past history” that “is no longer thought, but only recorded in abstract words, which were once upon a time concrete and expressive.” But by deviating from the linear strictures and comprehensive ambitions implied by chronology, and by interrogating how the models of the “well-laid table” and the “marketplace” functioned as an interface between individual and institution, the dissertation also veers into the realm of what Croce considers “history.” For Croce, “history” embodies an altogether different “spiritual attitude” than “chronicle.” Because “history” constitutes a mode of thinking, in contrast

to recounting events, it necessitates an engagement with the past as a dimension of the present. “History is living chronicle,” while “chronicle is dead history,” he concludes.\textsuperscript{55}

To reinforce this point I offer a seemingly superficial though nonetheless valid correlation. A significant research component entailed my own interviews with Boyarsky’s friends and family, and former AA tutors and students, all of whom were able to remember specific details about the figures under investigations just as much as they were capable of forgetting or misremembering others. But more importantly, they were able to speculate on how these details—remembered, forgotten, or misremembered—resonated with the current state of architectural education in relationship to contemporary practice, new media, globalization, and history. Therefore, these interviews either appear or (more often) are implied in the dissertation not as a matter of record or truth, nor even memory, but in conjunction with other archival sources as a matter of “history.” From warm bodies to cool televised images, from institutional diaries to unrealized manuscripts, from house to school, the dissertation’s archive exists “between tradition and oblivion,” revealing “the rules of a practice that enables statements both to survive and to undergo regular modification.”\textsuperscript{56} It divulges the contours of an architectural discourse in which pedagogy and its history are intensely operative.

A person, an institution, and a pedagogical system: to effectively engage these disparate subjects the dissertation adopts a strategy that resonates with Sigfried Kracauer’s ruminations on historiographical method. As he shifted his attention to the

\textsuperscript{55} Croce, 19.
philosophy of history rather late in his life, Kracauer recognized the recurrence of ideas that he had expressed in his theories on film. The “historical universe,” he suggests, can be examined through balanced combination of “close-ups” and “long-range views,” or what he alternatively characterizes as a “traffic” between the “micro” and the “macro.” The “micro dimension” of the “close-up” affords a level of intimacy for analyzing minutiae and psychological issues. A quintessential example of a “close-up” in the dissertation is its interception of unpublished correspondence between Boyarsky and his wife Elizabeth during the 1960s. Alongside reports of rather quotidian occurrences (movies that were seen, furniture that was purchased) appear his lucid assessments of his teaching methods and historical concerns. Equally high-resolution “views” are to be found in the domain of audio and video recordings, in which we eavesdrop on conversations between seen and unseen protagonists. In lieu of the “macro history” that Kracauer associates with the “long range view” of historical events and phenomena, in the dissertation a broader discussion of the history of architectural education is also interwoven with critical analyses that draw upon cultural, media, and political theory.

The dissertation is organized in four sections, each of which examines different iterations of the “well-laid table” and the “marketplace,” as developed and tested by Boyarsky in his teaching and institutional work. Set primarily in the 1960s, Section 1 investigates Boyarsky’s own intellectual engagement with the history of modern
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architecture and urbanism, from his tutelage under Colin Rowe at Cornell to his early teaching experiences at the University of Illinois in Chicago. Particular attention is paid to his research and teaching on the history of Chicago, and his concomitant attempt to revise its modernist narratives. I show how he developed an “à la carte” teaching strategy (a gastronomic precursor to “well-laid table”) that relied on postcarded representations of the city and that appropriated Chicago’s urban infrastructure as a pedagogical model. The central focus of Section 2 is Boyarsky’s role as the founder and director of the International Institute of Design (IID), an independent summer school that took place in London during the early 1970s. Densely programmed with seminars, lectures, and workshops, the IID realized the “well-laid table” in the form of an ephemeral institution. The chapter discusses how Boyarsky constructed this educational experiment by establishing a complex, international communications network.

While the first half of the dissertation considers Boyarsky’s activities—speaking, writing, teaching, and designing—before he took up the post of AA chairman, the second half illuminates how his redesign of the AA’s institutional program fostered such activities during the 1970s. In Section 3 I examine Boyarsky’s overhaul of the school’s horizontal, modernist studio curriculum through his introduction of the “unit system.” A competitive framework of vertical design studios, or “units,” this teaching model—pitched by Boyarsky as a “marketplace”—provided tutors autonomous pedagogical territory to develop and pursue individualized theoretical investigations. Section 4 looks at how Boyarsky expanded the AA’s institutional program to include exhibitions, performances, lectures, and various media outlets, including newspapers, books, magazines, and video recordings. Viewing mass media as the crux of the AA’s
institutional operations, the chapter illustrates how its cultural production of architecture worked in tandem with its “marketplace” of architectural education.

Sections 3 and 4 limit discussion of Boyarsky’s chairmanship to his first decade at the AA, during the 1970s. I identify these years as an intense period of institutional experimentation and reinvention during his tenure, when he established certain traditions and mechanisms that carried its “ongoing experiment” into the following decades and that indelibly shaped its late twentieth century identity. Certainly, the second decade of Boyarsky’s chairmanship was an important moment in his career and in the careers of many contemporary architectural designers and thinkers who were teaching and studying at the AA. In lieu of a detailed historical overview of the school’s activities during the 1980s, my closing remarks instead address the ways in which during this period Boyarsky and the AA began to historicize its recent institutional transformation and accomplishments.

The reader will find that although the dissertation’s sections are organized according to a general chronological sequence, its narrative is often punctuated by flashbacks, as well as glimpses of the future. Rather than a step-by-step historical account, this fluid temporality accommodates the thematic concerns of each chapter (urbanism, an ephemeral institution, studio teaching, media practices) and, moreover, underscores the transatlantic nature of Boyarsky’s career and the expanse of his network of contacts.
LECTURE HALL

On the morning of February 27, 1975, Alvin Boyarsky momentarily exchanged his role as chairman of the Architectural Association for that of expert on the urban history of Chicago. Summoned from his office to the school lecture hall, he was invited to participate as a guest speaker in “World Cities,” a course coordinated by AA tutor Anthony Sutcliffe and inspired by geographer Peter Hall’s pioneering book of the same name. In his introductory remarks Boyarsky announced that he would be sharing a “series of anecdotes” about a city he had “lived in and was fascinated and mesmerized by,” noting that images of “early postcards” (from the early twentieth century) would appear in his accompanying slide illustrations. “There is a cult of postcards,” he confessed to his audience, “and I succumbed to it while living in Chicago.”

2 In fact, Hall had initiated the course the year before at the AA. According to him, however, though Chicago was a “real giant” among major metropolitan centers it did not qualify as a “world city” because—like Los Angeles, and unlike Paris or Berlin, for example—it had only “a regional, not a national or international significance.” Peter Hall, The World Cities (NY: McGraw Hill, 1966), 9. We might identify Boyarsky’s lecture, then, as a counterargument.
3 Alvin Boyarsky, “Chicago” lecture, delivered February 27, 1975 at the Architectural
many of the postcards that he showed that morning he had handpicked from the city’s junkshops and flea markets during his residency there in the late 1960s [figs. 1.1, 1.2].

To qualify his inclusion of (and predilection for) these objects, Boyarsky established their particular historical value. Not only did postcards provide glimpses of different stages in the development of the city’s industry, landscape, and infrastructure, he explained, but they also revealed the “special view which people have of their existence at a moment in time and what they consider to be of some significance for visitors and posterity.”

A material and visual fragment of a past time and worldview, the medium therefore presented a unique tool for analyzing and even, as Boyarsky demonstrated, for teaching its history.

Using two projectors, he advanced through his slides, discussing the historical and recent events that flickered across the screen: the Burnham Plan, the controversial installation of Picasso’s sculpture at the Chicago Civic Center in 1967, the city’s reconstruction after the Great Fire of 1871, the emergence of its suburbs, as well as its slums. As they were juxtaposed with the space and temporality of Chicago’s contemporary conditions, as encapsulated in recent photographs, the popular imagery of postcards actualized the city’s history. They operated as “dialectical images,” understood by Walter Benjamin as historical objects that when perceived in the present dissolve notions of temporal discontinuity by “telescop[ing] the past into the present.”

---

4 Boyarsky, “Chicago” lecture, ABA. Here, a notable precedent is Walker Evans’ collection of American postcards, which the photographer used in his lectures on the American vernacular. See Walker Evans and the Picture Postcard (New York: Steidl/Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2009).

5 Benjamin, “On the Theory of Knowledge, Theory of Progress,” [N7a,3], 471.
“It’s not that what is past casts its light on what is present, or what is present its light on what is past,” Benjamin posits, “rather, image is that wherein what has been comes together in a flash with the now to form a constellation.” If for Benjamin such “flashes” could ignite critical lines of inquiry on the conditions of modernity, and indeed furnish the foundations for a “materialist education,” for Boyarsky the postcard’s agency as a “dialectical image” was but one facet of a composite method of urban research and pedagogy that grappled with the juncture of Chicago’s historical past and its modernist present. And if for Benjamin “image is dialectics at a standstill,” then in contrast, as his lecture’s stream of juxtapositions suggest, Boyarsky sought to put dialectics in motion.

During the earliest years of his chairmanship Boyarsky delivered his postcarded lecture several times at the AA. In each instance, however, his arbitrary selection of slides (and postcards) inflected the content and trajectory of his extemporaneous commentary. As a result of this “à la carte” delivery, no two lectures were the same and none followed a linear chronology. His objective, however, was not to render a historically accurate portrait. Conversely, as this chapter argues, his intention was to essentially inhibit, even refuse, a definitive reading of the city in an effort to formulate a theory of contemporary urbanism that threw both its historical myths and its contemporary realities into flux.

---

This chapter traces the intellectual and methodological origins of his Chicago lecture. Through an investigation of his education and early teaching experiences, it distills an “à la carte” method of urban analysis in Boyarsky’s research and pedagogy. Appearing in the title of his 1970 essay “Chicago à la carte,” published in the British magazine *Architectural Design*, his adoption of the term is significantly multivalent, and delineates the range of his concerns and strategies. First, the gastronomic meaning of the phrase “à la carte” suggests a process of selection from an implicit “menu.” Throughout this chapter, then, we anticipate the consumptive aspects of the educational model of the “well-laid table,” though in this earlier period of his career we find the logic of consumption at work in the realm of urbanism. Concomitantly, as its French translation denotes, the word “carte” indicates that this process of selection is integral to a mapping of the city’s history through images. This mapping—visual, historical, theoretical—relies on his voracious appetite for postcards, objects that he uses to (re)construct the city *à la carte postale* and that, as collectibles, tacitly affirm the role of the “marketplace” in his urban analysis.

I begin with an overview of Boyarsky’s architectural education in North America after the Second World War, first in his hometown of Montreal at McGill University and then in Ithaca, New York at Cornell University. These little-known episodes supply some biographical background on Boyarsky, while at the same time illustrate how a postwar generation of teachers informed his perspectives on the history of modern architecture and, importantly, the history of cities. I read his investment in the latter through his Cornell graduate thesis on the Viennese urban planner Camillo Sitte, which was written under the supervision of the British historian and theorist Colin
Rowe. A pivotal figure in Boyarsky’s intellectual development, it was Rowe who first impressed upon him the metaphorical implications of the “well-laid table.” To understand how these implications began to play out in Boyarsky’s pedagogy, I traverse his early teaching appointments, with an emphasis on the AA and then the University of Illinois in Chicago (UIC). The contrast between these urban and institutional contexts—the former an independent school in a historical European city, the latter a new university in a modern American city—marked a critical turning point in his thinking, prompting his search for a theoretical framework that could negotiate the differing attitudes toward urbanism that he encountered in each setting. Underscoring the role of media in this search, I show how his collection of postcards and his slide lectures contributed such a framework. In conjunction, I consider how he articulated his hypotheses through the textual and visual composition of his essay “Chicago à la carte,” which I identify as a mediatic extension of his pedagogy, rather than an autonomous project.

Despite its somewhat entropic format, Boyarsky tested and honed his postcarded lecture for several years in front of multiple audiences. Like its resuscitation of discarded images of Chicago, then, its recurrence at Bedford Square “telescoped” scenes from his academic past into the institutional present of his AA chairmanship, producing a kaleidoscopic “flash” that points to the decisive and convergent role of urbanism, collecting and media within the broader constellation of his educational work, and in which Chicago functioned as a formative didactic instrument.
Born in Montreal in 1928, Boyarsky was the son of Jewish Eastern European immigrants—his mother, Romanian, and his father from Belarus. In an unpublished interview, he recalled that it was his general interest in “buildings, drawings, and graphic things” that had led him to the study of architecture. After graduating from high school in 1946, Boyarsky immediately entered the five-year undergraduate program in architecture at McGill University. As he recalled, being at McGill on the heels of the Second World War, one felt as if “one was at the front line.” On the one hand, his analogy conveyed the aesthetics of his university experience, with a student body comprising recently returned troops “still wearing their army pants” and with barracks doubling as classrooms and dormitories. On the other hand, the allusion cast architectural practice as a civic duty in the midst of intensive postwar building efforts in Canada, when “houses were necessary in the same way as furniture, refrigerators and television sets.” To contribute to such “positive constructive activity,” his own fifth-year thesis at McGill proposed a master plan for the expansion of Montreal’s high school system in anticipation of an increase in student population, as augured by the city’s recent boom in elementary school construction.

The subject of his undergraduate thesis project was not inconsistent with McGill’s modernist program of architectural study, which was shaped during the 1940s by the Canadian architect John Bland, director of the university’s School of Architecture from 1941 to 1972. Bland, in fact, had studied planning at the AA during
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9 Alvin Boyarsky, interview by Bill Mount, 1980, audiocassette recording and transcript from unpublished Boyarsky monograph, ABA.
10 “One wanted to get into positive constructive activity. At the age of 18 or 19 it was really an important thing to do.” Boyarsky, Mount interview.
the late 1930s when the eruption of a modernist revolution within the school expedited the dissolution of its Beaux-Arts training. Reverberations of this shift thus traveled across the Atlantic as Bland phased out the Beaux-Arts remnants of McGill’s curriculum and restructured its program, situating planning alongside the study of the “scientific empirical and artistic bases of architecture.”

Newly appointed faculty and the university’s existing engineering department provided support in the study of planning and building technology. To further cultivate architecture’s “artistic” dimension Bland made two significant hires: to teach art history, the painter Arthur Lismer, then Educational Supervisor at the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts; and to develop a foundational course, the artist Gordon Webber, who had studied in Chicago under László Moholy-Nagy at the New Bauhaus, and had taught at its later incarnation, the School of Design. Webber’s indebtedness to the educational philosophy of the former Bauhaus master and Vorkurs instructor comes


12 Webber (who was also a pupil of Lismer) studied at the New Bauhaus in 1937; the institution was later renamed the School of Design in 1939, and then again, the Institute of Design in 1940. According to Sibyl Moholy-Nagy, Webber taught a “Children’s Class” at the School of Design. Sibyl Moholy-Nagy, Moholy-Nagy: Experiment in Totality (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1969), 171. In 1956, Bland also hired the architectural historian Peter Collins. On faculty appointments at McGill during Bland’s tenure, see Annmarie Adams and Martin Bressani, “Canada: The Edge Condition,” Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 62, no. 1 (March 2003): 78.
across in his own contribution to the McGill curriculum. “Basic Elements of Visual Design,” Webber’s first-year course, aimed “to co-ordinate the eye, the hand and the mind, in the basic elements of line, shape, texture, colour, light, space, and movement,” elements which were “explored in workshop procedure.” By way of Chicago, the Bauhaus network further expanded and evolved in Montreal.

In conjunction with Bland’s contributions and revisions to McGill's program of architectural study, the combined “artistic” lessons of Lismer and Webber introduced undergraduates to the experiments in art and architecture that had blossomed in Europe during the first decades of the twentieth century, not to mention the more recent endeavors of Bauhaus protagonists. Divulging the indelible imprint of his early education in modernism, decades later Boyarsky recalled his initial response to such phenomena.

One discovered a world of incredible paintings and works of art of all sorts, incredible alliances. One reads, one identifies and on the whole is mesmerized. I was mesmerized by the whole European thing. I was blinded by it. It was a cabalistic conjunction of Giedion’s Space, Time and Architecture, Vision in Motion by Moholy-Nagy and things of that

---


sort. I must have spent restless nights, night after night, trying to understand. The images forced one to read carefully about the history of the modern movement in the arts. One became slowly a product of that rationale.\textsuperscript{15}

Here, Boyarsky’s attentiveness to the interplay between text and image—a modernist mode of experimentation recognizable in his pedagogical deployment of postcards and other media—cannot be overestimated. Certainly, in both cited publications photographic images and typographic layout do not simply illustrate textual content; rather, they jointly mobilize the discursive argumentation of each author. The juxtaposition of photographs, in the case of Giedion’s historiographical project (and more prominently in his \textit{Bauen in Frankreich, Eisen, Eisenbeton} of 1928), can be understood as a strategy for providing “insight into the moving process of life,” and for uncovering the “secret synthesis” that, as the architectural historian argues, latently unifies an otherwise seemingly fragmentary contemporary culture\textsuperscript{16} [fig. 1.3].

Alternatively, in his efforts to outline the principles of his post-Bauhaus pedagogy, Moholy-Nagy’s exposition of the interrelatedness of the biological, aesthetic, social, 

\textsuperscript{15} Boyarsky, Mount interview.

and technological dimensions of artistic production seeks a performative synthesis. The dynamic choreography of text, typography, and images in *Vision in Motion* stimulates (though somewhat less graphically acrobatic than his other publications) a perceptual experience of modernity, seeking to establish what one might characterize as a distinct valence of “space-time” that is produced through a highly mediatized mode of reading \(^\text{17}\) [fig. 1.4].

Differences in presentation and argumentation aside, both publications promote a notion of “synthesis” as fundamental to the experience of modernity. And such a message was made legible, as Boyarsky himself gleaned, through a cognitive reconciliation of image and text. In Giedion’s and Moholy-Nagy’s publications, then, we find a set of extracurricular tools that facilitated Boyarsky’s proficiency in the modern movement: its objects and images, but also, importantly, its compositional strategies. In Boyarsky’s Chicago lecture at the AA we catch sight of such strategies mobilizing his mediatic assemblage of photographs and postcards, a recirculation of images from the social domain of popular culture into the educational space of the lecture hall. Yet his own manipulation of modernism’s image-making instruments sought to overturn its very totalizing visions by inserting questions of history and urbanism into this didactic assemblage, a method that drew upon his formative encounters with Rowe at Cornell.

Following six years of professional practice in architectural offices in Montreal and in London (where he met his wife, Elizabeth), in the fall of 1957 Boyarsky

\(^{17}\) On this aspect of Moholy-Nagy’s books, see Pepper Stetler, “‘The New Visual Literature’: László Moholy-Nagy’s *Painting, Photography, Film,*” *Grey Room* 32 (Summer 2008), 88-113.
relocated to Ithaca, New York to begin graduate studies in City and Regional Planning at Cornell University’s College of Architecture.\textsuperscript{18} His arrival at Cornell serendipitously coincided with that of Rowe, whose year-long residency as a visiting critic was but a brief stop-over between teaching appointments: at Cooper Union (1956-1957), though preceded more notably by his time as a “Texas Ranger” at the University of Texas at Austin (1953-1956); and later a less raucous sojourn at Cambridge University (1958-1962). In 1962 Rowe would return to Cornell for what would be a twenty-five-year tenure. Honing the teaching experiment begun in Austin with his fellow “Texas Rangers,” at Cornell Rowe developed his seminal urban design program, the theoretical foundations of which formed the basis of \textit{Collage City}, co-authored with Fred Koetter and published in 1978.\textsuperscript{19} Though not yet fully articulated during the brief time that their paths crossed in Ithaca, the inchoate concerns that would preoccupy Rowe for the rest of his career imbued, if not defined his intellectual relationship with Boyarsky during the late 1950s.

In his memoirs Rowe narrates in vivid detail his first meeting with Alvin and Elizabeth Boyarsky in September 1957. Introduced by Michael McDougall, who was at the time also a graduate planning student at Cornell, the party dined on pizza by

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{18} Alvin Boyarsky, “Vitae,” in “Camillo Sitte: ‘City Builder,’” Master’s Thesis, Graduate School of Cornell University for the Degree of Master of Regional Planning, September 1959, ii. Boyarsky worked as a draftsman in Montreal from 1951 to 1953 before moving to London, where he was employed at the office of Yorke, Rosenberg, & Mardell until 1955. The decision to work in England was likely influenced by McGill faculty members, many of whom, as mentioned above, had studied and practiced in London.

\end{flushleft}
candlelight in Heller House, a residence hall nicknamed “Morbid Manor.” Rowe qualified the sobriquet:

It was an interior of the late nineteenth century with a lot of _en suite_ rooms, with a grand piano, an organ, and an Errard harp, with fake and not so fake seventeenth-century furniture, Tiffany lamps, and quite good oriental rugs. With dark walls, during the day it was lugubrious; but at night, with the reflection of mirrors, with _amphorae_ hanging in elliptical cutouts, with a miscellany of oils of Dutch ecclesiastical interiors (not so bad) and with a fire burning in the small room, it produced a certain subdued brilliance, like a remote and transatlantic descendant of Sir John Soane’s Museum.  

A diamond in the rough, the domestic setting of this first meeting between the Boyarskys and Rowe bespoke a telling foil to the training ground of McGill. For according to Boyarsky, he was “personally educated” by Rowe “by means of long conversations about everything, by browsing through his books and travels with him to see things.”  

Elaborating on the informal nature of their exchanges in Ithaca, Rowe confirmed that he saw the Boyarskys “pretty incessantly,” most often at the young couple’s “dreadful prefabricated hut, Cornell’s answer to post-Second World War emergency,” which despite its rather humble character supplied the backdrop for

---

21 Boyarsky, Mount interview.
“sumptuous Sunday breakfasts—bloody Marys, bagels and lox, champagne”—after which the Boyarskys “insisted on taking everybody off to attend odd redneck auctions in Owego, Marathon, Connecticut Hill, or wherever else it might be.”

If at McGill the typology of the barracks had framed Boyarsky’s education within the experience of war (“temporary housing, temporary facilities, it was just like the army—mud everywhere and freezing rain,” he recalled), his graduate schooling took place over a veritable “well-laid table” and in a “marketplace” where Rowe complicated his pupil’s perspectives on the history of modern architecture.

This “personal education” indeed circumvented the curriculum at Cornell [fig. 1.5]. As a visiting critic in the department of architecture, Rowe in fact played little (if any) part in the planning program in which Boyarsky was enrolled. Moreover, the program soon became the frequent target of Rowe’s institutional critique. In a satirical poem that lampooned Cornell’s planning curriculum, he denounced its distillation of urban study to “statistical analysis, [p]arking studies, and sociology,” with students “counting cars at intersections” and all too often asked to “calculate, analyze, and comprise, more nonsensical, irrelevant data!”

A 1958 group project by Boyarsky and his fellow classmates seems to corroborate this sardonic portrait of Cornell’s Planning Department. Brimming with traffic and population data, the “General Plan for Auburn,

---

New York” reflects a course of study that emphasized administration, zoning, and professional practice alongside field research and analysis24 [figs. 1.6, 1.7].

In an essay on architectural education written in 1971, Rowe declared his suspicion of such formalized curricula—a suspicion that his “pupil” would eventually share with equal vehemence. Skeptical of “institutionalised systems and much more skeptical of institutionalised objectives,” Rowe insisted that “once a thing is teachable, can be specified and codified, it is, almost certainly, not very much worth learning.” Furthermore, such prescriptions were particularly ill-suited to the “presumptive” nature of the design studio; “for these reasons,” he found himself “believing very much in the virtues of confusion and the impromptu.”25 Rowe’s provocation at once invokes pedagogy as a form of insurgency to counter both the modernization of education within the university and the totalizing cultural stronghold of modernism. In the essay he outlines a hypothetical curricular sequence structured according to three objectives: “to encourage the student to believe in architecture and modern architecture,” “to encourage the student to be skeptical about architecture and modern architecture,” and “then to cause the student to manipulate, with passion and intelligence, the subjects or objects of his conviction and doubt.”26 If Boyarsky’s belief in modern architecture had emerged on the “front line” at McGill, then to approximate the lessons in skepticism

24 Alvin Boyarsky et al. Auburn, General Plan: A Study by Graduate Students of the Department of City and Regional Planning, College of Architecture, Cornell University. Ithaca, NY: Department of City and Regional Planning, Cornell University, 1958.
26 Rowe, “Architectural Education in the USA,” 43.
that took place over meals, in the library and on the road with Rowe, we turn to Boyarsky’s own written thesis at Cornell. Submitted in 1959 and supervised by Rowe, it documents the pedagogical dialogue between tutor and pupil, and which transpired over the historical and theoretical terrain of urbanism.

It is Rowe whom Boyarsky credits “for planting the seed” of his thesis.27 Although his mentor had initially proposed a study comprising four separate essays on Camillo Sitte, Patrick Geddes, Ebenezer Howard, and Daniel Burnham—a coterie whom, according to Rowe, were “conceived to be stylistically different representatives of a proto-Modern urbanism”—Sitte ultimately carried this burden alone in the final thesis.28 “It is time to reexamine the myth which has been handed down by the ‘historians’ of the modern movement,” Boyarsky announces in his introduction, “which is at once iconoclastic and suspicious of the past, and often adjusted to reflect their own images and cabalistic conjunctions.” Unequivocally positioned as an “apologia for the ‘Victorian’ image” that had stigmatized Sitte in (or occluded him from) extant historical accounts of modernism, Boyarsky’s thesis set out to reevaluate both the historical and contemporary import of Sitte’s urban theories, as encapsulated in his Der Städtebau nach seinen künstlerischen Grundsätzen of 1889.29

Outlining a template of “artistic principles,” in his text Sitte promoted a contemporary method of “city building” that drew upon the urban and architectural artifacts of previous generations. In contrast to the lack of visual stimulants offered by the open spaces, repeated forms, and abstract regularity of large scale modern urban

planning (for example, in Haussmann’s Paris), Sitte maintained that the intricate arrangement of vistas, solids, and voids that the historical city accrued over time both enabled and heightened the spectator’s aesthetic perception of the urban environment. For in its formal and spatial complexity the city operated reflexively as a viewing mechanism that spectacularized its very status as a total work of art. The city as an apparatus for a *vision in motion*: to be sure, though pre-dating Moholy-Nagy, this was the crux of Sitte’s urban theories.

A rigorous engagement with these theories, however, is lacking in Boyarsky’s thesis. Commendable as a critical re-reading of Sitte rather than as a work of groundbreaking research, his study nevertheless reveals how the city, in its variable iterations, provided both teacher and student a critical tool for disarticulating monolithic historical conceptions of the modern movement. The thesis introduces Sitte in a biographical sketch that emphasizes the planner’s expansive career in education, the fine arts, architecture, and music, identifying him as a “universal man” in the likes of Alberti and Le Corbusier.30 Boyarsky’s transhistorical humanist characterization here echoes Rowe’s ongoing efforts to unveil shared fundamental principles across historical periods, a comparative method of analysis first put forward in his seminal study of Le Corbusier and Palladio in the 1947 essay “The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa,” and later between “Mannerism and Modern Architecture,” as heralded in the title of his essay of 1950.31 But as Boyarsky’s study attests, the paternity of this historical posture runs deeper. Largely a critical review of scholarship on Sitte published in English, the

30 Boyarsky, “Preface” in “Camillo Sitte: ‘City Builder,’” xii.
thesis chronicles the reception of his theories by his contemporaries in Europe ("Part 1: Camillo Sitte as the Father Image"), in American debates on civic art in the early twentieth century ("Part 2: Camillo Sitte and the Vitruvian Tradition"), and in the context of discourses on modern planning and architecture in the early twentieth century ("Part 3: Pragmatism Viewed Through Utopian Spectacles"). In this third section the thesis’ shadow figure of Le Corbusier emerges in full force as a critic of Sitte, and reappears as a modernist counterpoise in a fourth section on the “Second American Revival” of the Viennese planner. In the latter, Charles T. Stewart’s 1945 English translation of Der Städtebau (The Art of Building Cities) serves as the point of entry for a discussion on the withdrawal from modernist ideals in town planning during the 1930s and 1940s.

Presciently, albeit ingenuously, Boyarsky responds to the now notorious inadequacies of the 1945 English edition by including translations of excerpts from Sitte’s original text that had been omitted by Stewart. The impetus and primary source for this corrective gesture (which predates the 1965 publication of George and Christiane Collins’ authoritative full translation of Sitte’s book) was most likely a
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32 Camillo Sitte, The Art of Building Cities: City Building According to Its Artistic Fundamentals, translated by Charles T. Stewart (New York: Reinhold Publishing Co., 1945). Boyarsky’s thesis includes three appendices: “A Foreword” by Sitte, which originally appeared in 1904 in the journal Der Staedtebau, and which was translated from the German by “Professor Peter Kahn and transcribed by the author’s wife”; and two sections, “The Use of Landscaping in Modern Towns” and “Streets,” which Stewart excluded from his English translation of the French edition of Sitte’s book. However, the latter two appendices in the thesis were translated from the French edition by Boyarsky (who was fluent in French, but not German) and again transcribed by his wife.

33 Camillo Sitte, City Planning According to Artistic Principles, translated by George Collins and Christiane Collins (New York: Random House, 1965). In fact, Boyarsky would later meet George Collins in the Spring of 1966 at a conference at Columbia;
review of Stewart’s translation that appeared in the journal *Town Planning Review* in the summer of 1947. Authored by the architectural historian Rudolf Wittkower, the review enumerated its many and egregious discrepancies with the original German text. It is worth noting that the book review was published in the same year that Rowe completed two important works: his own thesis on “The Theoretical Drawings of Inigo Jones: Their Sources and Scope,” which Wittkower had supervised as Rowe’s advisor at the Warburg Institute and University of London; and second, “The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa,” published in *The Architectural Review* and which co-opted the underlying arguments of Wittkower’s own analysis of Renaissance architecture, expressed earlier in articles but fully expounded two years later in the book *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism* (1949). A shadow figure of a different kind, Wittkower’s appearance in Boyarsky’s thesis nonetheless illuminates the intellectual contours of a pedagogical-theoretical network constituted by Boyarsky and Rowe, as well as Sitte and Le Corbusier.

It is with a passage from Wittkower’s 1947 review of Stewart’s translation that Boyarsky launches his discussion of the conflicting urban theories of Sitte and Le Corbusier, as solidified particularly by the latter’s *Quand les cathedrales étaient* Collin informed Boyarsky that he had read his Cornell thesis. Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 15 May 1966, ABA.


blanches (1937) and Urbanisme (1929). The thesis offers the following quote by Wittkower from his book review:

Le Corbusier incorporated Sitte’s ideas into his Urbanisme though, admittedly, much disguising his debt by new emphasis and new viewpoints; he replaced Sitte’s nineteenth-century level-headedness by a pseudo-mechanistic twentieth-century romantic enthusiasm.

“Certainly, on the surface, this is hard to believe,” Boyarsky prods, in reference to Wittkower’s claims, but soon sets out to certify such paradoxical “debt” by guiding the reader through a series of passages in which Le Corbusier euphorically declares his “romantic enthusiasm” for New York, and the modern city more generally. For as Wittkower implies and Boyarsky seeks to substantiate, what is at stake in recasting Le Corbusier as a “hopeless sentimentalist,” and in turn Sitte as the figurehead of a “nineteenth-century level-headedness,” is modern architecture’s dialectical appropriation of the very tradition that it purportedly rejects. Projecting such ideological tensions at an urban scale, Wittkower succinctly posed a polemic concerning the modern and the traditional city that would underpin Rowe’s teaching and writing in the coming decades.

For prior to his brief period at Cornell in the late 1950s, in Rowe’s writing the city had played a peripheral role in his efforts at tackling the problem of “form without utopia” that haunted modern architecture. It was largely through a historical range of architectural objects that he had theorized the schism between form and ideology, whether latent in the irresolvable discrepancy between the “Platonic ideal” and “Virgilian dream,” as introduced in his study of the villas of Palladio and Le Corbusier, or manifest in the split personality of the steel frame, as both the “cultural symbol” of a polemic for early twentieth century European architects and the first Chicago School’s trophy of a “structural revolution” that was “largely without any such theoretical support.” The latter, as we will see shortly, was a transatlantic comparison that Boyarsky later revitalized in his own analysis of Chicago’s history.

But for Rowe, the breach between ideology and form was personified in the very figure of Le Corbusier, whose continual dance between the sensual and the abstract enacted a “spectacle of self-division” (also intrinsic to Mannerism) that advanced the inherent “dilemma which the whole modern movement appears to share.” Indeed, at the close of his first teaching appointment at Cornell the “spectacle of self-division” embodied by Le Corbusier steered a critical turning point in Rowe’s thought towards the city of modern architecture. On the one hand, his investment in urbanism surfaces (via Wittkower) in Boyarsky’s thesis on Sitte, its subject essentially shaped by Rowe.

---

His emergent urbanistic concerns were also contemporaneously expressed in his article “Le Corbusier: Utopian Architect,” first published in *The Listener* in February 1959, just a few months after his departure from Ithaca.

Keen to emphasize the multimedia aspect of the architect’s humanistic enterprise, Rowe argues for the centrality of the “medium of the illustrated book” in Le Corbusier’s career, citing “his early treatise, Towards a New Architecture” and the *Oeuvre Complete* as analytical tools for accessing his architectural work. “For in these books he evolves a frame of reference, persuades us to accept it, poses the problems, and answers them in his own terms,” Rowe contends, “so that, like the great system makers of the Renaissance, Le Corbusier presents himself to us as a kind of living encyclopedia of architecture, or as the index to a world where all experience is ordered and all inconsistency eradicated.”

Yet within this vision of totality—a solipsism generated through printed media—it is Le Corbusier’s urban projects that reveal its very fissures. Though purporting an aesthetic and formal relevance to his broader architectural schema, Le Corbusier’s urban proposals, Rowe insists, were ultimately informed by social abstractions that produced a “city of the mind.”

Advancing this interrogation of the disjunction between architectural form and ideology at the scale of the urban, in *Collage City* Rowe (now with Koetter) charges that the city of modern architecture, with its “veneers of rationalism,” suppresses its fantastical aspirations and

---

its “psychological lava.”\textsuperscript{44} Thus harboring the very crisis of modernism, the city of modern architecture presented “a prime illustration of an irrepressible tendency to edify”; in this way, it was, for Rowe, an inherently “didactic instrument.”\textsuperscript{45} In Benjaminian terms, then, its atemporal, rationalist lesson obstructed all possibility of “telescoping the past into the present”—a historical impasse that Boyarsky would later attempt to dismantle with alternative forms of printed media.

Though such arguments were not yet fully formed in his own writing of the late 1950s, Rowe’s early questioning of the modern city and its dichotomy permeated his pedagogy at Cornell—idiosyncratic and extracurricular as it was. Boyarsky’s thesis on Sitte, a vindication of the historical city, serves as evidence.\textsuperscript{46} Yet taking up an opposing point of view was another “student” of Rowe: Michael McDougall, Boyarsky’s classmate in Cornell’s Regional Planning program, who had first introduced the Boyarskys and Rowe at “Morbid Manor.” In 1959 McDougall submitted a modest thesis titled “Le Corbusier’s ‘Urbanisme’ - A Study in Ideal Form.” In his acknowledgments McDougall, like Boyarsky, reserves his deepest gratitude to Rowe. In defense of Le Corbusier’s “lucid and intellectual” urban visions, McDougall upholds the architect/city planner as a foil to “the Dionysiac-orgiastic, irrational, piston-like severity of power-stations as in the Futurist cities of St. Elia and the grossness of the early Eric Mendelsohn.”\textsuperscript{47} The critical invocation of these avant-garde figures was


\textsuperscript{45} Rowe and Koetter, \textit{Collage City}, 120-1.

\textsuperscript{46} Boyarsky, “Preface” in “Camillo Sitte: ‘City Builder,’” 97.

\textsuperscript{47} Michael McDougall, “Le Corbusier’s ‘Urbanisme’ a Study in Ideal Form,” Master’s Thesis, Graduate School of Cornell University for the Degree of Master of Regional
surely a direct response (orchestrated by Rowe) to recent scholarship by the historian Reyner Banham, whose resuscitation of early twentieth century avant-gardes, such as Futurism and Expressionism, also aimed to revise the historical narratives of modern architecture.48

Across the theses of Rowe’s two student theses, then, an implied genealogy is vicariously tested and overturned, curiously situating both early twentieth century techno-fetishism and rational utopianism as the descendants of nineteenth century sentimentality. And while Boyarsky in his thesis argues that city planning “today is inevitably on the side of Sitte,” McDougall conversely observes that many of Le Corbusier’s “plans thought to be impractical during the twenties are now being considered in a new light.”49 Presenting comparative studies of the same problem, the two student projects hypostatized the nascent theoretical bifurcation that would become central to Rowe’s continuing formulations on the city. And together, they demonstrate how pedagogy appropriated the very structure and mechanisms of the modernist construction whose imbricated historical and ideological complexities it sought to unravel.

ITHACA > LONDON

In a letter written in September 1958, just a few weeks after leaving Ithaca for Cambridge, Rowe melancholically confided in Boyarsky: “I feel that I’ve been giving a

---


lecture all the year and have only just caught up with the illustrations. Here they are all around—and here I am with no one to lecture to.”

Thinly veiling his nostalgia for Cornell and the convivial exchanges that had constituted his former pupil’s “personal education,” the letter inaugurated a string of melodramatic accounts of the harrowing (according to Rowe) atmosphere at Cambridge, and of English culture more generally. Despite the change in institutional scenery, Rowe assured Boyarsky that his “themes” remained wholly intact. “It is still the old combination of formalism and squalor which breaks one,” he remarked, insisting that in fact he found “these conditions to be locked together wherever I go and acting upon each other in quite the most deadly fashion.”

To illustrate this dilemma he recounted a recent dining experience at the university’s Jesus College. In stark contrast to the decorum required upon “being placed next to the Master,” during the meal curtains made of “the most deplorable piece of uncut moquette or cheap brocade” were inescapable from his line of vision. “Everybody wore preposterous gowns,” Rowe sneered, and yet the quality of the portraits hanging on the walls was subpar. Finally, he bemoaned, “the dinner was so inadequate that when I got back [home] ravenous I had to eat enormous quantities of bread and marmalade.”

Rowe seemed to be witnessing was an inversion of the perverse charm of Ithaca, where splendid meals had unfolded in a “dreadful prefab hut” and the ostentatious décor

50 Colin Rowe to Alvin Boyarsky, 14 September 1958, ABA. In late August 1958, it was Boyarsky, in fact, who drove Rowe from Ithaca to New York City, where Rowe boarded the Mauritania and set sail for England. For Rowe, the scene at Cambridge would soon transform upon the arrival of new pupils: “Peter Eisenman, from Cornell-Columbia and Jacquelin Robertson from Yale-Oxford-Yale,” as he recalled, “and, thenceforward, with the exception of a piece on La Tourette, it was conversation that usurped the role of writing.” Rowe, As I Was Saying, Vol. 1, 134.

51 Colin Rowe to Alvin Boyarsky, 29 October 1958, ABA.

52 Ibid.
of “Morbid Manor” had provided the setting for a candlelit pizza dinner, and where, moreover, conversation had effectively mediated such “formalism and squalor.” Accordingly, his suggestions for refurbishing the dinner ceremony at Jesus College quickly lapsed into a criticism of the dearth of intellectual stimulation at Cambridge.

I couldn’t help thinking then how very much better it would really be if Jesus were to set up a very elegant cafeteria service line and cut all the crap. Because as it is the students come habituated to this sort of thing and expecting its continuation in later life they are content to put up with cheap imitations and from this everything follows: the horrors of restaurant service, the stale water or the lack of any water at all, the stained table cloths even in good places, the horrors of lunch in a pub [where] the universal pork is of dubious provenance and the equally suspicious sausage roll, the lamentable ice cream, the inability (almost universal) to distinguish between the act of service and the condition of servility, the filth of the railway carriages en [sic] the London trains, everywhere in fact the almost universal substitution of a badly executed form for a substantial reality.53

In the meal—carefully constructed and hospitably presented—was another inherently “didactic instrument,” one whose potential lessons, Rowe argued, extended beyond aesthetics and good taste. By lavishing upon the student a host of exceptional choices,

53 Ibid.
an educational model based on the “very elegant cafeteria service line” would instigate informed and intelligent decision-making, thereby instilling an instinct to demand and produce objects and conditions of superior quality beyond the domain of the dining hall. Rowe’s chosen metaphor—to be sure, a genteel vision of a rarefied approach to learning that quite unambiguously ran counter to any populist notion of schooling—incontrovertibly struck a chord with his former student. What his mentor had initially proposed as a “very elegant cafeteria service line” Boyarsky later refashioned as a “well-laid table,” an educational model stocked with a rich selection of comparative positions on architecture.

But even before he began to envision this pluralistic system at an institutional scale, Boyarsky internalized its comparative mechanisms as he assumed the role of teacher during the 1960s. In this respect, he appropriated the pedagogical method of Rowe, though his confrontations with divergent strands of contemporary urbanism in London and in Chicago enabled him to complicate the lessons of his tutor and to formulate an alternative theoretical position on the modernist city and its history. This position, therefore, was defined by Boyarsky’s own strain of transatlantic anxiety.

Inspired by his student experience at Cornell—“an intellectual awakening” that also included various teaching assistantships—Boyarky’s academic career commenced in 1959 with a brief teaching post at the University of Oregon.54 There, he taught

54 Boyarsky, Mount interview. During his graduate studies at Cornell, Boyarsky was a teaching assistant: for two terms in a Materials of Construction course taught by Professor Thomas Canfield, and also for two terms for architectural history courses taught by Professor Henry Detweiler, a scholar of Near Eastern archaeology. On Detweiler’s courses in architectural history at Cornell, see Otto, “Orientation and Invention: Teaching the History of Architecture at Cornell,” 111-12. In his final term of graduate studies in the spring of 1959 Boyarsky lectured or taught on his own “in the
alongside Lee Hodgden, a former “Texas Ranger” who had recently left the University of Texas at Austin to join the faculty in Oregon in the previous year. Again, we are reminded of Boyarsky’s identity as a node within the pedagogical network of the “Texas Rangers,” a role that he wholly acknowledged later in his career.  

Boyarsky characterized his three-year sojourn in Oregon as an attempt to establish “a lively academy of urban design, or contextualism, on the West Coast.” Corroborating this claim is Hodgden’s own description of the studio exercises that he and Boyarsky collaboratively designed within and against the boundaries of an educational program that was then (by Hodgden’s account) rather unpolemically concerned with issues of regionalism. Together, the two teachers “introduced, quite innocently at the time, multiple grid collage plans, derived from analyses of the certain suggestive works by Frank Lloyd Wright,” and proposed speculative interventions in the historical urban development of Rome.  

On the periphery of the University of Oregon architecture curriculum surfaced the prefiguration of the urban studios that would soon flourish at

---

History of Architecture”; the historical scope of this course, however, is not specified in his *curriculum vitae*. Boyarsky, “Vitae,” in “Camillo Sitte: ‘City Builder,’” ii.

On the lineage of the Texas Rangers, Boyarsky would note (in the midst of his chairmanship) that “the Texas Ranger thing has given birth to the Peter Eisenmans of this world…It has influenced a lot of people who are now the major teachers at Princeton, Columbia, Cornell, Harvard and Yale who all flowed from that tradition which can be largely attributed to Colin Rowe. I’m a cousin to all that. I’m one of them in a way, although I never ride shotgun with him these days.” Boyarsky, Mount interview.

Boyarsky, Mount interview.

Lee Hodgden, “Alvin in Oregon” (1992), unpublished Boyarsky monograph, ABA. In addition to undergraduate degrees in art and in architecture, the University of Oregon’s School of Architecture and Allied Arts at the time offered master’s degrees in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Fine Arts, and a “Master of Arts, Master of Science—for historical and theoretical studies in the visual arts, art education, and urban planning.” See University of Oregon Catalog, vol. 47 (1960-1961), 199-208. University of Oregon Libraries, Special Collections and University Archives, Eugene, OR.
Cornell with the emigration of a number of “Texas Rangers” to Ithaca: among them Hodgden in 1961, Rowe a year later, along with Fred Koetter, who had studied in Oregon under Hodgden and Boyarsky.

But after three years in Oregon, Boyarsky “couldn’t take being in the woods any longer,” and like Rowe (who at that precise moment was plotting his own retreat from England back to the United States) he longed for an atmosphere “where there was conversation and feedback.” In 1962 Boyarsky returned to London (where he had worked briefly after graduating from McGill) to take up a lectureship in architectural history at the Bartlett School of Architecture [fig. 1.8]. In the following year he acquired similar teaching responsibilities at the AA, where he quickly advanced to the post of Fourth Year Master in 1964. Then structured according to a five-year curricular sequence, known as the Year System, studio teaching at the AA introduced students to architectural problems of increasing scale and complexity (a sequence that is discussed in further detail in Chapter 3). As Fourth Year Master Boyarsky oversaw the year of study devoted to urban studies, which placed emphasis on the redevelopment of institutional complexes in central London.

The mission that Boyarsky assigned himself was “to lay down an urban design scene at the AA,” and to further the “contextual” line of teaching he and Hodgden had begun in Oregon. As then AA tutor and Archigram member Peter Cook recalled,

---

58 Boyarsky, Mount interview.
59 Architectural Association “Student Information Notes from the Principal, Session 1964-1965,” 5, AAA.
60 Boyarsky, Mount interview. In fact, Boyarsky's goal coincided precisely with the school's own attempts to formally integrate urban studies into its academic program. As noted earlier, a School of Planning and Regional Reconstruction had existed at the AA between 1935-1938. Founded by E.A.A. Rowse, the planning school subsequently
Boyarsky arrived at Bedford Square “wrily pitching a Colin Rowe-ish flag onto the scene,” able to “pedal his own North American formalist canoe among the European rapids that he obviously relished.”\textsuperscript{61} The Fourth Year program that he devised took as its site the Royal Courts of Justice, located on the Strand. In conjunction with an analysis and redesign of the institution’s circulation and program, the brief also called for a rethinking of its physical integration with the surrounding urban area\textsuperscript{62} [fig. 1.9]. Some students “played figure ground games and urban design games,” but much to Boyarsky’s surprise and initial dismay most students “tore London down.”\textsuperscript{63}

The whole urban vocabulary of streets, boulevards and squares was anathema to [students]. They were trying to build a world where they would separate traffic from its surroundings in London. The Hayward separated from the AA in the form of the Gordon Square School for Planning and Regional Development, which was overseen by Rowse and Jacqueline Tyrwhitt. In the 1960s discussions on reviving such a program at the AA first took the form of a Department of Urban and Regional Design, first introduced in 1963 and then culminating in the (re)establishment of a postgraduate degree-granting School of Planning in 1965. See “AA Department of Urban and Regional Design,” \textit{Architectural Association Journal} 79, no. 878 (January 1964): 172. For contemporary discussions of urban design and planning departments at the AA see Hugh Wilson, “Impressions of the Planning Scene,” \textit{Architectural Association Journal} 80, no. 889 (February 1965), 195-201; and Arthur Korn, “Town Planning at the AA,” \textit{Architectural Association Journal} 79, no. 876 (November 1963): 113.


\textsuperscript{62} Alvin Boyarsky, “Royal Courts of Justice, Autumn Term 4\textsuperscript{th} Year, 1964:65,” dated 17 November 1964, ABA.

\textsuperscript{63} Boyarsky, Mount interview. For commentary on student projects that occupied a position in between these two poles, see Warren Chalk, “Royal Courts of Justice,” \textit{Architectural Association Journal / Arena} 81, no. 895 (November 1965): 109-113.
Gallery was their kind of curious topological image married with the kind of expressionism which the school generated during that period.64

Boyarsky’s notion of “topology” here refers to an intensification and integration of infrastructure and megastructures, resulting in the transformation of the city into a continuous multi-level surface, as epitomized in his account by the Brutalist Southbank Centre building complex, to which the Hayward Gallery belonged. This point of reference was a far cry from the discriminating meditations on the history of European cities—with their continuous, though historically textured, urban surfaces—to which he was accustomed. Boyarsky’s account of such jarring confrontations with “heathens who were more interested in wires and in elevated walkways” demands parsing [figs. 1.10]. For it points to an emerging counterculture within the AA during the mid-1960s that would exceed the curricular parameters of its professionalized Year System, and that also revealed to Boyarsky the limits of his own historical vocabulary.

On the one hand, the highly technological strain of “expressionism” that Boyarsky perceived at the AA was buoyed by the recent historiographical resurrection of modernist avant-gardes. In its championing of Le Corbusier, MacDougall’s Cornell thesis had implicitly critiqued this recent turn in scholarly activity, which, however, did not elicit equal attention within the ambit of Boyarsky’s study on Sitte. With Banham’s publication of Theory and Design in the First Machine Age in 1960, the culmination of ideas that the historian had introduced in journal articles in the years prior, Expressionism and Futurism were no longer forgotten historical episodes. A seminal

---

64 Boyarsky, Mount interview.
reassessment of the history of modern architecture, and which critically modified the narrative trajectory of Nikolaus Pevsner’s *Pioneers of the Modern Movement* (1936)—from William Morris to Walter Gropius, as its subtitle outlined—Banham’s study featured a revised cast of avant-garde protagonists whose experimental and theoretical projects resonated with a postwar generation of young British architects increasingly seduced by the promise of electronic environments, megastructures, pneumatics and mobile dwellings.65

Based in London, the collective Archigram explored and disseminated such contemporary experimental ideas through their eponymous magazine (1961-1970), as well as through their teaching at the AA [figs. 1.11, 1.12]. When Boyarsky joined the school’s staff in 1963, nearly all the group’s members were tutors there, as was their colleague and unofficial guru Cedric Price. Perhaps more than any other project it was Price’s Fun Palace (1959-1961), an unrealized techno-monument to leisure, that sparked the British postwar avant-garde’s enchantment with anticipatory structures during the 1960s [fig. 1.13]. Indeed, Boyarsky witnessed the repercussions in the work of his Fourth Year students at the AA when the school’s “Electric Decade” was in full swing.66

---


66 See Peter Cook, “The Electric Decade: An Atmosphere at the AA School 1963-1973,” in *A Continuing Experiment: Learning and Teaching at the Architectural Association*, edited by James Gowan (London: Architectural Association, 1975), 137-46. Writing in 1966, Cook noted that Christopher Alexander’s ‘The City is Not a Tree’ “became standard reading for most students in 1965 and was just the necessary definition at the time. The most recent full fifth year has had the advantage of some primary thinking by such people as Alexander, Friedman, and most directly, Cedric
But if Archigram and Price were the spokesmen for experimentation in new technologies and media at the school, the figurehead of its “topological” tendencies, according to Boyarsky, was Peter Smithson. By the late 1950s, the British architect—who with his wife Alison was a founding member of the Independent Group and a key player in the urban polemics of Team 10—had made his mark at the AA as an influential Fifth Year master. Throughout the 1950s the Smithsons had proposed urban and architectural schemes for “cluster cities” and “streets-in-the-air,” concepts crystallized in the design partners’ Golden Lane Estate housing project (1952) [figs. 1.14, 1.15]. Such expression of circulation through architectural form at an urbanistic scale was ingrained in the architectural culture of the AA, and informed the “topological rationale” that Boyarsky discerned in the monumental complexes envisioned by the AA students of the 1960s [figs. 1.10, 1.16].

Though he had lived and worked in London in the mid-1950s, Boyarsky acknowledged that the “topological rationale” and urban debates that were then brewing at the AA and in the city’s architectural circles had not inculcated his own thinking at the time. Therefore upon his return to England in the 1960s, he discovered that while he had been sharing a “well-laid table” with Rowe in Ithaca, probing the modernist city’s historical identity crisis, in London “the whole Team 10 phenomenon…the Smithson phenomenon had occurred.” It was a phenomenon, moreover, that had directly inspired Price.” See Peter Cook, “Responses,” Arena 82, no. 907 (December 1966), 143-144. For a selection of AA student projects from the 1960s, with annotations by AA staff members, see James Gowan, ed. Projects: Architectural Association, 1946-1971 (London: Architectural Association 1972). Also see special issue of Architectural Design, “What did they do for their theses? What are they doing now?” (March 1969); the issue of AD looks back at 1967 theses by students at the AA, Bartlett, and London Polytechnic (now University of Westminster).
Archigram; indeed, in the late 1950s Cook had studied under Smithson at the AA and succeeded him as Fifth Year master at the start of the school’s “Electric Decade.”

Introducing Boyarsky to a foreign pedagogical genealogy rooted in contemporary urban questions and alternative modernist legacies, Boyarsky’s experience in London exposed the restricted historical and theoretical scope of his “personal” education under Rowe. If his mentor’s comparative method of analysis had formalized a dialogue between the historical and modern city in order to hypothesize a combinatory model of urbanism, its binary structure had occluded current urban imaginaries and discourses that rendered its theoretical and formal vocabulary obsolete. As Boyarsky conceded in retrospect, there were in fact “a dozen beginnings to the sixties.”

His observation saliently reiterates the broader aims of this dissertation, and echoes Jameson’s assertion that a shared historical situation provokes multiple courses of action, whose varying arguments and outcomes shed light on the very “rhythm and dynamics” of that situation. Following Jameson’s thesis, in both the dialectical teaching of Rowe and the experimental proposals of the London avant-garde what was at stake was the historical status and identity of the contemporary city in the wake of the unfulfilled utopian aspirations of modern architecture and urbanism—a concern that sustained critical debates on urban renewal and reconstruction throughout the 1960s, whether filtered through the lens of sociology by Jane Jacobs in *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961), or theorized through the concept of architectural typology in Aldo Rossi’s *The Architecture of the City* (1966).

---

67 Boyarsky, Mount interview.

Boyarsky’s understanding of the contemporary and modernist city, however, was guided by a distinct constellation of historical issues. While Rowe had encouraged his student to circumvent the formal abstractions of the modernist city by polemically historicizing its ideological lineage, at the AA Boyarsky witnessed a rewriting of modernism’s lineage in monumentally elastic forms. The “topological rationale” that penetrated through the urban schemes of AA students, Archigram, the Smithsons, and even Sant’Elia’s Città Nuova (which was a frequent reference for the Smithsons as well as Archigram), introduced a cross-historical, comparative framework for theorizing the emergence of a contemporary form of urbanism. Yet as Boyarsky’s subsequent teaching in Chicago reveals, he did not wholly abandon the line of questioning that he inherited from Rowe in favor of the one that confronted him in London. Rather than align himself with one or the other, he explored a middle ground between the two—a theoretical space was ultimately shaped by the urban conditions of Chicago.

Boyarsky’s journey from London to Chicago, however, was not an easy one. To be sure, the AA’s “Electric Decade” was imbued with the vitality of the experimental avant-garde as much it was rife with institutional conflict. The following brief overview of this conflict explains Boyarsky’s reluctant exit from the AA in 1965 and departure for UIC, but also provides the context for his subsequent return as chairman.

Historian Thomas William Heyck has characterized the period from 1950 to 1970 as “two decades of crisis and exhilaration in British universities.” Impelled, on the one hand, by the baby boom of the late 1940s and an attendant increase in student enrollment, and on the other hand, by a nationalized effort to boost economic and

---

industrial growth, both Labour and Conservative initiatives set in motion a rapid swell in higher educational opportunities during the postwar decades, with an emphasis on creating of further outlets for advanced scientific research. Alongside the expansion of existing universities, the establishment of new universities and polytechnics widened the stage for the “two cultures” debate, as technology, science and industry were effectively repackaged with academic legitimacy and precedence within postwar educational reform.  

Part art, part science, architecture played an ambiguous role within this nationalized educational scheme, which was as much a matter of improving academic quality as was the distribution of government grants.

With the rapid transformation of the British educational system a reassessment and rearticulation of architecture’s disciplinary identity was imperative. Measures for reform materialized during an event that came to be known as the Oxford Conference. Convened in 1958 by the Royal Institute of British Architects’ Board of Education, the objective of the Oxford Conference was to formulate a “coherent policy” that would systematize the curricular permutations that individual schools of architecture had developed in response to the evolving demands of postwar reconstruction.  

In its efforts to promote a nationalized system of architectural education, the Oxford Conference’s recommendations included raising entry requirements, the creation of programs for full-time study, and further emphasis on “research,” particularly in the realm of building systems. But perhaps the most ambitious and instrumental of the
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71 Crinson and Lubbock, *Architecture, Art or Profession?*, 137.
72 Crinson and Lubbock, *Architecture, Art or Profession?*, 142.
Oxford Conference’s recommendations—and which would impose tremendous ramifications upon the AA—was that schools of architecture enter into universities and similar institutions of higher education, thereby situating architecture as an academic discipline amongst others recognized by the national educational system. Reevaluating the AA’s unique attribute of institutional independence, in the early 1960s members of the Council concluded that it was a “uniqueness, which whether we like it to be so or not, is something of an anachronism.” Though seemingly dismissive of the AA’s heritage, this bald observation was nevertheless a wholly accurate estimation of the school’s standing as against recent developments in British higher education.

Following the recommendations of the Oxford Conference, in 1964 the AA began negotiating a merger with the Imperial College of Science and Technology. A branch of the University of London, Imperial College invited the AA to join its institutional aggregate, which then included the Royal College of Science, the Royal School of Mines, and the City and Guilds College. From within Council, supporting
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73 The AA and The Imperial College of Science and Technology (London: Architectural Association, 1964), 40, Architectural Association Archive (AAA). This booklet was published by AA Council for its membership. As Council noted, “the AA is the only architectural school in Britain which stands outside the national or local government education systems and the university system.” The AA and The Imperial College of Science and Technology, 33.

74 Already in 1956 the AA had been approached by the Ministry of Education to join a National College of Architecture and Building, administered by the London County Council; the AA declined. The AA and The Imperial College of Science and Technology, 34. And Imperial College had in fact first approached the AA with a merger proposal in 1961. In addition to the Oxford Conference, further stimulus to negotiate came from the 1963 Robbins Report, which introduced into the nationalized educational scheme a “binary” system that included polytechnics alongside universities. As Peter Clarke notes: “In the post-Robbins era, it was the new polytechnics which set the pace in opening up higher education to first-generation students. By the time he left the Education and Science Department in 1967, [Secretary Anthony] Crosland had commissioned thirty polytechnics, to be jointly controlled by his department and by
arguments for the merger were founded on practical concerns, on the one hand. The AA had “outgrown” its Georgian townhouses at Bedford Square, the lease on which was set to expire in 1976; the anticipated increase in rent was beyond the AA’s means, as was an expansion of its premises. The proposed merger ensured the AA (both the Association and the School) institutional space within Imperial College’s site in South Kensington. Moreover, institutional affiliation with Imperial College would mean that the AA would receive financial support through a government grant, and thus “the price of education would no longer be exactly related to the level of the fees.”

As Council argued in support of the merger, there were, in addition, pressing “academic reasons for change.” Importantly, affiliation with Imperial College and the University of London would yield valuable contact with other fields of study, namely engineering and the sciences, thus strengthening and expanding opportunities for the AA to engage more rigorously in architectural research, as well as to effectively simulate the interdisciplinary realities of the profession. Conflating the mandates of the Oxford Conference with Bauhaus dogma, Council contended that the study of architecture in Britain was too much indebted to a nineteenth century conception of architecture as an “art,” and should instead strive for “a true integration of the arts of architecture and planning with the sciences and technology of building”—an achievement that was, indeed, “a central task of modern architecture.”


75 The AA and The Imperial College of Science and Technology, 3.

76 Ibid., 2.

77 Ibid., 32.

78 “Foreword,” by President, Gabriel Epstein, The AA and The Imperial College of Science and Technology, 4.
education in the service of modern architecture: an imprecise venture, to be sure, yet presented as an incontrovertible duty, nonetheless. With Council’s claim for the “growing need for a more systematic approach to architectural problems, for the use of scientific methods and for a closer link with structural and civil engineering,” one therefore also discerns a parallel claim for a more systematic approach to architectural education that adhered to the judgments of a governing institutional body, rather than a sphere of collective discourse.\(^7\) For as a consequence of the merger, tenured teaching appointments would be made at the discretion of the College and University. On this concession, Council rued: “You cannot have your cake and eat it, at least not within the national system.”\(^8\)

With the proposed merger’s fulfillment of the reform guidelines drafted at the Royal Institute of British Architect’s Oxford Conference on architectural education in 1958, it came as no surprise that William Allen—AA Principal from 1961 to 1966, and one of the conference’s principle organizers—supported negotiations with Imperial College.\(^9\) Alongside Allen, who had made a name for himself as an acoustics specialist at the Building Research Station, both Leslie Martin and Richard Llewelyn Davies had also participated at the Oxford Conference. As heads of prominent schools, during the 1960s all three men would play formidable roles in shaping modernist architectural education in Britain: Allen as AA Principal, Martin as Chair of Architecture at Cambridge (1956-1972), and Llewelyn Davies as professor of architecture at

\(^7\) The AA and The Imperial College of Science and Technology, 20.  
\(^8\) Ibid., 10-11.  
\(^9\) On the Oxford Conference, see Mark Crinson and Jules Lubbock, Architecture, Art or Profession? Three Hundred Years of Architectural Education in Britain (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), 125-156.
Bartlett (1960-1969) and later Professor of Urban Planning and Head of the School of Environmental Studies (1970-1975).\textsuperscript{82}

Though overshadowed by the institutional legacies of his colleagues, Allen’s brief tenure at the AA was nonetheless stamped by a technocratic ambition to strengthen studies in the building sciences. More specifically, in the 1964-1965 academic year Allen attempted to integrate building systems and technical requirements within the Fourth Year of study, thus encroaching upon Boyarsky’s Royal Courts of Justice program—an issue over which principal and young tutor butted heads. Exacerbating the discord between the two was Boyarsky’s vocal opposition to the proposed merger and his sympathy with a faction of students and staff who demanded the preservation of the school’s identity and independence. Embroiled in the institutional politics that created a tense backdrop to the AA’s “Electric Decade,” Boyarsky was “sacked” by Allen in the summer of 1965.\textsuperscript{83} The outcome was an unexpected blow for the young tutor, who as a result of his misfortune at Bedford


\textsuperscript{83} Correspondence between William Allen, Alvin Boyarsky and Elizabeth Boyarsky in folder labeled “AA Sacking,” ABA.
Square accepted a rather timely invitation to join the faculty of the College of Art & Architecture at the University of Illinois’ Chicago Circle Campus (UIC).

LONDON > CHICAGO

When he moved to Chicago in the autumn of 1965, Boyarsky was certainly far from an expert on the city’s history or its current events. He was, in fact, very much a tourist. Just a few months after his arrival, he shared some of his initial impressions of the city’s architecture in an interview conducted by Chicago’s Sunday American Magazine (“a foreigner looks at Chicago,” its cover announced). Speaking from the sidewalks of the Loop, he praised a number of contemporary buildings, commending some of the resulting historical juxtapositions played out in stone (Burnham’s Monadnock) and glass (Mies’ Federal Building). However, he was equally disturbed by the lustrous architectural residues of postwar urban renewal, as monumentalized in the city’s “second” school of architecture. “Chicago is a city of great extremes,” he mused. “On the one side you have this architectural sophistication and on the other side disintegrating slums. The compressed tensions created by the presence of the two is the frightening thing about Chicago.”

Upon arrival, Boyarsky was still carrying the “flag of contextualism.” But the exuberance of the London avant-garde, too, was still fresh in his mind. During an excursion through the city by car in the spring of 1966, he marveled at the city’s multi-level section, its layers pierced by an intricate transportation network. In his own words,

these were the “futurist aspects of Chicago,” as he observed in a letter to his wife.\textsuperscript{85}

Running deeper than its architectural legacy, the complexity of the city’s “compressed tensions”—social, technological, aesthetic, historical—presented an urban conundrum that preoccupied Boyarsky for the remainder of his tenure at UIC, and that defined his transition from tourist to teacher.

The offer to take up a dual position as Assistant Professor and Associate Dean in UIC’s architecture program had come from Leonard Currie, founding dean of the university’s College of Architecture & Art. The invitation was prompted by an early demonstration of Boyarsky’s organizational prowess at an international scale. While teaching at the AA, he had acted as the European coordinator for the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture Student Exchange Project, a short-lived transatlantic initiative that during the summer months placed American architecture students in European architectural offices and home stays, and vice versa. From across the Atlantic Currie, the American-based coordinator of the program, was deeply impressed by his colleague’s administrative skills and adroit formation of a diverse network of contacts. In Boyarsky he saw an ideal candidate to assist him in the development of the university’s architecture program.\textsuperscript{86}

\textsuperscript{85} Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 1 March 1966, ABA. When Boyarsky moved to Chicago in 1965, his wife and two children remained in London; they would join him in Chicago from the summer of 1966 until the spring of 1968, and thereafter returned to London. Boyarsky would spend the Winter 1968/1969 term on sabbatical in London.

\textsuperscript{86} Leonard Currie, “Remembering Alvin,” 9 March 1992, from unpublished Boyarsky monograph, ABA. For ACSA Student Exchange correspondence between Boyarsky and Currie, see Leonard M. Currie Papers, University Archives, University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), Box 5, Folder 82, “BOYARSKY—Architectural Association.”
The UIC department of architecture was established in 1961, and with a commitment to “the architect’s growing need for competence in the social and physical sciences and in technology.” Its mission put forward a third generation of Bauhaus principles that had been filtered through the American academic system; nevertheless, these were still directly indebted to Walter Gropius, who was Currie’s mentor at the Harvard Graduate School of Design in the late 1930s. The pedagogical direction of UIC’s architectural program, however, was dually informed by the institutional growth of the university and its inscription upon Chicago’s urban fabric [fig. 1.17]. The city’s first comprehensive public university, UIC vacated its original facilities at Navy Pier in 1965 and moved into a new campus planned by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, under a design team led by architect Walter Netsch [fig. 1.18]. Programmatically organized according to function (e.g. faculty offices, classrooms), rather than by disciplines, and

87 “College of Architecture and Art, Department of Architecture,” University of Illinois Chicago Undergraduate Division (1964-1965), 61.
88 On Gropius’ contribution to architectural education, Currie remarked: “To me, the basic precept that underlies all of the great lessons that we have learned from Gropius is that of regarding man in his entirety and looking at the world of nature and of man in its totality. The unifying principle apparent in Gropius’ work from his ‘Total Theatre’ to the educational philosophy of the Bauhaus and of the Harvard Graduate School of Design has been the wholeness of man and the wholeness of what man creates—that pervasive emphasis on the unity of hand and head and heart—in a world in which a confluence of forces urges toward an ever-greater fragmentation, dichotomy, and specialization.” Leonard J. Currie, “Some Thoughts on the Occasion of the 80th Birthday Luncheon for Walter Gropius, Cambridge, Mass.,” Currie Papers, UIC, Box 5, Folder 74, “Philosophy on Education and Architecture.”
with a comprehensive circulation system punctuated by double-height “pedestrian expressways,” the UIC campus was, for critics, the ultimate realization of modernist urban planning. As Architectural Forum enthusiastically anticipated upon its opening, the campus presented “a slightly scaled-down model of what a 20th Century city might be.”

Only a few years earlier Josep Lluís Sert had argued that the “university campus is a laboratory for urban design,” a sentiment that certainly prevailed in postwar university planning in North America, but that also reflected a concurrent reevaluation of the role of urban studies across schools of architecture. This was a disciplinary reformulation that Sert spearheaded via his establishment of the Urban Design program at Harvard in 1960. Following suit (and paraphrasing Sert), in its discussions on how to introduce an “Urban Affairs” program UIC identified its own campus as “a laboratory for the investigation of significant questions oriented about [the] process of urban change and renewal.” The claim was both ambitious and sentient. Beyond the

---

90 “Campus City, Chicago,” Architectural Forum 123, no. 2 (September 1965), 23.
93 “An Urban Affairs Program at Congress Circle: A Discussion of the Opportunities and A Draft Proposal for a Center for Urban Development,” circulated internally by Academic Advisory Council, [University of Illinois] Chicago Undergraduate Division, February 22, 1964. Currie Papers, Box 5, Folder 74, “Philosophy on Education and Architecture.” An endeavor to which Currie in his initial job offer had suggested Boyarsky might contribute, and which certainly piqued the young teacher’s interest. See
innovations of its master plan and architecture, the hotly contested site of UIC’s new campus had become the stage for the politics of urban redevelopment. Located between Harrison and Halsted on Chicago’s Near West side, the university had appropriated a plot of land previously designated for urban renewal. Uprooting residents and local businesses, the new campus generated much public controversy throughout its planning stages. While architectural circles were enthusiastically awaiting the completion of the campus, effected community groups protested its construction, bringing their case to the Supreme Court. In this way, the university’s promotion of the study of urbanism through a conflation of the city and its institutional program can be understood as an attempt to define and legitimate its own identity, transfiguring its very material, urban presence into epistemological matter.

Although UIC would not inaugurate its College of Urban Sciences until 1973, during the late 1960s design studios in its architecture department nevertheless grew increasingly responsive to the ongoing imbrication of Chicago’s social and urban

---

letter from Boyarsky to Currie, dated 16 June 1965, quoted in statement by Edward L. Deam, “In Memory and Celebration of Alvin Boyarsky.” Provided to author by Jayne Kelley at UIC School of Architecture. When Boyarsky joined the faculty at UIC, there was an absence of any comprehensive urbanism programs in Chicago’s higher educational institutions. It is worth noting that the Illinois Institute of Technology’s Department of City and Regional Planning was founded in 1955 by Ludwig Hilbesheimer, and that in 1965 the IIT’s School of Architecture and Planning became an autonomous school within IIT (and in 1975 the College of Architecture, Planning and Design). The term “urbanism,” however, during the 1960s and 1970s was not in use. At IIT, education in planning adopted the school’s philosophy of “clarity” and “expression,” extending it from the scale of architecture to the city. Alfred Swenson and Pao-Chi Chang, Architectural Education at IIT, 1938-1978 (Chicago: Illinois Institute of Technology, 1980), 101.

transformation. In the spring of his first year at UIC, for example, Boyarsky joined a community-initiated planning study of the neighborhoods surrounding Garfield Park. Blighted by slums, the area had recently seen a rapid increase in its African American population. With a group of third year students he conducted a survey of the eastern part of the neighborhood in order to develop proposals for nonprofit housing schemes. For Boyarsky, studio teaching supplied a visceral introduction to contemporary Chicago, with its slum conditions and housing crisis then at fever pitch. (It was in January 1966, for example, that Martin Luther King, Jr. famously took up residence in West side slum housing as part of the Chicago Freedom Movement’s campaign against slumlords.) As he recalled, “I found myself actually working to get rats killed in an area, or to clean up backyards, and to get the garbage collected, and to fix curbs.” He also helped

---

95 For documentation leading up to the College of Urban Science’s founding, see, for example, Currie Papers at UIC, Box 7, folders 116 “Urban Studies Program,” which illustrates attempts between 1964 and 1969. In these documents terminology fluctuates between “urban renewal” and “urban development,” and as well as “urban design” and “urban planning.” Also see “Report on Urban Related Programs for the College of Architecture and Art,” memo drafted by Boyarsky, Associate Dean, College of Architecture and Art, to Leonard E. Goodall, Associate Dean of Faculties, UIC, dated 14 May 1969. Currie Papers, UIC, Box 7, Folder 112, “College of Urban & Regional Science.” As Boyarsky stated: “Activities of the DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE are characterized by a well-balanced educational program in professional and humanistic studies. Traditionally, however, the students are trained in a problem-solving studio workshop situation, and these ‘design’ courses serve to synthesize and crystallize the nature of the architect’s diverse roles in society. Increasingly, studio situations are related to problem areas of the Greater Chicago region. In this way, the students are brought into direct contact with people, institutions, government, agencies and professionals concerned.”

96 Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 6 March 1966, ABA.

97 “Report on Urban Related Programs for the College of Architecture and Art,” memo drafted by Boyarsky, Currie Papers, UIC, Box 7, Folder 112, “College of Urban & Regional Science.”

“neighborhood groups, on abandoned sites, to produce a little bit of housing overflow” 99 [fig. 1.19].

Supplementing his contemporary lessons on the sidewalks and in the poverty-stricken neighborhoods of Chicago, other research methods further complicated his reading of the city’s “compressed tensions.” Inspired by its “futurist aspects,” Boyarsky turned his attention to Chicago’s history in section—that is, the development of its multi-level infrastructure. In this respect, his primary textbook (or “bible”) was Frank A. Randall’s *History of the Development of Building Construction in Chicago* (1949). A chronological catalog of buildings in the Loop, the book compiled construction data that Randall amassed while serving as Chicago’s Consulting Structural Engineer for the Department of Subways and Superhighways. 100 In addition, Boyarsky consulted trade journals and publications on transportation and engineering at local institutions, including the Chicago Public Library, the Newberry Library, and the Chicago Historical Society 101 [fig. 1.20]. From this array of sources he culled lithographs, photographs, and

---

99 Boyarsky, Mount interview.
100 Frank A. Randall, “Preface” in *History of the Development of Building Construction in Chicago*, 2nd edition (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press), xi. Importantly, in this civil position, it was Randall who “established the cross section of the subway tubes” in Chicago; Randall was also responsible for creating a photographic catalog of buildings above subway lines in order to evaluate the effects of future underground construction on them. John D. Randall, “Preface to the Second Edition,” *History of the Development of Building Construction in Chicago*, xv. I am grateful to Robin Middleton for bringing to my attention the significance of Randall’s text to Boyarsky.
101 In Boyarsky’s personal archive, for example, are xeroxes of the following publications: *Cable Railways of Chicago*, Bulletin Number 10, Electric Railway Historical Society (no date); *The Tunnels and Water System of Chicago: Under the Lake and Under the River* (Chicago: J.M. Wing & Co. Publishers, 1876), 3rd edition; *Chicago Subways* (October 1943).
engravings, which during the late 1960s began to appear in his UIC lectures on the history of urbanism.\textsuperscript{102}

Importantly—and as this chapter’s opening sequence in the AA lecture hall has already confirmed—slides made from postcards also began to enter into his roster of lecture images and signal the emergence of a new urban dialectic. For Boyarsky, postcards elucidated a fundamental difference between the architectural and urban topography of Europe and America. The pastoral scenery and townscapes that dominated British postcards, for example, he argued, were in keeping with the “continuity of space and surface and scale” that permeated European cities. Conversely, the development of Chicago in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century introduced a series of modern building typologies, such as “the grain elevator, the stock yards, the office buildings.” Captured on postcards, the latter developments exemplified a “city building process” that was intertwined with industry and that was, he maintained, quintessentially American.\textsuperscript{103} Deep within the infrastructural and industrial history of Chicago, then, Boyarsky recognized a dynamic urban template that dismantled the binary opposition between Sitte and Le Corbusier that Rowe had instilled in him. The industrial American city now surfaced as a seeming antithesis to the historical European city, posing a new binary relationship to explore. “I gave a talk today describing the differences between Vienna and Chicago,” Boyarsky reported to

\textsuperscript{102} Alvin Boyarsky, order for 35mm slides from the Chicago Historical Society, 24 May 1968, ABA.
\textsuperscript{103} Boyarsky, “Chicago” lecture transcript, unpublished Boyarsky monograph.
his wife in May 1968, recounting a classroom experience; as he conceded, “maybe Chicago came out on top.”

Significantly, the ascendancy of Chicago’s “city building process” was fueled by his collecting practices. “By just going to a junk shop on a Saturday afternoon and pawing through what is there,” he recalled of his hunt for postcards in Chicago, “it was possible to find very unusual material about the history of industry, certainly the history about cities.” Collectors,” Benjamin notes, “are people with a tactical instinct; their experience teaches them that when they capture a strange city, the smallest antique shop can be a fortress, the most remote stationery store a key position.” But collectors also, Benjamin adds, have “tactile instincts.” Scavenging the city’s detritus for these social documents constituted a critical component of Boyarsky’s continuing urban education—or rather, his consumption of Chicago’s history. His seizure of these commodified windows onto the urban past in turn fortified a cavernous dream world of the collector, a private pedagogical realm of urban history that was constructed “à la carte” from the “marketplace” of the city. In order to fully grasp the implications of his subsequent release of these private objects via his lectures and in relationship to his

104 Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 3 May 1968, ABA.
108 Drawing upon psychoanalysis and Marxist criticism, a rigorous and thoughtful discussion of collecting and souvenirs is to be found in Susan Stewart, On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993).
recalibration of his perspective on the contemporary city, a few remarks on his collection and on the medium of the postcard, more generally, are necessary here.

Testimony to Boyarsky’s lifelong membership to a “cult of postcards” are the thousands that today make up his personal collection, which encompasses a geographical and historical range of views spanning nearly one hundred years of international tourism. Some are blank, while others carry deracinated morsels of correspondence between senders and recipients—named, but anonymous, and from another time. Others are directly addressed to Boyarsky, inscribed by friends whose messages knowingly double as gifts for the renowned collector. Browsing through the cigar boxes in which he stored his postcards, an array of scenes flicker before one’s eyes: from the muted glow of a seaside sunset at Cornwall to the crispness of bathing beauties in Rio de Janeiro; from Garnier’s Opera House in Paris to Utzon’s typological variation in Sydney; from the highways of California to the medieval streets of Bremen [figs. 1.21, 1.22]. Though expansive in scope, the collection is dominated by American postcards manufactured during the first half of the twentieth century, and a considerable number of these depict sites in Chicago—its waterfront, the Union Stockyards, Michigan Avenue, Merchandise Mart, bridges, parks, to name but a few scenes. As a complement to these historical visions, the collection is also rich in more contemporary postcards of the city, featuring Marina City, O’Hare International airport, and the Eisenhower Expressway, for example [figs. 1.23, 1.24].

Boyarsky acquired much of this collection in Chicago, where he formally joined a “cult” by the name of the Windy City Postcard Club, “dedicated to deltiology since
1948\textsuperscript{109} [fig. 1.25]. The deltiologist: that unique breed of collector spawned by the very introduction of imagery into postcard production at the turn of the twentieth century after worldwide shifts in postal regulations allowed mailing addresses and messages to occupy the same side of the card.\textsuperscript{110} Working in tandem with a rising industry of tourism, idealized images of sites and destinations came to rival message in the postcard’s hierarchy of information. Such destabilization was indeed mobilized by the simple material structure of the object whose very flatness facilitated, even provoked, the very toppling of this hierarchy, as what was once known as recto soon became rewritten as verso. Like Chicago, then, the postcard also embodies its own “compressed tensions.”

Within this ineffable chasm between recto and verso, between image and message, resides a perpetual collapse of order—a veritable “postcard apocalypse,” for Jacques Derrida.\textsuperscript{111} The very prompt for the philosopher’s reasoning points to the intrinsically didactic potential of the medium, and in turn reveals its particular efficacy in Boyarsky’s urban outlook. Confounded by a postcard that portrays Socrates writing at a desk and seemingly guided in his work by his disciple Plato, who stands behind him, Derrida finds in this disorderly composition (for it is Plato who writes of Socrates,


\textsuperscript{110}Such postal regulations came into effect in 1902, 1903, and 1907 in Great Britain, France, and the United States respectively.

the orator who precedes him) a “revelatory catastrophe”\(^{112}\) [fig. 1.26]. By fictively staging one lesson, the postcard’s image discloses another. “Finally one begins no longer to understand what to come [venir], to come before, to come after, to foresee [prévenir] to come back [revenir] all mean,” Derrida expounds, “along with the difference of the generations, and then to inherit, to write one’s will, to dictate, to speak, to take dictation, etc.”\(^{113}\) To resist narrative sequence, then, is itself an act of edification. With its irreconcilable confrontation of image and message—a perpetual caesura of overturning—the postcard is therefore pregnant with pedagogical agency. Its two faces quell a matrix of spatial and temporal disjunctions that have the potential to unleash both epistemological disorder and enlightenment.

A specimen from the epistolary and imagistic complex of Boyarsky’s collection further illustrates this disjunction and its spectacular potential, which Boyarsky would exploit in his lecture. “Hi Alvin,” greets Archigram member Dennis Crompton on a postcard, from beneath a 1972 postmark\(^{114}\) [fig. 1.27]. “Saw this—well laid state—one more for the collection,” he reports, offering a gift and with an affectionate nod to the (then newly appointed) AA chairman’s educational model of the “well-laid table.” Crompton’s message both refers to and competes with an image of gargantuan apples traveling by freight, which flamboyantly occupy the opposite side of the postcard. Though its caption, “1876 – A Carload of Apples from California,” purports a certain degree of historical precision, the image itself—a fantastic type of montage known amongst deltiologists today as an “exaggerated product”—was produced by graphic

\(^{112}\) Derrida, *The Postcard*, 12.

\(^{113}\) Ibid., 21.

\(^{114}\) Postcard from Dennis Crompton to Alvin Boyarsky, 18 May 1972, ABA.
technologies that would not be available until decades later. This latent temporal
duplicity is complicated by a complementary spatial distortion. On the one hand, the
postmark “Miami, FLA” obfuscates Crompton’s reference to a “well laid state,” while
the postcard itself was likely manufactured in Germany.\footnote{This postcard was produced by the E.H. Mitchell company. Known for its
“exaggerated product” cards, the company had its postcards manufactured in Germany,
as did many postcard publishers in the early twentieth century. On the montage
processes of picture postcard production, with special attention to the history of
postcard production in Chicago, see Jeffrey L. Meikle, “A Paper Atlantis: Postcards,
286.} Together, the origins of object, sender, and message maintain a contingent uncertainty that is further amplified
by the “Carload of Apples from California” that is depicted. Although its fictive starting
point is implied (California), its destination remains unidentified. Its movement remains
arrested within the cardboard frame as an unfulfilled promise—a paradox that, for
Derrida, is nevertheless wholly characteristic and essential to the postcard as a medium.
“The condition for it to arrive is that it ends up and even that it begins by not arriving,”
the philosopher affirms. “This is how it is to be read, and written, the carte of the
adestination.”\footnote{Derrida, \textit{The Postcard}, 29.}

Within Boyarsky’s collection, the “compressed tension” intrinsic to the
postcard—between \textit{recto} and \textit{verso}, and between origin and destination—attributes to
the object a certain duplicity that nevertheless makes it effective in disarticulating the
“compressed tensions” of the city: between its historical origins and its contemporary
conditions, and between its “psychological lava” and its gleaming surfaces. Put
differently, what we find in the convergence of Boyarsky’s collection of postcards and
his lecture on Chicago is not a historicist project. Accordingly, the veracity of postcard
imagery is inconsequential. His aim is not to render a finite image or narrative of the past.\(^{117}\) Rather, they are deployed precisely to subvert such narrative tendencies and mythologies, and to explode all semblance of historical continuum. In this way, to return to Benjamin’s “dialectical image,” as the wares of the “marketplace” fuel the assemblage of didactic tableaux, the “materialist presentation of history leads the past to bring the present into a critical state.”\(^{118}\) The resultant “recombinant” form of urban history\(^{119}\)—transatlantic and transhistorical, material and visual—that Boyarsky’s lectures realized supplied the foundations for an alternative narrative and myth: in other words, the foundations for a theory of the contemporary city. In his lectures at UIC, however, the postcard did not perform autonomously.

Boyarsky’s analytical method was first tested and developed through a simple media experiment, some features of which are by now familiar to the present reader. “I tried out an exquisite three projector [lecture] the other day,” Boyarsky enthused in a letter to his wife in 1969.\(^{120}\) He described his performance and the objective of his tripartite slide projection:

\(^{117}\) Walter Benjamin, “Eduard Fuchs, Collector and Historian,” *One Way Street, and Other Writings*, trans. Edmund Jephcott and Kingsley Shorter (London: NLB, 1979), 352. “Historical materialism conceives historical understanding as an after-life of that which is understood, whose pulse can still be felt in the present.”


\(^{120}\) Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 6 May 1969, ABA.
…one reel has to do with reviewing the history of European humanism, social revolutionary thought and the attempt to fuse this with the USA [in the] present[,] the second reel is the tradition of building Chicago as a mechanistic interlocking of sewers and highways and tunnels and railways and winds up somewhere close in imagery to say [Archigram’s] plug in city and the third reel is all about O’Hare as the Versailles of our time[,] better pop imagery than Venturi’s hamburger stands and roadsigns[,] the point of the O’Hare reel is that it sums up the second reel and represents the present and embodies in large part the mobility dream, the controlled environment, the all happeningness of futurists in Europe at the moment. In these three parallel ways I was finally able to communicate the way I felt.121

What was this feeling, precisely? In effect, the three projectors parsed the different stages in his urban education, though illuminating its recurrent conceptual collocations: between rationalism and romanticism, as implied in the first reel, with its trajectory spanning the theories of Sitte to the utopian ethos of early twentieth century European architects to the formalism of postwar American modernism; and in the second reel, the paradoxical historicism of the London avant-garde’s technological futurology, doubled by the affinity between the Italian Futurists and Chicago’s early history. As the third reel demonstrated through the example of O’Hare, this affinity extended to an alternative American vernacular—one ineluctably defined by both technological

121 Ibid.
advances and legacies, and which thus ran counter to the populist tenor of emerging
theoretical discourses on the city’s as-yet-unnamed postmodernist possibilities, as
personified (for Boyarsky) in the figure of Venturi. As Boyarsky seemed to reason, such
a revised conception of the vernacular therefore demanded a more appropriate
symbolism—namely, airports rather than road signs.

And so, Chicago was not simply an antithesis to its European precedents. For its
past and present (the former reified in its “mechanistic” infrastructural network, and the
latter in O’Hare) also resonated with the “topological rationale” of the London avant-
garde and even before them, the Futurists. (Seemingly unbeknownst to Boyarsky was
the Futurists’ own enthusiasm over published images of American cities.) Within the
space of his postcard collection he discerned a new historical time that pierced through
these disparate urban episodes, yielding an “à la carte” temporal aggregate that was
animated in the space of the lecture hall through a parallel aggregate of didactic
techniques—from the comparative method of Rowe, to the modernist assemblage of
Moholy-Nagy and Giedion, to the “dialectical image” of the postcard. Indeed, as a
vehicle of exchange between conflicting iconographies and ideologies, the postcard was
the quintessential educational and theoretical tool for Boyarsky. 122

For Boyarsky, the implicit objective of the multiple projector format was to
identify and explore the theoretical threads running through these historical episodes
through an exhaustive process of visual analysis. The lecture “could come out different
depending on which reel one addresses one[’]s remarks to or what random pattern of
remarks one makes,” he observed. “Meanwhile the audience buys three images at a time

and are fully occupied visually if confused mentally.” Reminiscent perhaps of the work of the Eameses, but more likely influenced by the multimedia presentations of Archigram (more specifically the “Archigram Opera,” which he most surely witnessed during visits to London in the late 1960s) this stratified projected imagery animated individual “scenes” precisely through a strategy of visual fragmentation. These streams of images, moreover, were not unlike the sequences of frames that comprised his own postcard collection, as each individual object itself became subject to multiple stages of dissemination and recombination: as message, junk, collectible object, pedagogical tool, and as mental image. As he suggested, mediating between teacher and student was an educational strategy predicated on ambiguity. On the one hand, the juxtaposition of fleeting images encouraged Boyarsky’s own improvised, “à la carte” assembly and reassembly of didactic material—a demonstration of the “virtues of confusion and impromptu” that Rowe had once praised. But this teaching experiment also significantly imposed the task of selection onto his audience, demanding their active engagement through the seemingly passive act of being “occupied visually”—that is to say, through the consumption of images and the attendant onus of cognitive reconstruction. Between Rowe’s “elegant cafeteria service line” and Boyarsky’s “well-laid table,” then, was an “à la carte” model of urban pedagogy.

Boyarsky continued to hone his lecture technique during the Fall 1969 term. He began to distill his concerns and illustrations into a dialectical two-projector format,

---

123 Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 6 May 1969, ABA.
124 For an account of the “Archigram Opera,” which entailed multi-screen projections, spoken commentary, and music, see Martin Pawley, “‘We shall not bulldoze Westminster Abbey’: Archigram and the Retreat from Technology,” *Oppositions* 7 (January 1976): 25-35.
which allowed him to put “two self contained systems of ideas or evidence on separate screens,” though their joint purpose was “to find the common denominators and the strands in each which must be woven together to make some new and more relevant system or idea.” If this discussion of his “à la carte” lecture technique has established the historical concerns, media strategies, and pedagogical methods that underpinned his urban inquiry, then in its printed analogue, his essay “Chicago à la carte,” Boyarsky proceeded to layout a “more relevant system or idea” for a discussion of contemporary urbanism. A close examination of his argument and its composition further reveals how the postcard was once again vital to his theoretical construction, and how printed medium of the magazine absorbed and advanced his pedagogical message.

DÉCOLLAGE

After having spent the winter term on sabbatical in London and traveling through Europe, in the Spring of 1969 Boyarsky returned to UIC and began to plan a special issue of Architectural Design devoted to Chicago, for which he was to serve as guest editor. That Fall he enlisted a group of fifth year UIC students enrolled in his seminar on Chicago’s history of “city building” to assist him with his research. In addition to articulating his notion of the city as a “complex organism,” his intention was to highlight the contemporary “scene” in Chicago, which was “opposite in every way to the ambitions and taste of the international readership of AD.” That this special issue of AD was delivering a message from foreign territory is communicated by its very

125 Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 22 November 1969, ABA.
126 Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 15 October 1969, ABA.
127 Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 13 April 1969, ABA.
cover, which when unfolded reveals itself to be a postcard [fig. 1.28]. A blown-up reproduction of a specimen from Boyarsky’s own collection, this souvenir from Chicago depicts a cutaway view of its subway system, illustrating the city’s substrata and surface simultaneously [fig. 1.29]. Tacitly addressed to his colleagues across the Atlantic, on the opposite side was an equally multi-layered, didactic message that theorized these “compressed tensions.”

The essay, too, begins with a postcard from its author’s personal collection. Emblazoned across it, the name “Chicago” creates a window that looks over the city’s skyline [fig. 1.30, 1.23]. It is a self-reflexive gesture that demonstrates the capacity of this city (and all cities) to operate as a frame—that is, as a stage or a theater—and here in the “scene” of America, what Hubert Damisch has deemed the site of “fiction par excellence.”128 Flanking this typographic vista are two seemingly totemic structures. Inhabiting the first “C” is Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill’s Hancock Tower (1965-1969), and within the concluding “O” stretches Lake Point Tower (1965-1968), designed by Illinois Institute of Technology alums Schipporeit and Heinrich, who have dutifully resurrected the 1921 design for a skyscraper by their mentor Mies van der Rohe. As a resident of Chicago in the late 1960s, Boyarsky witnessed firsthand the simultaneous construction of these two towers during a particularly charged historical moment when the city was providing the stage for a continuous stream of riots and political demonstrations.129 Exploiting the city’s spectacular qualities, it is with this

postcard that Boyarsky begins to choreograph his own “Chicago,” suppressing the object’s standardized “Greetings” in order to present his essay “Chicago à la carte.”

The centerpiece of the December 1970 issue of AD, the article is Boyarsky’s most substantial piece of published writing and research. Eschewing standard historical fare, he does not invoke the buildings of Richardson, Sullivan, Mies, Wright, or any other heavyweights of Chicago architecture. Rather, his overarching concern is the development of the city’s infrastructure.

The exoticism of the city’s origin is taken up in the article’s introduction, and echoes and amplifies some of the major themes from his slide lecture, as well as its use of postcards [fig. 1.31]. Recapitulating a trope deployed by an extensive lineage of writers—that is, America as a nation without history—Boyarsky contrasts Europe’s “uninterrupted history in stone” to the “instant history” of America, though now referring to the latter’s cities as “an urban archaeology of peeling décollage.” His choice of words is telling. In an art historical context, décollage refers to the lacerating and peeling away of superimposed images (often posters), creating new images by unveiling hidden layers. A practice pioneered in postwar France by Jacques de la Villeglé and Raymond Hains, décollage both drew from and targeted the public sphere of the urban environment, shifting the artist’s “operation from the space of the studio to that of immediate intervention in the street”¹³⁰ [fig. 1.32]. Yet closer to Boyarsky’s field of inquiry, décollage also conjures Rowe’s appropriation of its opposite, collage, in his efforts to theorize the discordant convergence of the modernist city and its historical

counterparts. As he and Koetter insist in *Collage City*, “an approach in which objects are conscripted or seduced from out of their context, is—at the present day—the only way of dealing with the ultimate problems of, either or both, utopia and tradition.”\(^{131}\) In this combinatory method Rowe and Koetter promoted a position that Boyarsky had followed since his days as a graduate student in Ithaca, and which he was asked to revisit during the late 1960s as an invited critic at juries for Rowe’s urban studios at Cornell, a platform for cultivating the arguments of *Collage City*. Certainly, the reprinting of Rowe’s 1956 “Chicago Frame” article alongside “Chicago à la carte” in *AD* is in deference to the guest editor’s former tutor [fig. 1.33]. However, Boyarsky’s divergent invocation of *décollage* also imposes a critical—even *antithetical*—distance from the intellectual paternity of Rowe and the “collage city” that he propagated.

For with its implication of “making unstuck” and “taking off” that which has been layered and collaged, Boyarsky’s *décollage* argues for a broader process of *undoing*: a “mechanistic cycle of growth, redundancy and replacement” unique to America in which the cultural acceptance of technological progress sustains its topographical exfoliation. In “Chicago à la carte” the postcard becomes the carrier of this message in more ways than one. Alongside Boyarsky’s text appear spreads of picture postcards depicting multiple views of American landscape and industry. Railroads, bridges, steamships, ports, oilrigs, and grain elevators are juxtaposed with farms, parks, tree-lined suburban streets, and cityscapes. Together, these postcards do not simply depict, but *reify* the “peeling *décollage*” of America. They participate as mass produced objects that have been purchased, discarded, and subsequently
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\(^{131}\) Rowe and Koetter, *Collage City*, 144.
accumulated by Boyarsky for his personal collection, and then are redefined once more as they are selectively wrenched from that collection in order to perform in the article [fig. 1.34].

The frank presentation of these layers of objects, with their built-in captions and borders, appearing at a one-to-one scale and set against blank white pages—not unlike stamps affixed to a postcard verso—create an unresolved confrontation of both scenes and objects. But their composition also results in a tension between images and the article’s text. It is a calculated separation that demonstrates Boyarsky’s deft assimilation of modernist visual strategies à la Giedion and Moholy-Nagy, on the one hand, and on the other, his acquiescence to and exploitation of the postcards’ status as objects. They are industrially produced, highly manipulated, fleeting visions that are importantly—and like the city itself—part fiction. Moreover, confronted with these variegated views and objects, it is the reader who selectively consumes images and text, thereby participating in the process of décollage precisely by undoing Boyarsky’s message, and in turn, mobilizing an “à la carte” (re)construction of the city.

To be sure, American popular imagery, as well as actual voyages to American cities, had fueled the imaginations of a previous generation of European architects—from Gropius to Le Corbusier, and even later, in a different way, Archigram and the Smithsons. Yet Boyarsky’s reading and deployment of such images is distinctive. As he shifts his focus to Chicago and expands his visual vocabulary, the critical nature of his project surfaces. In sweeping prose he recounts the city’s engineering feats and the growth of its industry. Tracing the development of the city’s multi-layered

---

infrastructural network, he weaves into his layout vignettes and photographs, adding further complexity to the article’s barrage of words and images. As the subtitle of the article specifies, Boyarsky is interested in “the city as energy system.” It is a system that is produced by its multi-layered infrastructural mechanisms, but also continually disarticulated by those mechanisms as the constant flux of its roadways, waterways, railways, subways, and airways sustain the “peeling décollage” that in the article has inversely gained a monumental status via its postcarded miniaturization.

But for Boyarsky, it is O’Hare International Airport that is the true monument of Chicago.

An inspiring diagram, speaking the poetry of flow, an unheralded masterpiece descended from such giant prototypical installations as the stockyards, the pier, the service tunnels, Soldiers Field, etc., it recalls the generic style of the city itself. Open-ended, each with its own characteristic realm of geometry, scale, service and information, the automobile, the passenger and the aeroplane are linked. The built facility, idealised by Team X topologies, spare and laconic, traces the edge of their interface.133

The airport thus plays double genealogical duty: as the successor to the city’s “original anatomy” and as the prototype for a contemporary urbanism exemplified by the post-CIAM theories of the Smithsons—in other words, the “topological rationale” that he

133 Boyarsky, “Chicago à la carte,” 636.
had recognized coursing through the London avant-garde. The feat of O’Hare is not its architectural virtues; rather, it is its lack thereof. With its perfected accommodation of an internal “interface” of intersecting circulation and transport patterns the airport is a synecdoche of Chicago. It is a multi-layered “city as a building” whose own circulation of passengers, trains and automobiles flourishes with each plane’s décollage, or “lift-off,” from its runways.

Chicago’s infrastructural phenomena had certainly not escaped historians, as the pivotal example of Randall has already confirmed. But in its deliberate absence of architectural monuments Boyarsky’s study critically rejects the city’s architectural legacy as its identity—a methodology that had underpinned, for example, Carl Condit’s canonizing Chicago School of Architecture (1964). Favoring more popular and dynamic visions, Boyarsky’s study shares more common ground with the contemporary analyses of Kevin Lynch, as well as Robert Venturi, Denise Scott Brown, and Steven Izenour (in adequacy of road signs aside). His approach, however, perhaps resonates most with Banham’s Los Angeles: The Architecture of Four Ecologies (1972), an account of the city that Anthony Vidler has aptly described as “a freeway model of history.” Just as Banham—the historian-as-tourist—argues that in Los Angeles “form matters little,” and that what does matter is that it “works,” Boyarsky extols Chicago’s “mechanical efficiency.” As he argues, “from the very beginning, Chicago already
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possessed the basic hardware and Dionysian qualities of Sant’Elia’s version for Milan 2000.”

Here, his conflation of Chicago’s past with Italian Futurism urban projections obscures a definitive sense of historical origins. Yet what his mutated chronology does make clear is that over the five years that followed his rather unceremonious departure from the AA, the London avant-garde had become a critical lens for reading the history of the American city. Among those affected by Banham’s revisionist historiography, then, we must also count Boyarsky. Indeed, his drafts for “Chicago à la carte” include pages of quotations from Futurist manifestoes [fig. 1.35]. Notably, he summoned Boccioni’s “Technical Manifesto of Futurist Sculpture” (1912), whose call for a new dynamic art fueled by the assemblage of ephemeral materials echoes within the composite topography of “Chicago à la carte”—a stockpile of media that Boyarsky himself identified as a “photographic a la carte futurist landscape.” Within the text itself a latent process of accumulation also occurs as Boyarsky borrows and tweaks multiple phrases from Marinetti, Sant’Elia, and Boccioni, surreptitiously embedding them within his own prose. And in his declaration that Chicago is a “masterpiece of junk culture whose unexpected luster, fractures, misalignments and fascinating details invoke an inverted aesthetic acceptance,” another layer of his research surfaces. As his personal archive suggests, his sources for “Chicago à la carte” also include Independent Group member Lawrence Alloway’s essay “City Notes” (1959), as well as
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136 Boyarsky, “Chicago à la carte,” 603.
138 Boyarsky, “Chicago à la carte,” 610.
“Junk Culture” (1961), which in fact features quotations from Boccioni’s “Technical Manifesto.” These two Alloway texts position communication and transportation networks as the basis of a new source of monumentality in the American city.139

Boyarsky’s recourse to the Italian Futurists, however, should not be interpreted as a purely celebratory gesture, nor one limited to the rhetoric of assemblage. Rather, it reads as a measured invocation of the early twentieth century avant-garde that posed a subtle critique of the overly zealous technological enthusiasm that the movement’s revival had inspired in the 1960s (a phenomenon that Banham himself would later lament). And in point of fact, the London avant-garde’s fascination with cybernetics and space technology, as epitomized in the work of Archigram, reenacted the Futurists’ fervent appropriation of American technology and culture: a double affirmation, then, of Damisch’s thesis that “America functions as the unconscious of Europe.”140 But emptied of their ideological origins, as Boyarsky cryptically implies, such atavistic impulses were deeply troubling when anachronistically projected onto the “squalid reality” of the urban present.141

To illustrate the “squalid reality” of Chicago, the article also addresses its contemporary slums and housing shortage—urban scenes that exposed the city’s dystopian futurist present. While Boccioni, for example, had once called for an artistic practice that incorporated a myriad of objects and materials—“glass, wood, iron, cement, hair, leather cloth, electric light, etc.”—Boyarsky instead invokes similar elements to describe the “rubble” of Chicago’s slums: “old bedsprings, cracked toilet

---


140 Damisch, Narcissistic City, 91.

141 Boyarsky, “Chicago à la carte,” 603.
bowls, twisted and rusting scrap, the streets littered with newspapers and rags, the sleeve of a shirt, a doll’s eye, an automobile bumper.”

We can understand this as yet another aspect of the city’s “peeling décollage,” whose stark contrast to such crystalline, ossified structures as the Hancock building and Lake Point Tower supports Boyarsky’s pessimistic pronouncement that “today’s generation has not the ability to make large plans to inspire the future in keeping with the giant bones and sane topology of [Chicago’s] original anatomy.” For even though O’Hare—deemed the “Versailles” of Chicago—had captured the true essence the city’s historical “anatomy,” it was a site, as Boyarsky pensively observed, “where only the rich can circulate.”

The article thus constructs and unveils a highly textured amalgam of urban modalities: of collective memory and the “technological sublime,” as well as postindustrial planning and social inequality. On the article’s concluding page Boyarsky dramatically renders the psychology of the city’s split personality through a stark layout of contemporary images [fig. 1.36]. On the left hand side, a photograph of a riot scene is repeated three times. Above it appears a target from a shooting range. Occupying the right hand side is the front page of the Chicago Tribune, dated July 28, 1970. The newspaper’s mediatic surface seamlessly condenses announcements of ongoing riots in the city, airfare hikes at Midway Airport, and the projected record-breaking height of the Sears Tower. The visual staccato of the overall layout contrasts with the article’s earlier presentation of overlapping postcards. Here, then, the process of décollage slows down and the reader’s vision readjusts as Boyarsky substitutes idealized visions of the

---

142 Ibid., 632.
143 Ibid., 622.
144 Ibid., 636.
past with jarring documentation of the present. It is a calculated and sparse juxtaposition, producing the blinding “flash” of dialectical imagery that exposes an implacable tension between the historical and contemporary city, and which is the ultimate, though decidedly inconclusive message of “Chicago à la carte.”

If for Boyarsky décollage—a recurrent principle across time and cities—offered the theoretical promise of understanding and alleviating such “compressed tensions,” within the mediatic space of the article it also had a parallel destructive aftermath. During a visit to London in 1970, Boyarsky frequented AD’s editorial office to supervise the layout of “Chicago à la carte.” He was assured by the magazine’s editors that the glue used to fix his postcards in place would do them no harm; they could easily be peeled away, he was told. Despite these promises, however, the backs of his postcards today bear the scars of décollage, which left the collector quite heartbroken [146]

[fig. 1.37].

P.S.

During the late 1960s Boyarsky envisioned a format similar to his three-projector slide lecture at UIC for an unrealized book, its tentative title oscillating between The New Urbanism and City Building: A Study of the Immediate Past. Its objective was “to take stock of…the great cycle of city building” from the late nineteenth century to the contemporary. Boyarsky planned to organize the book according to three “parallel streams of mutually reinforcing information”: one section on the evolution of images of the city, from Burnham to Le Corbusier to the Smithsons
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to Archigram; a second section with drawings outlining “the surprisingly few generic
city types”; and a final section with chronological tables [fig 1.38]. “In this way,” he
clarified, “it will be possible to permit the reader to cross-reference and see different
aspects of the same problem at a glance, in theory, in context and with comparative
detailed information.”147 With its matrix of images and texts, its content and strategy
echoed the décollage of images in his slide lectures at UIC and in “Chicago à la carte,”
as well as the “à la carte” participation of the viewer. Yet it is also, perhaps, testimony
to his unfaltering position within a modernist tradition, cemented in part by Rowe. In an
interview conducted just a few years after he began his AA chairmanship, when asked
which modern “master” had left the most lasting impression on him, Boyarsky singled
out Le Corbusier over a lineage Bauhaus protagonists. This sense of kinship, he
explained, was based on the architect’s “uncanny ability to produce words, drawings
and buildings which incorporated both the polemic of the time and shall we say the
culture and the history of architecture in itself.” Le Corbusier’s expanded architectural
practice, Boyarsky stated, “allowed one to speak coherently on many fronts
simultaneously.”148

Despite his ambitions, a publishing contract with Studio Vista (London),
research trips abroad, and even a successful grant application to the Graham Foundation
in Chicago, the book never progressed beyond notes and fragments. The project was
abandoned as Boyarsky became increasingly preoccupied: first, with the International
Institute of Design, the independent summer school he established in 1970, and in
which airplanes, postcards, and stamps reappeared as icons and catalysts; and then his

147 Alvin Boyarsky, Graham Foundation book proposal, ABA.
148 Boyarsky, Mount interview.
chairmanship at the AA, which began in 1971.\textsuperscript{149} Within both these educational contexts, however, his “à la carte” pedagogy first tested in Chicago certainly reverberated, though eliciting readings of an entirely different nature—indeed, an expected effect of his preferred medium of the postcard. It is a medium of inherent instability, defined by its tension between \textit{recto} and \textit{verso}, by its suspension between sender and recipient, and whose message is always plagued, yet also constituted by the very possibility of not arriving.

\textsuperscript{149} In April 1972, during his first term as AA chairman, Boyarsky returned the advance he had received from Studio Vista. David Herbert (Studio Vista Publications Director) to Alvin Boyarsky, 19 April 1972, ABA. Boyarsky had also proposed to Herbert the \textit{AD} Chicago issue as the basis for a possible book; Herbert, however, rejected the idea. Herbert to Boyarsky, 28 January 1971, ABA.
SECTION 2 | PEDAGOGY’S PROGRESS:
THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DESIGN SUMMER SESSIONS

We emerged from the city, which was lit by the finest conflagration
the world has ever seen: it formed a huge pyramid which, like the
prayers of the faithful, had its base on the earth and its peak in
heaven. Above this atmosphere of flame and smoke there was bright
moonlight. It was an imposing spectacle; but in order to enjoy it one
would have had to be alone, or with intelligent people.

Stendhal

WAITING FOR THE WORD

During his travels abroad in the latter half of 1968, Boyarsky continued the
comparative urban investigations that Chicago had inspired. Over that summer he
visited “several continental universities” in Europe to deliver his “Chicago talk”—“a
presentation of the [city’s] prototypical mechanistic situation, a counterpoint to such
historically evolved prototypes as Moscow, Vienna, Paris, Brussels, etc.” With a
research grant and book contract in hand, a sabbatical from his academic duties at UIC
permitted him to join his family in London for the Fall term as he commenced research
on his book-length study on contemporary urbanism. However, while circulating
through continental Europe towards the close of the 1960s—a heated moment when a
kaleidoscopic expanse of political and social unrest precipitated a wave of upheavals at
educational institutions worldwide—he discovered other grounds equally ripe for

1 Stendhal (Henri Beyle), Letter to Félix Faure, from Moscow, 4 October 1812, in To
the Happy Few: Selected Letters, trans. Norman Cameron and ed. E. Boudot-Lamotte
2 Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Dean Leonard L. Currie, “Summer Schedule” memo,
May 28, 1968, ABA.
critical comparison. The rapid and heterogeneous rearticulation of curricular objectives at schools of architecture presented a new body of research material that would fundamentally shift the focus of his energies in the coming years, and indeed the rest of his career.

Within the context of architectural education, the tumultuous events of the late 1960s had inflamed ongoing cross-examinations of the foundations of architectural modernism, as well as the discipline’s complicity within extant political and economic power structures. At American schools such interrogations surfaced against the contentious backdrop of the civil rights movement and protests against the Vietnam War. Architectural students at Columbia, Berkeley, and Yale, for example, took their host institutions to task on racial discrimination and the repercussions of university expansion and planning policies on local communities, in addition to demanding curricular reforms receptive to current social and economic realities. Boyarsky most certainly followed the contemporary turmoil unfolding at other institutions. His colleagues at Cornell, for instance, kept him abreast of the Afro-American Society’s three-day armed takeover of Willard Hall in April 1969, an act of protest fueled by existing racial tensions within the university and students’ demand for a black studies

---

program, but triggered specifically by a burning cross placed outside the premises of an organization for black women students.⁴

Back in Chicago, Boyarsky had a front row seat as tensions reverberated within UIC. In the architecture department newly formed student groups, such as SARA (Student Architects for the Reform of Architecture) and TAR (The Architects of Revolution) appeared, as did “Maoist posters” ridiculing “the lackeys of the administration.”⁵ In May 1970 friction escalated across the university in response to the American invasion of Cambodia, followed swiftly by the Kent State massacre. During a student and faculty strike prompted by the former, the College of Art & Architecture was transformed into a “headquarters bunker” and “communication center” for various student groups at UIC,⁶ and hosted sit-ins in which Boyarsky participated⁷ [figs. 2.1, 2.2]. Despite the gravity of its origins, the politically charged pandemonium at the university unequivocally dazzled Boyarsky as it animated Netsch’s labyrinthine edifice.⁸

Also attentive to contemporary crises pervading European schools, the resolutely transatlantic Boyarsky viewed the state of architectural education through a distinctly international lens at the close of the 1960s. His own identity as an American
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⁴ Boyarsky recounted the events, which began on April 19, 1969, and the aftermath in a letter written to his wife a few days after the occupation. Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 23 April 1969, ABA
⁵ Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 21 May 1969, ABA.
⁸ As indicated by correspondence with his wife. Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 10 May 1970, ABA.
academic, in fact, was unceremoniously pronounced for him when during a trip to
Berlin in 1968, at the invitation of Oswald Matthias Ungers, students (presumably at the
Berlin Technical University) protested his visit with “flags hanging saying that
Professor Ungers was a traitor because he invited an American to give a lecture in his
University.”9 Anxiety had many faces. In Italy, where university admission was opened
to graduates of technical high schools in 1969, architectural student populations swelled
at an unmanageable rate. Meanwhile in France, on the heels of the explosive events of
May 1968, the dramatic dissolution of architectural study at the École des Beaux-Arts in
France was followed by the introduction of unités pedagogiques. Though “all starting
out bravely and newly without any tradition,” these individualized schools were
dispersed throughout “very provincial places all over France”; in Boyarsky’s eyes, it
was “a fairly sad sight to behold.”10 The atmosphere at Swiss and German schools, he
observed, mirrored the situation in American universities: “people bound up in
academic quarrels, people isolated from each other waiting for the word, whatever the
word might be, and generally speaking, students only too happy to receive anybody
from the outside to bring some news.”11

Across European schools of architecture, “provinciality reigned”: for Boyarsky
this was, in effect, the crux of the dilemma that pervaded architectural education

9 Boyarsky had first met Ungers when the architect visited Chicago and UIC in the
Spring of 1968 (incidentally, at the moment that Ungers was offered the chair at
Cornell). Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 5 May 1968, ABA.
(AAVA). For a detailed account of the emergence of the unités pedagogiques see
Martin Pawley and Bernard Tschumi, “The Beaux-Arts since 1968,” Architectural
worldwide. What was needed, then, was a mechanism to cultivate an international community of architectural students, as well as teachers and architects. Thus, in the summer of 1969 his plans for an independent and international school of architecture began to take shape, originating as a “twin idea of operating in a comparative way and of providing an alternative to the available education.” Boyarsky therefore began to transfer his method of urban analysis, predicated on transnational juxtapositions of the historical form of cities, into the field of institutional design.

Describing his role as director of the International Institute of Design (IID), as the school that he founded in 1970 was to be named, Boyarsky recalled, “I used to sit in my bathrobe at the kitchen table in Chicago and call Moscow, you know, and do things.” As his account of a typical day at the IID reveals, the establishment was one of curiously humble means. Active under Boyarsky’s direction until 1972, the IID was an independent architectural school without a permanent faculty, a student body, a defined curriculum, or its own premises—save for its director’s kitchen, perhaps. This chapter investigates how in lieu of such conventional academic resources, lines of communication, from the telephone to postcards, supplied its institutional infrastructure.

Although the IID was cooking in Chicago while Boyarsky was teaching at UIC, the feast took place in London, which is the primary setting of this chapter. The following account therefore retraces the urban axis on which the previous discussion of his teaching experiments was hinged, and reasserts that his transatlantic movements,
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12 “I found this to be the case in Italy, in Scandinavia and even in England,” Boyarsky declared. Alvin Boyarsky, interview by Bill Mount, 1980, unpublished Boyarsky monograph, ABA.
13 Boyarsky, Mount interview.
14 Ibid.
both physical and conceptual, directly informed his pedagogy. The IID’s main preoccupation was the organization of three Summer Sessions, hosted by the Bartlett School of Architecture (1970), the Architectural Association (1971), and the Institute of Contemporary Arts (1972). Frustrated by the “universal syndrome of statically based, isolated, bored and often intellectually under-nourished school communities,” Boyarsky sought a single educational resource that would make available an international assortment of teaching methods, design strategies, theories, and projects. In the words of the IID director, the Summer Sessions offered “a well-laid table and a platform for free-ranging souls as opposed to the arid battery fare of their local school and professional cafeterias.” Based on this institutional mission, then, we can identify the IID as his first attempt to fully realize at an institutional scale the “elegant cafeteria service line” once cynically conjured up by Colin Rowe in the late 1950s as an antidote to Cambridge, and which Boyarsky had implemented during the late 1960s at the scale of his “à la carte” slide lectures. For its director, the IID presented an appropriate institutional typology and educational model to inaugurate the 1970s.

At each six-week event students and participants from around the world gathered in London to partake in a dense program of specialized workshops, seminars, and lectures. Momentarily freed from the confines of local schools and professional obligations, attendees from over forty different countries—including Nigeria, Sweden, Japan, France, Yugoslavia, Australia, and Cuba—were invited to indulge in the Summer Sessions’ programs according to their own curiosities and skills. To augment the notion of architectural education as a form of consumption, Boyarsky also pitched
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the IID platform as a “market-place” (a concept that became more prominent during his AA chairmanship, and which Chapter 3 discusses in detail). Among its contributors, the IID welcomed a broad spectrum of avant-garde architects, historians, and theorists: Archigram, Germano Celant, Coop Himmelb(l)au, Yona Friedman, Antoine Grumbach, Hans Hollein, Charles Jencks, Rem Koolhaas, Anatole Kopp, Missing Link, Stanislaus von Moos, Gordon Pask, Horst Rittel, Superstudio, and Bernard Tschumi—to cite only a small number of the many individuals involved. More than just an educational alternative for students, the Summer Sessions also provided refuge for theories and experiments that were without a professional or institutional environment in which to develop. By culling such a cross-section of individuals and ideas, and by deploying pedagogy as a catalyst for architectural experiment on a global scale, the IID’s educational platform crystallized an international avant-garde architectural network.

By the beginning of the 1970s progressive architectural journals had already laid the groundwork for such a network through the dissemination of polemics and projects to an international reading audience. Magazines, as we will see, certainly played a pivotal role in Boyarsky’s institutional design. However, as the following study of the IID’s development makes clear, by instigating direct contact between individuals at the Summer Sessions his strategy of “cross-fertilization” was intended to surpass the efficacy of print (Chapter 4 continues this argument by emphasizing his interest in television and video technologies). After an international architectural community

16 Boyarsky, “In Progress IV,” 220.
congregated, collaborated, and exchanged ideas over a six-week period, its members were to return to their home institutions and practices equipped with newly acquired skills and perspectives that would not only inform how they operated within local contexts, but that would also reframe those localized activities as part of a global matrix of design strategies and discourses. In this way, Boyarsky’s invocation of the concept of “cross-fertilization” echoed his contemporary (and fellow Canadian) Marshall McLuhan’s own use of the term to characterize the social and cultural potential of the interpenetration of different forms of media and technology.\textsuperscript{18} For McLuhan, the “hybrid energies” produced by such intersections—whether between radio and cinema, or jets and typewriters—facilitate a process of “decentralization,” enabling individuals to communicate, operate and co-exist globally.\textsuperscript{19} Transcending biological and geographical limitations, media, as McLuhan famously maintained, were the veritable “extensions of man.”

In principle, the IID and Boyarsky operated according to a similar logic of “decentralization” that was sustained via an elaborate media network. Recall our peripatetic protagonist’s self-portrait: at home in Chicago, phoning Moscow, while organizing an international gathering in London. He seemed to revel in his itinerancy. “I don’t have a base,” he once claimed, explaining, “I move around the world and so I always think of my activities as being involved with international events.”\textsuperscript{20} In a similar spirit, the IID was without a firm base. It was mobilized by multiple channels of

\textsuperscript{20} Boyarsky, Mount interview.
communication including letters, magazines, postcards, telephones, audio recordings, video and film. These were essential to its realization, its operations, and indeed its legacy. Rather than establish a permanent school with a singular mission, Boyarsky’s objective was to create a “by-passing ad hoc agency” offering an “alternative ambience” imbued with ongoing ideas, dialogue, and activity.\(^{21}\) Both an aggregate of modes of architectural communication and a platform for the exchange of information on a global scale, the IID recast the school of architecture as a deviant, hybridized media technology. A point of clarification is necessary here: existing texts and audio documentation suggest that the word “global” was not an active part of Boyarsky’s vocabulary in his discussions on architectural education (or any other matters). His preferred term was “international,” which denotes an interest in multi-culturalism and multi-nationalism, over against the spatial implications of “global,” though the latter was certainly the implicit (and, later in his career, increasingly explicit) concern of many of his institutional activities.

Paralleling his collecting and assemblage practices, the IID harnessed multiple systems of architectural education, thinking, and practice; it was not simply a matter of extension, then, but also contraction—a crucial point that suggests that McLuhan’s media theories resonate with the IID only on the surface. Despite its convergence of various communications technologies, its pluralism of ideas, its rejection of traditional localized education, and its resolute internationalism, the IID points to the “sutures” in McLuhan’s seamless, spatially distorted conceptualization of a “global village” of

\(^{21}\) Boyarsky, “In Progress IV,” 221.
decentralized, interconnected relations and systems of exchange. Following McLuhan’s lead, nonetheless, the non-urban connotations of his “global village” prompts us to find a more appropriate “didactic instrument,” and in contradistinction Saskia Sassen’s “global city” in fact proves a more fruitful conceptual tool.

For Sassen, what qualifies a “global city” is not simply its ability to facilitate the “spatial dispersion of economic activities and the reorganization of the financial industry”; more precisely, she argues, such territorial decentralization of capital—or “capital mobility”—demands the “agglomeration of central functions in a relatively few sites, that is, in global cities.” Decentralization, then, necessitates a proportionate centralization of activity and, ultimately, political power, within a site that is, for Sassen, decidedly urban; and as others have shown, on the broader scale of such “post-industrial” transformations and the “informatization of production,” media has been an integral force. Given Boyarsky’s interest in cities, which as we shall see recurs pedagogically at the IID Summer Sessions, as well as the persistent theme of the “marketplace” as a counterpart to the “well-laid table” in his educational theories, Sassen’s notion of the “global city” therefore poses a more fitting framework for
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22 “For in seeing an aesthetic interchangeability, and by striving for an artifice so perfect that it conceals all the sutures in the final artefact and even blurs the difference between it and nature itself, it presupposes the same radical alienation from anything natural that its attempt to establish itself as a unified “second nature” sets out to obscure.” Theodor Adorno, “Music Drama,” in *In Search of Wagner*, trans. Rodney Livingstone (London: Verso, 2005), 97.


disarticulating the IID’s “hybrid energies” and for identifying the stakes of Boyarsky’s institutional design. Accordingly, this chapter argues that the IID’s objective to liberate architectural education from its localized conditions, through recourse to internationalism and media, was predicated on its realization of an institutional typology that at its core maintained a highly centralizing function; under the guise of unrestricted global exchange, “cross-fertilization,” then, constituted a new disciplinary model.

THE “GO-BETWEEN”

At the moment that Boyarsky began to sketch the contours of the IID, he was certainly not alone in seeking a new type of institution for architectural education—one distinct from a university or technical college, and autonomous from nationally regulated systems of training. During the late 1960s and early 1970s architects, theorists and educators began to rigorously reassess the structure and scope of schools of architecture, putting forward institutional alternatives and educational reforms that varied in their degrees of realization as much as in their ambitions. In the French unités pedagogiques, successor to the Beaux-Arts system, one finds an enduring example coordinated by the state. In other cases, however, the idea of an “institution” was more flexible, and embraced as a medium for critically posing questions to the discipline at large. Such was the case in curator Emilio Ambasz’s Universitas project, an attempt to formulate a multi-disciplinary institutional model broadly attuned to the demands of “post-technological society.” The impetus for a symposium hosted by the Museum of Modern Art in 1972, Ambasz’s enterprise engaged an expansive roster of historians, scientists, planners, philosophers and architects in discussions about design in the urban
environment and the attendant need for appropriate educational models and methods. Other endeavors took a more introspective approach. Consider Global Tools (1973-1975), the short-lived collaborative research program and “counter-school” whose establishment was announced on the cover of Casabella’s March 1973 issue.

Spearheaded by Italian magazine publishers and architects—including Superstudio, Archizoom, 9999 and Casabella editor Alessandro Mendini, among others—Global Tools reexamined the shared aims of disparate “radical” practices in Italy. Though it initially proposed to do so through a series of workshops exploring pre-industrial modes of production, its aspirations largely remained relegated to the pages of its eponymous magazine. Numerous other examples, both hypothetical and realized, further substantiate how educational reform and institutional design offered a method for rethinking and redrawing the limits of architectural theory and practice. However, here I call attention to a few specific examples that indisputably informed Boyarsky’s conceptualization of the IID and its Summer Sessions, and which, moreover, reiterate the transatlantic nature of his thinking and work.

The first example is the Institute of Architecture and Urban Studies (IAUS). Based in New York, the IAUS was founded by the American architect Peter Eisenman in 1967 and remained active until 1983. Envisioned by Eisenman as a “halfway house” that would “bring the real world into the academic world,” the IAUS sought to create an intellectual space devoted to architectural culture and discourse, which would also
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incorporate a pedagogical agenda via collaborative projects and consortium affiliations with colleges and universities. Historians have addressed the seminal role of the IAUS in launching a series of theoretical debates through its rigorous program of lectures, symposia, exhibitions and publications—most notably the journal *Oppositions*, which saw its first issue in 1973. The magazine’s role in cultivating a dialogue between intellectuals and practitioners in the United States and Europe has also been noted elsewhere. What remains to be explored, however, are the contemporary parallels between Eisenman’s IAUS and Boyarsky’s IID (and later, the AA).

That the underlying ambitions, institutional strategies and personal backgrounds of Eisenman and Boyarsky were in fact not so distant was argued in 1976 in the second issue of the London-based magazine *Net*, the mouthpiece of Art Net (1975-1977), Peter Cook’s gallery and event space located in Covent Garden [fig. 2.3]. As Cook’s editorial pointed out, the IAUS director and the (then) AA chairman were both married to women named Elizabeth; both had one daughter and a son named Nicholas; both were collectors of publications and antique rugs; and both were North Americans irrevocably steeped in English culture. The uncanny affinities between the two men even predated either of their institutional ventures. For both men had also studied closely under Colin Rowe. As we saw in the previous chapter, Boyarsky’s intellectual indebtedness to Rowe

---

27 “Three Institutes are Formed to Study Urban Problems,” *Architectural Record* 142, no. 6 (December 1967): 36.
was established at Cornell in the late 1950s. During Rowe’s subsequent appointment at Cambridge (1960-1963), an analogous tutelage evolved as he took on the role of Eisenman’s doctoral advisor.  

Striking up what would be a lifelong friendship, nourished by a healthy dose of collegial competition, Rowe’s two former advisees became acquainted within the American architectural scene of the late 1960s and through a shared determination to reinvigorate architectural culture through its institutions. While living in the United States during the late 1960s Boyarsky kept a close eye on the emergence of the IAUS and its expanding program, sporadically attending and even contributing to some of its events as he passed through New York. “The Institute,” as it came to be known, then offered a source of inspiration and emulation for the nascent IID director. Between the autumn of 1969 up until the first IID Summer Session took place in July 1970, Boyarsky on various occasions consulted Eisenman. He discussed his plans for the
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30 In a rather lovely anecdote shared at a memorial symposium for Boyarsky, hosted by the AA in 1990, Eisenman also acknowledged how the parallels between himself and Boyarsky hinged upon the figure of Rowe. Eisenman recounted his first meeting (and “first meal”) with Boyarsky, which took place in Italy in 1964—and in the company of Rowe. This meeting was unplanned. Traveling with his wife, Boyarsky followed the itinerary of a previous trip to Italy with his former supervisor. Upon visiting a restaurant where they had dined together, the Boyarskys there bumped into Rowe, who was seemingly retracing the same itinerary with his new pupil at Cambridge, Eisenman. See Peter Eisenman, “Architecture in a Mediated Environment,” in The Idea of the City: Architectural Associations, ed. Robin Middleton (London: Architectural Association, 1996), 61-62.

31 Robin Middleton has remarked that though John Hejduk and Peter Eisenman were “staunch admirers” of Boyarsky, “had they operated on Alvin’s home ground, they would have been rivals.” Robin Middleton, “Foreword,” in The Idea of the City: Architectural Associations, ed. Robin Middleton (London: Architectural Association, 1996), 7. And in this sense, as a first generation “Texas Ranger” and later head of Cooper Union—an independent school without any university affiliations—Hejduk and his role in late twentieth century architectural education present another a point of comparison to Boyarsky.
summer school and sought advice on funding sources, organizational tactics, and ways to attract students and possible collaborators—all similar issues that his colleague had recently faced when launching the IAUS.\textsuperscript{32}

Boyarsky, however, initially identified a set of objectives that quite consciously distinguished his own project from the IAUS. These distinctions can be read through the evolution of the name he first proposed for his summer school: the “Atlantic Institute of Architecture.”\textsuperscript{33} The name should feature a “blanket word,” Boyarsky suggested in a letter to Cedric Price (whose role as an interlocutor we will address shortly); “Atlantic,” he reasoned, adequately described “its network and objectives.”\textsuperscript{34} Implicitly, it also mirrored the scope of his architectural and urban interests at a time when he was frequently traveling between London and Chicago. While initially framed within American and European parameters, the eventual collaboration of participants from Asia, Africa, South America and Australia saw the project outgrow its original scope, thereby necessitating the adoption of “international” as a modifier more representative of the school’s projected outlook. And yet the word “school” also proved problematic. Taking a cue from Eisenman, Boyarsky suggested that the name “should include words like institute or association or groups so that it has some of the sound of a corporate body,” and thus without the ring of academic conventions. The connotation was appropriate, for as we will see, the realization of the IID was predicated on Boyarsky’s

\textsuperscript{32} As indicated by various correspondence between Boyarsky and his wife during late 1969 and early 1970.
\textsuperscript{33} Boyarsky’s wife immediately discouraged him from the name Atlantic Institute of Architecture; “A.I.A. has nasty overtones,” she argued, implicitly referring to the acronym of the professional organization American Institute of Architects. Letter from Elizabeth Boyarsky to Alvin Boyarsky, 29 September 1969, ABA.
\textsuperscript{34} Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Cedric Price, 30 September 1969, ABA. As Boyarsky informed Price, the initial suggestion of “Atlantic” came from Peter Cook.
deft entrepreneurial skills. Finally, its name “should have a subject,” such as “architecture, urban studies, etc.” Though a trope of architectural modernism, the multivalence of “design” was accommodating. On the one hand it flexibly encompassed a range of practices—architectural, urban, as well as the then ubiquitous and expansive category “environmental.” On the other hand, its inclusion can be interpreted as a nod to modernism’s history in Chicago, and even further it is a reminder of his early education in modern architecture at McGill. It implies an homage to Moholy-Nagy’s Institute of Design (successor to the New Bauhaus and the School of Design), and even via its acronym, IID, it offers a playful twist on IIT (Illinois Institute of Technology), the mid-century academic abode of Ludwig Mies van der Rohe.

In fact, Boyarsky originally intended to base his summer school in an American city, capitalizing on his newly established field of domestic contacts. But the breadth of his relations in London, cemented while teaching at the AA in the early 1960s, proved equally alluring, if not more advantageous. Acting as “the go-between [for] the real architects and the avant-garde” while still maintaining relationships with “that older generation of people,” including Jim Stirling, Robert Maxwell, and Alan Colquhoun (the “English branch of the Texas Rangers”), at the AA Boyarsky had operated at the intersection of various architectural circles and generations. Writing in 1968, Cook recalled the former Fourth Year Master’s knack for composing juries.

He would deliberately juxtapose (say) a picturesque-merchant with a leader of the English Cool with someone from Archigram. He would dig
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35 Boyarsky to Price, 30 September 1969, ABA.
them all in the ribs and get them back again for more. His network was
the complete London-Atlantic geography (the only invitation-brushoff
coming from the Smithsons). A wit. And a professional academic at
work.\textsuperscript{36}

Conveniently poised between North America and continental Europe, the choice of
London as an urban setting was confirmed as the premises of the Bartlett became
available to host the proposed school during the summer months.\textsuperscript{37} And with that
decision, Boyarsky invited his British colleagues to serve as core “faculty” at the IID. If
in his slide lectures, Chicago had come out “on top,” his institutional design threw
London into high relief.

London proved a fitting context, moreover, for as Boyarsky openly admitted,
the IID was “modeled in words, if not in deed” by architects in the city’s “optimistic
scene” of the 1960s.\textsuperscript{38} Prior to the IID’s first Summer Session, the British architectural
avant-garde was already steadily preoccupied with the relationship between
technologies of information transfer and the typology of mobile educational facilities.
Such pursuits were energized in part by the postwar expansion of the British education
system, which saw the rapid construction of new universities and schools, as well as the
integration of multimedia technologies within the design of new learning

\textsuperscript{36} Peter Cook, “Conversations,” \textit{Arena: The Architectural Association Journal} 84, no.
\textsuperscript{37} His wife also encouraged him to have a European city—such as London, Paris, or
Amsterdam—as a base, rather than an American city. Letter from Elizabeth Boyarsky to
Alvin Boyarsky, 29 September 1969, ABA. The AA was first proposed as the venue for
the 1970 IID Summer Session, but was abandoned most likely due to ongoing internal
politics concerning the Imperial College merger negotiations.
\textsuperscript{38} Boyarsky, “Academicism Lives On.”
environments. One of the most ambitious and long-standing achievements of the British Department of Education and Science during this period was the founding of the Open University, a “teleuniversity” offering distance learning programs through the use of various media technologies, including television and audio cassettes [fig. 2.4]. Without identifying his precedents by name, Boyarsky’s remarks invoked the work of Price and Archigram, protagonists of London’s “optimistic scene” who were testing the architectural limits of such advancements in educational technology and environments. Enlisted as IID London correspondents and early “faculty” members, both Price and Archigram were also consulted regularly during the early planning stages of Boyarsky’s summer school. With their own store of contacts in Europe, both contributed to the construction and expansion of the IID’s network of individuals and resources.

Price was an important sounding board for Boyarsky [fig. 2.5]. Indeed, education was one of the dominant themes of the architect’s oeuvre, whether expressed via a cybernetic logic of “learning,” as implied in the responsive environment of the Fun Palace, or more overtly in the Potteries Thinkbelt (1964–1966), his detailed proposal for a technical school comprising mobile learning environments sited on the obsolete railways of the Staffordshire Potteries [fig. 2.6]. Boyarsky was certainly

---


familiar with the latter project as it developed.42 Though it was Price’s National Schools Plan, first published in the *Architects’ Journal* in 1966, which I argue presented an institutional template for a “cross-fertilization” of media, mobility, and architectural education.43

While the Potteries Thinkbelt had proposed a reform of England’s technical education system, its counterpart, the National Schools Plan, undermined the Royal Institute of British Architects’ postwar efforts to establish a nationalized and modernized system of architectural education across British schools, as formulated at the Oxford Conference of 1958. To counter the redundancy of architectural curricula and methods of training, the National Schools Plan called for a network of specialized architectural schools distributed throughout Britain, each unique in its program and staff. At each school, students would encounter individuals with expertise in specific fields, thereby receiving a comprehensive education in a variety of learning environments and fostering communication across communities of architectural students and teachers. Supported by an information network serviced by nationally distributed communication facilities, participating architectural schools would be able to maintain contact despite their distances from one another. As Price argued, “only through totally restructuring the national architectural education machine can there be any positive architectural contribution made to society.”44 Put differently: only by decentralizing architectural education can architecture again become socially, culturally

and politically relevant. Irreducible to a school or a curriculum, or even architecture, as Price implied, architectural education instead constituted a matrix of processes operating within a broader nationalized infrastructure; though he recognized national governance as an integral aspect of the project’s organization, his continued emphasis was the geographical and mediatized dispersal of the proposed network. Upholding this point of view, he continued to develop the project during the 1970s, christening the enterprise Polyark, an ephemeral institution that would eventually “link up” with Boyarsky’s IID at its Summer Sessions (as well as with the AA during his chairmanship, as Polyark’s reappearance in Chapters 3 and 4 attests).

In addition to Price, members of Archigram, too—and in particular Cook, the group’s unofficial spokesperson, as well as Dennis Crompton—played a pivotal role as interlocutors and collaborators during all phases of the IID’s organization and the staging of its Summer Sessions. From its inception as a “little magazine” in 1961, the group had been attentive to issues in architectural education, publishing student projects alongside the work of experimental architects within the pages of Archigram, as well as promoting the magazine as a subversive venue that introduced students to contemporary architectural explorations unfolding outside the domain of professional practice. To be sure, Archigram was not alone in its efforts. During the 1960s an international proliferation of newly founded student journals created an expanded forum for addressing the perceived shortcomings and isolation of architectural schools, and sought to establish channels of communication between them.\textsuperscript{45} The presence of numerous student magazines, published in Britain and elsewhere, within Boyarsky’s personal

\textsuperscript{45} For a survey of these, see Buckley and Colomina, eds., \textit{Clip/Stamp/Fold}. 
library confirm that the IID was launched not simply as a form of institutional critique, but also as a direct response to the frustrations and views of architectural students.

In conjunction with its publishing activities, during the 1960s Archigram, like their contemporary Price, had also become increasingly invested in the theoretical design of alternative educational institutions. From Ideas Circus’s itinerant package of seminar spaces, to the more introspective educational environment of Info-Gonks, to the megastructural Plug-in University (an extension of Cook’s iconic Plug-in City), the group’s proposals underscored mobility as a requisite for institutional reform and new modes of teaching and learning⁴⁶ [fig. 2.7]. This argument echoed across the pages of Archigram’s ninth issue (1970) in the group’s manifesto for an international network of architectural schools. Exploding the domestic aspirations of Price’s National Schools Plan into a global scheme, Archigram mapped a series of geographical regions called “Archizones” that were interconnected through the distribution of publications, slides, video recordings, and bodies—a proposed “cross-fertilization” of media and educational reform strategies already galvanized by the magazine’s distribution [fig. 2.8]. As one of the “Archizones” captions asked rhetorically, “why should schools put any limits on students’ freedom of movement”?⁴⁷ As if in answer to this rhetorical question, that issue of the magazine featured an advertisement for the first IID Summer Session [fig. 2.9].

What was tacitly advertised was not only freedom from individual schools, but also freedom from the printed page; the IID promised an alternative to both. Like the proposed strategies of Price and Archigram, which both graphically and discursively

⁴⁷ Archigram no. 9 (1970), n.p. For further discussion of the “Archizones” project see Sadler, 148–156.
theorized a decentralization of architectural pedagogy and knowledge through the use of media, and indeed like Boyarsky’s own teaching experiments that dispersed urban history into images, the IID was effectively mapped out as a trail of media. And yet, the “freedom of movement” that the IID provided ultimately culminated in a singular destination.

IN PROGRESS

In the early spring of 1970, advertisements for an “international summer school” open to “senior architectural students and recent graduates from all over the world” began to appear in architectural magazines, including Archigram, Domus, and Architectural Design (AD). In AD’s March 1970 issue an advertisement announced the agenda for the summer school, which was scheduled to take place in London during July and August of that year.

In addition to providing a unique opportunity for cross-fertilization and interchange and first-hand studio and seminar contact with a variety of personalities, it is hoped that a synthesis will be sparked off by some of the conflicting attitudes represented towards education, the role of the professions, and approaches to the problem of the environment.48

The notice named Boyarsky as the school’s director, with a list of participating “personalities” that included Cook and Price, as well as Reyner Banham, Tony

Dugdale, Nikolaus Habraken, Hans Hollein, Robin Middleton, Gunther Nitschke, Colin Rowe, Ionel Schein, Thomas (Sam) Stevens, and James Stirling. One year later, and once again in the pages of *AD*, Boyarsky identified this advertisement as the launch of the IID. Born in the press, the institution would continue to develop through other media outlets.

While Boyarsky secured “personalities” and premises for the first summer school meeting via letters and telephone from his kitchen table in Chicago, a publicity campaign was underway at the IID’s satellite office in the kitchen of his London home. In London, the IID “Secretariat”—Boyarsky’s wife, Elizabeth, and Helen McEachrane, at that time an assistant to Price—provided administrative and managerial support. In addition to coordinating advertisements in periodicals during the first few months of 1970, the Secretariat (with the help of the Boyarsky children, Nicholas and Victoria, who stuffed envelopes) sent notices to schools and practitioners worldwide announcing the six-week event. It is fitting, then, that among his many slogans Boyarsky would also refer to the IID as a “cottage industry.” This characterization certainly spoke of the domestic origins of its initial activities, though it belied the global reach of the enterprise. Yet its conflation of the space of the domestic and the space of production also perfectly captured how his concerns hovered between the refined culture of the “well-laid table” and the rational efficiency of the “marketplace,” a tension of opposing scales that is the crux of his educational methods.

In the letters sent to schools Boyarsky requested the nomination of an exceptional student or two and also inquired about possible sources for funding student
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49 Boyarsky, “In Progress IV,” 221.
travel and tuition. Architects and firms were asked to make donations to cover student expenses, and Boyarsky welcomed proposals for potential seminars or workshops. This savvy yet daring organizational approach—simultaneously soliciting students, “adjunct faculty,” and funding—was key to the realization of the IID’s first and subsequent Summer Sessions. For the institution itself had no income or funds. The bulk of donations covered student travel fees and scholarships; when tuition was collected from students the funds went toward general daily expenses. With vacated institutions offering their facilities free of charge during the summer months, it became possible to move “several hundred people [to London] for six weeks and use unused situations in the city” at little cost.\(^{50}\) The porosity that is attributed to the city of London is striking. A global city by Sassen’s definition, it was even understood by Boyarsky in 1970 as a node through which specialized services are offered and where production takes place.\(^ {51}\) In this way, the urban once again yielded an educational model, and which was eagerly seized upon by the IID (a gesture that in turn conjures Georg Simmel’s bald pronouncement that “through the entire course of English history London has never acted as the heart of England but often as its intellect and always as its money bag”\(^ {52}\)).

The response to the publicity campaign was tremendous, and Boyarsky fully exploited it [fig. 2.10]. Some individuals requested further information from the IID director after encountering advertisements for the summer school in magazines. Schools and offices that had received formal announcements suggested potential students,


\(^{51}\) Sassen, 5.

proposed workshops, and offered financial support. Boyarsky compiled these letters in photocopied booklets titled *In Progress*, which he redistributed to the growing number of IID contacts in an “effort to keep everyone abreast and to begin the process of feedback and interchange between participants, ‘faculty’, sponsors and interested observers”\(^{53}\) [fig. 2.11]. In its appropriation of the cybernetic principle of feedback and flows of information, *In Progress* signaled that the IID was developing its own system of communication in which information was disseminated but also reciprocally harnessed.

As Boyarsky remarked, *In Progress* was “progressively becoming the medium through which the ambience of the session was developed.”\(^{54}\) It was through the simple medium of letters that the institutional experiment had really begun [fig. 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 2.15]. For unbeknownst to the correspondents their responses were part of the IID’s activities. By participating in this epistolary dialogue they were actually constructing its program from abroad. *In Progress* I began with the IID advertisement that had appeared in *Archigram* no. 9—a gentle reminder of the project’s origins in the pages of architectural magazines. This was followed by a letter from Boyarsky to *Architectural Forum* editor Peter Blake; in it the institution’s director explained the international crisis in architectural education he had observed in Europe and in the United States, and positioned the Summer Session as an antidote to the detrimental autonomy of schools of architecture across the world. Candid about the IID’s shortcomings, Boyarsky stated that student enrollment would be limited to approximately forty places and that the IID had no available funding to cover student

\(^{53}\) Boyarsky, “In Progress IV,” 220.

\(^{54}\) Boyarsky, “In Progress IV,” 220.
expenses. By opening In Progress with this letter to Blake, Boyarsky cleverly pitched the Summer Session as an exclusive event with limited capacity and at the same time exposed its financial constraints in order to attract further funding from outside parties (as well as to dispel any financial expectations of the IID).

Because letter writing was becoming the quintessential IID activity, the graphic designers Sampson/Fether (whom Boyarsky also enlisted to create a visual identity for the second Summer Session in 1971) created sets of postage stamps that were sent to the IID contact list as promotional material. One set provocatively juxtaposed a description of the Summer Session’s objective of “cross-fertilization” and contact information with an assortment of popular imagery that reflected the anticipated diversity and ambience of the educational program [fig. 2.16]. A second set mimicked the graphic layout of baseball cards, depicting the core IID “faculty” members in the format of portrait stamps. Along with Boyarsky, Price and Cook, those featured included Reyner Banham, James Stirling, Anthony Dugdale, Warren Chalk, Nikolaus (John) Habraken, Hans Hollein, Dennis Crompton, Brian Richards, Robin Middleton, and Colin Rowe. Separated only by delicate perforations, each figure was framed by a set of miniature details: a “Summer Session” banner, a plaque bearing their names, the number “70,” and a label identifying each as a member of the “Architects of the World Series” [fig. 2.17].

Both Boyarsky and his correspondents affixed stamps to letters; thus stamps were also reproduced on the covers and interior pages of In Progress 2 and 3, as well as subsequent ephemera. Price’s personalized copy of the Summer Session diary illustrates
the effects of reproduction\textsuperscript{55} [fig. 2.18]. Equipped with a cigar (a signature accoutrement), Price, as one of the “Architects of the World Series,” makes an appearance on the cover of the Diary in the form of a portrait stamp. Though he appears here in the flesh, so to speak, looming above him are the xeroxed ghosts of his fellow “faculty” members: Rowe, Habraken, and Banham, who each bear the faded heraldry of their life as IID stamps. Charming as these portraits are, the juxtaposition of their varying degrees of vibrancy—the outcome of differing modes of reproduction—is haunting. In this setting, with a muted grin, barely discernible from behind his cup of tea, a grey Rowe can only strive to match the cobalt crispness of Price’s profile, while both Habraken and Banham, too, are veiled by the transparency of their imprint.

Here, Walter Benjamin’s ruminations on the life of stamps resonate with this printed congregation of figures. “Stamps bristle with tiny numbers, minute letters, diminutive leaves and eyes,” Benjamin writes. “They are graphic cellular tissue. All this swarms about and, like lower animals, lives on even when mutilated.”\textsuperscript{56} Price’s appearance on the cover of the Diary was indeed an act of mutilation. But who enacted this mutilation—which is in fact an act of immortalization—by tearing Price away from his “team” and placing him on the cover of the Diary? And who fixed his gaze eternally on his female companion: a stamped reincarnation of Allen Jones’s 1969 Chair sculpture, pasted into Price’s line of vision, and who herself has been mutilated from Sampson/Fether’s complementary set of IID stamps, inked in green? Was this a cheeky

\textsuperscript{55} International Institute of Design Summer Session Diary, 1970, Cedric Price Fonds, Folder x34, Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal.

match-making attempt by an outside party? Or, perhaps a self-willed departure and rendez-vous constructed by Price as a playful display of his own weakness for the opposite sex?

Media mischief aside, we here witness Boyarsky’s “à la carte” strategy at work in the IID’s miniaturized world of stamps and in the space of *In Progress*. The collector of postcards applies his “tactical instincts” to creation of this institution, and transfers his “tactile instincts” into the hands of a multitude of individuals. It is the IID’s participants who now manipulate a constituency that has been transmogrified into the currency for the circulation of architectural messages. An international chorus of voices conjoined with the mediatic presence of the “Architects of the World Series,” the *In Progress* booklets became a traveling collection of people and ideas. In its consolidation of messages and image, it prefigured the international network that the IID director was designing and steering into London.

In order to further elicit response from readers, *In Progress* 1 and 2 were replete with letters of interest from students, teachers, and architects in Finland, the United States, England, Japan, Spain, Germany, and numerous other countries, as well as letters from additional invited “faculty” who specified what type of activities they intended to contribute. Among these, the French historian Anatole Kopp suggested a lecture series on Russian Constructivism, drawing from his recent research in Moscow. Protégés of Buckminster Fuller, based at the Southern Illinois University, offered to run workshops on the subject of their mentor’s World Game. Meanwhile, Banham proposed “a set of balanced classes comparing urban growth and design in London and Los
Angeles.” Though this particular research project would culminate in the 1971 publication of Banham’s *Los Angeles: The Architecture of Four Ecologies*, in his performance at the Summer Session Banham’s investigation took the form of a comparative urban study—an approach that surely appealed to Boyarsky, who was in the midst of his own comparative urban studies between European and American cities (I will return to this intersection of urban analyses in a moment). Dovetailing with these newly printed teaching proposals, in the pages of *In Progress* 2 students began to articulate their personal interests—from systems analysis to housing to politics—and identified specific participants with whom they wished to work. A relieved Boyarsky confirmed to the IID network via a letter published in *In Progress* 2, “I am now happy to say that the Institute is definitely on. In fact, it looks very well as if we may be inundated.”

With the third installment of *In Progress* Boyarsky produced an annotated roster of participating students that identified their intended areas of research and personal information (“Speaks Russian,” “wants to organize a mobile housing group,” “He got the laws of Switzerland changed,” “Has done work on C.A.D.”). The circulation of these snapshot portraits—in essence, a supplement to the “Architects of the World...
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57 Letter from Reyner Banham to Alvin Boyarsky, 27 May 1970, *In Progress* 2, ABA.
59 Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Michael Pearson, 14 April 1970, in *In Progress* 2, ABA.
60 *In Progress* 3, ABA.
“Series” stamps—introduced participants to one another before the Summer Session began. Beyond the urban marketplace that enabled him to assemble the private realm of his postcard collection was a global marketplace of ideas and participants that allowed him to assemble an international architectural public. And like the private collection’s construction of an autonomous historical time, so too was there a specific temporal character assigned to this international architectural public. The IID existed in a time outside of the “optimism” of the 1960s. The 1960s London avant-garde, in particular, was history in the eyes of its director—a subject that he had even requested that Banham take up at the first Summer Session. Yet as the historian politely declined, “I am not sure that the recent history of the English avant garde needs formal teaching when so many of the people involved will be around the school and available for direct questioning.”61 Boyarsky’s attempt (via Banham’s expertise) to historicize the 1960s was thus symptomatic of a contingent goal of the IID: to set the contemporary architectural culture of the 1970s in motion.

Further proposals for events appeared in In Progress 3. For example, Price suggested a weekly “question/answer/question” session, Habraken stated his intention to run workshops on “detachable units” in housing, and Rowe outlined a lecture series on “Utopia or Collage City.”62 To be sure, urbanism a major theme in all the Summer Sessions. Predating the publication of Collage City (1978), at the 1970 Summer Session Rowe’s lecture series continued the dialogue on historical and modern urbanism that he had in fact begun with Boyarsky at Cornell. His participation under the institutional jurisdiction of the IID therefore signaled an inversion as his theoretical project began to

62 In Progress 3, ABA.
unfold further within a pedagogical arena modeled by his former student. Moreover, it was arena that was itself designed as a comparative model, and in which positions on urbanism were confronted with one another. Like Rowe, Banham took to the city in order to flee the formal abstractions that had saturated and undermined modern architecture. Yet he veered dramatically from Rowe, however, as he opted instead to pursue the notion of infrastructure as a new form of monumentality, and shared with the IID director a fascination with the American city as a fresh lens on the history of modernism. To Boyarsky’s love affair with Chicago, Banham answered with his devotion to Los Angeles, both in their studies leaving a somewhat jilted London across the Atlantic.

Boyarsky’s indebtedness to and deviation from Rowe’s urban theories have already been discussed; so too have the correspondences between his and Banham’s studies been raised. What is significant here is that in 1970 the IID provided an opportunity for its director to juxtapose his urban theories with those of his esteemed colleagues, and in front of an international audience. With an impressive list of sponsors confirmed to support travel and tuition, the first Summer Session was certainly “on,” and Boyarsky, too, felt obliged to comment on how he might function during the event.

As genial host it is hard to predict how I will best operate, however I am keen to discuss and possibly follow up on a studio basis, if there is any interest, a comparative study of the development organization and dynamic of typical European and American cities, e.g. Vienna, Milan, Paris, Moscow etc., and American cities, leading perhaps to individually
selected contextual ‘problems’. I am best equipped to deal with Chicago at the moment.\textsuperscript{63}

Once again, we perceive an overlay of Boyarsky’s pedagogy at differing scales: at an institutional scale, in the form of the IID, and also at the scale of his “à la carte” slide lecture. To reiterate: Boyarsky began planning the first Summer Session at the precise moment that he was experimenting with multiple slide projectors and using picture postcards from his personal collection as illustrations in his UIC lectures. At the inaugural Summer Session in 1970 he did in fact deliver a postcarded lecture titled “U.S.A. à la carte,” which subsequently provided the template for his \textit{AD} article “Chicago à la carte.”

The IID’s “cross-fertilization” of media and pedagogy therefore allows us to redraw and extend the trajectory of Boyarsky’s educational methods outlined in Chapter 1: from the urban marketplace of Chicago to the “dialectical image” of the postcard, from lectures at UIC to the IID, and into the printed pages of \textit{AD}. Furthermore, this extended trajectory dually illustrates the decentralizing agency of the IID. An extra-institutional institution, it filtered theories and analytical methods circulating within disparate locations, plotting their convergence in London. And yet, while it thrived on the ensuing conflict and difference of ideas—as exponentially embodied in the Rowe-Banham-Boyarsky agglomeration of comparative urban studies, for example—what the IID ultimately did not, or rather could not, fully realize was its own potential as an institution to formulate its own position. Thriving on feedback, its own “word”—

\textsuperscript{63} Alvin Boyarsky, statement in \textit{In Progress 2}. 
indeed, like the postcard’s message, destined to never arrive—remained indiscernible among the “noise” that it produced and sought to amplify.

SS70

The uncertainty and flexibility that Boyarsky expressed in his comment above was characteristic of the IID’s activities up to that point. While the ambiguity of the IID advertisements and the open-endedness of the *In Progress* booklets were unequivocally successful in securing participants, activities, and money for the first Summer Session, what they did not establish was a structure for the overall program. How would the Summer Session work once everyone arrived in London? Given the diversity of interests, skills, and goals that had accumulated within the pages of *In Progress*, how would these be balanced and managed once the authors were face-to-face with one another?

Up until the first week of July 1970 Boyarsky and some of his core “faculty” were still debating how students should operate within the given platform. Should the “faculty” organize individualized “ateliers” based on specific projects? Implement one overarching program? Or perhaps simply allow attendees to freely participate in activities throughout the six weeks? “[W]e were a load of bums,” Cook recalled, “dragging poor Alvin this way and that on the relevance or irrelevance or usefulness or narrowness of a stated project or programme.”64 Down to the wire a resolution was finally reached. “And it happened,” Cook commented. “We’d run the pedagogy too tight: [the students] would arrive in a week, and we agreed to ‘play it by ear’, with a few

of our own individual party pieces and projects packed away in case we needed them.”

In his introductory statements at the first Summer Session, which commenced on July 13, 1970, Boyarsky candidly informed his audience of the “serious case of stage fright” that the “faculty” had just experienced, as well as their anxiety about the attendees.

We were all very concerned: how would everybody find their way? Would there be any problem of people wearing stiff clothes so that we would have to send them down the road to buy jeans, white shoes, and so on. So we were very, very anxious, and I suppose the two-thirds of you [who] have already arrived have dispelled that worry.

With a group of eager students and contributors before him, the next phase of the IID dialogue could begin. For the six-week Summer Session was a live counterpart to the printed conversation that had saturated the pages of In Progress. If the mediatic technology of In Progress had supplied part of the IID’s institutional “hardware,” then the present student body and roving “faculty” constituted the “wetware of knowledge.” In London the process of feedback and exchange was to gain more immediacy as the IID network materialized in a very different form.

---

66 Transcript of IID Summer Session discussion, 13 July 1970, ABA.
67 “European universities were, as Ernst Robert Curtius put it, ‘original creations of the Middle Ages.’ They differed from previous organized studies of classical antiquity by virtue of both their wetware, the so-called universitas magistrorum et studentium, and
Boyarsky assured the students that the “faculty” could “make anything available in London that is required,” such as studio space, audiovisual equipment, or libraries. But his introduction suggested that at the Summer Session the primary resources were, in fact, people. He clarified how “faculty” members could best be used:

[M]ost important of all for those of you who, in addition to taking part in the odd workshop in the morning, your own project and seminars in the evenings, who wish to pursue something with anyone of the ‘faculty’—especially those who will be here for the five or six week period: the Archigram Group, Tony [Dugdale], myself and Jim Stirling, and Cedric [Price]—you have the possibility. . . . We would like to be asked if you feel you want to operate with us and you want to pursue some special interest of your own or something which we are following. That is the game we are trying to play.68

The Summer Session was very much a “game,” as Boyarsky insinuated, in which individuals had to navigate through a web of “adjunct faculty” (who participated intermittently during the six weeks), “faculty” members, and students. It was also a game that could extend beyond the vicinity of the Bartlett, and that could also draw further external sources into London. “Robin Middleton is sitting over a hot telephone and he is receiving all the mail all the time and knows what is going on over at their hardware: lecterns, libraries, and mail systems.” Friedrich Kittler, “Universities: Wet, Hard, Soft, and Harder,” Critical Inquiry 31, no. 1 (Autumn 2004): 244-5. 68 Transcript of IID Summer Session discussion, 13 July 1970, ABA.
Architectural Design,” Boyarsky informed students, advising that “if there are any of you who would like to take advantage of his network I am sure he will put some of it at your disposal.” In sum, what the director encouraged, then, was that students act upon their “tactical” and “tactile” instincts, an imperative key to the success of the collector of postcards and to the teacher of urban history, and now equally imperative to students in the assemblage of an educational carte.

Indeed, the pedagogical terrain was dense. Each day (excluding Sundays) during the six weeks was packed with activities coordinated by an IID “faculty” of twenty, and an additional “adjunct faculty” totaling thirty-six, who intermittently contributed over the course of the Summer Session. In addition to the facilities of the Bartlett, the Summer Session program utilized the city of London as a major resource in the form of tours (“Cook’s Tour of London”; Sam Stevens’s “early English Modern Tour”; a “High Density Public Housing Bus Tour” led by Don Genasci and Rick Mather), office visits (a “G.L.C. Visit” led by Ellis Hillman; trips to the offices of Ove Arup, Building Design Partnership, and the firm of Yorke, Rosenberg, and Mardall) and, of course, pubs. Some of the other offerings included workshops on Geodesic Housing, a “Systems Seminar” led by Roy Landau, and Stirling’s presentations of “On-going Work.” In its first iteration over twenty countries were represented from Asia, Europe, North America, South America, and Australia. Regional issues were a strong theme in seminars and lectures—such as Gunter Nitschke’s “Japanese Whisperings,” workshops on “The Argentine Scene” by David Santana, Emilio Prado, and Sara Rossi; and Dick Hobin’s “Cuba Revisited.” Fittingly, architectural education was also a common thread.

69 Transcript of IID Summer Session discussion, 13 July 1970, ABA.
70 “SS70 Diary,” 1970, ABA.
Cook showcased AA thesis projects from 1965 to 1970, Emilio Escobar, the director of Havana’s School of Architecture, gave a talk on the “Education of Architects,” while Bengt Lundsted spoke on the “Finnish Education Scene.”[Appendix A].

The “International” attribute that the IID’s name boasted is significant in the identification of it as one of architecture’s postmodern institutions (among which we may also count the IAUS72). It critically reclaimed the word “international” from its more familiar association with the so-called “International Style.” As I have argued already, the polemical efficacy and strategy of the IID was its engineered inability to articulate and promote a distinctive institutional position on architecture, whether in terms of style, theory, politics, or method. In this respect it marked a deliberate rejection of the universalizing mandates of modernism’s rappel à l’ordre, and in its international scope (somewhat unwittingly) put forward a postmodern institutional foil to the international ambitions of modern architecture’s premier institution, the Congrès internationaux d’architecture moderne (CIAM). The regional concerns expressed at the Summer Session, however, did not reflect a collective nostalgia for originary cultures or a desire to recuperate vernacular architectural traditions; nor did participants’ contribution demonstrate the “double mediation” of “critical regionalism”—to “deconstruct the overall spectrum of world culture” and “to achieve, through synthetic contradiction, a manifest critique of universal civilization.”73 Instead, by

71 “SS70 Diary.”
73 “To deconstruct world culture is to remove oneself from that eclecticism of the fin de siècle which appropriated alien, exotic forms in order to revitalize the expressivity of an enervated society. (One thinks of the ‘form-force’ aesthetics of Henri van de Velde or the ‘whiplash-Arabesques’ of Victor Horta.) On the other hand, the mediation of
choreographing a décollage of international “scenes” the IID Summer Session embodied a collective questioning, even uncertainty, that concerned the very historical status of contemporary architecture and urbanism. In effect, its animation and amplification of the spatio-temporality of the architectural present constituted another viewing mechanism in Boyarsky’s pedagogical repertoire.

At the first Summer Session the institute’s director advised attendees on how to operate this mechanism. He warned, “the one thing we don’t want to be this summer is Strasbourg geese.” Instead, he encouraged students to become “gourmets who had sampled the scene.” He clarified the rules of the “game,” revealing in fact that there were no rules in this anti-academic course.

[W]e are not here to push a line. We are not here to offer lectures and courses starting at nine and finishing at five, with a syllabus, lectures and so on. You will probably find that during the six weeks you will have listened to fifty lectures anyhow, but they will be spontaneous offerings from people dragged in from the street, and also from yourselves and from us. At the end of the six weeks you will probably be working on several so-called problems, but they will be problems of your own choice to begin with, and after you have tentatively begun you will find six other people, probably doing things not unlike your thing.  


74 “Participants Forum,” transcript, IID Summer Session, 14 July 1970, ABA.
75 “Participants Forum,” transcript, IID Summer Session, 14 July 1970, ABA.
“The secret of this whole operation,” Boyarsky advised, “is how soon you get breathing and operating in small packs, or in larger packs, or individually.” Rather than reaching a number of minor milestones, the intention was to instigate a synthesis of resources and ideas. The “real pay-off from our point of view,” Boyarsky informed the students, was “the sort of hybrid things you wind up doing towards the end.” Following their own individual trajectories across select activities and resources and developing their own strategies and solutions, students (as well as “faculty” and “adjunct faculty” who would encounter one another) were to utilize the Summer Session’s “well-laid table” in order to create, essentially “à la carte,” their own individual networks of information and individuals. Again, the issue of scale—here, from the international back to the domestic—points to the subversive motives of the “well-laid table.” Theories, methods, and people from around the world are uprooted and are collected within this domestic model, in which sociability and conviviality unsettle preexisting institutional norms. The “well-laid table,” therefore, was not only a descendant of Rowe’s “elegant cafeteria service line,” but also, in spirit, of the Tischgesellschaft, or “table societies,” that had once supplied a discursive space autonomous from the state, or “public sphere,” and in which printed media played a formative role.77

But as a late twentieth-century architectural “table society,” the IID drew upon a range of available media. For example, Banham’s lecture on “L.A.: The Structure of the Scene” was accompanied by an 8mm film. The World Game team showed a video
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76 “Participants Forum,” transcript, IID Summer Session, 14 July 1970, ABA.
77 Jürgen Habermas, The Structural Transformations of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society, translated by Thomas Burger with the assistance of Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1989).
recording of Fuller speaking on the project,\(^\text{78}\) and Yona Friedman delivered “a videotape version” of his “university course about ‘objective methods,’” to be played for students prior to his arrival in order to prepare them for his seminars on the same subject.\(^\text{79}\) Under the supervision of Dennis Crompton lectures and group discussions were recorded and then transcribed by Elizabeth Boyarsky. Not only part of the IID’s institutional infrastructure, such communications technology also enabled its documentation, thereby expanding the opportunity for further “cross-fertilization.”

The critical reception of the first IID Summer Session offers some perspective on the scope of its “cross-fertilizing” capacity. Again conceding that the IID “wasn’t a necessarily novel idea” (tacitly acknowledging the precedents set by Price and Archigram) Boyarsky distinguished it from previous proposals for educational alternatives by claiming that “the novelty of it was that it worked fabulously well.”\(^\text{80}\) The flexibility of the program for the first Summer Session, however, arguably had made the event too successful. For the British student Grahame Shane, who attended the Summer Session in 1970 as a Cornell graduate student, it was certainly an extraordinary opportunity to interact with such an international mélange of figures.\(^\text{81}\) (In fact, Shane was then a student of Rowe, who suggested that his latest pupil present his research on London’s urban history in conjunction with his own lecture series on “Utopia or Collage City,” thereby complicating the lineage of comparative urban studies embedded within the Summer Session.\(^\text{82}\)) But as Shane recalled, instead of being selective, many

\(^\text{78}\) IID Summer Session Diary, 1970.
\(^\text{79}\) Yona Friedman to Alvin Boyarsky, 23 June 1970, in In Progress 3, ABA.
\(^\text{80}\) Boyarsky, “Academicism Lives On.”
\(^\text{81}\) Grahame Shane, interview by author, 24 October 2005, New York.
\(^\text{82}\) Letter from Colin Rowe to Alvin Boyarsky, 9 June 1970, in In Progress 3.
participants “went to every presentation,” which “combined with a lack of studio space meant that little research or collaborative exploratory work was undertaken.”

Furthermore, because of the unanticipated over-enrollment of students (almost sixty students turned up, whereas Boyarsky had intended to accept only forty) it “was difficult to introduce participants to each other, especially as the sessions had to move into neighboring pubs and restaurants when the school closed in the evening and at weekends.”

As one Summer Session attendee criticized, the liveliest conversations took place in the pubs—a veritable satellite location of the “well-laid table.”

Corroborating Shane’s account, in a review of the 1970 Summer Session published in the February 1971 issue of *AD*, Cook noted that “in the end, the work hardly happened and the ‘chat shows’ became oppressively frequent.” Nevertheless, he recognized that the Summer Session’s function as an international “chat show” was its import, for by offering a stage for discussion it was reinforcing relationships and communication among pre-existing networks of individuals. “How long is it that we’ve been talking about the international network?” Cook asked. “Folk cropping up in one place and carrying on a conversation that they left off three thousand miles and six months ago.”

Asserting that previous conferences, or “jamborees,” such as the 1966 International Dialogue of Experimental Architecture at Folkestone (“couldn’t have been more chaotic”), the student-organized Indesem Delft of 1967 (“A gentler, more academic scene”), and the “2000+” conference in Liverpool in 1969 (dominated by a

---

84 Author unknown, letter to Cedric Price, 16 July 1970, ABA.
“traveling faculty” of *AD* contributors) were critical moments when figures from around the world had rubbed shoulders, Cook claimed that these “jamborees” were ultimately unsuccessful in maintaining an ongoing exchange of architectural ideas because of their brevity. “Our shyness gets the better of us in a two day festival,” he concluded. In contrast, with the Summer Session’s extended period of six weeks, Boyarsky “pins us down,” Cook remarked, “long enough to get itchy, twitchy, and human.” And by summoning participants from past conferences, the Summer Session brought “together the group that could go back and forth over its battle-scars from previous jamborees and teaching situations.” In this way, the Summer Session stimulated new conversations as much as it revived dormant ones, acting as a channel through which messages were produced, received, and reinvigorated. Echoing Boyarsky’s appropriation of cybernetic terminology, Cook recognized the Summer Session as a mechanism for “putting noise into the system.” Moreover, in a temporally extended platform such as the Summer Session, “noise” could be “developed to a pitch where it is gathering momentum—and constantly modifying its message with the effects of reception and feedback.”87 In effect, the Summer Session presented a responsive discursive environment in which ideas were not simply conveyed but continually inflected and reshaped, thereby generating the participatory design of an architectural network.

This design process, however, was neither homogeneous nor unflawed. According to Cook’s review, the conversations that transpired at the first Summer Session varied in their delivery as much as in their topics. He distinguished two types of conversations. The first were those of “designer-types,” referring to members of the

87 Ibid., 100–2.
“acting profession” who build reputations behind the safety of publications and completed projects. However, when “up on their feet” in front of an audience, Cook was disappointed by their lack of charisma, especially in comparison to the conversations of the “true boffins,” who demonstrated a talent for making “something trite seem to have compelling significance,” and “who can keep you interested in something that bores you.” Praising in particular the conversational craft of three “true boffins” who appeared at the Summer Session—cybernetician Gordon Pask, “geologist-politician” Ellis Hillman, and the historian Thomas (Sam) Stevens—Cook marveled that

their characteristic dynamic is, seriously, the way in which they can wring a creative idea out of snippets of material: they spin a web, and you listen to its construction, and it has the kind of structure that they, and only they, want it to have, irrespective or [sic] whether it is absolute or normative.88

As Cook suggested, conversation was an art of assemblage, a point of view that the IID director shared, as his own teaching résumé makes clear, and in particular, his “à la carte” slide lectures. Furthermore, in the broader context of the six-week event, the difficulty of achieving a balance between the varying degrees of conversational wit while at the same time providing ample colloquial room for responses was the Summer

88 Ibid.
Session’s “underlying problem of catalysis, of teaching, of forcing an ambiance.” In effect, it was a design problem. Cook elaborated:

To hold seventy people together, to pass them through conversations that are not completely random, and have the pace forced by a few people whose presence is not at all random, is a design activity in its own right. Like any design process, though, it depends upon a foreknowledge of the material used: and because it is human material it is erratic. It has to be cajoled and occasionally tempered. Alvin is good at this. His technique with a “faculty” is that of a canny sheepdog: you are hustled until you are embarrassed, or flattered or made to feel guilty until you do or say something or “enter into a meaningful confrontation.”

As Cook implied, the provision of activities alone was insufficient in activating the IID’s pliable “wetware of knowledge.” In his institutional design Boyarsky had to be conscious of the efficacy of human stimulants in order to maintain the process of exchange. Although on one level the IID was continually reconfiguring and redefining itself through the “à la carte” composition of its program and participation of attendees, the overall system of operations was ultimately of Boyarsky’s design, informed by his “tactical” and “tactile” instincts, and concentrated within the IID’s institutional bounds.

Hungry for more, Cook suggested that the next Summer Session “must contain even more the mechanics of response” and “must be less concerned with architecture.
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89 Ibid., 102. Emphasis in original.
and even more concerned with ideas. It must be even *more* ongoing.”⁹⁰ In fact, the Summer Session was still carrying on, for there were other types of stimulants incorporated within the IID program that were to react even after the six-week session and beyond London. As Cook commented, the “sheer *audacity*” of the Summer Session was its capacity to “act as a point of broadcast, because there will be plenty of scatter from it.” He delighted in “how many worrisome tentacles can be sent out in five months.”⁹¹ The “scatter” was a vital aspect of the sessions: participants returned to their local “scenes,” “bringing some news” to their peers—an institutionalized delivery system that attests to the IID’s function as a centralized message center.

But Cook’s article, too, was also enacting this “broadcast.” Entitled “A Letter from Peter Cook to Warren Chalk,” the magazine article’s epistolary form appropriated the strategy of the *In Progress* series, reopening the IID’s communication network through print [fig. 2.19]. In the short history of the IID, *AD* proved an important support system for each Summer Session and instrumental in its process of “cross-fertilization.” *AD*’s technical editor, Robin Middleton (a member of the IID “faculty”) and chief editor Monica Pidgeon shared the magazine’s contacts and resources with Boyarsky. Additionally, *AD* supplied the IID director with magazine pages for features on each of the three Summer Sessions (not to mention Boyarsky’s own personal contribution, transposed in the form of “Chicago à la carte,” which was part of a separate special issue on Chicago.)⁹² Significant coverage of the first session appeared in *AD*’s April 1971 issue. Designed by Richard Yeend, the front and back covers were populated with
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⁹⁰ Ibid., 104. Emphasis in original.
⁹¹ Ibid., 100–2. Emphasis in original.
⁹² Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Nikolaas Habraken, 11 January 1971, ABA.
cartoon portraits of the IID “faculty” playfully lounging in a landscape, while the magazine’s interior was flooded with transcripts of selected Summer Session 70 talks that had been recorded\textsuperscript{93} [fig. 2.20]. In the same way that it had infiltrated the Bartlett’s facilities, the IID had infiltrated the pages of \textit{AD}, spreading its “worrisome tentacles” abroad through the means of the parallel network of \textit{AD}’s readership.

That the magazine had supplanted one of the IID’s primary broadcast outlets was divulged in the title of Boyarsky’s introduction to the Summer Session feature: “In Progress IV” [fig. 2.21]. A primer that explained the aims and accomplishments of the first Summer Session, “In Progress IV” also advertised the event’s upcoming sequel, scheduled to take place in London in July 1971. As Boyarsky invited \textit{AD}’s readers, who were now unwittingly entangled in the IID’s network, “Come and join us at SS 71, where the discussion in part will be devoted to determining just what sort of organization it is to become.”\textsuperscript{94}

\textbf{SS71/SS72}

A few months after the close of the first Summer Session, Boyarsky reported back to Eisenman, his confidante and consultant. “I do not think we established a consensus of what is the international scene circa 1970,” he lamented.\textsuperscript{95} Yet, Boyarsky’s faith in a possible consensual definition of the “international scene” points


\textsuperscript{94} Boyarsky, “In Progress IV,” 220.

\textsuperscript{95} Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Peter Eisenman, 12 October 1970, ABA.
to a certain degree of naïveté regarding his own role in its very manufacture. As international as the Summer Session’s program may have been, it could not have been entirely comprehensive in its scope. On the one hand, Boyarsky unequivocally identified and cultivated the IID as anti-academic; any “conflicting attitudes” that were pitted against one another were solicited precisely for their perceived existence on the periphery of mainstream practice and academia. On the other hand, conspicuously absent from the IID’s first Summer Session were certain contemporary discourses and teaching innovations that were providing new theoretical directions in architectural culture during the early 1970s, and with which Boyarsky was most certainly familiar. For example, notable absences included Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown, whose celebration of “road signs” had stirred Boyarsky to critique, and to counter with praise his for airports. Also absent at the Summer Sessions were John Hejduk and Robert Slutzky, two “Texas Rangers” who radically transformed the architecture curriculum at the Cooper Union in the late 1960s. And finally, Eisenman and the IAUS itself were also missing from the IID’s international “scene.” Whether deliberately orchestrated or not, I argue that the absence of these American figures, then major players on the American architectural “scene,” was optimal in the broader scheme of Boyarsky’s project. It anticipates the “scurrilous comparison” later posed in Net between Boyarsky’s AA and Eisenman’s IAUS, and even later, Middleton’s contention that though Hejduk and Eisenman were “staunch admirers” of Boyarsky, “had they operated
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96 On Hejduk and Slutzky’s renovation of Cooper Union’s architecture program, see Education of an Architect: A Point of View (New York: Cooper Union, 1971); and Rafael Moneo, “The Work of John Hejduk or the Passion to Teach. Architectural Education at Cooper Union,” Lotus, no. 27 (1980): 65-85.
on Alvin’s home ground, they would have been rivals.” Boyarsky’s notion of an “international scene” can be understood as polemically autonomous from, and indeed even intended to transcend the American “scene” that he had been cautiously observing throughout the late 1960s as a fledgling academic, and whose institutions and discourses would prove fertile ground for the emergence of postmodern architectural culture, discourse, and practice in the United States.

Boyarsky’s development of the 1971 and 1972 Summer Sessions illustrates this crucial and critical shift in his purview and objectives: to cultivate an international, and not simply transatlantic, avant-garde “scene.” The declaration of the IID’s ambitions to do just that is unambiguously expressed throughout its graphic identity. For the 1971 Summer Session Boyarsky again called upon the firm of Sampson/Fether to update the IID’s promotional material. As an outgrowth of the previous year’s media campaign, the firm designed a series of promotional flyers and postcards [fig. 2.22, 2.23, 2.24]. The latter depicted a London city bus; a vintage photograph of a banquet framed by the IID’s “well-laid table” mission statement; updated portrait stamps; and a new IID logo rendered as sailboats, among other images [figs. 2.25, 2.26]. These postcards were sent to the IID network in packets, along with an assortment of postcards from Boyarsky’s own personal collection, thus activating a “cross-fertilization” between the IID’s resources and its director’s own store of didactic imagery, which was now steadily coursing through both his Chicago lectures and the second Summer Session.98
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98 Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Nikolaas Habraken, 22 March 1971, in ABA.
By advancing the design conceit of the first Summer Session’s stamps, which captured the centrality of postal communication in the *In Progress* series, the promotional materials for the second event conveyed a different mode of international exchange. The institution itself was now packaged as a portable entity. By juxtaposing the IID’s graphic identity with postcarded images of foreign lands and episodes, these abbreviated collections of postcards each constituted a synechdocal media construction that illustrated the global reach of the IID. If the stamp portraits in the first publicity campaign denoted “personalities’” transcendence of geographical borders through the space of media, then the distribution of the Summer Session 1971 postcards implied that it was now the IID that was traveling the world. In this institutional complex, which was predicated on the intertwined processes of consumption, production, and reproduction of images, postcards now bestowed a mythic status onto its educational program. In place of the “technological sublime” conveyed in the popular imagery of his collected postcards, the newly produced IID postcards conveyed an “institutional sublime,” idealizing its uninhibited powers of circulation, while at the same time masking the disciplinary regime that it reified.

Indeed, the shift in iconography for the second Summer Session reflected an increasing programmatic emphasis on movement and circulation. As Shane and Cook had pointed out, the overarching flaw of the first event had been congestion. The IID director was also sensitive to the traffic caused by over-attendance at certain events, taking note of participants’ gravitation toward “the rather individualistic ‘all star’ offerings.” For the second session Boyarsky attempted to give the “human material” a
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99 Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Nikolaas Habraken, 11 January 1971, in ABA.
bit more direction. If the initial obstacle had been getting bodies to London, now the IID’s task was to keep those bodies moving along its international network of people. This refined objective was apparent in the 1971 program’s decreased participatory provisions. For example, Boyarsky’s intention was to circulate an “In Progress Think Pack,” which was to include a mission statement, bibliographies, and other information, “so that all those attending will be informed and the process of communication and interchange will begin in advance” of the second Summer Session. However, the packet, eventually retitled “In Progress V,” was distributed to participants upon their arrival\(^{100}\) [figs. 2.27, 2.28]. Similar information packs containing maps, magazines, and other ephemera were also distributed for the third session, but again no “interchange” among participants preceded the six-week event.

The second Summer Session took place between July 12 and August 20, 1971, with the AA as its host. For the seventy-five students and one hundred full-time and part-time “faculty,” the “well-laid table” was again overflowing with events. However, this time Boyarsky tried to give the event a bit more structure. Drawing upon his own research interest in the history of infrastructure, in his organization of the events he adopted the theme of urban transportation. The 1971 Summer Session program was graphically and conceptually modeled after the London Underground, and comprised three “lines.” Boyarsky explained:
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\(^{100}\) Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Nikolaas Habraken, 30 April 1971, in ABA. Boyarsky’s change in plan may have been a result of the anticipated delays of postal deliveries in the aftermath of Great Britain’s first postal strike, which took place between January and March of 1971 and significantly delayed the arrival of promotional material for the second Summer Session. A postal strike in Italy occurred at the same time.
It was structured to provide opportunities either to work with special interest and polemical groups drawn from all parts of the world, on the Workshop line; to take part in a series of seminars, lectures and one-off chance visitor contacts on the Oracular Circle Line; or to continue on private research, plug into faculty projects, report on the local scene, use London facilities, consult resident panels, etc. on the On-going Line.\textsuperscript{101}

The classification of offerings according to these “lines” was an attempt to give cohesion to all the Summer Session activities throughout the six weeks: to organize the production, dissemination, and consumption of services and information—in effect, the glimmer of a “global city.” Whether the transportation “lines” actually successfully organized flows of information and people or remained simply a clever diagram of the program is unclear. However, the introduction of workshops that regularly met throughout the six weeks—the project-based “ateliers” that the “faculty” had rejected the previous summer—“focused participants[‘] attention” and engendered more rigorous collaboration and conversation.\textsuperscript{102}

Audio recordings make eavesdropping on these conversations possible. One discussion in particular, a seminar series on Le Corbusier organized by Charles Jencks, reveals the ways in which the IID functioned as both a structural support and catalyst for revisiting the history of modernism. Invited seminar participants included Boyarsky, Cook, Jencks, Paul Oliver, Thomas “Sam” Stevens, Stanislaus von Moos, Martin Pawley and Alan Colquhoun. Though not billed as part of the seminar’s cast,

\textsuperscript{102} Shane, “The I.I.D. Summer Sessions,” 6.
Superstudio member Adolfo Natalini also contributed to the conversation. At the event Boyarsky noted with pleasure how in 1971, six years after the architect’s death, one was finally able to talk about Le Corbusier “without anger,” and how it was thus possible to “look forward to the rest of the 1970s.”\textsuperscript{103} Both the remark and the seminar betray Boyarsky’s underlying anxiety concerning architecture’s postmodern future. As if a dual requiem, the seminar seemed to identify in Le Corbusier the very personification of the Modern Movement, a corporeal-historical unit whose passing nonetheless weighed heavily upon the contemporary conscience of the discipline, as the ensuing debate revealed. Speakers took differing points of view on the architect’s contemporary significance—from von Moos’ systematic historical reassessment of the role of the fine arts in his architectural thought process to Pawley’s characteristically vitriolic diatribe on the repercussions of Le Corbusier’s utopian propaganda (as Pawley remarked, his talk could very well have been titled “Le Corbusier: He’s Sure Got a Lot to Answer For”).\textsuperscript{104}

As the seminar progressed within the AA lecture hall (now familiar territory to the reader), it became clear how in yet another instance of “cross-fertilization” a different director was choreographing the event through an auxiliary media outlet. Also present throughout the seminar’s proceedings was the BBC presenter John Donat, accompanied by a television crew who filmed the presentations on Le Corbusier and the ensuing discussions. Before the cameras rolled, Donat prodded speakers to produce a lively debate—and in terms accessible to a lay television audience; meanwhile, on

\textsuperscript{103} “Corb” audio cassette recordings, 11 August 1971, ABA; transcripts of papers and discussion from Le Corbusier seminar, ABA.

\textsuperscript{104} “Corb” audio cassette recordings, 11 August 1971, ABA; transcripts of papers and discussion from Le Corbusier seminar, ABA.
camera he attempted to animate speakers with his own directed provocations. Though the recordings never aired on the BBC, the seminar would make its mediatic debut elsewhere. Returning through a veritable feedback loop into the pages of *AD*, a selection of papers from its 1971 Summer Session, including those from the Le Corbusier seminar, was published in a special issue devoted to the IID’s second meeting. Though the Le Corbusier seminar had garnered such considerable attention, by Boyarsky’s own account one of the most successful events at the 1971 Summer Session was the Covent Garden Workshop [fig. 2.30]. Bringing together students, planners, historians and local authorities, the focus of the workshop was the site’s planned redevelopment and its repercussions for the local community and residents. This collaborative investigation and the attendant public inquiry surrounding the redevelopment scheme brought widespread attention to the matter, and actually helped to prevent the realization of the planning proposals. According to Boyarsky, its

---

105 “Corb” audio cassette recordings, 11 August 1971, ABA; transcripts of papers and discussion from Le Corbusier seminar, ABA. No documents relating to these recordings exist in either John Donat’s personal archive or in the BBC archive, leading me to conclude that this program never aired.


success demonstrated “that however short the six weeks’ interval it was possible to move in on a situation, amplify it, and merge with the local community, student body and sympathetic professionals to provide a measure of detached international sensibility in support of the venture.” As an operative force in current architectural and urban problems, the IID was proving to be more than just a mechanism for “spreading the word.”

The success of the Covent Garden Workshop significantly informed Boyarsky’s programmatic redesign of the third and last Summer Session, hosted by the ICA from July 24 to August 25, 1972. Once again the program of the third Summer Sessions featured a rich itinerary of events, though its general organization around three workshops—the London Workshop, the Made in Italy Workshop, and the Manhattan Workshop—marked its evolution from its two predecessors. A follow-up to the Covent Garden Workshop of the previous year, the third Summer Session’s London Workshop focused on the city’s office and waterfront developments, transportation systems, as well as the fate of Piccadilly Circus, where a new pedestrian concourse was under discussion (the proposal was scrapped later in the year). Like the 1971 Covent Garden Workshop, the 1972 London Workshop was aided by the expertise of planners and city officials, and once again inserted students and educators within an ongoing dialogue on a contemporary urban project. In contrast, members of the Italian avant-garde led the Made in Italy Workshop. From Natalini’s discussion of the Museum of Modern Art’s exhibition Italy: The New Domestic Landscape to Germano Celant’s “Playing games”; Peter Cook, “Towards a quietly technologized folk-suburbia”; Warren Chalk, “Archigram Opera.”

“Introduction to Radical Architecture” to “The Struggle for Housing” discussion by the Strum Group, the Italian “radical” discourse assumed a political and conceptual edge markedly distinct from the debates on urban redevelopment that fueled the London and Manhattan Workshops. For like the former, the latter also involved planners and historians in its research on the relationship between energy consumption and urban renewal in New York, with a focus on a specific site owned by Con Edison. Indeed, what made the workshop unique was the participation of Con Edison, who partly funded the project and flew in a team of “New Yorkers drawn from the Universities, Regional Plan Authorities, Citizens Groups, etc.”

Regardless of the frustrations that the opposing attitudes produced, Boyarsky viewed the Manhattan Workshop as a significant achievement for the IID. This much was made clear by AD’s special issue on Summer Session 1972 (May 1973), which focused its coverage exclusively on the Manhattan Workshop [figs. 2.33, 2.34].

In this distillation of the IID program, the revised structure of three dominant workshops in fact reflected Boyarsky’s original conception of an international venue for comparative studies of issues in architecture and urbanism. London, the network of Italian “radicals,” and Manhattan: here were three contemporary “scenes” juxtaposed, again reminiscent of Boyarsky’s multi-projector slide lectures. But at the IID Boyarsky choreographed a performance that transcended imagistic projections. Instead he produced tableau vivant, as individuals were transported from each of those “scenes.” This was the institutional dream-world of the collector, where milieu materialized in miniature in order to construct an historical time called the present.

---

And like his multi-projector slide lectures on the history of urbanism, *décollage* was also a central principle at the IID Summer Sessions, as suggested by its refurbished graphic identity for the third session. Designed by Archigram, this graphic identity crystallized the institute’s global ambitions in the dominant iconography of the jetliner, which flooded IID advertisements, posters and stationery [fig. 2.35]. In the 1972 Summer Session letterhead a layout of superimposed frames of a plane animates a “take off,” thereby reenacting a process of *décollage* once performed by Boyarsky’s postcards in lectures and in the pages of “Chicago à la carte,” yet which here asserts that the terrestrial infrastructural system invoked in the previous Summer Session has here resolutely been superseded by a technologically advanced internationalism facilitated by air travel. It was an elision already latent in Boyarsky’s claim in “Chicago à la carte” that O’Hare was the new Versailles. Analogously, the IID presented itself as an institutional monument to a contemporary global architectural culture.

P.S.

The 1972 Summer Session also marked what was without question the IID’s most significant instance of “cross-fertilization,” and in fact the institution’s denouement. For the third Summer Session took place immediately after Boyarsky completed the first year of his AA chairmanship (1971-1972). This was to be a permanent transition from IID director to AA chairman, and a parallel infiltration of the Summer Sessions model into the institutional envelope of the AA. Boyarsky, however, did not enter the position of chairman without some trepidation. Over the course of the second Summer Session in 1971, the initial “cross-fertilization” of his institutional
responsibilities at the AA and the IID prefaced the dilemma that Boyarsky would encounter when his tenure as chairman commenced. Could his pedagogical model, predicated on ephemerality and the repudiation of geographical boundaries, successfully operate within a permanent institution? “I had to make a very very difficult decision,” he later confessed in an interview, for the IID,

which had its own build-up of tradition and style was getting ready to be something more than something which met for six weeks every year, but something which might have had a roof over its head and been around for a while, and entertain people under a more long-term basis using the same rules of the game.¹¹²

The AA therefore posed an architectural problem. In its very materiality the school was anathema to the IID, which through the Summer Sessions had been constructed out of ongoing conversations, interactions, and experiences—not studio spaces and lecture halls. “Architects without buildings, and students without a school. This is surely the import of the International Institute of Design,” Cook had insisted.¹¹³ But with a roof over its head at Bedford Square, the IID model would require a few adjustments. How to avoid becoming, in Boyarsky’s words, “local battery fare” and keep the education gourmet? And how to make it “broadcast” in the way that the IID had? For if today Boyarsky’s reputation as an architectural educator rests primarily on his chairmanship at the AA, his work there must be understood as at odds with the founding principles of

the IID. Trapped in a static, localized institution, how could he keep the AA from turning into a stagnant repository for ideas and people?

To preface our entry into Bedford Square and as a coda to the history of the IID, a final note: With the global scale of Boyarsky’s purview on architectural education and the international composition of his institutional experiment, the IID certainly resonates with the programs, institutional strategies and objectives of many of today’s schools of architecture. The proliferation of “global” design studios and “satellite” schools purport to attune architectural pedagogy, education, and knowledge to the multi-cultural, multi-national, and complex economic terrain of the twenty-first century. This chapter’s historical narrative, however, might give us pause to reevaluate the claims and implications of this ongoing recalibration of architectural education and transformation of its schools. For it is hardly useful to simply read the IID as one of many precursors of the current “network fever” exhibited by architects, educators, and institutions.¹¹⁴ More productively and responsibly, the history of the IID instead might serve as a cogent reminder that even in the present, what ultimately follows the decentralization of resources, knowledge, and power is a centralized form of redistribution.
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SECTION 3 | THE ‘RAINMAKER’

What allows me to pass from a history written in the plural to a questioning of that very plurality?

- Manfredo Tafuri\textsuperscript{1}

36 BEDFORD SQUARE

Without losing sight of his prowess as an impresario of images, events and people—a prowess that, as the dissertation maintains, distinguishes him from his contemporary pedagogues—we now abandon the peripatetic perspective that has thus far been imperative for understanding Boyarsky’s approach to educational reform. Fixing its gaze on 36 Bedford Square, the remainder of the dissertation considers how during his AA chairmanship Boyarsky’s pedagogy further developed within and as a response to the institutional parameters of the AA. Reciprocally, this pivotal episode in Boyarsky’s career also demarcates a significant cross section in the history of the AA, which now fully emerges as the dissertation’s second protagonist.

Upon his appointment in 1971, Boyarsky began to strategize a new model of architectural education for the AA, one that shared the pluralist and international ambitions of the IID’s “well-laid table.” To be sure, the AA chairman was quite explicit in identifying his programmatic renovation of the school as a continuation of the IID’s efforts. However, if the AA initially co-opted the anti-academic and anti-institutional

ethos of its ephemeral predecessor, the IID, the alternative model of architectural education that Boyarsky tested during his chairmanship was ultimately institutionalized as a regulated system of architectural teaching and learning that persists at the AA to this day.

To explore this issue, the current chapter examines the AA’s transition from its postwar professionalized studio curriculum to a competitive framework of design studios that supported a gamut of teaching methods and architectural inquiries. The latter form of pedagogy, introduced by Boyarsky in the early 1970s and known as the “unit system,” encouraged AA tutors to hone highly individualized theoretical investigations. Within the domain of the design studio, or unit, some tutors chose to explore Victorian notions of domesticity, for example, while others focused on urban politics, and others conducted research on energy resources. Veering away from realizable building proposals and towards provocation, student work often took the form of manifestoes, expressionistic drawings, photomontages, or community action. Supporting a diverse range of pursuits and experiments, the unit system was in essence a transposition of the program of the IID Summer Sessions, and in particular the focused workshops that took place during the second and third sessions.

Instead of the “well-laid table” of the IID, however, the unit system would become more closely associated with another slogan that Boyarsky had also used to promote the Summer Sessions, and that more aptly captured both the spirit and inner workings of this model of studio teaching. At the start of each school year AA unit tutors pitched their teaching agendas in order to attract students to their units, a spectacular ritual that led Boyarsky to promote the unit system as a “marketplace.” This
chapter, however, does not aim to portray the introduction of the “marketplace” of the AA unit system as evidence of a condition of institutional *tabula rasa* at Bedford Square, inaugurated by Boyarsky’s chairmanship. On the contrary, it aims to show how the turn to the logic of late capitalism in his renovation of the AA’s studio pedagogy was informed by preexisting conceptual templates: not only the IID’s “well-laid table” and the “free market,” but also the AA’s complex institutional history. As the following account argues, Boyarsky’s unit system sought to reconcile the AA’s modernist and Victorian heritage with its identity as a late twentieth century institution. To be sure, this is the allegory of the photographic portrait with which this dissertation began, which reveals Boyarsky in the office of the chairman, engulfed in a sea of telephones and paper work as Christopher Wren and Inigo Jones, the ambassadors of architectural tradition, look on with stoic amusement [fig. 01]. In this chapter we will see how Boyarsky handled and complicated this matter in the more public space of the school. For as AA tutor Fred Scott speculated in 1975, if there were to be busts decorating the stairwell of 36 Bedford Square, they would be in the likenesses of Daniel Bell and Karl Popper.²

**UNIT SYSTEMS**

Before detailing the circumstances that led to Boyarsky’s occupation of that specific space and role, it is necessary to outline some of the institutional conditions that he inherited. For the unit system that Boyarsky launched at the AA in the early 1970s

was in fact the descendant of a teaching model born out of emergent modernist polemics at the school during the late 1930s, which was then revived in the late 1960s in a critical stroke of revisionist modernism. An overview of these earlier iterations of the AA unit system will elucidate the foundations and motives of its subsequent reincarnation during Boyarsky’s chairmanship, but also serves as a reintroduction to the second protagonist (and sometimes antagonist) in this dissertation.

When it was first introduced in the Spring of 1936 by the Scottish planner E.A.A. Rowse—then Principal of both the AA’s School of Architecture and its School of Planning—the unit system precipitously overturned the five-year structure of the extant Beaux-Arts course. Abolishing the sequence of yearlong curricula, the new academic structure vertically integrated students from across the five years of study within fifteen different “units.” Comprising a small group of students (approximately sixteen to twenty), each unit operated under the leadership of one tutor; students could enter these on a termly basis at three intervals per year. More indebted to the sociological theories of Patrick Geddes than the expanded socio-esthetic program of the recently dissolved German Bauhaus, Rowse’s unit system encouraged group work, analysis, and research methods appropriate to the course’s new emphasis on town

---

3 As noted in Chapter 1, Boyarsky’s own teachers at McGill had studied at the AA School of Planning in the late 1930s during Rowse’s tenure.
4 The Prospectus would note that the “full Course is one of five years’ duration and on entering the School the students are placed in units of some 15-20 persons and a Master is appointed to take charge of each unit; this Master may be in charge of his unit for more than one term. The Master is responsible for the work of his unit and arranges such visits to buildings in course of erection, builders’ yards, and showrooms as and when he considers it necessary; he also arranges for Specialists to come to the School to discuss the problem on which the students are engaged.” “System of Work,” Architectural Association Prospectus 1939-1940 (London: Architectural Association, 1939), 8-9.
planning and contemporary architecture. As historian Elizabeth Darling has remarked of the AA’s departure from its Beaux-Arts teaching, “enquiry would replace the *esquisse*”\(^5\) [figs. 03, 0.4, 0.5].

Unsurprisingly, the unit system’s rather abrupt metamorphosis of architectural education at the AA during the late 1930s was not without controversy. In 1938 Rowse was dismissed by his superior, H.S. Goodhart-Rendel, AA Director of Education and supporter of the school’s Beaux-Arts teaching model. The following year students launched a press campaign in the student journal *Focus* in support of both the unit system and architectural modernism. These intertwined events would become the stuff of legend within the AA by the postwar period, fueled in part by John Summerson’s 1947 centenary history of the school, which concluded by conflating the AA’s internal revolution of the 1930s with the rise of modern architecture in Britain.\(^6\)

In the aftermath of the Second World War, the unit system continued to foster collaborative work in an increasingly “realistic” format that was intended to simulate

\(^{5}\) Elizabeth Darling, *Re-forming Britain: Narratives of Modernity before Reconstruction* (London: Routledge, 2007), 184. Rowse was appointed first as the AA’s Assistant Director in 1933, and subsequently founded the AA School of Planning and Research for National Development (SPRND). One of the most often cited AA student projects of this period is “Tomorrow Town” (1936-1937), produced by a team of fourth and fifth year students educated within Rowse’s unit system. For an excellent analysis of this project and account of architectural education at the AA during Rowse’s tenure, see Darling, 179-191.

the working methods of an architectural office. At the AA design focus shifted to the building typologies then dominating postwar reconstruction efforts: mass housing, offices, hospitals, schools—these, the new monuments of the Welfare State. By the 1950s, the promise of modern architecture had become less revolutionary than it was restorative. At the same time the identity of the unit system, and with it its polemical bite, had begun to wane at the AA. Forced to reconcile an increasingly professionalized agenda with an influx of students returning from war, the AA reinstated the horizontal Year System, as it would become known, as a more effective structure for its modernized curriculum.

Though it formed the basis for the school’s curriculum for nearly two decades, the AA Year System has received scant attention from historians; indeed, scholarship on the AA’s institutional history during the 1950s and 1960s has been piecemeal. Certainly, the postwar Year System was not necessarily innovative or distinctive in its organization or its overarching objectives; by the late 1960s, the modernist agendas of other leading British schools of architecture, including Cambridge, the Regent Street Polytechnic, and the Bartlett seemed to corroborate Allen’s statement. Nevertheless, an understanding of the AA’s postwar studio curriculum is here pertinent as it allows us to retrace our steps back to Boyarsky’s first encounters at the AA in the mid-1960s.

---

8 The efficacy of the unit system as an educational structure had in fact already been questioned in 1944. Recognizing the incongruity of the termly autonomy of studio teaching with lecture courses and technical teaching, school administrators (under the principalship of Frederick Gibberd, 1943-1945) proposed an alternative “Group or Stream System” that would integrate units within a yearly sequence of study. “School Plan, 1944,” Architectural Association Archive (AAA), Box 1991:7.
9 Crinson and Lubbock’s invocation of the AA’s curriculum during the 1950s, for example, primarily serves as a platform for discussing the Oxford Conference.
During their five years of study, the AA’s postwar students were confronted with projects of increasing scale and complexity, which were supplemented by a series of “Related Lectures” dealing with history, structures, materials, and theory. The First Year of study introduced the student to modes of three-dimensional design and representation, proceeding from the visual arrangement of planes, studies in color and proportion to the design of a single cell space [figs. 3.1, 3.2, 3.3]. In the Second Year inquiry advanced to the scale of town planning, and exercises in different construction techniques (for example, a “Medium Span Timber building,” a “steel building,” or “Load-bearing construction either monolithic or brick and concrete or brick and timber”) prepared the Second Year student for the development of a final “community design scheme” [fig. 3.4, 3.5]. Emphasis on professional practice and construction technology was further honed in the Third Year. During the early 1960s the Third Year began with a reinforced concrete building project that required cost estimates, technical analyses, and the preparation of working drawings; the year would conclude with a medium-sized town planning project [figs. 3.6, 3.7] Using London as its site, the Fourth Year (as Chapter 1 noted in its discussion of Boyarsky’s teaching at the AA) focused on projects at the metropolitan scale. Study began with the design of an office building and then progressed to the redevelopment of an area in central London, the design for a “Public Assembly Building,” and “Multi-Storey housing in Central London” [figs. 3.8, 3.9]. The Fifth Year was largely devoted to an independent thesis

---

10 “Year 1” and “Year 2,” *Architectural Association Curriculum Table* (1963-1964), AAA.
based on a brief developed by the student and through individual tutorials with designated staff members [figs. 3.10, 3.11].

With the exception of the First Year and the Fifth Year, each year of students was subdivided into smaller groups—what was in fact the postwar iteration of the unit. Each of these was supervised by a Unit Master, who was in turn supervised by a Year Master. We will recall that as Fourth Year Master Boyarsky attempted to extend his explorations of the historical fabric of cities, begun during his graduate studies at Cornell, by designing a Fourth Year program that focused on the redevelopment of the Royal Courts of Law in London. While the Year Master was responsible for overseeing the curriculum, the Unit Master was responsible for guiding student work on a more intimate level.\(^1\) No longer the defining element of the “system,” the unit had become auxiliary to the Year System curriculum. Just as the modernity of the unit system, in terms of both its educational method and content, had once eclipsed the tradition of Beaux-Arts teaching at the AA, an institutionalized pedagogical practice of architectural modernism now eclipsed the original polemical agency of the unit system. Indeed, invoking this “battle” that had unfolded three decades earlier at the AA, in 1965 AA Principal William Allen declared that the original “argument is now a memory,” for “what was fought for now prevails.”\(^2\)

In his subsequent roles as IID director and AA chairman, Boyarsky’s critiques of professionalized modernist curricula must be understood as a reverberation of his

---

12 In principle, throughout the year students were to change units or Unit Masters to “encounter a variety of outlooks upon architecture,” though in fact some students opted to remain within the same unit for the duration of the year. *A.A. Information Notes* (1962–1963), 7, AAA.

13 *AA Prospectus* (1965), 9-10, AAA.
own participation in the AA Year System. As Chapter 1 recounted, in 1965 his academic appointment was terminated as a result of his fractious relationship with Allen, which was grounded in his criticism of the technocratic direction of the school. Yet in Boyarsky’s absence, the Year System would in fact become the target of yet another radical overhaul of the AA’s educational structure. For Allen’s successor, John Lloyd, AA Principal from 1966 to 1970, curricular reform was premised on a revival of the unit system. Often overlooked in historical narratives of the AA, and likewise dismissed by first hand witnesses as an inconsequential figure within Bedford Square, Lloyd and his resuscitation of the unit system demand attention here, as his revisionist model of modern architectural education laid the institutional and discursive groundwork for the pedagogical innovations that his successor, Boyarsky, was to cultivate.

As Dean of the Department of Architecture at the Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology in Kumasi, Ghana from 1963 to 1966 Lloyd was responsible for developing the curriculum of the country’s first school of architecture [fig. 3.12]. For Lloyd, an AA graduate and former tutor, the ongoing development of West Africa presented an “open ended” situation that required a flexible pedagogical analog for a local faculty that found itself “by necessity, in order to teach, trying to define the role and form of the future Building Industry.”\(^\text{14}\) Rather than import preexisting

\(^{14}\) Lloyd used the metaphor of a tree to illustrate his position: “That the frame-work of the future is known, fixed, decided is probably undesirable anywhere, but here it is totally unacceptable. We are rather trying to create growth conditions for a tree. If we are sensitive enough we may assist in the basic trunk and some of the branches but in such a way that the direction, scale and form of future growth is free.” Lloyd, “Intentions,” *Arena, The Architectural Association Journal* 82, no. 904 (July/August 1966), “Kumasi Special Issue,” 40.
“paternalistic” teaching methods based on Western formal and aesthetic canons, Lloyd argued that the Kumasi curriculum should respond to Ghana’s national policies, building programs, local climatological conditions, natural resources, and emerging social dynamics. It was in this context that Lloyd began to advocate the education of “generalists” capable of strategic problem solving through interdisciplinary means.

Lloyd’s position firmly situates him within a second generation of modernist educators. Yet while many of his postwar contemporaries in Britain looked to the Bauhaus legacy and Gropius as a point of departure, Lloyd’s pedagogy alternatively drew more inspiration from the theories and work of Buckminster Fuller. Premised on a global perspective of the building industry that could effectively generate local rather than universal solutions, Lloyd’s educational outlook echoed, for example, that of

15 For Lloyd, it was imperative that the “new society” emerging from the development of Ghana, and of West Africa, “will be African and not in Europe’s or America’s or even Asia’s image.” To explain the rejection of Western teaching methods at Kumasi, Lloyd explained: “Proportion, for example, was removed from the area of aesthetic theory and studied only for its demonstrable performance characteristics, in such fields as the module and modulus of close packing bodies or in the relationship of certain proportions in structural members to changes in performance of those members.” John Lloyd, “Intentions,” Arena, The Architectural Association Journal, 40.

16 An approach that was successfully demonstrated through the Kumasi department’s involvement in the Volta Resettlement project, a relocation program for villagers displaced by recent dam construction, which entailed research on resident needs, village planning and housing studies, censuses, and construction. On Lloyd’s role at Kumasi see Hannah Le Roux, “Modern Architecture in Post-Colonial Ghana and Nigeria,” Architectural History 47 (2004): 385–389.

17 During his deanship in Ghana Lloyd invited Fuller as a guest speaker at the architecture school at Kumasi. During his visit he built, with students, a dome “prototype for emergency clinics” out of Ghanian aluminum. Le Roux, “Modern Architecture in Post-Colonial Ghana and Nigeria,” 389; also see Arena, The Architectural Association Journal, “Kumasi Special Issue.” Various individuals who taught at the AA during the late 1960s have suggested to me that underpinning the shared architectural outlook of Lloyd and Fuller was a shared spiritual commitment to Subud mysticism. Lloyd openly identified as a Subud, and during his principalship at the AA changed his first name to Michael, in accordance with Subud practices. I have yet to find evidence of Fuller’s ties to Subud mysticism.
Fuller’s World Design Science Decade. Further debt to Fuller was implicit in Lloyd’s AA Principal candidate statement (1966), in which he suggested looking to “naval architects, ship building, the aircraft industry and the car industry for industrial production and design techniques,” as well as to “[a]pplied physics, applied mathematics, methods engineering, chemical engineering, applied physiology, economics and the social sciences” for theoretical grounding and design methods. Lloyd’s sentiments, however, were not an expression of technological romanticism; rather, his call for interdisciplinarity and technological prowess was highly critical in nature. “Above all we must engender a scientific attitude amongst our students,” Lloyd asserted, “not just an ability in low grade applied technology but a grasp of underlying principles” and their potential global applications. This rejection of a technological “surface technique” in favor of a continuous and informed investigation of the potential of technology was an invective targeted at the “‘social’ architecture” produced by postwar professionals in Britain, but also implicated the “‘leading’ schools of architecture.”

Yet technology must be understood as an auxiliary concern within Lloyd’s broader educational philosophy, which was focused on unsettling the import of the curriculum in architectural education. At the AA, therefore, Lloyd’s cast his critiques upon the Year System. For Lloyd, the inflexibility of the standardized AA Year System curriculum had yielded individualistic solutions and engendered unnecessary

---

competition among students; as a result, architectural education had become incongruous with the collaborative exigencies that faced modern practitioners.\footnote{John Lloyd, commentary published in \textit{Architectural Design} (March 1969), special issue “What did they do for their theses? Where are they now?” 132.}

Accordingly, in the autumn of 1967 Lloyd abolished the Year System in order to facilitate research, independent decision making, and, importantly, a “shift in emphasis from the teaching of a curriculum towards the education of the individual will.”\footnote{John Lloyd, “Principal’s Comments,” \textit{Architectural Association School Handbook} (1968), 2. Reflecting back on his changes to the AA curriculum in 1975, Lloyd commented: “given the exuberance, diversity and ability of the AA it seemed to me criminally irresponsible to lay down a curriculum. Rather I believe that those affected by the series of decisions which make up a course of study are in a better position to take the decisions themselves. I was also confident that the staff had very much more to offer than had been possible under a curriculum-orientated school structure. Not least, I was sure that by restructuring the school so that participation was the norm there would be a great release of enthusiasm and creative effort.” Michael (John) Lloyd, “Reply,” in \textit{A Continuing Experiment: Learning and Teaching at the Architectural Association}, edited by James Gowan (London: Architectural Press, 1975), 163.}

This was a radical pedagogical overhaul that not only echoed the abrupt arrival of the unit system in the 1930s, but in fact reinstated it as the structural and philosophical framework of design education at the AA. Lloyd’s version, however, was not a wholesale revival.

While the First Year of study maintained its largely foundational aspirations (though adding subjects including physiology, sociology, anthropology, comparative philosophy and logic), it was through Lloyd’s consolidation of the second, third, and fourth years of study into a newly designated Middle School that the unit system dramatically rearticulated the AA’s modernist agenda.\footnote{John Lloyd, “The Structure of the Undergraduate Course,” \textit{Architectural Association School Handbook} (October 1967), 1.1.} Previously oriented horizontally within the postwar Year System as a way to distribute student supervision
among tutors, nine units were now oriented vertically through the Middle School. Unit Masters became responsible for defining the scope of design investigations, thereby establishing a pedagogical matrix within the school in which the student’s newly awarded “freedom of choice” encouraged engagement with a wide range of subjects, from industrialized housing to “problems caused by urban waste and refuse” to “the possible use of the continental shelf as an extension of human resources.” In effect, Lloyd stated, the unit system allowed students to “exercise a large influence on the structuring of their own curriculum and in particular on the nature and sequence of the problems studied as studio programmes.” It was through the unit system’s landscape of topics, navigated and explored “democratically,” that the student’s “generalist” education was to unfold.

The objectives of the Middle School unit system therefore reveal that Lloyd’s notion of educational reform was not defined solely by an expanded conception of architectural practice. Indeed, at the AA what was at stake in Lloyd’s restoration of the unit system was the restoration of the student’s “freedom of choice.” For the strictures of a curriculum, he argued, not only distort “the relationship between the individual and his society,” but in conjunction, and more gravely, hinder the fundamental rights of an individual in a democratic society to “choice.”

Commenting on the matter in 1968, Lloyd observed that “recent debates on the need to reshape Parliamentary democracy and the world-wide student unrest are the most obvious symptoms of the need” for a

---

25 Lloyd, “Structure of the Undergraduate Course,” 1.1-1.2. In this way, the figure that Lloyd sought to emulate was not Rowse, but Robert Furneaux-Jordan, AA Principal from 1948 to 1951, and under whom Lloyd had studied. Lloyd, “Reply,” in *A Continuing Experiment*, 163.
serious reevaluation of this relationship. A philosophical lineage, extending from Dewey to Rousseau, underpins this effort to compound democracy and education, yet is here tailored to respond to the conditions of late modernism and its architectural manifestations. Accounting for multiculturalism, alternative technologies, as well as political change, the elastic modernism of Lloyd’s approach to architectural pedagogy posed a deliberate and jarring departure from the teleological framework of the AA Year System. Yet at the same time, this notion of a democratic model of architectural education unequivocally capitalized on the AA’s origins in Victorian liberalism; the AA was an institution, as Lloyd and later Boyarsky were quick to acknowledge, founded by students, for students. Indeed, closer consideration of the implications and consequences of this conflation of democracy and architectural education, so uniquely intrinsic to the institutional identity of the AA, allows us to trace the convergence of Lloyd’s Middle School experiment and Boyarsky’s “well-laid table” in the form of the “market place” model of architectural education. For the latter was rooted not simply in the economic strategies of its namesake, but also in the very mythological origins of the AA.

THE ELEGANT BEEHIVE

In February 1970 Imperial College rescinded its proposal to merge with the AA. The conclusive dissipation of negotiations that had loomed for nearly a decade, and which had promised financial and academic stability for the AA, quickly threw the school of architecture into a state of flux. To better understand the aftermath of this turn

---

of events it is worthwhile here to recall the unique two-part institutional structure of the AA: 1) an association of members governed by an elected Council and 2) a school of architecture. Established in the mid-nineteenth century as an alternative to the apprenticeship system, its progressive approach to architectural education was premised on a democratic institutional model that afforded its students a say in how the school was run [fig. 3.13].

With recourse to the AA’s founding principles, during the late 1960s a faction of students and academic staff contested Council’s efforts to realize the Imperial College merger, arguing in favor of the preservation of the school’s independence. Opposition escalated at the decade’s close, culminating in the formation of the School Community, “a political unit” that “pitted against both the Council and Membership.” Exhausted of its negotiating possibilities, Imperial College finally deemed the AA and all its institutional idiosyncrasies—and quite pointedly, its actively democratic institutional structure—wholly “indigestible,” as AA tutor Charles Jencks aptly diagnosed the conclusion of the affair. Institutional change, nevertheless, unfurled at a tumultuously rapid pace. By June 1970 a new and more radical Council had been voted into place, led by a “Guerrilla group” intent to maintain the AA’s independent status; in August an Independence Working Party was established to investigate possible economic strategies for the school. However, burdened by pre-existing financial difficulties—now made a reality by severed ties with Imperial College—and without an immediate
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28 For another account of these events see Martin Pawley, “Inside the AA,” Architectural Design (March 1971): 190–1.
resolution in clear sight, in December 1970 Lloyd announced the school’s closure within two years time. Shortly after making this announcement, the School Community swiftly pressured Lloyd to “resign.”

Had it not been for the resilience of the School Community, the AA likely would have closed its doors permanently, as decreed by Lloyd. On January 13, 1971, the first day of the new term, “a new regime” took shape as students and staff took it upon themselves to maintain the AA’s facilities and operations for the remainder of the academic year. In his account of this episode, Jencks detailed the scope of the School Community’s newly assumed responsibilities.

The energy and creativity of the School Community was staggering; committees were formed to do every possible money-saving function, from cleaning the building at 6:30 in the morning to turning off the lights. There were committees on the school budget which showed methods for saving £70,000, committees on a new appeal, long-term finance, academic structure, staff appointments, the graduate departments and so on. Over this three-month period about 200 people, mostly students, actively took part in creating and running their school. An interesting political fact emerged. With the participatory system [of democracy], knowledge, skill and desire about politics decentralizes so there is no longer any simple leader or fixed structure of government.

---

30 Pawley, “Inside the AA,” 191.
31 Jencks, “125 Years of Quasi-Democracy,” 156.
Such profound loyalty to an educational institution, as evidenced in this veritable *coup d'état*, is certainly compelling on a narrative level. Indeed, Jencks’ narrative has here cast a utopian gloss on a knotty conflation of concepts, which demand further scrutiny. Education, democracy, freedom: to be sure, these concepts pervade the history of the AA and its changing attitudes towards pedagogy, as we have just seen in Lloyd’s contribution. Yet during the late 1960s, how were these concepts interdependent, contradictory, and even contrived? What is the effect of this cooption of the language of politics into the realm of architectural education? Is democracy at the AA in fact operative, or purely symbolic?

While it is tempting to categorize unrest at the AA as part of a broader, international wave of student protests that flooded the late 1960s, an important distinction must be made. Such protests in France or at American universities, for example, had produced quite public confrontations between education and politics. These were public not simply because they took institutions as the stage for mass action, but because in so doing they called into question the very role of higher education within political and socioeconomic power structures, whether concerning international warfare, racism, or the rights of the working class. In this sense, one is hard-pressed to identify the materialization and activities of the AA School Community as a protest movement cut from the same cloth. Ideologically distanced (though beneath the surface not entirely divorced) from external political or economic structures, the institutional insurrection at the AA was intensely hermetic, and despite a flurry of coverage in the architectural press, it remained a resolutely private affair. This much is made clear by the response, as Jencks recounts, to the announcement of the AA’s
closure: the maintenance of the school’s administrative operations and the upkeep of its physical premises. At the AA, politics was contained within its very architectural limits. Such seemingly mundane actions perhaps crystallized the purest form of democracy that the AA, as an institution, could support. Indeed, this was an act of regression, a subconscious reenactment of its Victorian past life that reveal the underlying paradox of what on the surface appears to be a “revolution.” For this radical resurgence of democracy was not intended to stimulate social, political or even institutional progress; conversely, its goal was the radical preservation of the very interiority of the AA and its cult(ure) of individualism.\footnote{It is difficult to convey the sense of loyalty to the AA felt by those supporters of its independence. A statement made by John Smith, a “Guerrilla” Council member, does this to some effect: “All of us associated with the AA, in whatever capacity and for however long a period of time, share a curious affection, a love perhaps, for the essence or charisma of the place that no-one can define. And out of this affection, which can link the generations in its intensity, we are prone to argue and dispute in a manner both perverse yet understandable.” Letter from John Smith, Chairman of AA Independence Working Party to John Dennys, President of the Architectural Association, 26 November 1970, printed in “Independence and the A.A.: A report of the AA Council’s Independence Working Party,” November 1970, unpaginated, AAA, Box 1991:20.}

The implications of such sentiments were hardly lost on those witnessing and participating in this highly charged episode in the AA’s history. The title of Jencks’ historical overview of participation at the AA—“125 Years of Quasi Democracy”—makes this clear, as does a delightfully scurrilous cartoon portrait of the AA, published as a flyer in 1969 by tutor David Wild\footnote{Wild was then teaching at the AA. He was also a founding editor of the “outside-left” architectural “little magazine” \textit{ARse} (1969-1972). The flyer carries the subtitle “a tiny fart from your local AARse.”} [fig. 3.14, 3.15]. Wild depicts 36 Bedford Square in section, its exposed interior cannily supplying the structure for a comic strip. Its multiple frames feature a cast of identifiable tutors and members of Council, as well
as students, providing a piercing glimpse “Inside the Elegant Beehive,” as Wild titled the illustration. With his own Meaning in Architecture tucked under his arm, Jencks crawls along the floor of the basement, where he encounters Wild engrossed in an issue of the Socialist newspaper Black Dwarf. Detecting “some incipient Bolshevik puritanism somewhere here,” Jencks opportunistically remarks, “perhaps we could have a seminar on it.” Upstairs in the AA bar we find Jane Drew, head of Council during the last stages of the Imperial College negotiations. “Get that School Community out of here,” she hisses, but is soothed by Maxwell Fry’s assurance that “Dow Chemicals have lost the napalm contract” (“Thank God,” she sighs, “of course we never knew, did we?”) —here, a dig by Wild at the couple’s recent employment as designers for the corporation.34 One flight up, an anonymous figure (likely a student) protests the Imperial College merger: “They can’t do this to the AA—this is a famous very special clever place.” His companion buoyantly concurs, “There’s all this sooper freedom” —with the misspelling “sooper” used cynically to portray a student guilelessly enraptured by the persona of the school.35 A hothouse environment thriving on a symbiosis of naïveté and self-interest, the “Elegant Beehive” is portrayed as a frothy concoction of ideologies and class politics. Yet, as Wild exposed, it was stifled and made stagnant by its own identity as such; or, put differently, by its very lack of identity—a dilemma that the IID, too, was at that moment about to experience, as well.

In the eyes of its late twentieth century critics, Jacques Rancière observes, democracy is perceived as “the reign of the limitless desire of individuals in modern

34 Namely as architects of an office building for Dow Agrochemicals (1960).
35 David Wild, “Inside the Elegant Beehive (a tiny fart from your local AARse),” illustration on flyer, 1969.
mass society,” often personified in the figure of the narcissistic consumer. With acerbic comic eloquence Wild’s portrayal of the AA’s institutional psyche vividly captured such “limitlessness” swarming the interior of “the Elegant Beehive,” a veritable topology of narcissism that seemingly anticipated the consumerism of the “market place.” Following Rancière, however, at the AA such “limitlessness” must be understood as a surface effect, rather than the crux of its institutional democracy. For democracy is not constituted by “the exponential multiplication of needs or desires emanating from individuals,” but rather by an “impurity of politics, the challenging of governments’ claims to embody the sole principle of public life and in so doing be able to circumscribe the understanding and extension of public life”; its “limitlessness,” then, manifests in its ceaseless displacement of “the limits of the public and the private, of the political and the social.” To extend this argument to the institutional sphere of the “Elegant Beehive,” within the AA democracy was not rooted simply in the notion of personal freedom or, in the case of the “market place,” uninhibited consumerism. Democracy instead materialized through the very questioning and manipulation of the limits and function of governance. The astute observation of a baby, who makes a surreal appearance “Inside the Elegant Beehive,” thus succinctly captures the democratic essence of the AA. In reference to the (then impending) merger with Imperial College, the baby suggests that “the appeal of authority has been that it would restrain us from ourselves.”

---

38 Wild, “Inside the Elegant Beehive.”
Through perhaps the most quintessential of democratic acts the AA sought to redraw the limits of its institutional governance. In the early summer of 1971 the School Community organized an election for the newly created post of AA Chairman, a title whose business-oriented connotations countered the academic undertones of “Principal.” This attentiveness to untraditional titles recalls Boyarsky’s own concerns over the naming of the IID—not a school, but an institute; yet it also discloses how in both cases such adjustments were simply surface effects that aestheticized overarching disciplinary objectives.

The Chairman’s Appointment Board (CAB) consisted of three student members (Peter Allison, Rem Koolhaas and Louis Pryce), three members of the teaching staff (Peter Cook, Sam Stevens and Elia Zenghelis), four members of Council (Sylvia Bartlett, William Mullins, John Smith and Michael Tree), and the Director of the Association (Roger Cunliffe). As the CAB announced in June 1971, it was “committed to the necessity of a chairman,” recognizing in this new leadership role an “opportunity to integrate School and Association more fully, thereby minimizing a source of structural conflict, and explicitly turning the School into the dominant commitment of the Association.”

This search produced two candidates, whom the CAB presented to the School Community. The first was the British critic and historian Kenneth Frampton, an AA graduate (1955), former Technical Editor of Architectural Design (1962-1965), and who had recently begun a teaching appointment at Princeton University. The second

40 “Notes by the Chairman’s Appointment Board,” 7 June 1971, AAA, Box 2007:55. The document indicates that there were 17 applications, out of which 5 candidates were interviewed.
was Boyarsky. Then Associate Dean of the College of Art and Architecture at UIC, Boyarsky was better known to AA students and staff as director of the IID, which had organized its first Summer Session in London the year prior. At “campaign” time Boyarsky was promoting the second session, to be hosted, serendipitously, by the AA. A third option of “no chairman” was also proposed, though as the CAB argued, “by leaving the post open, a vacuum would be created which would eventually have to be filled one way or another probably without the control of the school.”

While both short-listed candidates pledged to maintain the school’s unique democratic ethos, their respective curricular interpretations of this ethos diverged dramatically. In his candidate’s statement, Frampton observed that despite the recent period of uncertainty at Bedford Square, the “elements of healthy survival are already present in the School.” Therefore what was required, he argued plainly, was “a more coordinated educational program,” one that would support a “dissident position, reformist in intent” with which to confront the economic, technological, and socio-political forces underpinning contemporary architectural production. Frampton outlined his educational platform under four main headings: “Information,” “Design,” “Technique” and “Cultural.” Though he sketched these points only briefly and schematically, they nevertheless revealed a distinctly socialist vision for the reorganization of the AA’s academic structure—not to mention a constellation of intellectual concerns that would resurface in his later theoretical and historical projects. Under the first heading of his curricular outline, “Information,” Frampton proposed the
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41 “Notes by the Chairman’s Appointment Board.”
establishment of an in-house publishing program; the consolidation and distribution of data and information, he suggested, would offer an essential resource for teaching and research. Second, teaching staff would collaborate to develop a sequence of design programs to be administered throughout the AA, so that “the design work of the School would acquire the character of research.” In conjunction, studies in “Technique” would approach building production and technology through a “critique of the ‘means-end’ relationship, in relation to economic constraints and culturally embedded values,” while “Cultural” studies would “trace the evolution of the urbanized built environment as an inter-related socio-economic, symbolic and political manifestation, with particular emphasis on the period coming after 1750.”

In sum, Frampton advocated a comprehensive curriculum engineered to integrate socioeconomic inquiry and architectural design. It was a stance that reflected his intellectual investment in the Hochschule für Gestaltung at Ulm, the focus of an article that he would publish in *Oppositions* in 1974, and which demonstrated how its curriculum had served to “publicly proclaim the ideology of the school.” However schematic Frampton’s own educational platform may have been, his candidate statement clearly disclosed his intention to similarly construct an ideology of the AA through its curriculum.

From his manner of presentation to his vision, Frampton proposal could not have contrasted more starkly with that of his opposing candidate. With the second IID Summer Session in the wings, and the first still fresh in the minds of many at Bedford Square, Boyarsky unsurprisingly rechanneled many of the slogans used to promote the
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43 Frampton, “Statement of Intent.”
IID into his discussion of the AA’s future. He argued for the need to “link up” interdisciplinary schools across Britain and Europe, and called for “a platform, workshop and agency” to support “ground-breaking” work. What was needed was a “well laid place at the table for free-ranging individuals and groups where the problems of education and the underlying strategies for dealing with a variety of environmental situations are constantly under review.” Unlike Frampton, Boyarsky did not propose any type of academic structure. Conversely, in his laconic candidate’s statement he ambiguously suggested that the school might “aspire to the creation of an ambience” where conversations could be “elevated, amplified and counterpointed” on a global scale in order that “new strategies for approaching environmental problems might emerge.”

To be sure, these redeployed IID “slogans” were intended to dazzle. But they also conjured a decentralization of academic and administrative structure that in fact resonated with the School Community’s recent redistribution of governance within the AA. Yet instead of presenting or promising a pre-packaged remedy for the AA’s institutional instability and financial woes, in a speech delivered at Bedford Square Boyarsky offered a now notorious palliative. In an interview from the early 1980s he explained his strategy for a speech he delivered at the AA and its recourse to folklore.

---

45 Even before the 1971 Summer Session and prior to his candidacy for the chairmanship, Boyarsky’s name had been bandied around as a figure who could lead the school out of its woes. See Pawley, “Inside the AA.” On several occasions, his peers have suggested to me that Boyarsky established the IID Summer Sessions in 1970 in anticipation of the AA’s collapse.


47 Boyarsky, “Aa Forum and Context for the ‘70’s?”
I wasn’t sure that I wanted to get involved in the first place, so I told the story about the rainmaker. A southern preacher fellow dressed in black is riding a black mule through dried-up cotton fields. He comes into town and says: ‘Give me what I ask for and I’ll make rain’. So he gets his food and his drink and his women and his gold and they want rain. ‘The rain won’t fall,’ he says, ‘until 24 hours after I leave town.’ And he gets onto his mule and turns his back and slowly rides off into the sunset. I promised to make rain.  

For an institution then “on its knees” (as Boyarsky characterized it in his own reminiscence), this was a brazen invitation to partake in a reckless gamble. As Boyarsky’s interviewer observed, the “opportunism, the theatricality, the instinctive sense of occasion, the aggressiveness, the complete self-assurance” were “absolutely in character.” Indeed, as his audience at the AA in 1971 was well aware, he had already played the role of the “rainmaker” at the first IID Summer Session, where his mettle had shone through with spectacular results. The barrage of postcards, flyers and advertisements for the second installment promised that there was more rain to come. But the journalist’s characterization, quoted above, elicits an alternate reading. Boyarsky’s opportunism, theatricality, and all the rest were also “absolutely in character” with the AA itself, that “elegant beehive” where individualism and opportunism was an institutional pastime, if not a survival technique. His success in the election was not an affirmation of the voting student body’s faith in his loosely
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48 Alvin Boyarsky, interviewed in “Ambience and Alchemy,” *Architectural Review* October 1983): 27. The figure of the “rainmaker” had been introduced to and clearly made an impression on Boyarsky in the various community leaders that had solicited him to participate in West Side planning initiatives in Chicago.

49 Boyarsky, “Ambience and Alchemy,” 27.
articulated commitment to global networks or “ground-breaking” work, or even his deliberately opaque vow to “make rain.” Victory, instead, confirmed that he was recognized as one of their own.

PREDATORY CREATURES

During his first several years in office Boyarsky did in fact produce a considerable amount of “rain” at Bedford Square, much of it falling in the region of the unit system. Introduced only four years earlier by Lloyd and tested as the Imperial College merger crisis was reaching fever pitch, the unit system that Boyarsky inherited in 1971 was still very much in its nascency. Throughout his first year in office the new Chairman, teaching staff, and students together evaluated the efficacy of Lloyd’s academic model and the limits of its educational philosophy. Rather than a radical overhaul spearheaded by Boyarsky alone, the reorganization of the AA’s educational program, like the IID, was shaped through a process of critical dialogue. The issues raised at the beginning of Boyarsky’s chairmanship were in fact strikingly similar to those that had confronted him as he was designing (and redesigning) the structure of the Summer Sessions.

Although their opinions and interests were by no means uniform, both students and tutors agreed that the intensely “democratic” nature of Lloyd’s educational policy—that is, the insistence on the student’s responsibility for steering the course of his or her education—was in principle highly desirable, and certainly, in keeping with the ethos of the AA. Left largely unchecked, however, such “democracy” had proved counterproductive. Combined with their unit work, the disparate agendas of the
“service” departments—Systems Studies (building technology), Arts & History (visual arts and the history of art and architecture) and, newly introduced in 1971 by Boyarsky, the Communications Unit (audio-visual technology)—put AA students in a “confusing position of attempting to reconcile several points of view.” The result was the veritable “fragmentation of the student mind,” according to one student.50

Teaching staff, too, had experienced their own strains of “fragmentation.” First Year Master Tony Gwilliam flagged the difficulties of supervising and managing the entire group of sixty First Year students. His suggestion was to break the monolithic introductory course into a sequence of smaller teaching units each developed by a different tutor—a curricular structure that would better prepare students for the range of methods and work undertaken in the Middle School.51 Yet rumblings were also heard from within the Middle School. The high degree of individualism across student projects, which not uncommonly departed from established project briefs (and were under Lloyd’s policy encouraged to do so), was compounded by the student’s freedom to move from unit to unit, thereby complicating the demands and scope of tutorial supervision.52 Corroborating accounts surfaced in a “Middle School Survey” coordinated by the AA Newsheet, a new in-house bulletin covering the school’s day-to-

51 Tony Gwilliam, “First Year AA’72,” AA Newsheet, no. 16 (Summer 1971/1972), unpaginated.
day affairs.\textsuperscript{53} A report on “MS2”—nicknamed “the Greek Unit” after its tutors Thalys Agaropoulos and Elia Zenghelis, and which took as its theme “buildings and the city”—revealed that the unit had amassed an enrollment of nearly one hundred students by the Summer term. The population of the “Greek Unit” thus constituted an overwhelming majority of the entire Middle School student body of two hundred and fifty [fig. 3.16]. In contrast, the Middle School community action unit taught by tutor Brian Anson had less than thirty students in the same year.\textsuperscript{54}

But it was in the last year of study, overseen by Fifth Year Master Peter Cook, then assisted by a team of tutors who included James Stirling’s ex-partner James Gowan, the Swiss architect Bernard Tschumi, and the Czech émigré Dalibor Vesely, that “educational freedom” perhaps reached its apotheosis. At times the price of a student’s independence in the Fifth Year was virtual anonymity. Today, many former Fifth Year tutors recall a typical scenario at staff meetings on students’ progress: as the roster was read aloud, all too often several student names rung unfamiliar.\textsuperscript{55}

Nevertheless, a student’s independence in the Fifth Year could also yield extraordinary and fiercely original results. Notable student projects from the period include Robin Evans’ piezoelectric study (1969); “Motorolarama” by Piers Gough, Diana Jowsey, and Philip Wagner (1971); Mike Hickie and Bob Jardine’s establishment of a community television station in North Kensington (1971); and Peter Crump and Bruce Haggart’s

\textsuperscript{53} The \textit{AA Newsheet} was founded by Neil Steedman, an AA graduate, in Autumn 1971 and ceased publication in Summer 1974.


ecological manifesto published as the little magazine *Street Farmer* (1971)—to highlight just a few⁵⁶ [figs. 3.17, 3.18, 3.19].

The pressing matter that penetrated such heterogeneous critiques of the existing educational structure at the AA, therefore, was not the quality of student work; nor was it the capabilities or methods of the teaching staff under question. Many of the latter had in fact established themselves as resident personalities at Bedford Square. Tutors such as Keith Critchlow, Gowan, and Zenghelis, for example, and especially members of Archigram, had inspired and guided a generation of students during the latter half of the 1960s as the school principalship shifted from the technocratic regime of Allen to Lloyd’s platform for self-discovery. What students and tutors implicitly advocated was a more structurally sound institutional model of “fragmentation.” Infiltrated by a unit system that had swiftly and boldly overturned a rigid two-decade-old curricular sequence, the authority of pedagogy had seemingly dissolved under the “generalist” rubric of Lloyd’s Middle School unit system and its privileging of the “will” of the student. AA tutor Fred Scott drollly summarized the resulting temperament at Bedford Square: “While eyes often met in agreement, eyeballs rarely did in confrontation, and it was a long time before someone felt moved to write on a wall: ‘Do I have to do what I want to do again today?’”⁵⁷ (A plea written, we can imagine, by the grownup version of Wild’s baby, who upon being thrust into the “Elegant Beehive” had so sagaciously discerned “the appeal of authority.”) Counter to the broad strokes that his “campaign” had enigmatically painted, what was at stake in Boyarsky’s appointment as chairman,

⁵⁷ Scott, “Myth, Misses, and Mr Architecture,” 169.
then, was the creation of a highly engineered, comprehensive structure for architectural education at the AA.

In the Summer term of 1972, towards the end of Boyarsky’s first academic year as chairman, Archigram member and AA tutor Warren Chalk dismissed the Middle School unit system as nothing short of an “abysmal failure.” He even conceded that “the re-adoption of [the] Year Master would help to shoulder the responsibility of so many lost souls, shopping in the Middle School Department Store.” As he added parenthetically with acerbic disdain, “note I didn’t use [the word] Supermarket, because there is nothing super about it.”\(^{58}\) Chalk’s recourse to the language of consumerism in his indictment of the unit system is revealing on multiple levels. We need only to consider his roots in Archigram as a reminder of how deeply the logic of consumer culture had become ingrained in the British architectural avant-garde [fig. 3.20]. During the 1960s, obsolescence, ready-made components, and consumer choice were championed the group and its colleagues, such as Price and Banham (and before them in the 1950s, through the Independent Group’s religion of mass culture), as antidotes to the formalism and abstraction of modern architecture; and in a different way, and from across the Atlantic, we can also situate the urban exploits of Boyarsky’s deltiology within this ethos.

The mobile dwellings and megastructures that flooded AA student portfolios during the late 1960s reveal how the flexibility of the Middle School unit system had in fact supported experimentation with ephemeral structures and new technologies [figs. 0.7, 3.21, 3.22]. In parallel, Chalk’s instinctive transposition of the shopping metaphor

\(^{58}\) Warren Chalk, “Go Tell It To the Mountain,” *AA Newsheet*, no. 11 (Summer Term, 1971/1972), unpaginated.
into his analysis of the Middle School unit system demarcates a trajectory from off-the-peg design and “throwaway” esthetics into the domain of pedagogical method. Whether in the “department store” or the “supermarket” the student was already understood as a consumer at the AA, even before Boyarsky unequivocally redefined the unit system as a “market place.” To be sure, prior to his chairmanship he had already identified architectural students as consumers at the IID Summer Sessions, which operated not only as a “well-laid table,” but also—as he had declared prior to Chalk’s remarks on an AA “supermarket”—as a “marketplace for exchange of ideas.”

Hosted by the Institute of Contemporary Arts in 1972, the final Summer Session in fact allowed Boyarsky to situate educational reform at the AA within an international exchange of ideas on the current challenges facing schools of architecture. In a series of “Participants Forums” devoted to architectural education, teachers and students from Denmark, Italy, Hungary, South Africa, Canada and other countries described the objectives, pressures, and solutions that were currently shaping their respective educational “scenes.” For example, four representatives from the University of Toronto outlined the Department of Architecture’s new “open-ended” curriculum, which had been formally introduced in the autumn of 1968 and was designed to “encourage each student to develop his own view of architecture.” The presentation sparked an

60 “Toronto Curriculum” presentation, “Participants Forum,” audio recording, IID Summer Session, 2 August 1972, Alvin Boyarsky Archive, London (ABA). Peter Prangnell’s redesign of the first year of architectural study at Columbia University had prompted Australian architect John Andrew, then Chairman of the University of Toronto Department of Architecture, to hire Prangnell to undertake a similar curricular overhaul at Toronto. For a detailed description of the Toronto curriculum see “Winds of Change,” Parts 1, 2, and 3, Canadian Architect (February 1969): 32–44. This article
animated group discussion among attendees on the role of the curriculum in architectural education. A fellow North American participant expressed his own frustration over the time and energy he had spent grappling with the curricular recommendations and guidelines published in the so-called “Princeton Report,” an assessment of curricula in American schools drafted by Robert Geddes and Bernard Spring in 1967, which was sponsored by the American Institute of Architects. Another attendee critically observed the inherent paradox of the student’s purported “freedom” to develop an individual position within the prescribed, overarching philosophy of the Toronto Department of Architecture.  

Joining the debate, Boyarsky imparted his own interpretation of the broader role of the curriculum in architectural education—a position that is today available for consideration thanks to the IID director’s determination to audio record the full proceedings of the 1972 session. Through its sequence of technical exercises, design programs, and other requirements, the curriculum promised to teach the student “how to see,” “how to join brick and glass,” or even “how to write,” he proposed. Put differently: latent in such curricular constructions was the epistemological promise of architecture itself. Through the sum of its parts, the curriculum therefore presupposed a definition of architecture in all its visual, spatial, material, tectonic, and even discursive constituents. However, it was through such teleological gestures that the curriculum—regardless of institutional, historical, or national context, or even its composition or

---

was read aloud as part of the Toronto contingent’s presentation at the 1972 IID Summer Session.  

design—would remain inherently “paternalistic” and “tyrannical,” Boyarsky contended: paternalistic in the sense that its obsolescence is inevitable in the face of unrelenting social and technological developments, and tyrannical in the sense that its prescriptions nullify the cultural and intellectual differences of those who engaged with it.\(^{62}\)

Echoes of Lloyd, who himself had found it “criminally irresponsible to lay down a curriculum,” are perhaps audible here. By parsing his modernist stance on pedagogy against Boyarsky’s ruminations, a distinction between methods and objectives becomes clear, however.\(^{63}\) Although based on the conviction that individual students should steer the course of their education, Lloyd’s notion of “educational democracy” ultimately relied on a totalizing conception of architecture as the product of an interdisciplinary framework of operations and a conception of the architect as its coordinator, trained to adapt and respond to changing social demands and contexts. In this way, Lloyd’s philosophy recalled Gropius’ emphasis on the teaching of “method” versus “information,” as much as it did the global ambitions of Fuller’s proposals for an expanded multinational and multimedia educational network. For Lloyd, a “democratic” model of architectural education anticipated the “democratic” choices that the architect-as-coordinator would encounter in the dual role of member and spatial organizer of modern society.

In his response to the “Toronto Curriculum” presentation, Boyarsky made an alternative proposition. The new task of the school of architecture, he stated, was to “be a critic of society,” rather than merely its provider or form giver. Certainly, Boyarsky

\(^{63}\) Lloyd, “Reply,” 163.
was not alone in his call for architectural education to take on a more critical, rather than simply passive professional or social stance. The capacity of the studio, atelier, and other pedagogical platforms to adopt a manifesto had already become apparent, for example, in Robert Venturi, Denise Scott Brown, and Steven Izenour’s 1969 studio at Yale, which culminated in the publication of *Learning from Las Vegas* (1972), or even the radical formation of *Unité pédagogique* 6 (UP6) in France. But for Boyarsky, in contrast, the polemical potential of architectural education presented itself at an institutional scale and in the idiosyncratic shape of the AA. If a school of architecture was to function as a critical thermometer of contemporary architectural production, then it must be fueled by “the energies and interests of a lot of people, so that the school community is bubbling with dozens of sometimes contradictory interests and activities” and in which the “so-called curriculum,” Boyarsky argued, must therefore be “conditioned daily, weekly, and annually.” Conscious of the negative connotations of such an abundance and simultaneity of ideas, Boyarsky defended the institutional support of such an ongoing ideological surplus as “the most responsible activity of all for a school of architecture.” “It makes everybody uncomfortable and edgy,” he explained, “because everybody has to justify their own existence to themselves.” In other words: the duty of the school of architecture was to provide the stage for a collective, perpetual existential crisis—a true phantasmagoria of the interior.

---

66 Ibid.
Later in the Summer Session, in an independent presentation Boyarsky elaborated on the very architectural characteristics of this stage in a description that reveals the deeper implications of his educational philosophy and its bearing on the AA. In place of a traditional curriculum, he informed his audience at the Summer Session, the AA offered an “interactive kaleidoscopic situation.” Saturated by a cacophony of positions and with no tenured tutors, it was a highly mutable atmosphere. Indeed, with students and staff primarily working at home and in nearby offices, respectively, Boyarsky announced (with a touch of pride) that the AA “doesn’t have any facilities.”

It’s just a chandelier—which is an eighteenth century chandelier—[and] an eighteenth century marble fireplace, with nice windows overlooking a green London square, and a bar which sells whiskey and wine, [with] lots of comfortable chairs. Students get their crits in the bar or under the chandelier. It’s like downtown. You come to meet people to talk.

Enamored by this vignette, Boyarsky summed up the “relative informality” of the AA by declaring “there’s no place, there’s no money, and nobody’s there for very long periods of time. It’s very interesting.” With this enigmatically stark portrait he deftly refurbished, or rather, gutted the “Elegant Beehive.” To Boyarsky’s eyes and ears the AA—a gentleman’s club from its very beginning, still resonant with tinkling glasses and erudite conversation—exuded an unequivocal elegance and refinement. To these aural reverberations the club chairs, the chandelier, the fireplace, and even the fine
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68 Boyarsky, “Participants Forum,” (undated) 1972, ABA.
views of Bedford Square provided the material vestiges of old-world conviviality that had withstood the winds of change. And at the same time these were highly performative anachronisms, ossified symbols of tradition that clung to the skeleton of an institution now eviscerated to maximize the circulation, pursuit, and consumption of ideas. This was a place to dwell only fleetingly and—contrary to Walter Benjamin’s thesis—without leaving traces.69 No longer a domestic sphere of bourgeois individualism, this was an international arena of continuous exchange [fig. 3.23].

The conflicted space of a genteel interior blemished by improprieties is a recurring theme in this dissertation. It appeared first at Cornell in “Morbid Manor,” the lavishly decorated residential hall where Boyarsky and Rowe dined on pizza by candlelight. At Cornell it also revealed itself in the Boyarkys’ prefabricated “hut,” where lengthy conversations between pupil and mentor took place over elaborate spreads. But Boyarsky’s irreverently charming portrait of the AA also bears an uncanny resemblance to Rowe’s own account of his dining experience at Cambridge. Pitching the extreme “formalism” of the décor at Jesus College and the “squalor” of its food as an analogical extension of the university and its intellectual climate, Rowe had cynically argued that an “elegant cafeteria service line” would be a model dually suitable for dining and education, cultivating taste and discernment in matters both gastronomic and intellectual.

We have witnessed a sequence of Boyarsky’s pedagogical reinterpretations of Rowe’s “elegant cafeteria service line,” first in the “à la carte” readings of urban history

that his postcarded lectures on Chicago provoked, and then in the “well-laid table” of the IID Summer Sessions. Both of these descendants of Rowe’s original provocation share a quality of mobility. Boyarsky applied his à la carte method in classrooms and lecture halls, as well as in the printed pages of Architectural Design, while the IID operated as a siteless institution, with the “well-laid table” of its Summer Sessions realizable in any setting. The AA, however, posed a rather fixed set of circumstances: not only because it was a permanent site, but also because it was irrevocably imbued with tradition—tradition in which its new chairman, however, apparently took some perverse pleasure. Unlike Rowe, he seemed to revel in the dualism between “formalism” and “squalor” that was intrinsic to the AA. It was a private domestic interior that behaved like a public urban institution (“It’s like downtown,” Boyarsky insisted). Its history was deep, yet its future was perpetually uncertain. And while Boyarsky’s “well-laid table” suggested decorum and conviviality, its alter ego, the “market place,” encouraged conflict and threatened self-destruction. Ideological differences notwithstanding, “people at the AA have one thing in common,” Boyarsky delighted: “they’re all predatory creatures.” Accordingly, the remarkable changes that he soon applied to the AA unit system aimed to whet and satiate the appetites of these domesticated “creatures.”

THE MARKETPLACE

“The AA philosophy is one of selection by choice,” affirmed the AA Newsheet at the start of the Autumn 1972 term, before outlining the “dramatic changes” to the
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70 Boyarsky, “Participants Forum,” (undated) 1972, ABA.
undergraduate course that lay ahead that year. In deference to this philosophy, both Lloyd and Boyarsky had seized upon the unit system as a departure from a conventional curriculum. But if the modern choreography of Lloyd’s unit system had counterbalanced the individual “will” of the student within the regimented display of the Middle School “department store,” its redesign by Boyarsky as a “market place” turned this philosophy on its head by aiming instead to maximize the “choices” available.

To do so, during his second and third year in office the chairman distributed the unit system throughout the five years of the AA’s undergraduate course. In 1972 he introduced the unit system as the basis of design pedagogy in the First Year of Study and in the Intermediate School. In the following year he expanded it into the Diploma School, and also extended it to the newly reconstituted “Service Units”: the Technical Studies Unit (formerly Systems Studies), the General Studies Unit (formerly Arts & History), and the Communications Unit (which Boyarsky had already established in 1971). These three “Service Units,” however, did not operate under the same competitive logic of the “market place.” As the name suggests, the Service Units were instead intended “to act as consultants for the whole of the Association’s educational activities”; in other words, they together comprised an auxiliary academic structure to support the design interests of the “market place.” The Technical Studies Unit, for example, offered courses in environmental sciences, structural analysis, management and professional practice, as well as workshops in construction techniques, materials,

---

and even computers. In consultation with Technical Studies tutors, students developed technical essays and projects to both further unit work and satisfy RIBA requirements.\(^{73}\) (As the activities of the Technical Studies Unit makes clear, the professional onus of the architect was not jettisoned entirely at the AA.) The following chapter will elaborate on the responsibilities of the Communications Unit and the General Studies Unit during the period of institutional renovation.

Our present concern is Boyarsky’s reorganization of studio education at the AA, which reconstituted design teaching into First Year, the Intermediate School (second and third years), and the Diploma School (fourth and fifth years).\(^{74}\) While this new unit system invited students to resume their roles as savvy shoppers and to exercise “choice” in the course of their education, it now also pressured tutors to exploit the pedagogical territory of the unit. Boyarsky reflected on this shift in objectives:

> When the unit system was first launched there was great excitement. It meant that in order to teach at the AA you had to get up on a platform and say ‘I want to do this’. A platform, a forum, a marketplace, a workshop—these were the

\(^{73}\) According to the 1973/1974 prospectus, Technical Studies requirements that year were as follows: one submission at the end of First Year; one submission at the end of the Intermediate course (second and third year); and one Technical Thesis at the end of the Diploma course. “Student Requirements,” AA Prospectus, Admin & General Services (London: Architectural Association, 1973/1974), 11-12.

\(^{74}\) On the one hand, such reorganization was practical. With the creation of the Diploma School, the weight of RIBA requirements was shifted from the fourth year to the fifth, granting the fourth year student more time for design work while also imposing structure onto the fifth year. The caesura between the Intermediate School and the Diploma School coincided with the “year out” that followed the third year of study, but importantly also created a point of entry for continuing students from other British institutions and international students from abroad—a financial palliative to an ongoing saga at the AA during the 1970s, when the Department of Education & Science and local education authorities withdrew grants for students at the AA, a private and independent institution.
slogans of the time. There was competition for the students’ attention and it was a very serious matter because they were involved in something creative and positive. Even the most professional teachers had to sweat it out. Imagine having to get up and talk to 200 Diploma students and then go and sit in your room and wait for them to come to you. What are you going to do if nobody comes? And the students; what if nobody will offer them a place? There is an incredible tension.\textsuperscript{75}

With this description a crucial point is made clear, what Jameson upholds as “the paradox—of the greatest symptomatic significance for the Marxian theoretical tourist”: that the model of the market place is never driven by consumption alone, and is always in fact a model for production.\textsuperscript{76} Here, it is the “well-laid table” that performs a postmodern dance, turning on its head as it embraces the onus of the unit system “market place,” where pedagogy operates as a mode of production: of architectural culture, discourse, theory. Responsive to supply and demand, the unit system is self-organizing and equally self-effacing, a model of architectural education designed to counteract its own obsolescence. And it is a model in which “choice” presents itself as a facet of democratic “freedom” in what appears to be a decentralized disciplinary complex, but is in reality the engine for what is in fact a highly regulated institutional system. A closer look at this system, which formed the basis of the AA’s five year

\textsuperscript{75} Alvin Boyarsky, interviewed in “Ambience and Alchemy,” \textit{Architectural Review} (October 1983): 28.
\textsuperscript{76} Fredric Jameson, \textit{Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism} (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991), 267.
undergraduate design course, during its earliest and most experimental years elucidates how tutors and students responded and succumbed to its mechanics.\textsuperscript{77}

Throughout the postwar period, the programs and exercises of the AA’s introductory First Year had distilled architecture to its “fundamentals.”\textsuperscript{78} By contrast, under the new unit system the First Year now distilled modes of architectural inquiry. Divided into groups of twenty, throughout the 1972/1973 academic year students rotated through four “Briefing Units,” each designed and taught by a different tutor.\textsuperscript{79} Although the basic design and visual exercises in Tony Gwilliam’s unit might have preserved some of the original intentions and methods of the preexisting introductory year, the other three units adopted quite disparate tactics. Students in Stefan Szczelkun’s unit explored the relationship between mobility, technology, and education through the refurbishment of a London city bus purchased by the AA. After outfitting the vehicle with audiovisual equipment and living quarters, students tested their design during a two-week tour of British schools of architecture, documenting their encounters on video [fig. 3.24]. In a feedback loop with the IID and its affiliates, the AA First Year bus tour was jointly coordinated by Architectural Design, through the initiative of Technical

\textsuperscript{77} Andrew Higgott’s essay on Boyarsky’s AA chairmanship is to date perhaps the only historical account of the unit system, yet limits its study to the Diploma School. See Higgott, “Searching for the Subject: Alvin Boyarsky and the Architectural Association,” in Mediating Modernism (London: Routledge, 2007), 154-177. In fact, the unit system is most often associated with the Diploma School. By discussing the five years of the undergraduate course, my goal is to illustrate how the unit system and its logic operated much more comprehensively at the AA.

\textsuperscript{78} And in fact, its secondary function was as a probationary period to assess “whether or not the student has the potential to continue with the study of architecture.” See, for example, “Structure of the Undergraduate Course” in AA Prospectus (London: Architectural Association, 1968–1969), unpaginated.

\textsuperscript{79} “Lower School First Year,” AA Newsheet, no. 1 (Session 1972/1973 Autumn Term), unpaginated.
Editor Peter Murray, and by Polyark, the network of architectural schools conceived by Price [fig. 3.25]. Alternatively, the Briefing Unit taught by Grahame Shane used the city of London to introduce students to architectural issues in an urban context, while in Tony Samson’s unit the ecological and social conditions of a Welsh village in a “transitional phase” between postindustrial dormancy and redevelopment was the primary focus of research and design work.

A modification in the 1973/1974 academic year extended the First Year units into three year-long programs. After participating in a brief common course, students were able to join the unit of their choice for the duration of the year. Unsettling preconceived architectural “fundamentals” based on principles of form, space, and modes of representation, the First Year unit system established an alternative introduction to architecture. Its new objective was to equip the student with critical skills necessary to navigate the heterogeneity of architectural production beyond the AA, but even more urgently, within its Intermediate and Diploma Schools.

For such training was imperative for advancing into the Intermediate and Diploma Schools, home of the “market place” proper, where a more diverse cast of tutors amplified the spectacle and tensions intrinsic to the unit system. The overall
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82 The Diploma School did not adopt the unit system until the 1973/1974 school year. In the year prior, an overarching program was set for the Diploma course. One assigned design program, for example, focused on the “Street Corner.” For student projects, see “Street Corners,” AA Newsheet, no. 4 (Autumn Term, 1972/1973), unpaginated. The unexpected departure of Cook (formerly Fifth Year Master, made head of the Diploma School in 1972) from the AA in January 1973 (to take up what would be a brief stint as director of the ICA) encouraged a reevaluation of the fourth and fifth years of study. During a school meeting in January of 1973, Boyarsky proposed that the Diploma School student should be able to ‘‘weave’’ his way through a ‘rich supermarket’ of
effect was not simply a culture of competition. By forcing the student to align himself or herself with a theoretical position each year, the unit system sustained a continuous obstruction of disciplinary certainty. For example, arguing that “technology which exploits nature ultimately exploits man,” in 1973/1974 Intermediate Unit 4 (the self-proclaimed “Rational Technology Unit”) tutors Gerry Foley and George Kasabov invited second and third year students to investigate the energy crisis through seminars and research on resource consumption, population growth, and the conservation of materials and energy in an effort to understand how to “design with nature” rather than “against it.”

That same year Intermediate Unit 6, co-taught by Archigrammer David Greene and television director and filmmaker Mike Myers, appealed to the same second and third year students. Entering architecture through immaterial resources and technologies, Intermediate Unit 6 proposed that “the imaginative communications skills needed to make a good film or a good television programme are the same in principle as those needed to make good buildings. It is a question of designing pieces of time as well as blocks of space.”

(Reintroduced here, such investigations and concerns certainly strike a chord with present day architectural education and practice, in which sustainability and new media are prevalent concerns.)

Notwithstanding their differences, what the myriad concerns supported by the AA unit system during the 1970s maintained was a shared disenchantment with
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Michael Walsche, “Alvin’s staff meeting,” *AA Newsheet* 2, no. 10 (March 1973). Also see “Will Success Spoil Peter Cook?” *AA Newsheet* 2, no. 7 (January 1973).


professional practice, combined with a critical distancing from the idealistic tropes of architectural modernism. Viewed in this light, each unit concretized a manifesto that tackled the discipline of architecture at large. The potential of the unit as manifesto was already latent in Lloyd’s Middle School unit system, though overshadowed, if not suppressed, by its “democratic” emphasis on student choice. By foregrounding the unit, with its versatile production of theory and critique, as the building block of architectural education at the AA, Boyarsky’s unit system paradoxically synthesized a pluralist culture of polemic at Bedford Square. The following profiles of a selection of units present a cross-section of this emerging culture at the AA during the early 1970s. This juxtaposition of vignettes at once adopts the comparative method that pervaded Boyarsky’s pedagogy—from the décollage of images in his multi-projector slide lectures, to the workshops of the IID Summer Session, to the “market place” of the AA—and registers the effects and potential of its full institutionalization as a system of architectural education.

INT 4/DIP 10

To begin, we can expand upon an example cited above: the Rational Technology Unit, the pedagogical domain of tutor Gerald Foley. Its roots, however, can be traced back to the AA’s postwar history. In many ways, the unit was the successor of the AA Tropical School, a postgraduate program founded in 1954 by Maxwell Fry, who developed its curriculum in tandem with the climatological design methods that he and Jane Drew had been honing abroad, primarily in Africa and India. The history of the Tropical School, however, is perhaps most often associated with Fry’s successor, Otto
Koenigsberger. An architect and planner who had gained extensive professional experience in India, Koenigsberger broadened the program’s purview to include planning and urbanization. In 1971 both Koenigsberger and the Tropical School relocated to the University College of London, where it was renamed the Development Planning Unit (DPU). The departure from Bedford Square coincided with (and was in large part expedited by) the institutional revolution that culminated in Boyarsky’s arrival as chairman; following Lloyd’s exit from the position of Principal, Koenigsberger had in fact served as interim head of school.  

The establishment of the Rational Technology Unit in 1973 therefore reinstated environmental design pedagogy at the AA, and within the realm of its undergraduate program. Its primary tutor, Gerald Foley, had trained as a structural engineer. His professional work in the late 1960s and early 1970s had brought him into frequent contact with architects, planners, and contractors. It was these experiences that fueled his increasing interest in the relationship between energy resources and “the nature of the post-economic-growth society.” At the 1972 IID Summer Session he had delivered a lecture series on this topic. In 1976 further elaborated on these matters in his book The Energy Question, a “survey of energy supply and demand problems,” and in which he

85 See Jane Drew and Maxwell Fry, Tropical Architecture in the Dry and Humid Zones (London: Reinhold Pub. Corp., 1964); Otto Koenigsberger, Manual of Tropical Housing & Building (London: Orient Longman Private Limited, 1975). The full history of the AA Tropical School—which, as a postgraduate program, operated on the periphery of the AA’s central studio education—is outside the scope of this dissertation. However, the Tropical School has been the focus of much current research and resulting publications by contemporary scholars will surely make a significant contribution to this area of scholarship.


included research conducted by his AA students\textsuperscript{88} [fig. 3.26]. In the years leading up to its publication, then, the AA unit system facilitated his research and development of a position on the energy crisis and its repercussions within the contemporary built environment.

Foley launched the Rational Technology Unit in the autumn of 1973, based on the conviction that “the current technocratic, highly wasteful, energy intensive society is reaching its end,” and that “the days of rip it down and replace it are gone.”\textsuperscript{89} His timing was, if somewhat unwittingly, felicitous. Shortly after the AA’s academic year began, October brought the oil embargo; November brought a limited supply of coal, as unrest within the National Union of Mineworkers escalated; and the end of December brought the Three Day Week, as part of the Heath administration’s energy conservation measures during the winter of 1973/1974\textsuperscript{90} [fig. 27]. All the while, watchful eyes were looking to the domestic prospects and conflicts surrounding the recent discovery of oil reserves under the North Sea. In Britain, it was a snowball of events that pushed energy resources and consumption into the foreground of public consciousness, and that duly corroborated the unit’s call to reconsider “what the role of an architect is in this rapidly changing society.”\textsuperscript{91}

How did this translate into a program of study? “The Unit,” Foley explained, sought “an approach to design which would transcend the sterilities of conventional ‘building science’ and view man as a dependent creature within the web of the biosphere, rather than as a domineering technocrat free from the constraints of the

\textsuperscript{90} The regular work week was restored 8 March 1974.
\textsuperscript{91} Foley, “Introduction,” \textit{Rational Technology Unit}, 1.
natural world.”\textsuperscript{92} In other words, the unit was less concerned with the mastery of widely-practiced structural technologies and systems, than it was with understanding architecture and its users as part of a broader system of resources and forces. The Rational Technology Unit, therefore, initially operated more as a research platform than as a traditional design studio. Rather than assign a series of design exercises, Foley encouraged students to pursue individual research projects according to their own interests. The students who chose to join the unit, from amongst a selection of many in the AA “market place,” conducted a wide-range of studies on the energy consumption of buildings, both historical and contemporary, as well as studies of traditional and “alternative” technologies.

A self-published brochure documents the unit’s various activities during its inaugural year, and signals its ambition to disseminate its work to a broader audience [fig. 3.28]. Student Derek Taylor focused on windmills as a source of pollution-free energy. After extensively researching an international selection of contemporary models\textsuperscript{93} Taylor produced his own small prototype, a wind charger with wooden blades. He also organized a wind power workshop at the AA, which was open to students in other units [fig. 3.29, 3.30]. Taking a different tack, Patricia Pringle and Jiri Skopek collaborated on studies of methane digesters, and constructed a specimen using inexpensive scrap materials, such as bicycle inner tubes and Perspex, not to mention


\textsuperscript{93} Including those produced by: the Brace Research Institute at Mcgill; International Technical Assistance in US; Hans Meyer and the Windworks Company; Flight Concepts Laboratory at Princeton; New Alchemists Institute; Walter Schonball, Geneva; etc.
chicken manure\textsuperscript{94} [fig. 3.31]. Turning their attention to insulation and heating, the pair also produced and tested three different models of solar collectors. Indeed, the unit was populated by many “sun worshippers,” some of whom installed solar collectors on the roof of one of the AA’s buildings [fig. 3.32]. And in fact the AA’s Technical Studies department established a Solar Energy Workshop, which provided technical assistance for student projects and coordinated public events on solar-powered technologies.

For contemporary architects today practicing sustainable environmental design, some of the methods tested by the Rational Technology Unit might ring familiar. For example, “rammed earth and soil-cement construction” was investigated by students Andy Brown and Oliver Cockell. Taking samples from a site in Wales, the students analyzed the composition and properties of different types of soils before designing molds for individual blocks and then testing them in different structural configurations; one such example was deemed a “success” for it allowed “air to be circulated freely around the whole surface area of each block”\textsuperscript{95} [fig. 3.33, 3.34]. Joined by a third student, Dave Hodgson, Brown and Cockell continued their research in Wales with the goal of producing architectural design proposals for BRAD (Biotechnic Research and Development), a communal experiment in low-energy living sited on a hillside farm. BRAD’s four participating families pledged to implement alternative technologies—for example, heat pumps, as well as organic farming—in order to demonstrate a successful

\textsuperscript{94} The students constructed an example according to a design by John Fry, a specialist in methane digesters and then an affiliate of the New Alchemy Institute, an ecological research center based in Cape Cod.

\textsuperscript{95} Rational Technology Unit, 8.
way to “live off the land.”\textsuperscript{96} After detailed analyses of the site’s water supply, the insulating properties of an existing stone farmhouse, space and water heating, and local timber as a source of fuel, the student team devised three architectural schemes for expanding BRAD’s premises\textsuperscript{97} [fig. 3.35].

As these descriptions make clear, by limiting its activities to existing technologies, however “alternative” they might have been, in its earliest years the Rational Technology Unit hardly sought to reinvent the wheel. Yet the objective behind its research-intensive methodology perhaps comes across in the unit’s refusal to adopt the label “alternative technology,” which was by the early 1970s a ubiquitous neologism with ties to 1960s counter-cultural movements. Likewise, the unit also refused the label “radical technology.” This was the title of a well-known sourcebook published by Godfrey Boyle and Peter Harper. Editors of the British magazine \textit{Undercurrents}, Boyle and Harper in their book championed “the growth of small-scale techniques suitable for use by individuals and communities in a wider social context of humanized production under workers’ and consumers’ control”\textsuperscript{98} [fig. 3.36]. Foley, his students, and their peers at the AA were certainly familiar with both “alternative” and “radical” technology discourses, as well as their protagonists, many of whom (including Boyle, as well as Lloyd Kahn, author of the do-it-yourself manual \textit{Domebook}) were invited to give public presentations at the AA during the 1970s. But perhaps the AA’s


\textsuperscript{97} Illustrations of which I was unable to locate, unfortunately. Though their research and proposals were in dialogue with up-to-date “alternative” technologies, their domestic schemes—replete with library, office space, and children’s playroom—hardly deviated from domestic conventions.

best-known alternative technology ambassadors was the ecological group Street Farmer. Its members—Peter Crump, Bruce Haggart and Grahame Caine—had graduated from the AA in 1972. Known for their rather beautifully produced eponymous magazine, the group gained significant attention, even outside of the AA, through their Eco House (or Street Farmhouse) located in south London and constructed in 1972. Outfitted with methane digesters and a “hydroponic greenhouse that produced radishes, tomatoes, and even bananas,” the fully functioning house was in fact the subject of a BBC television documentary that aired in 1973 [fig. 3.37, 3.38].

Implicitly critical of such “alternative” and “radical” approaches to technology, Foley’s characterization of his unit’s agenda as “rational” can be interpreted on multiple registers (and to be clear: he in fact never explicitly defines what he means by “rational”). First, the unit’s self-proclaimed “rationalism” reflected its recognition of the rising popularity of “alternative technologies”—of which the BBC’s Street Farmer program was clear evidence. Suspicious of popularized trends, the unit sought to evaluate and substantiate the benefits and efficacy of technologies through rigorous research. By extension, its self-proclaimed “rational” approach also distanced the unit’s work from the utopian ecological and counter-cultural experiments of the 1960s, as well as the technological optimism that had swept the school in the previous decade, as epitomized by the work and teaching of Archigram. Lastly, Foley viewed the so-called “energy crisis” with utter skepticism. Without hard evidence of a shortage of natural
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resources, the “crisis,” he contended, was a hyperbolic construct born out of a discourse oversaturated with pessimism, and perpetuated by a stream of rather ominously titled publications, such as Can Britain Survive? (1971), The Death of Tomorrow (1972), and A Blueprint for Survival (1972). Thus the Rational Technology Unit sought to understand the “energy crisis” not simply as a saga of depleting resources, or as license for utopian (or dystopian, for that matter) fantasy, but instead as a matrix of natural, economic, political, and social factors in which architecture was irrevocably complicit.

After two years of intensive analysis of various “alternative technologies,” Foley decided that the unit’s research phase was, to a large extent, complete. In its third (and ultimately final) year the Rational Technology Unit therefore shifted its focus to “real contexts in the real world.” For example, in an innovative response to the problem of urban density, student Sean Rawley devised a housing scheme in London sited between canal basins, which, he proposed, could provide heating to residents through a shared pump system. Yet, as many of the students’ unit projects indicate, the more common approach was post-facto analysis: following detailed studies of newly constructed buildings and planning schemes, students designed interventions that would minimize energy consumption and maximize building performance. While some worked at the scale of individual houses, others worked at an urban scale, with a particular focus on the new town of Milton Keynes\(^\text{101}\) [fig. 3.39, 3.40]. This pedagogical tactic of taking on “real” projects in the “real” world—at the AA, known as “live projects,” or, projects that targeted specific ongoing architectural or urban phenomena—was not exclusive to the Rational Technology Unit, though it yielded
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\(^{101}\) See “Dip 10,” AA Projects Review.
thoroughly dissimilar end products and discourses under the rubric of other unit agendas.

INT 1/DIP 8

For unit tutor Brian Anson (1935-2009), articulating a polemic seemed to be second nature. Born and raised just outside of Liverpool, Anson had studied architecture at Manchester University (1960). He spent the early portion of his professional career as a planner in Liverpool, Dublin, Donegal and, quite fatefuly, at the Greater London Council (GLC). During the late 1960s Anson was the GLC’s deputy principal planner for a major development scheme in Covent Garden. After meetings with local residents threatened by displacement as a result of the incoming retail and office developments, Anson soon changed his tune, becoming the scheme’s most vocal critic. In solidarity with the residents of Covent Garden, he launched a public campaign that exposed the social injustices of the GLC plan, which was eventually overturned.\(^\text{102}\) As part of this campaign, Anson took the cause to the IID Summer Sessions, where he spearheaded the Covent Garden Workshop (1971) and co-organized the London Workshop (1972). Upon Boyarsky’s invitation, Anson brought his platform on “community action” and “community architecture” to the unit system, thus enacting a “cross-fertilization” of the IID and the AA.

As indicated above, Anson began teaching in the Middle School unit system in 1971, but subsequently transitioned into Intermediate Unit 1 between 1972 and 1975,

and later Diploma Unit 8 from 1975 to 1978. The intertwined concepts of cooperation and community were the foundation of Anson’s teaching philosophy. On the one hand, this was reflected in the repertoire of unit projects that encouraged students to reach out to local communities, and on the other hand, imbued students’ working methods. It was common practice for several “live” projects to develop simultaneously and autonomously in Anson’s units. Students would voluntarily distribute themselves amongst projects and work collaboratively in groups. The work, in the case of Anson’s units, entailed interviewing community members, conducting research, and often disseminating their findings and arguments through posters and (mostly independently produced) publications [fig. 3.41].

A notable example was the Scottish oil project, which crystallized in Intermediate Unit 1 during the 1973/1974 academic year. With the Rational Technology Unit’s interest in natural resources and the oil crisis in mind, the approach of Anson and his students vividly exhibits how the unit system thrived on ideological and methodological difference. The project’s objective was to educate Scottish communities on the onshore consequences of North Sea offshore oil drilling, following the recent discovery of oil reserves under Scottish waters. Unit members observed the onset of a “second industrial revolution,” which they predicted would incur an influx of migrant workers and that had already instigated a planning spree by developers. Three students working on the unit project—Dave Taylor, David Angus and Robert Niven—guest edited a special issue of The Architects’ Journal, in which they published their copious research on social and economic demographics in effected areas, suburban sprawl, real
estate statistics, national planning policies and international investments in Scottish natural resources.\(^{103}\)

Anson extended his teaching model to Diploma Unit 8. In the 1975/1976 academic year one of the unit’s most significant projects focused on the new town center in Ealing, an area of west London. Council planners had proposed a comprehensive development scheme that was to include “a motorway bypass through residential areas, multi-storey car parks, pedestrian underpass, office towers, high rise council flats and an air-conditioned shopping precinct which sweeps away the old working class community in Ealing’s centre with its network of Victorian terrace houses, small shops, pubs, playgrounds and churches.”\(^{104}\) After surveying the site and interviewing local residents, Diploma Unit 8’s Ealing group collaborated on an alternative master plan based around a medium-sized town square and which required no further demolition. In conjunction, students individually designed new buildings sensitive to the extant layout of streets and the small scale of Ealing’s urban fabric (over which Council planners proposed stretches of parking lots). One architectural proposal for a mixed-use structure, designed by student Peter Moloney (who elected to study in Anson’s units for four consecutive years), was presented at a public enquiry in Ealing. During the presentation the unit demonstrated that the student design proved “to be not only cheaper and quicker to construct, but (ironically) produced a better rateable value for the borough.” The public enquiry, organized by the community organization Ealing

\(^{104}\) Louis Hellman, “The revolution comes to Ealing,” *The Architects’ Journal* (9 July 1975): 62. Hellman, the celebrated architectural cartoonist, was a resident of Ealing and acted as a correspondent for the unit.
Alliance, culminated with a vote of no confidence in the Council’s planning capabilities\textsuperscript{105} [fig. 3.42].

This turn of events substantiated another central tenet of Anson’s pedagogy (and indeed, corroborated the broader underlying decentralizing motives behind the IID and the AA). In his teaching, Anson maintained the thesis that everyone, from the student to the layperson, was an “expert” in matters of architecture, urbanism and planning. This rationale permeated the sense of “community” within the unit itself.

A second year architectural student, if he has any quality at all, may have the position of a professor in relation to a skilled dock worker in matters pertaining to the physical environment. Likewise the dock worker if he has been involved in local community action is an environmental specialist in relation to his own factory manager who may never have stopped to think about the environment. And there can be no question of the Unit Master being above the group. Like everyone else he must at times function as teacher, student and comrade.”\textsuperscript{106}

By confounding the student-teacher hierarchy, Anson dually challenged the authority of the profession. This refutation of the expertise of the teacher and “professional” alike pervaded Anson’s unit teaching, including the assessment of student work. While other units at the AA typically invited practicing architects to participate in juries, Anson frequently asked residents and laborers from areas investigated in “live” projects to


review student work. In fact, it was not uncommon for Anson to solicit random people on the street to participate in juries, in order to support his claim that everyone and anyone was an “expert” on the built environment.\(^{107}\)

But Anson’s general suspicion and mistrust of the profession—more pointedly, the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA)—also infiltrated his teaching via his units’ continued affiliation with the Architects’ Revolutionary Council (ARC). Established in 1974 as an antithesis or foil (enemy, really) to the RIBA, ARC constituted a network of architects and planners committed to offering their “skills and services direct to local communities.”\(^{108}\) Though its membership certainly extended well beyond the bounds of the AA, Anson and his frequent co-tutor George Mills were the organization’s main protagonists. During the 1970s the AA therefore operated as an unofficial base for ARC’s activities—from a “press conference” in 1974 announcing its formation, staged with a touch of flash in a new television studio in the AA’s basement, to the prolific production of posters [fig. 3.43, 3.44]. Most of these were designed by Anson and inspired by the aesthetics and politics of Atelier Populaire, the subversive print workshop at the École des Beaux-Arts that had supplied a steady stream of graphic imagery during the May ’68 protests.\(^{109}\)

The majority of these were printed by Moloney in an annex of the AA, located on Percy Street, just a few minutes by foot from 36 Bedford Square. Along with Anson’s unit, many of the AA units concerned with housing, environmental and social issues were based at Percy Street, a microcosm whose physical separation from the

---

109 Moloney interview.
AA’s main premises was emblematic of a broader philosophical discrepancy from those units more invested representation, history, and form.

DIP 2/DIP 10

Anson’s posters, inspired by Atelier Populaire, were not the only evidence of how the recent political and social upheavals in France had entered into the consciousness of the architectural culture of the AA. Quite notably, a special issue of *Architectural Design*, published in September 1972, featured a highly detailed account of “militancy among architectural students in Paris” in May 1968 and of the subsequent establishment of *unités pedagogiques*.\(^{110}\) The issue was co-edited by two AA tutors: the Englishman Martin Pawley, an AA alum who had also studied at the École des Beaux-Arts, and the Swiss architect Bernard Tschumi, who had witnessed the events of May ’68 and its aftermath while living in Paris during a brief yet formative residency.\(^{111}\) Pawley’s dazzling editorial presence at Bedford Square will be discussed in Chapter 4,

\(^{110}\) Pawley and Tschumi, “The Beaux-Arts since ’68,” 533. In fact, the article also notes how in the previous year Peter Cook had taken fifth year students on a study trip to Paris, where they met with French architectural students and teachers. The magazine feature offers one of the most comprehensive English-language accounts of the architectural context of the events of May 1968 that was published during this period. It traced the dissolution of architectural study at the École des Beaux-Arts and the subsequent decentralization of French architectural education through the formation of *unités pedagogiques* (U.P.), with a particular emphasis on the radicalized pedagogy of U.P. 6. These “units,” however, comprised a “system” of individualized schools that must be distinguished from the AA’s unit system. In fact, the physical and intellectual isolation of French *unités pedagogiques* from one another, as Chapter 2 demonstrated, had partly incited Boyarsky’s disillusionment with architectural education and motivated his establishment of the highly networked IID as an antithesis.

\(^{111}\) After completing his architectural studies at the ETH in Zürich Tschumi moved to Paris, where he was employed in the office of Georges Candilis.
but here it is Tschumi’s distinctive contribution to the AA “market place” that commands our attention.

Tschumi joined the AA’s Fifth Year teaching staff in 1970 upon the invitation of Cook (then Fifth Year Master). Before the unit system absorbed the Diploma School, other educational outlets afforded Tschumi the opportunity to explore his notion of the city as an “environmental trigger” for political action, a theoretical reading of the “militancy” in the streets of Paris that he and Pawley would foreground in AD. Like Anson and Foley, Tschumi had also tested his architectural position at the IID [fig. 3.45]. In 1972, during its third Summer Session, he offered a seminar series on “Urban Insurgency,” which sought to understand how “environmental and urban conflicts will lead the city to become the inevitable and only starting point of revolutionary change.” Notably, one of these seminars transformed into heated debate as Anson aggressively challenged Tschumi’s interpretation of Free Derry and the political turmoil in Northern Ireland—a confrontation that augured the divergent relationship to politics in the units that each taught at the AA.

In fact, like many of his contemporaries, Tschumi shifted his gaze, albeit briefly, to America. In the Spring of 1973 an AA trip to Los Angeles with fourth and fifth year

---

112 In 1969 Tschumi left Paris for London with the intention of working for Cedric Price. Unfortunately for the young architect, Price was then not in a position to offer him employment. Price’s office was just a short distance from the AA, where Tschumi quite serendipitously crossed paths with then Fifth Year tutor Peter Cook in the bar of the AA—thus satisfying Boyarsky’s later claim that the AA was indeed “like downtown,” where people come to meet. A newcomer to the AA, Tschumi was somewhat detached from the controversy surrounding the failed Imperial College merger and the consequent election for the AA chairmanship in 1971.


114 Bernard Tschumi and Brian Anson, “Urban Insurgency” seminar, IID Summer Session, audio recording, 10 August 1972, ABA.
students led Tschumi to foreign urban conditions that revealed to him the “economic or social discrimination within the most affluent society in the world.”

Appearing in yet another *AD/AA* collaboration (September 1973), his analyses of urban segregation offers a compelling foil to Banham’s newly published and romanticized portrait of the city. Yet it also poses a complement to Boyarsky’s take on Chicago, with which Tschumi most certainly became familiar via the chairman’s lectures at the AA.

When he assumed responsibility of Diploma Unit 2 in the Fall of 1973, Tschumi was therefore well equipped with an intellectual platform on which to construct a pedagogical program. If in Anson’s teaching political action materialized through the organization of communities and as brash confrontations with professionals and bureaucrats, Diploma Unit 2 tackled the matter of “urban politics” through a more theoretical lens. Tschumi explained the meaning of “politics” for the unit:

Not politics in the institutional sense though (Parliament, elections, parties, local authorities. . .), neither politics in the ideological sense (class struggle, proletariat, party. . .) but politics in a sense that has not been yet defined, and which perhaps must always remain undefined. Such politics are not concerned with well defined alterations to institutional rules, but rather with the elaboration of subjective spaces and social playgrounds. Although based on an analysis of the city in terms of social relationships and modes of production,

This stated refusal to engage with the city’s form or its institutions and the invocation of the “everyday” reveals the unit’s indebtedness to Henri Lefebvre and the Situationists. Along with these sources, during the unit’s first year seminars and lectures taught by Tschumi and invited guests also discussed the writing of Benjamin and Adorno.\footnote{Bernard Tschumi, *The Discourse of Events*, (London: Architectural Association, 1983) Themes 3, 18.}

The definition of “politics,” cited above, appeared in Diploma Unit 2’s own “little magazine,” *Chronicle in Urban Politics* (1974) [fig. 3.46]. From the unit’s inception, Tschumi had envisioned a collaborative publication as a teaching resource that would encourage students to develop design work in conjunction with critical writing skills.\footnote{Bernard Tschumi, “Unit 2 ‘Sanctuary co-op’ and the ‘Urban Politics’ Magazine,” Diploma School, *AA Prospectus* (London: Architectural Association, 1973/1974), 4.} As its title suggests, the publication chronicled Diploma Unit 2’s activities during the school year, compiling student projects and texts alongside transcripts of lectures delivered by invited guests. During the unit’s inaugural year these included Antoine Grumbach, Fernando Montes, and a number of Italian radical architects. In particular, the Italians’ turn to conceptual practices as a critical withdrawal from architecture’s collusion with capitalist forces deeply informed the theoretical foundations of the unit—a position impressed upon Tschumi through publications, but especially as an attendee at the Made in Italy Workshops at the IID Summer Session in 1972, where a “cross-fertilization” of ideas was direct. Among the unit’s Italian fellow
travelers, Pietro Derossi (Gruppo Strum), Paolo Deganello (Archizoom), and Gianni Pettena hosted Tschumi and his students during unit trips to Italy. Symbolically capturing the unit’s dialogic itinerary, photographs on the front and back covers of *Chronicle in Urban Politics* depict table settings encountered during these trips, thus channeling the spirit of Boyarsky’s “well-laid table” as the stage for an international exchange of ideas.

At home in the AA “market place,” however, and in conjunction with Tschumi’s seductive theoretical agenda, what distinguished Diploma Unit 2 from its “competition” was its evasion of conventional forms of representation, and in particular drawing. To investigate how the conflicted relationship between politics and space transcended architectural form, students turned to other media, such as photography, film, and even performance. The final fifth year submission by Nigel Coates (1973/1974) is a quintessential specimen. Titled “Prison Park,” Coates’ Diploma Unit 2 project comprises five panels of photographic collages, each portraying subsidiary urban spaces unburdened by structural enclosure or aesthetic codes: bits of road under construction, a telephone booth, a dumpster—the latter a metaphorical container for the architectural detritus of the city [fig. 3.47]. A photograph of an individual seated in a lawn chair, with his back to the camera/viewer, reappears multiple times in the panels, anthropomorphizing a philosophical condition: through contemplation, architecture and the city are distilled to a raw spatial essence.  

Complicating this condition and disclosing the political impurities of this essence, a list of arbitrary acts prohibited in “Prison Park” earns it its name: “Behaving or being clothed in any way reasonably...”
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121 Nigel Coates, interview with author, 28 February 2011, London.
likely to offend against public decency”; “Wilfully disturbing or injuring any animal, fish or bird or taking any egg”; “Climbing trees or railings, fences or structures of any other kind”; and so on.\textsuperscript{122}

The convergence of irony, collage, and narrative in the conceptual construction of this “prison” bears the intellectual imprint of the Italian radicals, specifically Superstudio and Archizoom.\textsuperscript{123} But it also anticipates further forays into art and literature that would preoccupy Tschumi and his Diploma Unit 2 students in the following year. For example, in lieu of a formal solution for a given architectural program, Tschumi instead asked students to respond to literary texts, which, he argued, provided “the necessary dialectic between an existing cultural artefact and something that obviously could not be its mere illustration.”\textsuperscript{124} An allegory of the conflict between the modern individual’s identity and the utopian aspirations of society, Hermann Hesse’s \textit{Glass Bead Game} was the initial impetus for Dereck Revington’s student project [fig. 3.48]. In “the burned out fourth floor of an empty warehouse on Butlers

\textsuperscript{122} Nigel Coates, “Prison Park,” in \textit{The Discourse of Events}, 22.

\textsuperscript{123} As Coates agrees, the influence of the Italian radicals was central to his project and his subsequent architectural work. On the atmosphere of the AA during his student years, he recalls: “One day there was a huge batch of \textit{Casabella} magazines that appeared in the entrance of the AA—the issue with the gorilla on the cover, with ‘Architettura Radicale’ on the chest. That magazine in a sense carried with it the force, the energy of the Italians that had been in the MoMA show in New York, and certainly opened my eyes to architecture as an art form, of which this [Prison Park] is kind of a consequence of all those [unit] trips and that thinking that combines references to performance art, conceptual art, even history. I suppose this was particularly influenced by Ugo la Pietra who had a magazine called \textit{In Piu}. So there were lots of these little magazines. Lots of people who had found a way to work within architecture without necessarily making buildings. And that was it, that was what we were exploring: architecture as culture.” Coates interview with author.

Wharf, Bermondsey on the 22nd of May, 1975” Revington produced a scored performance. Photographs and notations recorded his movements—“rituals” in space and time analogous to the founding of cities, and an attempt “to extend the limits of both architectural language and methodology and to recapture that original lost sense of identity with our surroundings and creations, both symbolically and erotically.”

Appropriate to the intent of his project, Revington’s chosen title, “Alkahest, a resonance in traces,” paid homage to the mythical solvent that, according to alchemists, had the power to dissolve all materials.

Revington’s project is particularly illustrative evidence of (or to be more precise, in its very lack of evidence illustrates) how Tschumi’s unit teaching began to strike a dialogue with the work of conceptual artists and critics in Britain. These included, for example, Victor Burgin, Daniel Buren, John Stezaker, COUM Transmissions, and Roselee Goldberg—many of whom joined unit discussions. These conversations resounded in the form of “Space: A Thousand Words,” an exhibition Tschumi co-organized with Goldberg at the Royal College of Art in February and March of 1975, as well as a corresponding conference held at the AA. This line of inquiry continued at
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125 Dereck Revington, “Alkahest,” in *The Discourse of Events*, 30. As Revington detailed: “I created a score which prescribed very loosely the parameters of an action in space; the symbology to be mediated on, the signification of different territorial zones, the placing of occupation marks after an intense ‘feeling out’, the time span of an event, a guide to the use of materials, etc. The score can be performed by any person and is simply a matrix containing stimuli which allow the activity itself to generate its own results in process. It energises and guides, encourages and evokes responses, but does not control action. It demands an intense involvement for a period of six hours in which you are completely alone.” Dereck Revington, “Alkahest. A resonance evoked by traces,” description in “Diploma School Unit 2,” *AA Projects Review* (London: Architectural Association, 1974/1975).
Bedford Square in January 1976 in the format of a conference on “Real Space”\textsuperscript{126} [fig. 3.49]. My intention here is not to rehearse the rest of this trajectory within Tschumi’s subsequent oeuvre, namely the Manhattan Transcripts (1976-1981), the Advertisements for Architecture (1976-1977), and so forth—a trajectory that actually gained momentum during his time in New York in latter half of the 1970s and through a willful return to drawing.\textsuperscript{127} Rather, this examination of his pedagogical cultivation of Diploma Unit 2 seeks to reinforce the argument that the consumptive arena of the unit system “market place” necessarily doubled as the sphere for the limitless production of architectural theory, and in turn, for the emergence of postmodern architectural inquiries.

\textsuperscript{126} See Bernard Tschumi and Roselee Goldberg, Space: A Thousand Words, exhibition catalogue (Dieci Libri: 1975). The exhibition was conceptualized as a publication project. As Tschumi and Goldberg explained, “the refusal of any distinction between the talk about space and the creation of space, the dislike for any primacy of either the visual or the verbal coincided with the nature of the ‘exhibition-publication’ itself.” Each invited contributor was given the same constraint: submit a piece of work and a written commentary on that work, no longer than a thousand words. “Some wrote a story, some a moral tale, others a theoretical back-up, or a piece of spatial poetry, even a set of instructions. All of them tried to expand and explore a series of attitudes, all concerned with the modes, methods and myths in both the architectural and the art world.” Tschumi and Goldberg, “A space: a thousand words,” AA Events List, Week 7, 17-21 February 1975, unpaginated. Contributors included artists (e.g. Dan Graham, Daniel Buren, Gianni Pettena, John Stezaker), architects and AA tutors (e.g. Elia Zenghelis, Rem Koolhaas, Christian de Portzamparc), as well as former and current students of Diploma Unit 2 (e.g. Nigel Coates, Jenny Lowe, Dereck Revington). The “Real Space” conference took place at the AA on 21 January 1976; Tschumi was actually on sabbatical that year. For further discussion of Tschumi’s intellectual foundations in conceptual art and his collaborations with Goldberg, in particular, see Sandra Kaji-O’Grady, “The London Conceptualists: Architecture and Performance in the 1970s,” Journal of Architectural Education 61, no. 4 (2008): 43-51.

DIP 9

It was Boyarsky’s intention that new forms of urban investigations, in particular, would play a central role in the AA’s undergraduate program, with the unit system envisioned as a platform for comparative studies of cities.\textsuperscript{128} In this way, the Manhattan and London workshops at the IID were prototypes. As the teaching of Foley and Anson confirm, the unit system came to accommodate a much wider range of research. However, as suggested by Tschumi’s teaching at the AA, urbanism was certainly pervasive in the school’s theoretical production during the 1970s. Two final, contrasting examples of unit agendas make clear just how varied this production was.

While rejected outright by Tschumi in Diploma Unit 2, it was precisely the form of urban institutions that preoccupied Elia Zenghelis, founding tutor of Diploma Unit 9 and its guardian for the duration of the 1970s. His identity as a teacher at the AA had been solidified long before Boyarsky’s appointment as chairman. Born in Athens, Zenghelis relocated to London in the late 1950s to study at the AA.\textsuperscript{129} After graduating he was hired by the firm Douglas Stephens (which then also employed Frampton and Robert Maxwell, among others), and later joined the school’s teaching staff in 1963. Zenghelis therefore witnessed multiple regimes at Bedford Square: from the Smithson-driven postwar era to the technocratic reign of Allen; from the technicolor liberalism upheld by Lloyd during the late 1960s (a period when the AA was, according to

\textsuperscript{128} Tschumi, interview with author, 30 October 2009.
\textsuperscript{129} As a young man, Zenghelis spent summers in Johannesburg visiting his father. During those visits he spent time working in a Greek architect’s office, where he encountered an issue of the American magazine \textit{Architectural Forum} with a feature article surveying American schools of architecture, but which also included the AA. Though the magazine inspired Zenghelis to study architecture abroad in the United States, he and his family settled on the AA, which was a less expensive choice. Elia Zenghelis, interview with author, 3 November 2011, Athens.
Zenghelis, “a refuge for rice cooking hippies”) to the slick and bustling arena of Boyarsky’s marketplace during the 1970s.130

It was only in the context of the “marketplace” that Zenghelis developed a relationship with Boyarsky. As young tutors they had met at the AA during the mid-1960s, though only briefly, as the Fourth Year Master was soon “sacked” and forced to pack his bags for UIC. Because Zenghelis spent his summers away from London, he did not attend any of the IID Summer Sessions, where he would have seen the burgeoning impresario at work. These missed encounters perhaps partially explain why Zenghelis initially supported Frampton’s candidacy for the AA chairmanship election of 1971. Another factor, however, was likely Boyarsky’s affiliation with Peter Cook and Archigram, who supported his candidacy. For both Zenghelis and Rem Koolhaas, his student at the AA during the late 1960s, viewed Archigram as an anachronistic vestige of a 1960s exuberance that by the early 1970s had dulled, only to reveal its ideological bankruptcy. Nevertheless, during the course of the competing “campaigns” Zenghelis began to discern the merits of Boyarsky’s progressive institutional vision and the drawbacks of Frampton’s rigid curricular plan.131

“My ideas floated in a ‘void’ and my hopes lay in my Unit at the AA,” Zenghelis has remarked of his architectural thinking during the early 1970s, a pensive reflection that once again underscores the centralizing effect of Boyarsky’s
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130 Elia Zenghelis, “Text and Architecture: Architecture as Text,” in Exit Utopia: Architectural Provocations, 1956–1976, eds. Martin van Schaik and Otakar Máčel (Munich and New York: Prestel, 2004), 260. An analogous fixture at the AA who also witnessed and survived all these regimes was Peter Cook.

131 After the outcome of the election was confirmed, it was (a relieved) Zenghelis who telephoned Boyarsky to happily inform him of his victory. Zenghelis, interview with author.
decentralization of architectural education.\textsuperscript{132} The “market place” of the unit system provoked Zenghelis to pin down and refine his floating “ideas,” though the crux of these had already manifested in his previous teaching at Bedford Square. During the 1960s the city, and more specifically, an understanding of its borders and limits as sites as cultural and social activity, had suffused Zenghelis’ teaching; this was even the case as early as 1965 when he took on the role of AA First Year Master and attempted to incorporate urban concepts in the school’s introductory year of study.\textsuperscript{133} As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Zenghelis had led the so-called “Greek unit” in Lloyd’s Middle School, which by the time of Boyarsky’s arrival as chairman in 1971 was already recognized amongst students and staff as an in-house venue for urban investigations. In fact, an “Urban Design Course” proposed by Zenghelis that year appropriated “the attractively vague brief” of “The City as a Meaningful Environment” competition, launched by the Italian magazine \textit{Casabella} in its December 1971 issue.\textsuperscript{134}

While that course itself did not develop fully,\textsuperscript{135} the competition entry that Zenghelis and Koolhaas collaboratively produced, with now iconic illustrations by Madelon Vriesendorp and Zoe Zenghelis, would secure a prominent place in the history of late twentieth century architecture. Importantly, the project, titled “Exodus, or the Voluntary Prisoners of Architecture,” was very much a synthesis of ideas and a collaborative effort: it drew impetus from Koolhaas’ study of the Berlin Wall, submitted as a history assignment in his fourth year of study at the AA, as much as it did from

\textsuperscript{133} Zenghelis, interview with author.
\textsuperscript{135} As the \textit{AA Newsheet} author observed, some students were wary of partaking in a course that would inevitably be absorbed into the tutor’s competition entry. “MS2– The Greeks.”
Zenghelis’ longstanding interest in isolated and idealized urban environments. In addition, a third external source of inspiration was an article published in an American popular magazine that investigated the phenomena of prison inmates who preferred the minimalist and controlled milieu of incarceration over the psychological complexity of freedom outside prison walls. Proposing to clear and enclose a central strip of London within a walled zone that was densely, diversely and precisely programmed (with baths, squares, parks, institutions, etc.), “Exodus” hyperbolic and penetrating reification of the tropes of modernism sought not only to expose the modern metropolis as a composition of exclusionary strategies, but also to explore the persistence of such mechanisms in contemporary urbanism [fig. 3.50].

The theoretical underpinnings and history of this landmark project have been rigorously examined elsewhere. What is pertinent here is how pedagogy enabled Zenghelis (first) and (later) Koolhaas to further the theoretical provocations that “Exodus” put forward. It is necessary first to clarify some historical details. In 1968 Koolhaas began studying at the AA, during Lloyd’s principalship, and took on

---

136 For Koolhaas’ account of his Berlin Wall submission, see “Field Trip. A(A) Memoir (First and Last),” in S,M,L,XL (New York: Monacelli Press, 1995), 214-232. Koolhaas notes Boyarsky’s presence at the review of his project, mentioning the chairman’s fascination with Chicago. To be clear: the “Exodus” project was not, however, Koolhaas’ AA thesis project, as it has often been erroneously identified.


140 For an alternative account of Diploma Unit 9, with further commentary on unit projects not discussed here, see Robert Gargiani, Rem Koolhaas/OMA: The Construction Merveilles (London: Routledge, 2008), 46-56.
Zenghelis as a tutor during his second, third and fourth year. He would abandon his fifth year academic obligations in 1972 (deterred, by his own account, by the prospect of a year of study under Cook), opting to continue his studies at Cornell under Oswald Mathias Ungers. He would not return to the AA to co-teach with Zenghelis until 1975. While Koolhaas’ relationship with Ungers and experiences in the United States facilitated the further refinement of his theoretical position abroad, in the context of the AA’s shifting educational program during the first few years of Boyarsky’s chairmanship it was Zenghelis who independently used pedagogy to sustain and develop the central questions and arguments that “Exodus” had raised.

Already in the 1972/1973 school year Zenghelis had asked his Intermediate Unit 6 students to consider “the advantages of millions living together on relatively restricted areas”[141] [fig. 3.51]. But with Boyarsky’s introduction of the Diploma School in 1973, the pedagogical territory of Diploma Unit 9 enabled Zenghelis to press the matter further. Beckoning students to “shift from the domain of ‘reality’ to the scope of ‘possibility,’” in 1973 the unit’s stated objective was “to develop an architectural language for large scale and complex institutions,” one “based on ideological concepts on the city” and—unlike Anson and Foley, and to a certain degree, Tschumi—independent of “present reality, live issues, and social problems which depend on a particular historical moment.”[142] Under Zenghelis’ wing, in its inaugural year Diploma Unit 9 established an objective that would remain its intellectual foundation for the rest of the decade, and to which Koolhaas and Zaha Hadid, their star student (1975-1977),

[141] Intermediate Unit 6 program (1972–1973), 5, Peter Wylde Papers, AAA.
would subsequently contribute as co-tutors: to embrace the scale and density of the modern metropolis as a theoretical wellspring. Zenghelis identified the city as the “artificial territory for the maximum fulfillment of the aspirations of non-alienated, social man”—a definition that, he wholly acknowledged, polemically ran counter to socialist principles of urban planning. In its studio projects the unit distilled the formal architectural manifestations of urban desire into two categories: “Points (.), or Lines (---) of urban radiation and attraction.” Such were the underlying design constraints in its efforts “to propose new injections of urban intensity within the centre of the otherwise malfunctioning, or decaying urban fabric (ideological, social, and physical decay).”143

Transposing the programmatic complexity of “Exodus” into the agenda of Diploma Unit 9, Zenghelis asked students to take “a significant strip across London” as a site “to exploit its magnetic urban potential” [figs. 3.52, 3.53, 3.54, 3.55] Among other projects was an urban park “designed to hold a continuous ‘Ideological World[‘s] Fair.’” Of the latter he anticipated, “this territory of architectural dialectics will be an information battlefield and test bed of conflicting ideologies”—a projection that resonated not only with Boyarsky’s previous forays in theories of urbanism, played out through his experiments in décollage, but also with the very premise of the “market place” model, which the chairman explicitly intended to generate continuous debate between units.144

As Zenghelis clarified at the conclusion of the unit’s second year of activity, Diploma Unit 9’s aim “was to encourage the development of an urbanistic Movement that could act as the opposite and counterpart of the ‘Modern Movement’, in the same

144 Ibid. In fact, as Zenghelis recalls today, the unit system in fact did not provoke as much public debate as the chairman had wished. Zenghelis, interview with author.
way as an acceptance of the Metropolitan condition as an ‘ideal’ was seen as the ideological counterpart of present theoretical dogmas.”

Modernism, the unit argued, was an unfinished project, and only by mining its potential could an architecture of the late twentieth century truly begin to emerge. In the 1974/1975 school year this investigative framework allowed unit pedagogy and urban theory to converge as Zenghelis and Koolhaas developed their entry for the 1974 Roosevelt Island competition (a collaboration that marked the official launch of their professional partnership, the Office for Metropolitan Architecture) and as Zenghelis cultivated the AA unit as an “active collaborative workshop” comprising lectures, seminars and projects. The competition called for high density housing (one thousand dwelling units on a nine-acre site) on the northern end of a narrow island in New York City’s East River, a historically charged site once host to asylums, hospitals, and the poor (hence its former name, Welfare Island)—not to mention a succession of redevelopment proposals by modern architects over the course of the twentieth century. During the 1974/1975 school year Zenghelis introduced the competition brief as a Diploma Unit 9 project, noting that the site was “characterised by the ‘incidents’ of a bridge towards Queens (only connection with the mainland), a huge garage along the entire eastern

---

edge of the site, a park in the north, and a piece of demonstrably ‘Modern’ architecture in the south.”

In OMA’s own entry, Zenghelis and Koolhaas proposed an extension of Manhattan’s grid onto Roosevelt Island, drawing from a catalogue of metropolitan building typologies distilled to “Slabs,” “Towers,” and “Riverblocks”—an approach that would also subsequently inspire a series of other theoretical insertions into the city by OMA, and which would ultimately culminate in the “retroactive manifesto” that Koolhaas would publish in 1976 as Delirious New York [fig. 3.56]. Preceding its publication, however, paramount in Diploma Unit 9 pedagogy was an understanding of the urban grid as a stimulant for the manipulation of monumental forms. For example, one particular exercise introduced by Zenghelis in 1974/1975, “Grids in Space,” was based “on a project given by Leonidov to his students for a commune.” It asked Diploma Unit 9 students to enact “the imposition of an artificial discipline upon a landscape,” identifying the grid as an “extreme and strict architectural organisation used as a floor which becomes a geometric collage of different surfaces intended to accommodate and indicate activities which results in three-dimensional architectural composition” [fig. 3.57].

In the grid, then, we encounter a point of entry for another theoretical tool in Diploma Unit 9: the Russian avant-garde. For Zenghelis and Koolhaas the formal language and political program of the Constructivists supplied further fuel for the unit’s

---

148 Diploma Unit 9, AA Projects Review (1974-1975). And in fact, Diploma Unit 6, taught by Peter Cook, Ron Herron and Ingrid Morris, also used the competition as a unit project. See Diploma Unit 6, AA Projects Review (1974-1975).

pursuit of “a mutant form of Urbanism”\textsuperscript{150}—a characterization that recalls Boyarsky’s own recombinatory urban analyses that drew upon a variety of historical sources. On the one hand, Zenghelis had followed the scholarship of Anatole Kopp, author of 	extit{Ville et Révolution} (1967) and a frequent visitor to the AA, and who had also aided Zenghelis in his research.\textsuperscript{151} While on the other hand, during the late 1960s and early 1970s Koolhaas had developed a formative relationship with Gerrit Oorthuys, a Dutch historian of the Russian avant-garde with whom Koolhaas conducted research on Leonidov.\textsuperscript{152} The latter research was the basis of a catalogue and exhibition on Leonidov staged at the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies in New York in 1981. Even in the history of Diploma Unit 9, then, with its tutors physically and intellectually traversing London and New York, we find a retracing of the transatlantic palimpsest of Boyarsky’s pedagogical itinerary.

The introduction of the Tektonik project in 1975 demonstrates how within the AA unit system mediated and crystallized the pedagogical and urbanistic methods of Zenghelis and Koolhaas, and which would develop further, in parallel, within the professional context of OMA. The Tektonic project brought together three distinct historical sources. The primary source was its namesake, Kasimir Malevich’s “tektonics” of the 1920s, unprogrammed architectural models of buildings that were to “rest casually on the earth waiting to be occupied by the representatives of a new culture who would find the enigmatic buildings and ‘conquer’ them in a process of

\textsuperscript{150} Diploma Unit 9, 	extit{AA Prospectus} (London: Architectural Association, 1975-1976), 55.

\textsuperscript{151} Zenghelis, interview with author.

architectural specification.” The unit conceptually dismantled one of Malevich’s specimens, and distributed fragments of the chosen Tektonic amongst students.

Zenghelis and Koolhaas described the project:

Fragments of it were given to the members of the Unit who, accepting the external envelop[e] and such communal points as service cores and elevators, were asked to develop their sections with maximum explicitness. Through the extrapolation of the logic implied in forms, they inserted appropriate programmes to each part, developed interior spaces and specified internal and external materials. After each fragment was completed, the entire Tektonik was reassembled; an episode of modernism concretized in retrospect.

In this account, the tutors seemingly resurrect the logic of Boyarsky’s “à la carte” slide lectures, delivered at Bedford Square to the delight of many during his chairmanship.

In tandem with its Constructivist roots, however, the project’s reassembly of the collaboratively reprogrammed Tektonic also specifically drew directly from Surrealist practices, namely the “exquisite corpse,” with its unpredictable production of “unexpected juxtapositions” consumed as a creative elixir “in a time when the conscious and rational production of meaning appeared suspect and stagnant.” Lastly, the Diploma Unit 9 tutors identified the project’s origin in the realization of New York

---

155 “We made him give [the lecture on Chicago] again and again,” Zenghelis recalls. Zenghelis, interview with author. Other former AA tutors (Tschumi, Vesely, Cook, Crompton, etc.) concur.
skyscrapers, “an architectural version of the same Surrealist recipe” that saw simultaneous activity enacted within “architectural enclaves” and compressed within shared formal constraints\(^{156}\) [figs. 3.58, 3.59]. Notably, in the following years the unit identified its theoretical cornerstone—previewed in the conjunction of these three “anecdotes” crystallized in the Tektonik exercise—as the “culture of congestion,” a concept that Koolhaas was to rigorously elaborate in *Delirious New York*.

Zenghelis’ and Koolhaas’ development of Diploma Unit 9 is certainly noteworthy in the history of the AA unit system. Yet its enigmatic design exercises also reveal the intimate relationship between education and theoretical production in the emerging work of OMA—an intimate theoretical microcosm that demonstrates how the “marketplace” of the AA unit system was instrumental in the macrocosm of late twentieth century architectural culture.

\(^{156}\) The project intends to combine the above three anecdotes, taking a ‘tektonik’ as the point of departure, to design a building in a Metropolitan location and then dismantle it conceptually and develop internal sectors with maximum explicitness and precision. “Diploma/Unit 9—Malevitch sky/earth scraper,” *AA Events List*, Week 4, Autumn Term, 27-31 October 1975, unpaginated. Notable too is the “Pools as Urban Types” unit project, introduced in 1975/1976 in conjunction with the Tektonik project as “a further exploration of urban prototypical structures.” The exercise can be read as an extension of the OMA Roosevelt Island proposal, which also included in its program a floating urban pool. As the unit tutors explained: “The aim was to culminate in a catalogue of individually designed pools which cover a spectrum of types and attitudes both in terms of location, and in terms of programme activity, ranging from the rural and simply, to the metropolitan and sophisticated.” “Programme 2—Pools as Urban Types,” Diploma Unit 9, in *AA Projects Review* (London: Architectural Association, 1975-1976), unpaginated.
Just prior to launching Diploma Unit 9 in 1973, Zenghelis encountered the work of Krier in the Italian journal *Controspazio* (June 1973). The magazine published a series of projects that the Luxembourgish architect had recently exhibited at the Milan Triennale. Intrigued by these highly detailed, sweeping aerial views and axonometrics, Zenghelis invited Krier, who was then working in the office of James Stirling, to help him launch Diploma Unit 9 in 1973. However, when Krier first set foot in the AA “market place” and was asked by Zenghelis to state his architectural position before an audience of students-consumers, Krier was at a loss for words. He had never taught before; in fact, he had not yet even completed his own architectural studies. Moreover, his professional experience was of little help, since Stirling’s projects had not revealed to him a consistent or recognizable theoretical argument that he could adopt, or even challenge. In comparison, Zenghelis’ position was certainly clear, though hardly plausible to his new teaching assistant. In the following year Boyarsky hired Krier to teach his own unit, a platform that accelerated his formulation of a contrasting and distinctive argument on urbanism that cultivated his own identity as a teacher, practitioner, and theorist.

---

157 “Three Projects,” in Massimo Scolari et al., *Architettura razionale* (Milan: Angeli, 1973). That year, Zenghelis was also assisted by Thalis Argyropoulos and Stuart Knight.

158 For a counter reading of Stirling, see Anthony Vidler, *James Frazer Stirling: notes from the archive* (New Haven: Yale Center for British Art/Yale University Press, 2010).

159 “I never quite understood what Elia wanted, and we would always joke about it. Because the idea that you could have a limited urban experience between two walls was for me something incomprehensible. It was more to do with film than architecture. But certainly there was an agreement that it had to be urban. But what urbanity meant, was very different.” Léon Krier, interview by author, 7 April 2011, via Skype.
Krier’s employment as a unit tutor at the AA was brief, lasting only two years: in Intermediate Unit 10 (1974/1975) and Diploma Unit 2 (1975/1976).\(^{160}\) “Against the apocalyptic ruthlessness of the bureaucrats, against the ignorance of the planners, against the stupidity of the specialist,” Krier explained at the close of the 1974/1975 school year, speaking on behalf of Intermediate Unit 10, “we repropose the study of history.”\(^{161}\) Of the varied teaching tools that Foley, Anson, and Tschumi had applied in their units, history did not make an appearance; and though Zenghelis and Koolhaas recuperated early twentieth century modernism, its formal abstractions ran counter to the ontological concerns at the heart of Krier’s pedagogy and thinking. Through Intermediate Unit 10 Krier defined architectural culture as the “adaptation and evolution of TYPES”—“Types of settlements, types of spaces, types of buildings, types of construction”—and therefore argued that the formal and spatial configuration of the historical city was premised on the interaction of such types.\(^{162}\) By extension one of the unit’s design programs focused on the typologies of the urban square and the urban block, taking Trafalgar Square as its test site. Students were prompted to manipulate the site by exploring different strategies of enclosure. The objective was to grasp “the dialectic of buildings and urban space, of solid and void, of private and public realm,” and how this dialectic was “disrupted by the modern city” and was indeed still under threat by contemporary planning\(^{163}\) [fig. 3.60].

\(^{160}\) Diploma Unit 2 was Tschumi’s teaching responsibility until 1975, when he went to New York on sabbatical. Upon his return in 1976, he was reassigned to Diploma Unit 10.


\(^{163}\) Ibid.
The theoretical etymology of Krier’s urban vocabulary was distinct and, moreover, certainly familiar to Boyarsky. On the one hand, the emphasis on the “dialectical” texture of the city emerged out of Krier’s concurrent reading of Camillo Sitte, whose *City Planning According to Its Artistic Principles* was a key text for the unit.\(^{164}\) Interestingly, Sitte offered common intellectual ground between Krier and the AA chairman. Though, as Krier recalls, Boyarsky himself never informed the tutor of his previous research interest in the urban planner; it was only well after the chairman’s death that Krier learned of the fact.\(^ {165}\)

Regardless, the very presence of Krier’s investigations at the AA testify to the ideological porosity and volatility of its “marketplace.” As Krier’s Trafalgar Square exercise reveals, the unit’s investigations explicitly drew upon contemporary discourses on architectural typology, which turned to history as a critical tool in postmodern urban strategies. Since the late 1960s, the enduring relationship between morphology and cultural meaning had preoccupied Aldo Rossi and other Italian “Rationalist” architects, with whom Krier had already aligned himself at the Milan Triennale. Reciprocating the welcome he had received in Milan, in the Spring of 1975 Krier organized an exhibition on “Rational Architecture” in London at Peter Cook’s Art Net gallery, located near Bedford Square. Architects exhibited included Rossi, Vittorio Gregotti, Giorgio Grassi, as well as non-Italians such as James Stirling and O.M. Ungers. In conjunction Krier coordinated a series of lectures and debates, with speakers including Massimo Scolari and Carlo Aymonino [fig. 3.61]. With a nod to Rossi’s seminal book of 1966, the stated

\(^{164}\) Krier interview.

\(^{165}\) In addition, during this time Krier was also (allegedly) unaware of Colin Rowe’s contemporary interest in Sitte or his emerging theoretical work that would culminate in the publication of *Collage City* in 1978. Ibid.
goal of this “joint venture” between the AA and Art Net was “to outline a theory of Architecture and the City which emerges from the analysis of the European City as a cultural and political whole.” Thus a second Italian “scene” infiltrated Bedford Square. Juxtaposed with the Italian radical contingent hosted by Tschumi’s unit, as well as an alternative contingent implicit in Zenghelis’ and Koolhaas’ receptiveness to the work of Superstudio, Krier’s role as (the sole and short-lived) ambassador to Italian “Rationalism” at Bedford Square conveys the refined level of variation supported by the international “market place.”

In his second and final year as an independent unit tutor at the AA, Krier continued to argue for the “essential relationship between building typology and the morphology of the public realm” in the context of Diploma Unit 2 (1975/1976). Krier’s focus now shifted to the quartier, promoted as a fundamental measure of pre-modern city planning in which “work, leisure, and culture are integrated into dense and compact urban formations.” In contrast to Zenghelis’ fascination with the vertical density of the modern metropolis, Krier’s radically atavistic identification of the density of the quartier as the “basis of a new urban life” rejected the alienating forms of the twentieth century city—maligned as a “cultural tragedy”—and instead advocated an interplay of streets and squares, a compositional strategy perceived as intrinsic to European urban culture. Accordingly, one unit program called for the reconstruction of “different quartiers in the areas of London which have not been blighted by German

---

166 “Rational Architecture,” in AA Events List, Week 8, 24-28 February 1975, unpaginated.
bombs but by council planning operations.” To begin, students conducted historical research on assigned areas of London, analyzing transformations in street patterns, architectural structures, property types, street sections and urban blocks according to four different dates (1750, 1850, 1900 and 1970). The second phase of the project required students to conceptualize new streets and squares between existing structures, and then to reprogram these spaces in consideration of the dynamic between private and public spaces. Finally, in the last stage of the project students produced more detailed proposals for developing quartiers, taking into consideration boundary conditions, local centres, pedestrian routes, and the creation of public spaces [169] [fig. 3.62].

It would seem that Krier’s contribution to the unit system represented an urban ghost of Boyarsky’s past. It conjured the former Fourth Year Master’s commitment to the historical city that during the mid-1960s had made him somewhat of an outcast at the AA during its “electric decade.” In the “market place” of the 1970s, however, the tables had turned, as Boyarsky now occupied the center of the school. From his new coordinates, he now mapped an array of contemporary “scenes,” many of them urban. One of these, in fact, quite aptly describes the resulting institutional effect. From Foley’s “rational technology” to Anson’s “community architecture,” from Tschumi’s spatial politics to the “mutant urbanism” of Zenghelis and Koolhaas, from Krier’s “types” and even to Boyarsky’s own “à la carte” urbanism: architectural education at the AA produced and maintained a “culture of congestion.”

[169] “Students were asked to “use the voids, the nondescript ‘espaces verts’ left between post-war buildings, to reconstruct a STREET AND SQUARE ARCHITECTURE.” Ibid.
P.S.  

Even after the first year that the unit system was established as the overarching framework for the school, the implications of this institutional transformation had not gone unnoticed by its own participants. In the Summer term of 1974, following the unit system’s full infiltration of AA pedagogy, a new weekly bulletin, plainly titled the AA Events List, observed that “the school has changed from the well defined department store into a supermarket with something of everything, all polished and well stacked.” Yet as the editorial suggested, the school had even “moved on again from this point to the market place—and now perhaps the bazaar, where many things are offered, but there are few rules of presentation.”

The delivery of these observations coincided with preparations for the AA’s end of year exhibition: the first public showcase of the fruits of its new educational model. Appropriately, each unit was allotted a space within the school to design an exhibition of its activities and work. “The visibility and thus credibility of the school needs no overall format so each of the parts becomes self sufficient,” the Events List assured its readers, and clarified the stakes of the task at hand: “The visitor’s view of us depends on his needs and the degree of satisfaction offered to his taste.” Both tutors and students, then, prepared the school for the approach of the architectural public, a different species of “predatory creatures,” who would also participate in the consumption of ideas.

172 Ibid.
The implication of “freedom of choice” within the “market place,” and its apotheosis in the “bazaar,” is here doubled—from the unit system to the exhibition, from AA students to the AA’s spectators. As a result, the concept of “freedom” is doubly complicated. Indeed, we recall here Jameson’s identification of the “market” as “at one and the same time an ideology and a set of practical institutional problems.” Within the AA the “marketplace” formed the basis of an educational model that critically preempted totalizing architectural myths, yet which in its taste for heterogeneity fetishized polemic only in fragmentary form. But what we must also take into account is Jameson’s further acknowledgment that “the slogan of the market not only covers a great variety of different referents or concerns but it is also virtually always a misnomer.” The concept, he points out,

rarely has anything to do with choice or freedom, since those are all determined for us in advance, whether we are talking about new model cars, toys, or television programs: we select among those, no doubt, but we can scarcely be said to have a say in actually choosing any of them. Thus the homology with freedom is at best a homology with parliamentary democracy of our representative type.\(^{173}\)

We are reminded, again, that the “freedom” of the AA “market place” is an extension of the school’s historical, democratic core—which is to say, it is a surface effect of its underlying system of governance. And of the postmodern refurbishment of this system, AA tutor Fred Scott observed, several years after Boyarsky had begun his

\(^{173}\) Jameson, *Postmodernism*, 266.
chairmanship: “Never has a head of the School inhabited the Bedford Square premises as intensely as the present incumbent: the buildings seem at times to be an extension of his central nervous system, and . . . he of theirs.”

SECTION 4 | THE STATIC AGE

One speaking mouth, with many ears, and half as many writing hands—there you have to all appearances, the external academical apparatus; the university engine of culture set in motion.

- Friedrich Nietzsche

The promissory note of pleasure issued by plot and packaging is indefinitely prolonged: the promise, which actually comprises the entire show, disdainfully intimates that there is nothing more to come, that the diner must be satisfied with reading the menu.

- Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer

MEDIA ECONOMY

In a 1974 interview Boyarsky offered a twist on the notion of “cross-fertilization,” a concept that had pervaded the IID Summer Sessions and, quite fittingly, infiltrated Bedford Square. He noted that his recent reorganization of the AA’s educational program, and its unit system in particular, had required a “re-seeding of the school.” With remarkable candour, the self-proclaimed “rainmaker” forecast the effects.

---

“I brought in about a dozen young people who will be, in about 5 years time the famous names of the AA teaching staff”—“I mean house-famous,” he clarified.

As if to expedite this making of household names, at the conclusion of the school’s 1974/1975 academic year Boyarsky launched the AA Projects Review; soon after, the annual publication would become an institution in its own right (it is, in fact, still published today). The Projects Review compiled the kaleidoscopic range of investigations and activities that unfolded in all departments of the school each academic year. To the unit system, it allotted each unit a number of pages to state its argument and illustrate its method through a carefully edited selection of student work.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, at the start of Boyarsky’s chairmanship some tutors had been inclined to produce independent unit publications, such as the “chronicles” of Tschumi’s Diploma Unit 2 and the brochure by Intermediate Unit 4, Foley’s “Rational Technology Unit.” Even before debuting Diploma Unit 9, as Intermediate Unit 6 tutor (1972/1973) Zenghelis had produced a massive booklet that exhaustively catalogued student designs and research on “Housing Prototypes and Densities.” Krier, too, had intended to publish his students’ work in the form of a pamphlet, though in the end this never materialized.

---

4 Intermediate Unit 6 (tutor Elia Zenghelis), “Intermediate School Project: Housing Prototypes and Densities” (January 1973), Peter Wylde Papers, AAA. While teaching at the Hochschule in Berlin (1967-1970), O.M. Ungers’ students produced brochures that recorded studio projects; this was Krier’s inspiration for a similar (unrealized) publication at the AA. Léon Krier, interview with author, April 2011, Skype. An important contemporary example of a school’s publication of student work, of which Boyarsky was undoubtedly aware, is Education of an Architect (1971), which documented John Hejduk’s radical revision of Cooper Union’s architectural curriculum.
But in contrast to the fragmentary glimpses of the school offered somewhat arbitrarily by such individual unit publications, the reader of the Projects Review, like the visitor to the school’s end-of-year exhibition, received and perceived the AA as an ideologically concatenated totality, its abundance of tactics and propositions similarly “polished and well stacked” within the layout of the publication’s pages. To the temporary display of the end-of-year exhibition, then, the Projects Review answered with an enduring encore in print, a portable microcosm of the school whose circulation beyond Bedford Square could make tutors “famous.” In this regard, its establishment very much kept alive the spirit of the IID Summer Sessions, which thrived in pages of AD, as did Boyarsky’s UIC slide lectures on the history of urbanism in the form of “Chicago à la carte.” Certainly, a prevalent theme throughout this dissertation is the relationship between media and architectural pedagogy; as I argue, it is a relationship that crystallized not through translation, but by a “cross-fertilization” of these two practices. The current chapter returns to this theme and advances this argument by investigating the role of media in Boyarsky’s institutional transformation of the AA during the 1970s. Through its packaging of the school’s educational program and the centralization of tutors’ individual publishing endeavours within the jurisdiction of a single volume, the example of the Projects Review encapsulates this chapter’s primary concern: the instrumentality of media as an organizational and disciplinary apparatus within architectural pedagogy and its institutions.

As demonstrated by the centralizing principle of the Projects Review and by Boyarsky’s remarks, quoted above, the chairman’s purview of educational reform at the AA was total. It surpassed even the educational path plotted by Gropius, which began
only in the nursery and stopped short in the professional office. In contrast, Boyarsky’s conceptualization of architectural education was far more expansive in its outlook, extending from arable terrain in which tutors were cultivated and ideas “cross-fertilized”; to the arena of the “market place” where ideologies competed; and further still to the domestic sphere where the “well-laid table” provided a consumptive and social space, and where, in turn, household names were made. At the AA, pedagogy thus strayed radically from the teleological path of modern architectural education, seeking to construct neither social individuals (architects) nor social monuments (architecture). What its postmodern system of architectural education strove to realize instead was a pulsating culture of architecture: not only its artefacts and its representations, but also its institutions, discourses, and networks. Its overarching method was the regulation and coordination of a matrix of processes, encompassing production and consumption, but also reproduction and communication through various forms of media.

Accordingly, our perspective shifts from the arena of the competitive “market place” and onto the broader territory of an “informational economy,” in which “communication and information have come to play a newly central role in production.”5 The central thesis of this chapter approximates the logic of this model, arguing that as the communicant between the processes that comprise the AA’s institutional program, media—itself a product of “immaterial labor”6—keeps its system

---

6 “Since the production of services results in no material and durable good, we define the labor involved in this production as immaterial labor—that is, labor that produces
of exchanges operable, and indeed maximizes its performance. Moreover, it follows that within the space of media, Boyarsky’s institutional authority is unmistakably legible.

In addition to an extensive program of exhibitions and lectures, within the first several years of his chairmanship Boyarsky initiated a series of publishing and broadcasting projects at the AA. The Projects Review was but one among many in the AA’s media economy during the 1970s, and we will return to it at the close of this chapter. However, the following case studies—a weekly bulletin, a television station, and a newspaper—did not offer compendia of the school’s achievements, “all polished and well stacked” for public presentation and circulation outside of the school. Rather, they functioned as dialogic niches: nodes within an interiorized network that facilitated and fuelled its educational exchanges. Quite distinct from the ephemeral and itinerant body of the IID, as well as from his transient slide lectures, the AA’s media economy capitalized on the concentration of activity at 36 Bedford Square. Following Samuel Weber’s proposal that the “relation of form, place and media” is “above all a relation of forces rather than substances, subjects or entities,” 7 this chapter interrogates how the static site of the school steered and heightened this internal “cross-fertilization” of pedagogical, architectural and media forces. In so doing, it reveals an institutional design that is intrinsically spectacular. And though easily characterized as a media explosion, the intensification of media production at the AA instead points to an implosion of media and architectural pedagogy, whose ensuing distortions illuminate the very limits of Boyarsky’s educational reform.

---

Recall the image of Boyarsky seated in the chairman’s office at the AA, and with which this dissertation began [fig. 01]. He appears as if within a stage set, his “well-laid table” overflowing with props: telephones, slides, postcards, and paperwork. In a gesture of enthusiastic recognition, he points to the camera. He was, indeed, no stranger to the camera’s eye. An understanding of how this relationship was forged is in fact crucial to gauging the full scope of his “well-laid table” at the AA. And so, it is necessary to turn back the clock and briefly revisit Chicago. For even if prior to his appointment as AA chairman Boyarsky had emphatically declared the end of the 1960s, we are not quite finished with that historical moment.

Importantly, alongside his postcard collection and his multi-projector experiments, other forms of media began to enter into his didactic toolbox during his tenure at UIC. To be sure, the “communication systems” in the university’s newly constructed teaching facilities left the young professor in awe [fig. 4.1]. “Using a lecture room is quite an art,” he humbly remarked in a letter written to his wife in October 1965, just one month after his arrival in Chicago. He recounted his rather unsuccessful attempt to master the “art” of the lecture hall:

On one of my earlier efforts [,] by pressing the wrong switch the 12 TV things hanging over the seats came on in about 12 [different] closed circuit programs, the curtains around the exterior walls automatically opened, the screen silently...
went up and a tape recorder started going round and round under my nose but
the lights all went out. All I wanted to do was open the light on the lectern.\textsuperscript{8}

With just the push of a button, the classroom’s orderly technological construction was
undermined as Boyarsky unleashed its latent disorderly potential (a technologized
extension of Derrida’s “postcard apocalypse,” perhaps). This somewhat comical
spectacle of modern technology gone awry (here one thinks of the famous restaurant
scene in Tati’s \textit{Playtime}) poses a stark contrast to the aegis with which such multi-
media technology was then being manipulated in the realms of art and architecture.
Among such counter examples, one could count the “expanded” artistic practices of the
1960s American avant-garde, the exhibition designs and multi-sensory presentations of
Charles and Ray Eames, or even, as cited earlier, the “Archigram Opera.”\textsuperscript{9} But as
Chapter 1’s analysis of Boyarsky’s lecture techniques confirms, his early fumble in the
UIC lecture hall was soon overcome. What is of importance here, instead, is the utter
excess of media that he encountered in this institutional space. If his initial ambition had
simply been to “open the light on the lectern,” this modest gesture towards
enlightenment had inadvertently triggered a fully mechanized and disembodied form of
pedagogy seemingly beyond his immediate control and faculties. Moreover, this
technological-disciplinary apparatus was rendered inextricable from the very
architecture of the university.

\textsuperscript{8} Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 26 October 1965, ABA.
\textsuperscript{9} On the Eameses’ multi-screen projections, see Beatriz Colomina, “Enclosed by
Though the ensemble of classroom media, from television sets to tape recorders, was clearly a novelty to Boyarsky, its institutional imprint was the mark of longstanding educational research initiatives. Even as early as 1938 Buckminster Fuller had argued in favor of a “broadcast education” that would take place “on the air and screen.” Yet it was within the shifting social and economic dynamics that followed on the heels of the Second World War that the interface between instructional technology and the design of learning institutions began to gain international currency; Chapter 2 identified Great Britain’s Open University as an exemplar of such initiatives. In postwar America, among the new technologies that prompted a re-conceptualization of both the architectural and institutional typology of the school, educational television (ETV) figured centrally in discussions on the design of schools. In fact, during his first academic year in Chicago, Boyarsky became involved in such discussions on how UIC’s architecture department might participate in this area of research. Immediately

11 See *Architectural Record* 128 (August 1960), special issue on “Schools.” The magazine published excerpts from a study conducted by the Ford Foundation’s Educational Facilities Laboratories (EFL) titled *Design for ETV: Planning for Schools with Television*. Founded in 1958 to evaluate the demands upon universities and schools as a result of the postwar baby boom, EFL’s objective was to “maximize the quality and utility” of existing and new learning facilities. Its report, *Design for ETV*, aimed to initiate dialogue between educational administrators, teachers, interior designers, and architects. See also David Chapman, *Design for ETV: Planning for Schools with Television* (New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1960).
12 Boyarsky’s own out-of-body teaching experience during his attempted lecture at UIC would have surely amused Jonathan King, EFL’s vice president and promotional director, who in the Spring of 1966 introduced him to the organization’s mission in an effort to forge a relationship between EFL and the university’s architecture department. Boyarsky’s enthusiastic reception of EFL’s agenda can be read in his subsequent effort
upon his arrival in Chicago, therefore, the medium of television began to permeate his architectural thinking and teaching.

An especially formative experience, however, took place outside of UIC, and in fact outside of Chicago; nevertheless, it raised questions and issues germane to his developing educational practices at the university. In early October 1965 Boyarsky was approached by the British Broadcasting Corporation to participate in a “series of lectures” for a television program entitled *Master Builders: Implications of Change on Architectural Ideas*, scheduled to air in the spring of the coming year [fig. 4.2]. Followed by lectures by Joseph Rykwert on “The Town,” Reyner Banham on “The Street,” Robin Middleton on “The Functional Ideal,” among others, Boyarsky’s “lecture,” entitled “Towards an Architecture,” was the first in the series.13 Taking Le Corbusier’s Dom-in-o of 1914 as its point of departure, the episode set out to demonstrate how the notion of an “ideal home of man” formed the crux of the architect’s larger “cosmos of ideas” on architecture and urbanism.14 The television program, then, presented an opportunity to flesh out a counter study to his Cornell research on Sitte. The comparative analytical model of Rowe was unequivocally still

---


ingrained in his thinking, though not yet complicated by the soon-to-be discovered “futurist aspects” and postcarded past of Chicago. What the experience afforded, more importantly, was the first in a series of lessons on television production.

Underscoring his recognition of pedagogy as a form of performance, Boyarsky used a lecture at Syracuse University as a “rehearsal” for the December 1965 taping of the “Towards an Architecture” episode, which took place in London. After the taping, the show’s producers equipped him with “a verbatim transcript and slide sequence from the original tape” to help him prepare, rehearse, and edit his lecture for a second round of filming, to take place in March 1966 [figs. 4.3, 4.4]. These “rehearsal” tools—both the lecture and the script—betray the overlapping territory of academic instruction (here, in the domain of architectural history) and televised programming that the BBC series attempted realize. Save for some hi-tech decorative trusses, the Master Builders set simulated the conventional layout of the classroom. “Hosts” were seated at a desk, as they lectured alongside slide illustrations projected onto a screen, addressing a live audience comprising architecture students from the AA, the Bartlett, the Royal College of Art, and the Kingston College of Art.17

This “lecture hall” stage set was a stylistic production choice that, among other things, elicited harsh criticism in a review of the series that was published in the journal Building in July 1966, one month after its final episode aired. The ambitions of the series’ producers and the individual presenters were ultimately commended. Yet, in

15 Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 25 November 1965, ABA.
16 Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 24 February 1966, ABA.
terms of its content, the main fault of the programs, according to the reviewer, was the overall “seemingly haphazard choice of lecture themes.” Equally problematic, moreover, was the organization of these themes under the rubric of a body of “Masters,” as denoted in the title of the series. For the reviewer, the series did nothing more than perpetuate the tropes of established narratives of the “pioneers” of modern architecture from which the subtitle’s “Change” duplicitously promised to depart. The review pointed to Boyarsky’s episode on Le Corbusier as the epitome of this contradiction. “And Corbusier as an opening! Really, how tedious can one get?” (In this way, the Le Corbusier seminar at the 1971 IID Summer Session, at which Boyarsky expressed relief to be able to speak intelligently on the historical contribution of the architect, might be read as a rebuttal to this critique.) However, the most grievous censure was reserved for an unsatisfactory marriage of architectural history and television. Set in its “gloomy pseudo-lecture theatre,” the production was marred by “the obviously stultifying effects that must come from the act of reading from notes or script (sometimes delivered at impossible speeds).” This shortcoming was compounded by the producers’

---

19 The reference here being Nikolaus Pevsner’s *Pioneers of Modern Architecture* (later *Pioneers of Modern Design*), which during the 1960s came to bear the burden of criticism of the modern movement during the 1960s in architectural discourse in Britain especially.

20 And a further dig at Boyarsky specifically: “The BBC booklet may lay claim to Corb’s place in the series, by describing the validity of history in Corb’s own search for a new architecture, but if Alvin Boyarsky’s lecture was intended to reveal and relate this through the theme of ‘the ideal home of man’ then certainly it was not even foggily apparent.” Anstis, “Architecture on Television: A Critical Review of the BBC ‘Master Builders’ Series,” 64.
“extraordinary decision to project slide illustrations instead of exploiting the actual process of television itself.”²¹

From Nietzsche’s privileging of aurality in education (“One speaking mouth, with many ears, and half as many writing hands”), the Master Builders series advanced the teaching of architectural history two steps forward—or better yet, two screens forward—in its use of projected slides and its televisual transmission. Yet it ultimately also took two steps back through its inability to reconcile televisual content, that is, the live lecture, with its corresponding transmission onto the television screen, as well as its inability to reconcile architecture’s intrinsic spatiality with the dynamism of moving imagery. The reviewer’s reference to the producers’ neglect of the medium’s “actual process” implies, on the one hand, lost opportunities in terms of constructing spatiotemporal montages of dialogue, action, and imagery—processes similar to film, which had prompted Eisenstein nearly three decades earlier to argue that architecture was not only an ideal cinematic subject, but in fact a model for the medium.²² And on the other hand—and here the medium specificity of television weighs in—the criticism also implicates a failure to engage with the complexity of audience demographics: both the live audience of students seated within an auditorium during tapings versus a mass audience of “students” receiving the lessons via television from within their individual homes. Unlike the former, who were embodied within the processes of production


alongside the live performance of the lecture and its accompanying slide projections, the latter experienced the televised program as a totality that manipulated, condensed, and displaced the lecture method; for Weber, such conditions account for the contingent “split” in visibility and spatiality that is unique to television. The true “implications of change in architectural ideals,” then, was perhaps less a matter of stylistic development or historical periodizations. What was at stake, instead, was the cogent articulation and delivery of architectural messages through the use of media.

Another vignette from Boyarsky’s Chicago period finds the future chairman clearly inspired and stimulated by such a challenge. Within UIC’s Office of Instructional Resources (OIR) he learned how to “exploit the actual process of television” overlooked by the Master Builders producers. Stocked with audio-visual equipment for producing films, photography, television, and printed matter, the OIR was also responsible for creating both promotional and instructional materials for the university and its academic departments. Such an opportunity arose when the College of Architecture & Art turned to the OIR for assistance in the production of television programming on art and architecture to be broadcast on a local television station. In the

23 “What we see, above and beyond the content of the images, is someone or something seeing. But that someone or something remains at an irreducible, indeterminable distance from the television viewer; and this distance splits the ‘sameness’ of the instant of perception as well as the identity of the place in which such viewing seems to occur. When we ‘watch’ television, we are watching out for this split, for this instant and place turned inside out. The television transmission does not therefore, as is generally supposed, simply overcome distance and separation. (This is the illusion of a ‘global village’.) It renders them invisible, paradoxically, by transposing them into the vision it transmits.” Weber, 120-1.

24 The Office of Instructional Resources was established at UIC in July 1964. It would later become the Office of Instructional Resources Development, then the Office of Media, and finally the Office of Electronic Media, before closing in 2002. As Boyarsky noted, Cedric Price and Peter Cook “would feel at home for a while.” Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 1 February 1966, ABA.
Spring of 1966 Boyarsky contributed to two of these endeavours. In one program he discussed the house as a conceptual unit in Le Corbusier’s oeuvre, recapitulating the ideas already put forward in his Master Builders episode. For the second program he participated in a “group discussion,” likely with other staff members from the college.25

Independent of these departmental forays into television, which blurred the line between publicity and pedagogy, Boyarsky also indulged in the televisual resources available at the OIR on his own time. In combination with his experiences at the BBC, these resources presented invaluable “opportunities to learn the medium,” he enthused.26 To produce his own program on the design exercises and urban ideas that he had tested with Lee Hodgden while teaching at the University of Oregon, Boyarsky—now “seasoned with 5 years of post rationalizations”—scheduled rehearsals for “timing and technique,” with the intention of drafting a script with corresponding visual materials.27

Indeed, the discrepancies between his experiences in different types of television production—from the BBC’s rehearsed program to the one-shot recording for local television in Chicago to a designed media lesson within UIC—provoked his questioning of the very efficacy of the script. (And in this way he anticipated the criticisms that would be launched in Building’s review of Master Builders a few months later.) As host

25 Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 4 April 1966, ABA. According to Boyarsky the series, which was prompted by the UIC public relations office, was originally intended to total fifteen programs covering both art and architecture. Initially, the first of his programs was to feature his “basic design and second year” teaching at UIC, and the second was to focus on urbanism. Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 24 February 1966, ABA. Based on OIR archival documentation, it is unclear how many of these programs were realized and aired, and in what broadcast context.
26 Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 4 April 1966, ABA. My italics.
27 Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 9 April 1966, ABA.
for “Towards an Architecture” on the BBC, Boyarsky had certainly gleaned the mechanics of a television script,\textsuperscript{28} an organizational tool that he observed to be noticeably absent during his appearance on one of the UIC architecture department’s programs, which was filmed for a local news program. In contrast to the BBC’s production of \textit{Master Builders}—an experience that “was sort of like being Laurence Olivier,” he reflected—the taping of the local news segment was far less accommodating. “No rehearsal, no direction, no control over the sequence of slides, no screen or anything to talk to and a rigorous schedule to fit into,” he reported to his wife.\textsuperscript{29}

An excess of information and media had been trumped by an indefatigable economy of time: this was the true lesson imparted by television. “I had about 10 slides left and was quite incomplete when time was called mid-sentence and they began lighting up and asking what[’]s next,” Boyarsky rued. As he concluded, “I suppose the idea is you just don’t prepare at all and ad lib. In that way you can encompass all the practical little details of their set up and not be embarrassed.”\textsuperscript{30} We have witnessed the fruits of this methodology in his “à la carte” slide lectures, and even in the impromptu execution of the IID. To trace its pedagogical afterlives in other media during Boyarsky’s chairmanship, we re-enter the AA through a different set of scripts, television productions, and printed practices.

\textsuperscript{28} “I have been working on one of the half hour TV programs and I will do a talk on Utopian city planning..including Alberti and all that and incidentally drawing on the Corb stuff. I hope I lose stage fright…in any case after two here and one panel I should be in good shape for the BBC…which has the advantage of a script which needs refining. I play with it on odd moments.” Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 6 March 1966, ABA.

\textsuperscript{29} Letter from Alvin Boyarsky to Elizabeth Boyarsky, 9 April 1966, ABA.

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid.
CIRCULAR LOGIC

A cup of tea, an ashtray, a telephone, a typewriter and fresh piles of paperwork: another table, and another set of props. A photograph captures the AA’s Information Centre in action during the spring term of 1975. AA Events List co-editor Nikki Hay mans the “Eventphone,” while her colleague Mary Crettier is stationed at a typewriter (though the camera catches her regressing to the pen) [fig. 4.5]. The product of their labor—the school’s diary of courses, events and notices—is reborn weekly on this table, continuing the in-house publication launched over a decade earlier as unassuming typewritten timetables [fig. 4.6].

During his brief sojourn at the AA in the 1960s, Boyarsky would have first encountered the modestly formatted Events List, which were posted on notice boards within the school and also exchanged with the Bartlett School of Architecture. The didactic agency of the weekly bulletins was then already in effect. As the student’s “main guide for all lectures and other events,” an AA student handbook stressed at the start of the 1964/65 academic year, “it is important to read it regularly.”

Architecturally imparting credibility to the production and distribution of information, in 1968 the AA Student Union envisioned an Information Centre, located in a corridor behind the school’s lecture hall. When realized, it was outfitted with projectors, telephones and tape recorders, in addition to multiple display units for posters and notices, as well as blow ups of Events Lists [figs. 4.7].

31 “Students Information Notes from the Principal, Session 1964–65,” AAA.
32 Axonometric drawing of the Information Centre appears in Architectural Association School of Architecture Handbook, 1968, AAA.
Upon his return to the AA as chairman, Boyarsky recognized the Information Centre as the hub of the school, and the *Events List* as its central organ. In conjunction with his renovation of the school’s unit system, as well as the expansion of its lecture and exhibition programming, in the autumn of 1973 Boyarsky revamped the weekly publication. Culling “daily happenings” (at times with the aid of the Eventphone), and combining text with illustrations thanks to “IBM typesetting and offset-litho printing,” the *Events List* now packaged into one document “much of the information that was previously stuffed into pigeonholes on innumerable pieces of paper.”\(^{33}\) Now obsolete, the original format’s simple column of text was exploded within an interior double-page spread of multiple running columns of text, into which the new surplus of events was compressed [fig. 4.8, 4.9, 4.10]. To the annual microcosm of the *Projects Review*, it constructed an even more miniaturized counterpart, a weekly printed cosmos of the utmost spatial and temporal specificity. Structuring the institution’s overwhelming number of day-to-day activities, mapping them out hour-by-hour, room-by-room, in order to facilitate an ad lib navigation of the program, the new *Events List* embodied a productive tension between order and improvisation, architecture and education. In this way, it was a continually reinvented monument to Boyarsky’s pedagogical vision.

Seemingly limitless plots and denouements were latent within these weekly institutional scripts. A fresh supply of scenarios was ensured through the establishment of General Studies. One of the school’s three new “service units,” along with Technical Studies and the Communications Unit, General Studies coordinated architectural study in an area today more commonly known as “history and theory.” Boyarsky’s overhaul

of the AA’s Middle School unit system in 1972 consequently entailed the dissolution of Arts & History, a departmental remnant of the Lloyd era that had consolidated fine arts instruction and topical lecture courses, and which had been supervised by Paul Oliver (quite interestingly, an expert in both African Art and jazz). Arts & History’s list of First Year courses, which laid the foundation for its subsequent Middle School offerings, conveys the general outline of the department’s concerns and of its curriculum as a whole: “Man, Society and Environment” (“The organisation of man’s communities, and the shaping of the environment. Problems of technology, pollution, waste control”); “Communication” (“including [the use of] film, tape, conventional graphics etc”); “Theory and Elements of Design” (“emphasis on Perceptual studies and on the formal implications of design solutions”); and “Logic, Language and Linguistics.” Compounding the visual, philosophical and social worldview maintained by Arts & History was a repertoire of courses in the history of art and architecture that fell under three general categories: “History of the Tradition in Architecture and the Arts,” “History of the Modern Movement in Architecture and the Arts,” and (apparently transcending history) “Arts of Non-Western Cultures.”

Although in the Middle School Arts & History courses no sequence was necessarily imposed, these categorizations nonetheless established a pre-conceived framework for cultural and historical study.

With his replacement of Lloyd’s Middle School unit system with the Intermediate and Diploma Schools, so too Boyarsky replaced Arts & History. While the Communications Unit absorbed the “arts” component of the defunct department, taking on studies in fine arts and media (which we will return to shortly), General Studies took

---

34 “The First Year Course,” Arts & History brochure, unpaginated, AAA.
up "history," consolidating courses that addressed architecture and urbanism, but also the social sciences.\textsuperscript{35} As a "service unit"—that is, in service, always, to design pedagogy in the unit system—General Studies reorganized its courses according to First Year, Intermediate, and Diploma. Historical surveys, which were frequently team-taught, were not uncommon—for example, Robin Middleton’s First Year “History of Architecture” (antiquity to the nineteenth century), and an Intermediate lecture on “The Modern Movement in Architecture,” co-taught by Charles Jencks and Dennis Sharp.\textsuperscript{36} Less conventional fare included “Urban Food Production” (Intermediate, Colin Moorcraft), “Semiology and Architecture” (Intermediate, Charles Jencks), “The Forms of Poetry” (Diploma, Jasia Reichardt), and “African Tribal Arts” (Diploma, Paul Oliver).\textsuperscript{37} None of these courses, importantly, were mandatory or exclusive. At the end of each stage of study (i.e. First Year, Intermediate, Diploma), a student was required to submit an essay on a subject relevant to any lecture course and written under the supervision a tutor. Students were therefore free to attend any and as many (or few) lectures session and seminars as they wished. Therefore it was in the Events List, a veritable weekly “menu,” that students surveyed General Studies’ offerings as part of

\textsuperscript{35} In 1972/1973 General Studies staff included Dennis Sharp and Grahame Shane (urban history), Thomas Stevens (architectural history), Charles Jencks (architectural history, Robin Middleton (Architectural history) and Anne Holmes (social sciences). Alvin Boyarsky, supplement to AA Newsheet no. 1, session 1972/1973, Autumn Term, unpaginated.


\textsuperscript{37} “General Studies Service Unit,” AA Prospectus, Service Units (1973/1974), 2-12.
the AA’s “well-laid table.”

Alternatively, it is possible to reconsider these circumstances according to the following hypothesis: General Studies was modelled after the *Events List*. It is noteworthy that in 1973 Boyarsky appointed Robin Middleton as coordinator of this “service unit.” This was a highly strategic move on the chairman’s part; and in fact, the working methods of the two figures bear striking similarities. Middleton has played a recurring role in this dissertation, appearing simultaneously as an IID “faculty” member and Technical Editor of *AD*, where—much like the AA chairman, in his office, and the IID director, over his kitchen table—he presided over a “hot telephone.” Furthermore, as editor Middleton had overseen the publication of “Chicago à la carte” in the magazine (though he was partly responsible for the trauma caused to its author’s prized postcards), as well as its various IID Summer Session features. The latter, in fact, included the highly congested diaries for each session, which were clearly a point of reference for the remodelling of the *Events List*.

By extension, Middleton “edited” General Studies very much like a magazine—or, rather, he was pressed to “edit” it according to the programmatic template that the *Events List* enforced and embodied. In the years following his appointment as coordinator, the range of General Studies courses would increase and diversify exponentially. Middleton frequently sought academic expertise outside of the AA, tapping into London’s network of institutions to assemble a changing roster of specialists. And augmenting the chairman’s own invitations to guest lecturers, he also

---

38 Middleton was at the same time a lecturer and librarian at Cambridge University.
steered foreign visitors, passing through city, into Bedford Square to participate in General Studies courses and in the AA’s blossoming public lecture program.

As the *Events List* baldly pronounced across its pages, the AA’s “well-laid table” in its totality—a spread of lectures, exhibitions, unit presentations, seminars, film screenings, workshops—in fact absorbed General Studies, as it indeed did all other areas of the school. Middleton’s “editorial” process within the AA’s institutional program, therefore, was but a subset of another. Media are not only the extensions of man, but also of women. This much was already made clear to us by the IID Secretariat, Elizabeth Boyarsky and Helen McEachrane, who were responsible for the independent school’s media blitz. A few years later, in the AA Information Centre we find Hay over a “hot telephone” and Crettier assembling information, as they construct and reconstruct the *Events List*. From telephone to typewriter to program: it is the hands of these modern women that shape and reshape the AA, as collected information is organized and distributed onto the printed page. Yet as the photograph of the Information Centre reveals, *Events Lists* produced on the lateral surface of the table have escaped to scale the vertical surface of the walls. It is less a case of *ceçi tuera cela*, however, than of *telecommunication takes command*. From telephone to typewriter to program to architecture: this wallpaper of information is not merely a decorative coating. Of the same etymological origins as “textiles,” the “literal meaning of text is tissue,” Kittler

---

40 This was even the strategy of Middleton’s First Year “History of Architecture” course, which featured a roster of guest lecturers that would offer their expertise in a range of teaching methods, so that the course would “not be too consistent or humdrum.” “History of Architecture (1st Year)” description in “General Studies Service Unit,” *AA Prospectus*, Service Units (1973/1974), 2.
reminds us. Further still, in a late twentieth century Semperian twist, at work is an informatic “principle of cladding” that discloses the AA’s structural origins. It is information that produces the architecture school.

These structural origins run deep. No historical account of the AA will allow its reader to forget the circumstances of the school’s birth, and present company will not be spared a reminder. In 1846 the 18-year-old apprentice Charles Gray publishes a letter in *The Builder* lamenting England’s lack of proper architectural education, provocatively suggesting that students start a school of their own. Robert Kerr, aged 23 and also an apprentice, responds to the call. In 1847 he and Gray establish Britain’s first school of architecture, a child of the press. “Typescript amounts to the desexualization of writing,” Kittler, again, offers. “When men are deprived of the quill and women of the needle, all hands are up for grabs—as employable as employees.” Indeed, the secretarial guises of Hay and Crettier veil their true authority, which is wielded through the circulation of the *Events List*. From within the Information Centre the two women channel Gray and Kerr, relaunching the school each week in print and into the employable hands of a multitude of others.

Though the auxiliary, clandestine space of the Information Centre was folded within the concatenated interior of the AA, such a facility was fashioned as a permeable

---

42 See *The Builder* 4 (September 1846): 464–65. Over a century later publishing would prevail as a vital part of the school’s lifeblood, from official institutional organs, such as *The AA Brown Book* and *The Architectural Association Journal*, to independent student magazines, including *The Purple Patch*, *Focus*, and *Clip-Kit*. Though historical accounts frequently cite these and other documents as evidence of the AA’s vibrant publishing history, the agency of the *Events List* has received little attention.
43 Kittler, *Gramophone, Film, Typewriter*, 187.
space accessible to students and staff, whether by telephone or by foot. After all, it was quite literally a corridor, a point made in the first feature item of the inaugural issue of the newly formatted *Events List* in October 1973. Identified as the publication’s headquarters, the Information Centre is described as “the passage between front and back on the ground floor of 34 Bedford Square.” An architectural filter where messages were received, collaged and disseminated, it is a space dedicated to the circulation of both bodies and information.

But the new *Events List* itself was a circular. It was a collection of advertisements for the week’s offerings, sweetly heralded on the front cover of each issue by a unique numerical illustration marking the procession through the academic term’s sequence of weeks: a number one constructed out of Brillo boxes, a number eight rendered as two plates of eggs, a set of floor plans reconfigured in the form of a number ten, etc. [figs. 4.11, 4.22]. Populated by illustrated announcements, these front pages presented highlights for the week, whether new directions in unit work and courses, lectures, exhibitions, conferences or seminars. Inside, the week’s full range of events was explicitly advertised in the diary, and readers were encouraged to attend those events designated “open to everyone.” In its very printedness the *Events List* thus exposes another structural origin of the AA’s institutional program. Differentiating ongoing “regular events” (marked with a dot) from more ephemeral “special events” (starred) organised around guests visiting the AA, the *Events List* typographically crystallizes an institutional system of supply and demand. Here, on the page, events are transformed into commodities and pedagogy is continually reorganized through the

---

rhetoric of capitalism. Beyond the corridor, then, media becomes complicit in the AA’s traffic in architectural education.

As the weekly timetable of the Events List makes clear, the underlying force in the flow of traffic is, in fact, time. Time, as Michel Foucault maintains, contributes to a “micro-physics of power” and its organizational agency is equally essential to all disciplines; accordingly, it manifests its full instrumentality in the form of the timetable.45

The principle that underlay the time-table in its traditional form was essentially negative; it was the principle of non-idleness: it was forbidden to waste time, which was counted by God and paid for by men; the time-table was to eliminate the danger of wasting it—a moral offence and economic dishonesty. Discipline, on the other hand, arranges a positive economy; it poses the principle of a theoretically ever-growing use of time: exhaustion rather than use; it is a question of extracting, from time, ever more available moments and, from each moment, ever more useful forces. This means that one must seek to intensify the use of the slightest moment, as if time, in its very fragmentation, were inexhaustible or as if, least by an ever more detailed internal arrangement, one could tend towards an ideal point at which one maintained maximum speed and efficiency.46

46 Foucault, Discipline and Punish, 154.
Following Foucault’s postulation, the timetable of the *Events List* seeks to establish and moreover idealizes a “positive economy” of architectural education, and indeed architectural culture more broadly speaking. If it was a continually reinvented monument to Boyarsky’s pedagogical vision, then this vision was intently focused on pure productivity. Testimony to this claim—and to the tautology at the core of Boyarsky’s educational philosophy—is the inherent and instrumental obsolescence of the weekly bulletin: there will always be another *Events List*, because there will always be more to do; likewise, there will always be more to do because there will always be another *Events List*.

These printed timetables therefore illustrate a radical departure from the modernist “blueprint” of professional training. As a point of comparison, take, for example, the well-known diagram of the Bauhaus curriculum, that mythic origin of modernist education in which architecture is positioned as the destination reached via a concentric arrangement of practices; or even the uncompromising linearity of the curriculum of the Illinois Institute of Technology, outlining a distinct path towards Mies’s principles of clarity; or even the less graphically sophisticated, though no less teleological curricular charts presented to AA students in the 1960s [fig. 4.12]. Reifying Boyarsky’s model of the “well-laid table” precisely by making it legible, the refurbished *Events List* alternatively presents the quintessential diagram of a postmodern reconfiguration of architectural education: as a process of selection rather than prescription, as a method of consumption rather than regurgitation, and offered via an institutional platform whose agenda was perpetually reset anew in the space of media.
“LE SCANNING”

So the story goes, after hearing Boyarsky’s explanation of the AA’s institutional agenda (most likely sometime during the late 1980s), the French philosopher Jean-Francois Lyotard responded by incredulously characterizing the chairman’s rapid assessment of the discipline’s unrelenting modulations as “le scanning.” A criticism of the relentless economy of time underlying the school’s programmatic mutations, the charge provided an apt metaphor, conjuring an image of Boyarsky as a “couch-potato switching [television] channels with a remote control.” Yet “le scanning” has further implications. On the one hand, it evokes the very process intrinsic to the televi

tual transmission of images. Unlike photography’s “analogy to nature” and unlike the sequential structure of film, television “began as a radical cutting”; “it not only cut up movements in time, but it also disintegrated connections or shapes into individual points in space.” Indeed, a similar process is recognizable in the production of the Events List, a screen onto which disconnected fragments are reconstituted, much like the illuminated images passing by on a television screen. On the other hand, “le scanning” also calls to mind Lyotard’s own efforts to disarticulate the transmission of meta-narratives and the technocracy of information. In his critical project, education gains currency. “It is not hard to visualize learning circulating along the same lines as money,” he posits in The Postmodern Condition, “instead of for its ‘education’ value or

---

47 As recalled and interpreted by Grahame Shane. Grahame Shane, “IID Summer Sessions,” unpublished Boyarsky monograph, ABA. According to Shane, when recounting this episode Boyarsky would deliver Lyotard’s response in a French accent and with ‘a sardonic grin, at once pained and delighted’.

political (administrative, diplomatic, military) importance. To be sure, at the AA the Events List made the circulation of architectural education all too easy—yet with help from television along the way.

To further gauge education’s currency in the AA’s media economy, we take a cue from Lyotard, and “scan” a specimen of the Events List: Week 14, January 28 – February 1, 1974. Its front page is coated with the week’s specials: the disparate musings of David Greene, Fred Scott and Warren Chalk on their respective units’ attitudes toward landscape; a notice for upcoming seminars led by Freedom to Build (1972) author John Turner, an expert on informal housing; and Dalibor Vesely announcing his unit’s search for new strategies of urban analysis. Inside, the diary scintillates with even more options. A workshop on photomontage and collage techniques. Christian Norberg-Schulz’s guest lecture in a course on “Semiology and Architecture.” Argentinian scholar Horacio Torres’ presentation on Latin American cities. A lecture by Archizoom’s Paolo Deganello (invited by Bernard Tschumi) on “Italian Urban Politics,” to take place just before a seminar on Aldo Rossi and Italian Rationalism led by Elia Zenghelis, Léon Krier and Thalis Argyropoulos. Meanwhile, general notices flood the back cover. AA Council election results. The school’s 125th anniversary exhibition heads to Poland. Scholarship opportunities in Rome. And the launch of TVAA, a closed-circuit television network “opened to everyone in the school, as a Forum, a platform, a tool, an electric cow to be milked by anyone with fingers.

nimbled \textit{sic} enough to take the plunge\footnote{“TVAA,” \textit{AA Events List}, Week 28 January – 1 February 1974, unpaginated (back cover).} \footnote{Dennis Crompton, interview with the author, 26 June 2007, London. The two fifth-year students responsible for NKTV were Mike Hickie and Bob Jardine. As reported in a contemporary article: “Intended partly as a means of information dissemination for matters like rate rebates and tenant’s rights, the service will also provide a forum for discussion of individual problems and the possibility of teach-ins on a massive scale. In its scope and style the scheme represents a real possibility of community decision making.” See “Community TV in Notting Hill,” \textit{Design} (April 1971), 18. [figs. 4.8, 4.9, 4.10, 4.13]. As the history of TVAA reveals, “le scanning” was not just a metaphor for the AA’s operations. It was, in fact, a process technologically ingrained into its institutional structure.

Prompted by Boyarsky, TVAA was coordinated by the AA’s Communications Unit, the newly formed “service unit.” Directed by Archigram member Dennis Crompton (in another institutional life, the audio-visual technician of the IID), its instruction in various media, from photography to silk-screening to drawing, as well as film and video, loosely mirrored the responsibilities of the OIR at UIC, where Boyarsky had received the bulk of his media training. The launch of TVAA, as well as the Communications Unit’s more general commitment to television and video studies, was facilitated by the school’s inheritance of video equipment used in a 1971 fifth-year student project. Titled “NKTV,” the project took the format of a community television station for residents in London’s North Kensington neighborhood.\footnote{Dennis Crompton, interview with the author, 26 June 2007, London. The two fifth-year students responsible for NKTV were Mike Hickie and Bob Jardine. As reported in a contemporary article: “Intended partly as a means of information dissemination for matters like rate rebates and tenant’s rights, the service will also provide a forum for discussion of individual problems and the possibility of teach-ins on a massive scale. In its scope and style the scheme represents a real possibility of community decision making.” See “Community TV in Notting Hill,” \textit{Design} (April 1971), 18.} Reclaiming these tools to service the architectural community at Bedford Square, on the ground floor of the AA the unit constructed an in-house television studio stocked with three cameras, and sparsely furnished with Saarinen Tulip chairs, a table, and bits of foliage; adjacent to it was a control room for editing and broadcasting [figs. 4.14-4.18]. But before examining these broadcasts, it is useful to consider how even before television
production was domesticated at the AA in this way, the medium had already been adopted as a pedagogical model elsewhere within the school. All roads lead to the unit system.

Illustrating the collapse of architectural education into the remit of the page and the screen, the April 1973 issue of *Architectural Design* documented the recent adventures of the AA and Polyark. Price’s sequel to the Potteries Thinkbelt, Polyark’s proposal for a national, mobile network of British architectural schools was, we will recall, an inspiration of Boyarsky’s IID; here, it resurfaces as a catalyst for pedagogical experiment at the AA, mentioned only in passing in the previous chapter. A few months earlier, Peter Murray, the magazine’s Technical Editor and Middleton’s successor (the network is endless) had decided to put Polyark to the test. With the initial aim of establishing a mobile “extension of AD” comprising audio and visual documentation, Murray invited Price and a group of AA students from a First Year unit to jumpstart the project. The itinerary: a two-week tour of architecture schools across Great Britain. It was “a travelling road show that would entertain as well as stimulate discussion,” according to Murray, who cited Ken Keasey and the Merry Pranksters as precedents. Quite literally, this “cross-fertilization” of AD, the AA, and Polyark was mobilized through the AA students’ conversion of a Routemaster bus into living quarters, replete with audio-visual equipment and a video library whose collection grew as students recorded their interactions at each stop on the tour [figs. 3.24, 3.25]. As such televisual

---

54 Peter Murray, Polyark promotional statement, Folder x35 (Polyark), Cedric Price Fonds, Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA).
transactions unfolded, the frontiers of the educational project were drawn and redrawn. Even after the tour was complete this process was to continue, as Price identified the AA’s video catalogue as a resource for his mobile school and its subsequent “traveling road shows.”

Yet, the true vitality of the role of television and video in the \textit{AD}/AA/Polyark collaboration is precisely conveyed by the very nature of Price’s participation in the event. For it was only in the form of a video recording that Price attended the bus tour [fig. 4.19]. Commenting on his immaterial presence, the disembodied Polyark director informed attendees that the “value of videotape is similar to the value of magazines on a dentist’s table—that is, you can use this film when you can’t think of anything better to do.” Issuing a further didactic imperative to the students, he argued that the “learning process is one in which one should be able to rethink the direction one is going in without recrimination or losing points or not getting medals.” Here, Price proposed a fundamental departure from the structural principles underlying the BBC’s \textit{Master Builders} televised “lectures,” in which the sites of both the production and reception of content were presumed fixed. Alternatively, Price reinterpreted media (magazines and video) as a constant—and in fact, available at a whim. In this way, Price implied, video advanced a rewiring of architectural education as a continuous yet highly efficient process, rather than as a finite trajectory towards a static body of knowledge. It is a

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{55} In Price’s archive, documentation pertaining to Polyark includes a listing of the AA’s video catalogue. “Catalogue of Videotapes,” Communications Unit, October 1976, Folder x35 (Polyark), Cedric Price Fonds, CCA.
  \item \textbf{56} Cedric Price, transcription of video from bus tour video library, in “\textit{AD}/AA/Polyark Bus Tour,” \textit{Architectural Design} (April 1973): 203.
\end{itemize}
claim that has resounded throughout this study—in print, in audio recordings, and now through video—but whose deeper implications are discernible in a muted image.

The inconsequence of destinations, both epistemological and architectural, to the model of learning that Price promoted was communicated in the very cover of the magazine, which was, in essence, the very site of the “cross-fertilization” of the three institutions involved in the educational experiment [fig. 4.20]. Set against a blank background, a handheld television monitor displays an image of the AD/AA/Polyark tour bus on the road. Pedagogy is doubly suspended in the space of media by a feedback loop between video and print. A disembodied hand clutches the television monitor, the gesture silently asserting that architectural education is unmoored to institutions, and is instead directed by the will of its participants. And yet, the cover also bears the imprint of an invisible hand outside the frame, which has graphically masked out the television monitor’s power cord. Just as media could free architectural pedagogy from its institutional conventions, so too could it construct the image of this autonomy, obscuring its underlying sources of power.

To press this point further, it is here pertinent to recall Chapter 2’s recognition that the educational uses of such audio-visual tools did not escape but rather obsessed architects at the tumultuous close of the 1960s, a moment when the uncertainty of the future of architectural education reverberated internationally. It was a moment when, in turn, pedagogy, charged with an armature of media, began to pose an engaging design problem. Essentially, it was a matter of rethinking program—the circulation of bodies and information—whether taking the form of mail order “Video Seminars,” as proposed by Yona Friedman, or the “communication network” of Ant Farm’s Truckin’
University/Truckstop Network, or even the global mapping of Archigram’s “Archizones” project\(^{57}\) [figs. 2.8, 4.21]. And yet, from teaching machines to video lessons, from closed-circuit television to the Open University: by the start of the 1970s multiple forms of communications technology had already been widely institutionalized in educational systems worldwide, as Boyarsky’s own encounter in the UIC lecture hall attests. Experimental architects, then, were the ones learning from newly implemented disciplinary models. For the sites of disciplinarity, as they had been theorized by Foucault, had already begun to dematerialize, ceding to “control societies” in which, as Deleuze followed, the fluid rematerialization of governance and regulation unfolded in the immaterial form of information systems and media networks.\(^{58}\) Accordingly, what the silent message of the *AD* cover communicates is that media was at once the new image, the centralizing apparatus, and a reconfigured site of authority.

Elsewhere in the AA unit system, media illuminates further complexities. Just a month prior to the launch of AA’s television studio and station, Archigrammer David Greene had articulated the value of such an undertaking—and in the pages of the *Events List*, no less. The Intermediate Unit 6 tutor speculated that a closed-circuit television system could offer “new possibilities for changing the academic structure” of the AA. A resource to be harnessed and manipulated, video, he contended, “is not a magic wand it


is a tool”[^59] [fig. 4.22]. It could provide the foundations of an even more expansive learning network, bypassing the fixed site of the school via the production and international distribution of “video-newsletters.” Under the same spell as Price, Greene’s quixotic aspirations for the AA transcended his own unit’s multimedia explorations in the moving image, both in film and video. Dissimilar to his fellow unit tutors, before the introduction of the Projects Review Greene, quite appropriately, documented his unit’s activities not in print, but in film. His pedagogical experiment was captured in Warren, I Remember Architecture Too (1974), a short film co-directed with co-tutor Mike Myers, a member of the Tattooist International, the collective who had produced various films for Archigram during the 1960s. An admittedly “cannibalistic” collage of televisied programming and advertisements, Warren, I Remember Architecture Too includes clips of interviews with Intermediate Unit 6 students who were asked to describe an “ideal home” in thirty seconds. The time limit, conceived by Myers, who drew upon his experience in television and advertising, was didactically imposed as a productive constraint.[^60] It was a media lesson already impressed upon Boyarsky during the late 1960s, and which now manifested throughout the AA at various scales of pedagogy.

It is worth pointing out here that by the mid-1970s—nearly a decade after the publication of McLuhan’s theories on the “extensions of man” and after the introduction

[^59]: “Video is Not a Magic Wand,” AA Events List, 3–7 December 1973, unpaginated (front cover). Video was not a mandatory part of the Intermediate Unit 6 programme, and was but one among many design “tools.” For a student account of Greene’s Intermediate Unit 6 see Sand Helsel, “I Was a David Greene Student (This Sounds Like a Mantra),” in David Greene and Samantha Hardingham, L.A.W.U.N. Project #19: Studies in the Real (London: Architectural Association, 2008), B30–B33.

[^60]: David Greene, interview with the author, 2 July 2007, London. Other Tattooists members include David Fontaine and Dennis Postle.
of the Sony Portapak, the world’s first portable video recording device—television and video were also already deeply embedded in contemporary art practices. Myers’ mediatic exercise corroborates David Curtis’ identification of a “new model” of artistic practice in the late 1960s epitomized by the Tattooists: “hip young filmmakers who made enough money from selling their skills to television and advertising to support an independent filmmaking habit.”\(^{61}\) Alternatively, by turning to film and video, in addition to scripts, collage, poetry and photography, Greene’s own efforts to recast and refute both architectural form and representation had been decisively shaped by his encounters with the work of British conceptual artists during the late 1960s and early 1970s, which unequivocally informed his teaching at the AA.\(^{62}\) To be sure, it was a moment when television and video were hovering on that fetishistically fine line between art and architecture. Yet when seen against the contemporary work of Dan Graham, Nam June Paik, Haus-Rucker-Co, or Ant Farm, for example, which critically tackled the political, social, psychological and aesthetic dimensions of mass media, the broadcasting endeavours of TVAA disclose a wholly different relationship to mass media.\(^{63}\)

Though its activities would carry on in various ways into the following decades, it was in TVAA’s earliest years, roughly between 1974 and 1976, when its identity was

\(^{61}\) David Curtis, *A History of Artists’ Film and Video in Britain* (London: British Film Institute, 2007), 182.


strongest, its ambitions at a peak, and its programming at its most diverse, airing fairly consistently at one o’clock each weekday afternoon. Aside from general announcements, its broadcasts included films and videos made by students and of students’ unit work, replays of off-air television programs and feature films, live footage of oversubscribed events held in the lecture hall, and taped recordings of recent lectures. Original programming included interviews and discussions staged within the studio, exposing viewers to personalities visiting the AA, and whom they might not have had the opportunity to encounter face-to-face. Wired to the studio, to a camera in the school lecture hall, to a fixed television monitor on the first floor in the Back Members’ Room, as well as other unfixed monitors placed variably within the school, the control room broadcast both live and recorded programs from within and to the AA. Pumping through cables that literally burst through doorways, corridors and windows, this televisual material crawled and penetrated the interior surfaces of the AA’s Georgian home, yielding an intramural topology of information whose structural ambitions “cross-fertilized” with those of the Events List.

And so again: it is information that produces the architecture school. By “scanning” TVAA’s broadcasts, we can assess the institutional effects of this architectural and programmatic dispersal of televisual production, consumption, transmission and reproduction at the AA. Consider, then, the following clips, which recast a number of characters who have made guest appearances elsewhere in this dissertation, and whose reappearances on TVAA underscore the role of media as a

---

64 With the launch of TVAA the AA began to regularly record its public lectures and events, resulting in an incredible video archive that contains material dating from the mid-1970s to the present day.
structural constant over against the pedagogical, ideological and discursive variables coursing throughout all registers the AA’s system of architectural education.

Title sequence: The logo for TVAA appears embedded within a collage of architectural magazine covers: *A+U, Architectural Forum, Casabella, Building Design, Domus, Architectural Design, The Architect*. “Allegro non troppo” from Malcolm Arnold’s *English Dances* (1951) provides the musical accompaniment. As the score closes, the wallpaper of magazines—an informatic “cladding” that reinforces that of the *Events List* posted on the walls of the Information Centre—fades into a title screen that reads, “ARCHIitectural MAGazineS.” Price is named as the host for this episode, which aired on March 11, 1975. Cut to Price in the AA Communications Studio. He is seated at a table covered with magazines, bits of paper, an ashtray and a glass (presumably filled with brandy)—another table, another set of props. Behind him a dark curtain serves as a backdrop [figs. 4.23, 4.24].

“I use magazines very greedily,” Price immediately declares, speaking directly to the camera, “primarily in order to achieve economy in time.” A similar declaration had been rehearsed earlier at Polyark, just as it had been by Greene and Myers in Intermediate Unit 6, and indeed by Boyarsky in multiple institutional settings. But as this episode of “Archi-Mags” unfolds, a further economy of both architecture and media begins to surface. For television frames an architectural discourse on print in a McLuhanesque “cross-fertilization,” as one medium becomes the content of another. Conducting himself with a hint of restraint, Price glances furtively at a scrap of paper on
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65 Cedric Price, episode of “Archi-Mags,” 11 March 1975, Architectural Association Video Archive (AAVA). The episode was aired on 11 March 1975, but recorded on 6 March 1975, according to the AAVA records.
the table, ostensibly covered in notes, which he traces delicately with his finger; in his other hand, the obligatory cigar. Before he begins his discussion of the magazines he reads regularly, he offers a word of warning to the audience. For he is “not particularly interested in other architects’ views of architecture,” nor is he “interested in looking at detailed architectural photographs or indeed plans of chosen beautiful buildings.” Instead Price would prefer to see “a third-rate building being built than a first-rate one in the pages of magazines.” Commenting on the quality of illustrations and content, as well as the talents of individual editors, his demeanour loosens up considerably as he strays from his notes and delves into the periodicals before him: from Architectural Design to Country Life, from Building Design to New Society, from Underground Services, the journal of the London Subterranean Survey Association, to the journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects. As he is keen to note, not only does he receive a number of publications free by virtue of being a member of certain institutions, but the magazines themselves were often the sole reason for his membership. For in their delivery of information they often outperformed the activities of their host institution—a mediatic eclipse that seemingly paralleled his preference for photographs of architectural process over images of completed, built work, but also unwittingly resonated with the media network to which he was presently subordinate.

For Price, in the role of host, the table functions both as a pedestal for the hand-picked array of magazines over which he reigns and as the stage from which he commands our attention. The scene of the “well-laid table” is by now a familiar one,

---

reproduced throughout the AA: here, a televised restaging of the architectural space of the Information Centre and of the chairman’s office. This tableau, however, is hardly unique to the setting of the AA. Produced and broadcast on TVAA during the Spring 1975 term, the “Archi-Mags” series appropriated a format that would have been familiar to a viewing audience in Great Britain. The popular television show “What The Papers Say” had provided the production blueprint for this trajectory of print onto the screen: from its title sequence, which collaged the front pages of newspapers, to the use of Arnold’s “Allegro non troppo” as its theme song, to its changing line-up of hosts seated behind a desk and providing commentary on selected stories, culled from a crop of current publications [fig. 4.25].

Like the periodicals brandished in Price’s episode of “Archi-Mags,” and like the commodities advertised in the Events Lists, the host himself is both consumable and disposable. He is a placeholder who is repeatedly, even brutally, transferred from studio to screen in an act of televisual disfigurement that compounds the mutilation incurred via his perforated vulnerability as an IID Summer Session stamp. On TVAA, he is an architect inserted into a different kind of “world series,” domesticated within the AA.

Just weeks earlier, Murray—now editor at Building Design—had also subjected himself to TVAA’s disciplinary act of scanning [fig. 4.26]. Presenting his own episode of “Archi-Mags,” he reviewed the latest news in architecture while tacitly giving a media lesson on how to navigate a veritable marketplace of information. He compared (and not without bias) his own journal’s press coverage with that of its rival, the Architects’ Journal. At the same time he revealed the tricks of the trade, such as the benefits of employing trained journalists over architects (the former, Murray insisted,
are better at tracking down stories than the latter), and the difficulties of securing information from overseas, as was the case in recent efforts to gather information on the previous week’s World Trade Center fire.\(^{67}\)

At the AA, the program formula for “Archi-Mags,” however, was not entirely fixed. Godfrey Boyle participated in another episode as editor of *Undercurrents*, the magazine of “alternative technologies” and “radical science,” founded in 1972—in fact, one of the research tools in Foley’s “Rational Technology Unit” [fig. 4.27]. In conversation with Communications Unit staff member James Mellor, Boyle explained the magazine’s origins, and its promotion of “small scale” uses of science and technology.\(^{68}\) This was the general theme of the soon-to-be published sourcebook *Radical Technology* (1976). Compiled by Boyle and his *Undercurrents* co-editor Peter Harper, the publication championed “the growth of small-scale techniques suitable for use by individuals and communities in a wider social context of humanized production under workers’ and consumers’ control.”\(^{69}\)

Taking up Boyle’s definition, might we then identify TVAA itself as an example of a “small scale” use of technology, deployed within the context of an independent school of architecture that operated according to a self-regulated system of production and consumption? “Radical,” however, remains a questionable attribution for this use of technology, for reasons outlined above. And though the AA, as “Archi-Mags”


\(^{69}\) “Preface,” *Radical Technology*, 5.
spectacularly illustrates, manipulated established instructional technologies for the purposes of continuing the transmission of architectural messages that had previously been confined to the classroom, conversation, and indeed print, TVAA nevertheless unquestioningly conformed those messages to the existing conventions of popular television and, concurrently, to the architectural boundaries of the school. Here was the crux of television’s “cross-fertilization” with the AA’s institutional program, confined as it was at 36 Bedford Square: the subjectification of architectural discourse to the “split” spatial and visual conditions of television’s production and its consumption. This “split” was the implicit subject of critique in the review of the BBC Master Builders series a decade earlier, which called our attention to the objectification of the receiving audience, as well as the petrification of an otherwise spatially dynamic subject matter; yet within the AA the preservation of this “split” realized television’s “promise of providing a remote control, commanding not just at a distance but over distance as such.” Telecommunication takes télécommande.

If we zoom out of the studio and turn away from the screen, however, we might better grasp how television, in fact, posed a most appropriate apparatus for supporting the AA’s refurbished institutional program. Raymond Williams’ analysis of broadcast television offers an especially effective critical lens on this matter. Though seemingly providing audiences a multitude of programs as voluntary points of entry, broadcast television’s planned organization of discrete time-bound units of content instead mobilizes a sequential “flow,” as programming only becomes “available in a single

---

70 Weber, Mass Mediauras, 114.
dimension and in a single operation.”71 While liberating architectural education from the strictures of traditional, fixed curricula, and despite the “radical cutting” intrinsic to its program, at the AA a latent programmatic structure persists, whose linearity is obscured by the simultaneity of messages on which it thrives. The real internal organization of the AA, therefore, is less perceptible or audible in the richness of its moving images or its cacophony of voices than it is discernible in the rationalism of the timetable. In the Events List the static medium of print congeals and lays bare an educational program comprising a choreographed sequence of variegated units—an ever-changing, yet controlled flow unfurling within the temporal and architectural boundaries of the institution.

NEWS FROM NOWHERE

Another domestic “video newsletter,” sent via TVAA in May 1975. A title screen announces the series “Housing at the AA.” Cut to a wide shot of the Communications studio; the control room is visible on the left. The frame captures two other cameras in the studio, which focus on two seated figures. Zoom in for a close-up [fig. 4.28].

Continuing what he refers to as his “education in housing,” Communications staff member Gus Coral interviews architectural critic Martin Pawley in this episode of “Housing at the AA.” Aired during the spring term of 1975, the TVAA series showcased the various housing studies that were then simultaneously unfolding within the school; its guests included unit tutors Bruce Haggart, Gerry Foley, Brian Anson,

71 Raymond Williams, Television: Technology and Cultural Form (New York: Schocken Books, 1975), 86.
Ann Holmes, Dick Hobin, John Starling, Tom Woolley and Jeremy Dixon. In other contexts we have seen Pawley play the role of critic of Le Corbusier at the 1971 IID Summer Session, and co-editor, with Tschumi, of AD’s special issue on May ’68 and the École des Beaux-Arts. The subject of his TVAA lesson, however, is “Garbage Housing,” his call for the integration of industrial and architectural production systems based on the “second use” potential of consumer goods as building materials. From the Communications studio he offers Coral and viewers an index to gauge the current discrepancy between the two modes of production. “If by some magic all television sets disappeared overnight they could be replaced within six years,” Pawley approximates. In contrast, following a similarly supernatural effacement of housing, he argues, reconstruction would require sixty-four years.

Television could proliferate where architecture could not. This materialist levelling of the two media betrays perhaps more than a twinge of architecture’s television-envy—a tension doubled in the very broadcasting endeavour of TVAA, whose transmissions tacitly antiquated the physical site of the school. Indeed, such institutional elisions and distortions would not go unnoticed by Pawley, whose barrage of criticisms of the new educational platform of the AA under Boyarsky’s direction, and its attendant media outlets, were then reaching fever pitch. And though the school’s expanding media practices were a regular target for Pawley, his own critiques, launched off-air and in print, rendered him ineluctably complicit in the AA’s media economy.

Several months prior to his housing interview, Pawley had been invited by Boyarsky to edit a new weekly AA newspaper. Aided by a small editorial staff, which
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72 Martin Pawley interviewed by Gus Coral, “Housing at the AA,” (May 1975), video recording, AAVA. The series aired on TVAA throughout May 1975.
included Marilyn Jones and Lucinda Hawkins, over the course of the 1974/75 academic year Pawley steered the enigmatically titled *Ghost Dance Times* from its first issue to its last. He was an ideal candidate for the job. Then a regular contributor to the *Architects’ Journal* and *AD*, as well as the author of various books on the architectural repercussions of ongoing economic and technological developments, Pawley was just hitting his stride in what would be a lifelong and prolific career in architectural criticism. Conceived as an “independent critical voice” on “the most significant lectures, seminars, symposia and staff/student work” at the AA, *Ghost Dance Times* was originally pitched as a sister serial to the *Events List*, which dutifully announced the arrival of the printed newcomer at the start of the autumn 1974 term. However, given the newspaper’s task—that is, to critically reflect the program shaped by the *Events List*—this familial bond was perhaps predestined to mature into a case of sibling rivalry.

Beyond the stated function of the paper, Pawley’s own mission can be distilled from his provocative title for the broadsheet. He explained its origins in the inaugural issue, published on 18 October 1974 [fig. 4.29]. Deriving its name from the Native American “ghost dance” ritual performed to invoke spiritual protection in times of war, Pawley extended the “idea of magic as an antidote to technology” into the domain of architectural practice and education.

---

The ateliers of the ghost dance are filled with empty studios and crowded bars where promising students consort with brilliant tutors in a mutual exorcism of the professional reality the first have not yet faced yet the second have never enjoyed. Haunted by fearful images of the alienation and irrelevance of their impending fate, the occupants of this twilight world occupy their short span of freedom in the evocation of myths and visions analogous in their way to the ghost dancers of antiquity.  

Though Pawley had previously invoked the ghost dance in other published contexts, the ambivalent disposition of the pedagogical “twilight world” that he conjured spoke directly to the palpable climate of uncertainty then pervading the AA, deemed by Pawley the “last of the independents.” Looming on the school’s horizon was the impending loss of its Local Education Authority student grants, following directly on its near closure after the unrealized merger with Imperial College—a turn of events that had dramatically culminated in Boyarsky’s instatement as chairman. (Notably, the chairman, too, had had recourse to myth, adopting the identity of the “rainmaker” to fend off the school’s modern tribulations.) It was thus the “ghost dance times” of the
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74 “Why Ghost Dance Times?” *Ghost Dance Times*, no. 1, 18 October 1974, front cover.
school’s new regime of pluralism—fertile ground for the pursuit of architectural “myths and visions,” and a sanctuary from the earthly demands of architecture—that the newspaper sought to chronicle.

As promised, the paper focused primarily on those events designated as “open” to the entire school community [fig. 4.30, 4.31]. These were the predominant subject of feature articles, as well as critical synopses published regularly in a “Ghost Dance Diary” section. Unspiring in its critiques of speakers’ arguments and performances (not to mention fashion sense), reports also candidly described audience responses, whether fulsome, outraged or simply bored. From a slapdash delivery by Richard Sennett to the mystical oration of Ivan Illych, from an exasperated crowd enduring a Stanford Anderson lecture on Behrens and Le Corbusier to Malcolm McEwen’s imperiously sweeping portrait of British architects’ lack of agency (concomitant with his equally supercilious defence of the RIBA), or even the repeated no-shows of John Berger ("Ways of Fleeing," the headline quipped): the newspaper’s trenchant accounts of school events were remorselessly tongue-in-cheek, oftentimes scathing, yet unfailingly eloquent.

After only a few issues, however, its cutting reviews began to garner equally harsh counter-criticisms from readers at the AA, in addition to the chilly reception of Ghost Dance Times staff at school lectures. Alongside messages from readers voicing solidarity, such recriminations were published regularly in the paper’s “Letters to the Editor.” More sated than perturbed by the outrages of his detractors, from the platform of his editorial column an unwavering Pawley declared the paper resolutely “unrepentant.” In support of the paper’s vituperations he asserted that Ghost Dance
Times “believes wholeheartedly in the value of such internal criticism and appraisal,” and even encouraged students to join the cause by contributing their own reviews of lectures. As he argued, “open lecturers who mount a public platform are entitled to public comment on their performance” within the school. Moreover, in light of the school’s unabated torrent of events—a surplus of programming which would itself come under fire in oblique digs exposing empty lecture halls, cancellations and speakers’ failed appearances—the stimulation provoked by the sting of invectives, Pawley argued, should be more desirable than the breeding of an “indiscriminate enthusiasm” within the school. Criticism, therefore, was more than a right exercised by Ghost Dance Times; it was a duty.

In this way the paper distinguished itself from its printed contemporaries at the school. Among those that predated Boyarsky’s rewiring of the AA’s media network, Architectural Association Quarterly (AAQ, 1968–1983), the history and theory journal edited by Dennis Sharp, was less concerned with the school’s day-to-day activities than it was with the discipline’s emerging intellectual concerns (reason enough for its eventual dissolution at Boyarsky’s command). Likewise, neither AA Notes, a staid bulletin on internal affairs, nor the AA Newsheet, which had been so instrumental in the school’s recalibration of its objectives and identity during the early 1970s, were graphically or conceptually equipped to handle the massive influx of activities ushered in during Boyarsky’s chairmanship. That the AA’s augmented program had triggered

76 “Cutting the Crap,” Ghost Dance Times, 18 November 1974, 3. In fact, Pawley cites a recent report published in The Guardian, which relayed how in 1962 students at Oxford began publishing reviews of university lectures in the magazine Isis, followed by a similar efforts by students at Manchester.
77 “Against Interpretation,” Ghost Dance Times, 14 March 1975, 3.
publishing alternatives has been made evident already in the introduction of the *Events List* in 1973. To this roster we can add two other publications: refurbished in 1973, the *AA Prospectus*, a display of the year’s academic projections and offerings (and therefore, an introduction to the “marketplace”), and its companion, the *AA Projects Review*, inaugurated in the following year.

Had *Ghost Dance Times* lived to see the *Projects Review* and *Prospectus* flourish, the two publications would surely have fallen prey to its eagle eye. However, having cast its gaze too far, with jabs spotlighting the chairman’s administrative and financial moves, the broadsheet would suffer the consequences. “Ghost Dance Axed” gasped the sensational headline of the paper’s penultimate issue, published on 20 June 1975. The blow was allegedly struck by the hand of Boyarsky who, it is cynically reported, cited financial cuts as the justification for the paper’s swift demise—though an unconvinced Pawley nimbly accused the chairman of conservatism. Adding insult to injury was the fact that the newspaper would be survived by its “moribund rival publication,” which it maligned with the unfortunate nickname the “*Events List Beobachter.*”78

In a satirical forecast, the soon-to-be-former editor envisioned what the future of the AA’s burgeoning media culture might look like in the year 2000. It is an uncanny portrait, which from our contemporary perspective certainly gives us pause to consider the current increasing investment of architecture schools in expanding (yet, essentially centralizing) their media production, whether in print, on the web, or even in the gallery. As the Ghost Dancer grimly prophesied:

---

All publishing activities within the AA will be in the hands of an enlarged Department of Information whose main business will be the uninterrupted dissemination of meaningful facts. Digests of lectures, summaries of important seminars, microfilmed copies of important drawings, transcripts of important conferences and meetings—all will be patiently assembled and printed daily in blue ink on blue recycled paper for the perusal of serious students and members of the Association. 79

With “no room for the occasional smirk in lectures, no licence to guffaw in the soup kitchen,” Pawley implied, the increased, even obsessive production of documents—compounded and complicated, we might add, by the video newsletters on TVAA—would be proportionate to a suppression of critical exchange. Rearticulating the political critique launched by Adorno and Horkheimer decades earlier, the eagle eye of Ghost Dance Times robustly took the AA’s surplus of media outlets—and with it the veritable “culture industry” it mobilized—as its rightful prey, and in particular, attempting to expose the weekly diary’s complicity in Boyarsky’s institutional command. 80 Its dazzling array of options regularly sedated a readership “lost in wonder at the relentless pageant of spectaculars recorded week-by-week for posterity (if not for those all too frequently disappointed by their non-occurrence).” 81
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81 “All the Way Down,” Ghost Dance Times, 2 May 1975, 3.
circulation of information was, Pawley charged, counterproductively rendering the school intellectually static, as media was fated to pure currency.

Throughout the run of *Ghost Dance Times* the *Events List* would sustain continuous blows from Pawley’s broadsheet, a friction that would not go unnoticed by readers. In a letter to the editor published in May 1975, a student, Jonathan Davis, broached rumours of Pawley’s ambition to takeover its “moribund rival publication,” the *Events List*. Facetiously inquiring what the next step might be in the newspaper’s plot of institutional media domination, Davis asked, “*AA Notes* or *AAQ* or perhaps even that of the Communications studio to make way for a new Ghost Dance Television channel?” With a resounding “Yes!” Pawley drolly confessed, “we do wish to incorporate the absurdly Panglossian *Events List* into our Spenglerian newspaper.” He was equally enthused by the inadvertent proposition to seize both *AA Notes* (“pompous and provincial by turns, always priggish, usually dull”) and *AAQ* (“Who would not wish to lay hands upon that venerable organ? To sweep out its laborious pseudo-scholarship, tedious reviews and vain solemnity?”). But retaliation was not limited to print-on-print violence. Pawley also welcomed a takeover of the Communications studio, “that rich, pulsating vulva of electronic treasure, that pregnant yet strangely barren womb of the seven lively arts.” Indeed, the Communications Unit’s diligent efforts to record, produce and televise school events had continually fallen under the Ghost Dancer’s scrutiny (“make FILMS for Christ’s sake,” he implored). “We crave control of its

---

wasted production potential,” Pawley professed in mock lament, “we weep over its lost opportunities, its wasted resources.”

And here we are reminded that it is, in fact, the subject of waste—that is, of garbage—and the re-use of resources that so enchanted the charmingly irascible Ghost Dance Times editor as a key to more efficient housing production. A return to Pawley’s alter ego as an architectural critic on “Housing at the AA,” rather than the ghost-dancing critic of the AA, opens another perspective on Pawley’s appreciation and manipulation of the school’s media outlets. At first glance, his televised declaration of the architectural value of waste demonstrates a perhaps puzzling change of sides when one considers the Ghost Dancer’s concurrent invectives against the “barren womb of the seven lively arts.” However, when introducing Pawley at the start of the program, Coral makes no mention of his guest’s editorial role at the school; and Pawley, to be sure, maintains the utmost decorum—even modesty—throughout the interview.

His editorial identity was to be further suppressed on the channel. Just two weeks after his printed declaration of his ambitions of media terrorism in the pages of the school newspaper, TVAA aired an episode of “Archi-Mags” devoted entirely to Ghost Dance Times. Pawley, however, was not present. In what was perhaps a savvy twist of media revenge, it was Crompton, head of the Communications Unit and executive producer of TVAA, who took on the role of discerning host. Another “well-laid table,” but now turned. Crompton, whom Pawley had all too recently denigrated as the “moribund management” of the Communications Unit, now commandeered the editor’s domain of the newspaper. It was a veritable media coup that could perhaps only
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83 “All the Way Down.”
84 Archi-Mags episode, hosted by Dennis Crompton, aired 15 May 1975, AAVA.
take place on television, and which in part fulfilled Pawley’s own apprehensions on the inevitability of the medium’s domination over radio, cinema, books, magazines and newspapers.

For the increasing cultural, economic and even architectural agency of television haunts much of Pawley’s writing from the early 1970s—from his troubled acknowledgment of Richard Seifert’s all-too-perfected television persona, to his claims in *The Private Future* (1973) that the dissolution of the very concept of “community” was proportionate to the proliferation of private spheres shaped by commodities and mass media. And beyond its analysis of industrial production methods, his book *Garbage Housing* (1975) repeatedly invokes television [fig. 4.32]. The medium is charged with both the spectacularization of the “disasters that befall other people” (a phenomenon that Pawley termed “environmental terrorism”), and the projection of a distorted “image of housing” as an envelope for consumer products, thus skewing its functional and economic value—an effect of most serious consequence, Pawley argued, in the context of Third World communities in the midst of developing national housing schemes.

Resigned to the inexorable force of television programming and advertisements, however, Pawley suggested that retaliation was a matter of harnessing “media direction.” “Simply to forge a causal link between a transformational TV commercial,” he proposed, “and any TV news item about homelessness or the housing problem
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86 Pawley, *Garbage Housing*, 98, 47.
should be sufficient to launch the process of convergence.\textsuperscript{87} To assiduously infiltrate, manipulate and imperceptibly rupture television’s sequential structure via the insertion of meaningful noise: it is in this way that we find that the school’s most vocal critic has penetrated the media space of TVAA via his lesson for “Housing at the AA,” as the ghost of print is made flesh on the screen in a curious stroke of television magic.

\textbf{P.S.}

During the 1970s, the expanding ambit of the AA’s cultural production of architecture paralleled the breadth of activities undertaken by the IID, and indeed those of its institutional source of inspiration, Eisenman’s IAUS in New York. Yet Boyarsky’s investment in this cultural production also attests, on the one hand, to the persistence of his earlier intellectual commitment to a “humanist tradition,” which he saw penetrate the multifaceted œuvres of Alberti, Sitte, and Le Corbusier—figures who were not just architects, but also artists, writers, and philosophers. While on the other hand, it also recalls the scintillating world of modern artistic experiment into which Giedion’s and Moholy-Nagy’s plays on text and image had transported him. In these ways Boyarsky’s expansion of the AA’s media outlets during his chairmanship was a critically restorative gesture that broke a code of silence seemingly reified in the blank façades of late modern architecture. To be clear, however: what he propagated was neither the semiotic play nor the historicist language to which postmodernists turned during the 1970s as a means to recuperate architecture’s communicative capacity. These were, for Boyarsky, nothing more than passing fashions and shallow solutions, and not

\textsuperscript{87} Pawley, \textit{Garbage Housing}, 105.
the business of schools of architecture. Conversely, the problem of architectural education, he contended, was not a matter of style, populist appeal, much less the acquisition of professional skills. “The problem is to actually produce witty people who’ve got lots of conversations echoing in their ears when they leave” school, he declared.88

And what of their eyes? Once laid to rest in the horizontal plane of the book, but then summoned to the “dictatorial perpendicular” of newspapers, films and advertisements: Walter Benjamin’s ruminations on the movement of print evoke the bodily demands of the visual consumption of media.89 Following Benjamin’s line of inquiry, as well as Pawley’s provocation, it is through the very posture of the (literal and figurative) student body at the AA that we can read the stakes of its mediatized institutional infrastructure. From the surface of the table to the surface of the page to the illuminated surface of the screen, at the AA multiple horizons seemed to be projected in multiple dimensions. Refusing the student a clearly defined educational path, at the same time media constructed resolute, though imperceptible, pedagogical limits.

Outside of the school, however, its institutional image was subject to a different form of control, as evident in the printed organization of the Projects Review. Nevertheless, the serialization of the Projects Review embodied a certain anxiety concerning the posterity and legacy of the AA. For its institutional history was rewritten each year in the form of the Projects Review, a testament to its historicity.

88 Alvin Boyarsky, interview by Bill Mount, 1980, unpublished Boyarsky monograph, ABA.
It is at this point significant to reiterate that Boyarsky himself did not operate within the competitive “market place” of the unit system as a tutor; the odd lecture on Chicago was the extent of the chairman’s teaching duties at the AA. As expressed earlier, the tremendous demands of running the school had left him little to no time to pursue other projects, including his (abandoned) book project on contemporary urbanism. This pedagogical and scholarly withdrawal, nevertheless, gave way to a different form of production and, concomitantly, reproduction. For printed on each introductory page of each Projects Review we find Boyarsky’s signature, a final flourish on a dense architectural message whose destinations are infinite [fig. 4.33]. An unambiguous territorial claim, this gestural trace asserts that the excesses and volatility of the AA “market place” and the cultural vibrancy of its “well-laid table” were incited, contained and ordered by a sure and singular hand.
EPILOGUE

Postmodernism is not something we can settle once and for all and then use with a clear conscience. The concept, if there is one, has to come at the end, and not at the beginning, of our discussions of it.¹

- Fredric Jameson

BEYOND THE “WELL-LAIRED TABLE” AND THE “MARKETPLACE”

This dissertation has traced the overlapping conceptual terrain of the “well-laid table” and the “marketplace” in Boyarsky’s pedagogical theories and work. Its intention, however, has not been to portray these models of architectural education as wholly interchangeable; nor has it suggested a teleological progression, in which one culminates in the other. Rather, by mapping out a series of intertwined pedagogical experiments I have argued that the “well-laid table” and the “marketplace” constitute a dialectic that marks the major axis of Boyarsky’s efforts to reform architectural education. While the former conjures an aesthetic of conviviality, the latter appropriates the logic of capitalism; while one upholds cultural complexity, the other promotes competition. Yet a shared objective underpins both strategies: to deviate from a pedagogical tradition rooted in the utopian aspirations of the modern movement, but sterilized by its entrenchment within the technocracy of professional practice.

Recalibrated by Boyarsky, the juncture of architecture and pedagogy is reconceptualized as a system of integrated operations: consumption, production, and reproduction. As Boyarsky’s theoretical parameters for testing this juncture, the “well-laid table” and the “marketplace” have therefore provided a platform not only for investigating an episode of remarkable transformation and innovation in architectural education, but also for advancing discussion of the relationship between architecture and postmodernism.

This study has addressed the complexity of this relationship by emphasizing the agency of education within its bounds, and it is under such conditions that, I argue, one can speak of a postmodern system of architectural education. From a barrage of postcards that sought to overturn modernist narratives of the city to the international spectacle of the IID Summer Sessions, from the circulation of architectural ideologies within the unit system to the circulation of information within the AA: this dissertation has demonstrated how pedagogy confronted, manipulated and indeed even sublimated architecture’s engagement in late capitalism, globalization, media practices, and importantly, its own history. But to be more precise, it has not invoked Boyarsky’s dual recourse to the “well-laid table” and the “marketplace” as evidence of a “clean break” with architectural modernism. Rather, as the conceptual forces in Boyarsky’s development of an alternative system of architectural education that critically reengaged with architecture’s past as much as it did with its contemporary exigencies, these models have revealed symptoms of a disciplinary neurosis, what Reinhold Martin suggests is “the ultimate postmodern impasse, in which the relation between cultural
Turning its attention to the second and final decade of Boyarsky’s AA chairmanship, the dissertation’s concluding remarks explore the institutional repercussions of this impasse at the AA and the resulting disciplinary questions that the school’s activities provoked. The discussion that follows, however, does not offer a detailed historical account of the AA during the 1980s in the manner of preceding chapters. Certainly, the decade was an era of astonishing refinement and growth in the school’s programming and production. Publishing activity further flourished with the arrival of AA Files (1981- ), a handsome new in-house journal that emerged alongside numerous other book series. Among these were Themes, micro-histories of individual units, and the lavish Folios, which packaged drawings in twelve-by-twelve-inch boxes; both of these were realized as extensions of corresponding exhibitions [fig. 5.1, 5.2]. Indeed, the school’s rigorous program of exhibitions program became a central and remarkable component of its institutional activity during the 1980s. The work of AA
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3 *AA Files* replaced *Architectural Association Quarterly* (1969-1982) as the AA’s official journal; its first editor was Mary Wall (née Crettier), who appeared in Chapter 4 as part of the Information Centre staff. During Boyarsky’s chairmanship, the AA published six volumes in the Themes series (1982-1989), which focused on the units taught by Dalibor Vesely and Mohsen Mostafavi; Peter Cook, Christine Hawley, and Ron Herron; Bernard Tschumi and Nigel Coates; Mike Gold; Peter Wilson; as well as Technical Studies under the tutelage of Peter Salter. Architects featured in the Folio series (1983-1991) and corresponding exhibitions included: Zaha Hadid, Daniel Libeskind, Peter Wilson, Franco Purini, Peter Cook, Peter Eisenman, James Wines, Günther Domenig, Andrew Holmes, the artist Eduardo Paolozzi, Bernard Tschumi, Shin Takamatsu, Coop Himmelblau, and Kiko Mozuna. For an overview of the AA’s publishing and exhibitions during the 1980s see Andrew Higgott, *Mediating Modernism: Architectural Cultures in Britain* (London: Routledge, 2007), 177-84; and Igor Marjanović, “Lines and Words on Display: Alvin Boyarsky as a Collector, Curator and Publisher,” *Architectural Research Quarterly* 14, no. 2 (June 2010): 165-74.
tutors and contemporary architects and artists—such as Peter Eisenman, John Hejduk, Future Systems, Coop Himmelblau, Lebbeus Woods, Mary Miss, Eduardo Paolozzi, Mario Botta, Daniel Weil, Daniel Libeskind—regularly graced the walls of 36 Bedford Square (and sometimes the square itself) [figs. 5.3, 5.4]. So too did materials from a breathtaking range of historical and thematic shows, which testify to Boyarsky’s and the AA’s commitment to architectural research. During the late 1970s and 1980s the subjects of these exhibitions spanned from Czech Functionalism to the oeuvre of the Greek modernist Dimitris Pikionis, from the art and architecture of Libya to social housing in the Weimar Republic, from the paintings of Alvar Aalto to the drawings of J.J.P. Oud to the illustrations of Joseph Gandy [figs. 5.5-5.8]. Alongside exhibitions, a comprehensive public lecture program also flourished at the school [figs. 5.9]. And not to be overlooked are the architectural explorations that were launched by a new crop of unit tutors, among them Nigel Coates, Jan Kaplicky, Mohsen Mostafavi, Will Alsop, Wiel Arets, Zaha Hadid, Peter Salter, and Peter Wilson (some of whom will be summoned again momentarily) [Appendix D]. The extraordinary scope and vibrancy of institutional life at the AA during the second decade of Boyarsky’s chairmanship unquestionably warrants a more detailed, supplementary study. Alternatively, the remainder of this discussion addresses the legacy of the “well-laid table” and the “marketplace,” both within and outside of the AA, by considering the critical reception of the dramatic institutional changes that Boyarsky introduced there during the 1970s—self-reflections articulated from the perspective of the 1980s, and which introduce a sequence of other metaphors beyond the “well-laid table” and the “marketplace.”
“What’s next?” If during the 1970s the question had stimulated productivity at the AA, by the beginning of the 1980s the school began to pause to review its recent past. One of the earliest attempts to take stock of its institutional transformation under Boyarsky’s leadership was a first-hand account by Robin Evans, a unit tutor and himself an AA graduate of 1969. Published first in the 1981/1982 AA Prospectus, and soon thereafter in the inaugural issue of AA Files, his essay traces the evolution of student design work between 1975 and 1980.

Evans discerned two tendencies that had emerged within the unit system during the mid-1970s, which each offered a divergent response to the ideological and formal equilibrium perceived at the core of late modernism. According to his categorization, matters of housing, urban development, community action, and the energy crisis preoccupied one group of units, whose tutors included Foley, advocate of “rational technology,” and ARC founder Brian Anson. Despite their differences, these units “demanded social relevance in architecture,” a common stance that yielded a shared, “distinctly anti-formal” methodology. Accordingly, newspaper clippings, letters, compilations of data, and endless reports typically flooded student portfolios from these units, often to the befuddlement of examiners and jurors expecting to assess drawings.

In contrast, Evans observed, a different faction of units demonstrated “a revival of interest in architecture as such, indeed a positive yearning for it.” In the case of Krier’s pre-industrial typologies and the resuscitation of Suprematist and Constructivist principles by Koolhaas and Zenghelis, for example, this “revival,” on the one hand
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encompassed a critical return to suppressed historical moments. But here “revival” also intimated a renewed investment in *architectural form*, whether via “poetic intuition” or more “rationalist” strategies. Regardless of their modes of engagement or purported disengagement from the modern movement, this second category of units collectively upheld the conviction that “architecture is above all a medium of expression,” as students’ prolific output of drawings visually declared.⁵

Tracking the unit system’s pedagogical trajectory into the late 1970s, Evans asserted that this “mother theme of ARCHITECTURE” persisted within the refined teachings agendas of those units still flourishing by the decade’s end: those taught by, for example, Vesely and his former student Mostafavi; Tschumi and his former student Coates; Koolhaas, Zenghelis and their former student Hadid; Greene and Alsop; as well as new units, especially the unit taught by Mike Gold. In contrast, by the close of the 1970s the units “pledged to social relevance” had disappeared. This was, Evans estimated, in part a consequence of the harsh reality of the unit system, in which a tutor’s job security was directly proportionate to the amount of students that a unit attracted. But perhaps more tellingly, their extinction proclaimed “the end of a period when a particular frame of mind prevailed that was suspicious of architecture and hostile to form.”⁶ To characterize these winds of change at the AA, Evans reported: “ultimately those who wanted to use architecture like an axe left the stage for those who wanted to play it like a violin.”⁷

Here we interrupt Evans on the cusp of a cunning mixed metaphor in order to
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⁵ Evans, “Axes to Violins,” 116.
⁶ Ibid. Emphasis in original.
⁷ Ibid.
parse its formulation of a distinct chapter in the history of architectural pedagogy at the AA and, furthermore, in the history of architecture. Critically distanced from the technocratic mutations of the modern movement, architecture performs as a versatile prop on the stage that Evans imagines: in one scene a revolutionary weapon, and in the next, an instrument of formal innovation. We have seen Boyarsky grapple with architecture’s fluid transition between these two modes throughout this dissertation. The irreconcilable dualism of “axes” and “violins” echoes the concerns underlying Boyarsky’s investigations of the modern city, as evident in his excavation of the layers of Chicago’s history through his postcarded lectures, as well as in his Cornell thesis on Sitte. The performance of “axes” and “violins” at the AA also reprises the emergence of the IID Summer Sessions’ “well-laid table.” Formulated in the aftermath of the student uprisings and social unrest of the late 1960s, its pursuit of an international culture of architecture promised a more genteel radicalization of architectural education that would ultimately find more permanent institutional footing in the AA, and in particular within its unit system and its plethora of media resources.

But beyond its evaluation of the institutional state of affairs as the AA entered the 1980s, the dramatic vignette that Evans provides allegorizes (even if somewhat unwittingly) a contemporary discourse on the fate of architecture after modernism and the possibilities of its postmodern trajectories. The triumph of “violins” at the AA heralds not only the ascendency of formalism, as Evans implies, and with it its attendant resuscitation of historical episodes (Expressionism, Constructivism, Surrealism, Suprematism, in the case of Vesely and Koolhaas), but also, he suggests, architecture’s proportionate disengagement from the social and political conditions of its present.
Evans leaves the nature of this inverse relationship largely untheorized, his laconicism due primarily to his vested interest in the resulting effects on the production of architectural drawing at the AA (an important point to which we will return). Elsewhere, outside of the AA, we find others compelled to address the critical repercussions of architectural formalism. The matter, indeed, is one of utmost urgency for Manfredo Tafuri, who approached the issue through the lens of a contemporary scene that rivaled that of the AA: the American architectural elite of the 1970s. The target of Tafuri’s critique is both the work of the so-called “Grays,” moored to an “ideology of self-reflection” through recourse to semiotics and symbolism, and that of the “Whites,” enchanted by the purist language of the historical modernist avant-gardes. A source of lament for the Italian historian, the ineluctable message of such willful withdrawals into formal systems and nostalgia was that “there is no hope for architecture to influence structures or relations of production.”

If Tafuri was deeply troubled by the refusal of both the “Grays” and “Whites” to
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act upon architecture’s complicity in capitalist development, then one can surmise that Boyarsky’s institutional reinvention of the AA might have left the Italian historian with an equally heavy (if not heavier) heart. For in contradistinction to Tafuri’s diagnosis of the “Gray/White” debate, at the AA we find architecture in a paradoxical dance with capitalism. As an institution the AA unambiguously appropriated late capitalism’s structures and relations of production as a model for architectural education. It did so at both a rational and an aesthetic level. The reform of architectural education constituted a type of aestheticization of capitalist structures and relations. Stripped of (or rather, masking) its political import, in the unit system the “marketplace” is taken at face value as the inexhaustible engine for the cultural production of architecture, a productivity that is compounded through the production of media. Page after page, unit after unit, event after event, and drawing after drawing: Boyarsky’s institutionalization of an endless loop of transactions established within the AA an atemporal, mediated juncture of architectural pedagogy and the “cultural logic of late capitalism.” And while this could easily be interpreted as another mode of withdrawal, one by the name of *laissez-faire*, alternatively, a less reductive reading would instead recognize a model that amplifies critical engagement, prompting the interrogation of architecture aggressively from every historical, aesthetic, political and social angle, through the lens of multiple media, and never letting it out of the school’s sight, reach, or earshot.

**TYPEWRITERS AND DRAWINGS**

Whether framed between the “well-laid table” and the “marketplace,” or between “axes” and “violins,” at the AA pedagogy impelled architecture to pivot at “the
crux of postmodernism,” where it operated “simultaneously along an axis of representation and an axis of production.” In his assessment of the school’s activities during the late 1970s the phenomenon that truly captures Evans’s attention is the increased output and improved quality of architectural drawing—ranging from a return to figurative drawing (Gold’s Diploma unit[^11]) to atmospheric and dream-like urban visions (Vesely and Mostafavi’s Diploma unit[^12]) [figs. 5.10, 5.11]. This renewed enthusiasm for architectural representation (not witnessed since the Beaux-Arts[^13]) was,

[^11]: “People in Architecture” project, “which sets elementary architectural exercises within the context of a study in the relationship of figurative imagery to architectural thought. The programme locates the human figure at the beginning and, literally, physically and visually, at the focus of a progressively scaled series of exercises in coloured illustration and black and white technical drawing. First symbols and object, then furniture, architectural elements, spaces, apartments, and finally a whole building and city context are projected outwards from the figure, conjured up in consecutive stages, each stage evolved from and incorporating its predecessor.” Michael Gold, “Introduction,” *People in Architecture* (London: Architectural Association, 1983), Themes IV, unpaginated.
[^12]: Boyarsky commented on the work of Diploma Unit 1 in 1982, distinguishing its “small-scaled, spatially oriented, contextual solutions from the “Colin Rowe ‘Schule’ at Cornell University,” the “didactic typological solutions which Leo Krier has so seductively promulgated,” and from the “agit-prop tactics of Maurice Culot and his atelier in Brussels and Paris.” As the chairman explained, instead: “Attention is paid to the particulars of the site. The activities and services required of a neighbourhood are reprogrammed in terms of a practical, if unusual, list of urban facilities. There is for example, a music school, an hotel, a club for scientists, a specialized museum, a monastery, a home for the mentally disturbed, a cemetery, a place to be married in, a formal garden, etc which take their place alongside the Department Store, street markets, municipal administrative offices crèche, shops, flats, schools, playgrounds and other everyday facilities. Each student[s’] piece is developed alongside those designing facilities on adjacent sites. The gradual ironing out of an emerging unity while respecting the integrity of each institution and each design is a feature of the process as is the grand finale involving red-eyed staff, students and graduates when the design of the central garden or forum which hold the scheme together is produced.” Alvin Boyarsky, “Foreword,” in *Architecture and Continuity* (London: Architectural Association, 1982), Themes I, 3.
[^13]: As Arthur Drexler had argued in his 1975 Beaux-Arts exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art in New York—to which Robin Middleton had responded in 1977 with an
Evans conceded, the genesis of anxiety as much as it was promise. If for Tafuri the New York Five’s exit strategy from modernism was but an interminable path into a solipsistic world of drawings, the “ideal patron” of such architectural constructions “is the collector.” Preempting similar charges from his own local audience, Evans sidestepped such debate on architecture’s autonomy, as well as on the collusion between its commodification and its political immunity. “If there is a danger of drawing being venerated for its own sake—of its failing to refer to anything beyond the illusions of its surface, then,” he countered, “there is also a strong possibility of forging a new role for it that would allow the perception of the designer to flow in different channels.”

Rather than plunge architecture “into the bottomless well of the autonomy of form,” for Evans drawing propelled it into an expansive conceptual territory. His review of the history of the unit system is the glimmer of an intellectual project on the “peculiar powers” of architectural drawing “in relation to its putative subject the building,” and its “distinctness from and unlikeness to the thing that is represented, rather than its likeness to it.” Honed in his seminal essay “Translations from Drawing to Building” (1986) and further developed in The Projective Cast (published posthumously), Evans’ theoretical position was hardly a defense of the formalism that


14 Tafuri, Sphere and the Labyrinth, 296.
15 Evans, “Axes to Violins,” 119.
16 Tafuri, 294.
so troubled Tafuri; on the contrary, it supplied a counterargument, identifying the architectural drawing as an “unfailing communicant” that debunked the “solitude of pretended autonomy.”

The culture of drawing at the AA that stimulated this line of inquiry in the early 1980s was not limited to the unit system; it also steadily infiltrated the AA’s aforementioned exhibitions program. During the 1980s its continuous display of drawings by contemporary architects regularly provoked Evans to take to his pen. Drawing, now, had gained new currency at the AA during the second decade of Boyarsky’s chairmanship—so much so that, for the chairman, drawing became inextricable from the very identity of the institution. In an interview conducted in 1983 (part of the Architectural Review’s feature article on the AA), Boyarsky established the centrality of drawing at the school in what amounts to a veritable institutional mission statement.

If you have a curriculum then you are absolved of any other responsibility. It is as if you can wage the battle of architectural education with a typewriter, and having the best curriculum makes you the best school. We’re into something

18 “Fastidiousness about the purity of vision arises from a fear that all distinction will be lost as one category forces itself into another. We protect it because we think it in danger of being overwhelmed by a more powerful agency. With our minds fixed on the predominance of language we might even risk enclosing architecture within its own compound, denying it communication with anything else to preserve its integrity. This would be possible, yet it seems very unlikely to occur because, for architecture, even in the solitude of pretended autonomy, there is one unfailing communicant, and that is the drawing.” Evans, “Translations from Drawing to Building” (1997), 155.

19 See also Robin Evans’ AA exhibition reviews: “In Front of Lines that Leave Nothing Behind, Chamber Works,” AA Files, no. 6 (May 1984): 89-96; and “Not to Be Used for Wrapping Purposes, Peter Eisenman: Fin d’Ou T Hou S,” AA Files, no. 10 (Autumn 1985): 68-78.
quite different. We create a very rich compost for students to develop and grow from and we fight the battle with the drawings on the wall. We’re in pursuit of architecture, we discuss it boldly, we draw it as well as we can and we exhibit it. We are one of the few institutions left in the world that keeps its spirit alive.20

Typewriters and drawings as weapons in “the battle of architectural education”: so expands the vocabulary of Boyarsky’s (self-professed) predilection for punchy slogans—of no shortage in his media campaign for the IID Summer Sessions or over the course of his AA chairmanship. And yet, this bundle of catchphrases here leaves behind a provocative proposition on the relationship between architectural representation and education, to which we need attend.

The “battle of architectural education”: a battle over what, precisely? In the chairman’s remarks we might detect a whiff of late-1960s-revolutionary rhetoric, but this is, I believe, a somewhat unproductive tack to take, especially when one considers the previous concerted efforts to periodize the 1960s. More germane is the militaristic origin of the term avant-garde that this “battle” recalls—an association that nevertheless runs the risk of all too neatly packaging the AA as the cradle for a “neo” or “late” avant-garde. The assignation of the AA to one category or the other does not concern us; besides, neither are wholly appropriate.21 For if the historical avant-gardes

of the early twentieth century sought to disrupt the preservation of art’s autonomy from the vicissitudes of bourgeois capitalism, the AA’s manipulation of the logic of late capitalism seeks something else. The “battle” that architectural education “fights” is for the disciplinary preservation of architecture; it is a “pursuit of architecture” that exceeds beyond the “autonomy of form” and instead, more ambitiously, seeks to establish a culture of architecture\textsuperscript{22}—that is, once again, cultivated from an arable terrain of polemic, but now crystallized in drawing. As the genesis of discourse, production, and events, and (following Evans) as a conceptual playing field, drawings fuel this “pursuit” that is, according to Boyarsky, the onus of architectural education. Like trophies, they are valiantly hung on the walls of the AA to document an unending succession of victories in a “battle” that typewriters can only bring to a standstill by exercising what Boyarsky had once deemed the “tyranny of the curriculum” [fig. 5.12].

But another question remains. If during the 1970s bureaucracy, politics, social injustice, and the energy crisis had inspired tutors to take to the “axe,” what had encouraged others to turn to drawing during the 1980s? Although the latter half of Boyar sky’s tenure at the AA unfolded within the historical frame of the neo-liberal parameters of Thatcherism, the constituency of disparate agendas at the school suggests that the immediate context of Britain’s political and cultural climate during the 1980s—with its environmental issues, government funding cuts on housing and education,\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{23} In the realm of education the AA had in fact felt the burn, as then Minister of Education Margaret Thatcher was keen to take grants from the school—a dilemma that as many have alluded, was reflected in Boyarsky’s efforts to gain international studentship.
continued terrorist attacks by the IRA, the Falklands War, urban redevelopment, and the
soaring unemployment rate—was approached in less confrontational and more
introspective ways, turning to new modes of representation, theory and also,
importantly, to the question of history.

The chairman’s remarks quoted above appeared as part of the AR’s 1983 feature
article on the AA, which, as the introduction of this dissertation noted, was prompted by
Tschumi’s and Hadid’s success in the La Villette and Hong Kong Peak competitions,
respectively. A significant number of pages of the feature were devoted to outlining the
school’s modernist past and the present concerns of the unit system. This entailed a
historical survey by tutor Peter Cook, who constructed a chronology of episodes, with
titles such as “Post-War Grand Designs,” “Back to Expressionism,” “Mobile
Architecture,” “Whimsy and Conceptualism,” and “Counter Culture.” To supplement
this survey, the magazine highlighted a cross-section of current units, tracing the
evolution of each unit’s architectural position and pedagogy over the prior decade; these
included those taught by: Zenghelis, Koolhaas and Hadid (Diploma Units 9); Tschumi
and Coates (Diploma Unit 2); Vesely and Mostafavi (Diploma Unit 1); Gold (Diploma
Unit 5); and Krier, Rodrigo Perez de Arce, and Renée Davids (Diploma Unit 4).

Echoing the observations that Evans had made two years earlier, AR duly noted
the demise of those units “engaged in various forms of political analysis and action, in
energy studies and urban conservation.” Looming statically in the shadow of drawing,
these units were excluded from the magazine’s portrayal of the history of the school’s
design pedagogy because their “message is now familiar and understood— even if not
much acted upon.” But other architectural omissions in *AR*’s account disclosed how much the AA’s identity and perceived objectives had evolved by the early 1980s. Those units exhibiting sympathy for “High-Tech, or a Late-Modern re-run of purist Modernism or anything that vaguely resembles Post-Modernism are excluded,” the magazine explained.

Significantly Post-Modernism and Neo-Rationalism, the two dominant *avant garde* positions in most other schools, have now virtually no constituency at the AA. Though Charles Jencks has taught there continuously for nearly 20 years, Post-Modernism has been rejected as too easy and shallow. And though Leon Krier ran a strong Neo-Rat unit, his successors, Rodrigo Perez de Arce and René Davids, have compromised Rationalist clarity and attempted to come to terms with twentieth-century complexities.

Here we encounter Post-Modern Architecture as a retreat into pastiche and historicism, personified here by Jencks and Krier, though we are assured of the deficiency and vulnerability of Post-Modernism, and its affiliate Neo-Rationalism, under the jurisdiction of the AA “marketplace” system. Corroborating such claims, Boyarsky, as well as other tutors, repeatedly and proudly maintained that the AA, despite the active pedagogical presence of these two figures, had never succumbed to “the pastiche of post

---

modernism."\(^{26}\) And though during the 1950s the school had engaged with modernism of the 1920s and 1930s, it did so seeking ways to tackle contemporary design problems in an “elegant manner,” according to Boyarsky; likewise, the school now sought a similar approach, rather than resort to the “dead hand of historicism.”\(^{27}\) This form of resistance to Post-Modernism, and more pointedly its classical revivalism and re-appropriation of pre-industrial typologies, was therefore understood by the chairman and many AA tutors as intrinsic to the institutional identity of the school, and therefore a quality that distinguished it from other institutions. “So once again the AA sits poised upon a new territory,” Peter Cook declared in 1983, predicting that “the new ‘Twentieth Century’ architecture (part mechanistic, part choreographic, part ‘50s, part Suprematist, part Memphis, part megastructural-second-coming) is \textit{the Conversation}\(^{28}\) [fig. 5.13]. In the “battle of architectural education,” then, the AA approached Post-Modernism as an adversary to be conquered, with architectural history and drawing as the school’s weapons of choice.\(^{29}\)

\(^{26}\) Alvin Boyarsky, transcript of interview by Rodrigo Perez De Arce, 5 August 1986, unpublished Boyarsky monograph ABA.

\(^{27}\) Boyarsky, Perez De Arce interview.

\(^{28}\) “Post-Modernism never really took off in the AA—despite the regular courses by Charles Jencks. Maybe AA students regard it as too easy. In an odd way, plebian. The chosen manner for all follow-my leader schools. It has reached the High Street. So characteristically, arrogantly, the AA will drop it like a hot potato.” Peter Cook, “Cook’s Grand Tour: Highlights of Recent History,” \textit{Architectural Review} (October 1983): 43.

\(^{29}\) Prompted by Perez De Arce, Boyarsky commented: “I think the threat to architecture is that people like Leo [Krier] and Dimitri Porphyrios, to pick two from the English scene, remain a threat to architecture because they’re involved in creating a kind of architecture which requires a social system to make it manifest which I don’t subscribe to. I wouldn’t like to make it manifest. And they also negate really the vitality of life, the facts of history as they develop over the decades and centuries and, in a way, they are playing silly games and they are not a threat but, my God, they do have an influence because they’ve captured that Greek gentleman’s magazine down the road and they are
THE THOROUGHBREDS AND THE SECOND GENERATION

By the early 1980s, many of the “thoroughbreds” of the AA, as Boyarsky referred to the tutors who first tested the unit system during the 1970s, had departed. The AA was experiencing the “second generation phenomenon” as former students—Coates, Alsop, Salter, Mostafavi, Wilson, Hadid—were challenged to take over where their tutors had left off. “It’s an interesting problem,” Boyarsky mused in his AR interview.

What does one do? You can shoot the horses when they reach a certain age and bring in new thoroughbreds from Brazil or China or Russia or Italy or wherever. You can play it that way if you’re into having a fantastic stable of prime horseflesh. Perhaps we’re too inward-looking, but we’re also interested in evolving the ideas that we’ve spent so much time on over the years. Ideas take time to develop. Someone has to initiate them but then they are taken up and developed by others.30

Never one for subtlety, Boyarsky here paints a jarring picture. Tutors are akin to exquisite animals imported from abroad; they can be terminated once they are no longer able to perform and replaced by youthful, exotic flesh—nourishment for both the “well-laid table” and the “marketplace.” But as Boyarsky’s reflections upon the matter reveal,

the AA opts not for slaughter, but intellectual breeding.

In 1986, three years after making these comments, Boyarsky was asked by Rodrigo Perez De Arce—a second generation tutor who steered the unit of Krier, his former teacher, away from typology and Neo-Rationalism to a more twentieth century sensibility—if “the in-breeding” at the AA had “inhibited the formulation of very strong distinct positions” amongst its teaching staff. Circumventing the question slightly, the chairman observed that without question at the AA a unique “institutional sociology” had developed as the result of a “system of pedagogy” that was invented during the early 1970s, and by the latter part of the decade had reached a “high point when a lot of incredible energy was released” by tutors, who then went on to build individual careers outside of the school. “God knows what the situation will be like in three or four years from now,” he commented, since “the second generation of these young people is getting slightly involved in practice.” Indeed, for Boyarsky, the more pressing question was a familiar one: “what happens next?”

Just a few years later, the question was answered in part for three of his thoroughbreds—Koolhaas, Libeskind and Tschumi—and one of his second generation prizewinners, Hadid, in the form of an invitation to participate in the Museum of Modern Art exhibition on Deconstructivist Architecture [fig. 5.14]. In addition to these four, the exhibition, which took place in the summer of 1988, also featured work by Eisenman and Coop Himmelblau, whose projects were the subject of monographic

---

31 Boyarsky, Perez De Arce interview.
32 Ibid.
exhibitions at the AA: the former in 1985 and 1986, and the latter at the end of 1988.\textsuperscript{33} An exit strategy from postmodernist pastiche, \textit{Deconstructivist Architecture} was at the same time an attempt to affirm a counter revival of historical avant-gardes—which from an outside perspective had become seemingly inextricable from the AA. As curator Philip Johnson remarked in his introduction to the exhibition catalogue: “Special acknowledgment must go to Alvin Boyarsky and the Architectural Association of London, who acted as the key patron of most of the [exhibited] seven architects in their formative years. The A.A. has been the fertile soil from which many a new idea in architecture has sprouted.”\textsuperscript{34}

Indeed, the AA’s persistent concern with newness was announced in the form of a question that had become a veritable school motto, as suggested by Evans’ own assessment of the unit system in 1981. Observing, even then, that “teaching units, however insular, are becoming more and more alike, and that the subject matter for excitement is harder to find,” Evans—ventriloquizing the school chairman—suggested that this conundrum, “brings us appropriately enough to the familiar question, ‘What happens next?’”\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Deconstructivist Architecture}’s seventh architect, Frank Gehry, was included in the AA exhibition \textit{Los Angeles Now}, which took place at Bedford Square in 1983. In 1980 Eisenman also coordinated an exhibition at the AA on the Italian modernist architect Giuseppe Terragni.


With each utterance, then, in this interrogative loop, the question exposes both an anxiety and intense curiosity concerning the conditions of architecture’s historicity [fig. 5.15]. It therefore seems more than apt, and perhaps even imperative, to pose this same question to architectural education today at a moment when violins are asked to harmonize with sustainability, a global economy, and new political and social pressures; when drawings have slipped off of walls and dissolved into digital information; and when so many of Boyarsky’s “thoroughbreds” and “second generation” tutors from the AA now control the cultural pace of the discipline, both as practitioners and as heads of schools, and who now decide: slaughter or breed?36 Or, to pose the question more humanely: what happens next?

36 To name but a few examples: Bernard Tschumi taught at the AA from 1970 to 1980, and was Dean of the Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture, Preservation and Planning from 1988 to 2003. Tschumi’s student Nigel Coates, who completed his architectural studies in 1974, taught at the AA from 1978 to 1989; he was head of architecture at the Royal College of Art in London from 1995 to 2011. Daniel Libeskind taught at the AA between 1975 and 1977. From 1978 to 1985 he was the director of the Cranbrook Academy School of Architecture. Mohsen Mostafavi studied at the AA from 1972 to 1976, and taught there from 1979 to 1986. He later served as chairman of the AA from 1995 to 2004. He subsequently held the deanship at the Cornell University College of Architecture, Art and Planning, and since 2007 is dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Design. Peter Cook taught at the AA from 1961 to 1990. He was Chair of Architecture at the Bartlett School of Architecture at University College London from 1990 to 2006. Wiel Arets taught at the AA from 1988 to 1992. From 1995 to 2002 he was dean of the Berlage Institute, and in 2013 was appointed dean of the Illinois Institute of Technology College of Architecture.
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Figure 0.1  Alvin Boyarsky in the Office of the Chairman, Architectural Association, London, 1983 (photograph by Barry Lewis)

Figure 0.2  Exterior, Architectural Association, London; satirical performance by AA students in front of 36 Bedford Square, 1961 (photograph by Paul Simpson) (AAA)
Figure 0.3  C.O. Tremeer, “Entrance to a City Road Tunnel, Perspective,” AA Year 4, Term 2, Monument Studies, March 1934
Figure 0.4  A.K. Scott, “Land Settlement,” AA Unit 5 project, 1939
Figure 0.5  Elizabeth Chesterton, Peter Cocke, Ralph Crowe, David Duncan, Anthony Pott, Peter Thornton, John Wheeler, Arnulf Brandt, Richard Llewelyn Davies, David Gladstone, John Henderson, Peter Saxl, and Lamond Sturrock, “Tomorrow Town,” AA Unit 14 pre-thesis project, 1938
Figure 0.6  John Dalton, Anthony Eardley, Robert Knott, Ian Frazer, “High density housing in Paddington,” AA Fourth Year project, 1956

Figure 0.7  Christopher King, “Multi-Reality Structure,” AA student project, 1968
Figure 0.8  Bernard Tschumi, Parc de la Villette, competition entry, 1983

Figure 0.9  Office for Metropolitan Architecture, Parc de la Villette, competition entry, 1983
Figure 0.10  Zaha Hadid, The Hong Kong Peak, competition entry 1983

Figure 0.11  Alvin Boyarsky’s library, 64 Oakley Square, London
Figure 0.12  Alvin Boyarsky’s collection of architectural drawings on display, 64 Oakley Square, London
Figure 0.13  Reel-to-reel audio recording of International Institute of Design Summer Session, 1972, Alvin Boyarsky Archive (ABA)
Figure 0.14  Alvin Boyarsky postcard collection, 64 Oakley Square, London

Figure 0.15  Architectural Association Archive, London (AAA)
Figure 0.16  Architectural Association Photo Archive and Video Archive, London

Figure 0.17  Architectural Association Video Archive and cinema, London
Figure 1.1  Postcards from Alvin Boyarsky’s postcard collection
Figure 1.2  Postcards from Alvin Boyarsky’s postcard collection
Figure 1.3  Page spreads from Sigfried Giedion, *Space, Time and Architecture: A Growth of a New Tradition* (1941)
Figure 1.4 Page spreads from László Moholy-Nagy, *Vision in Motion* (1947)
Figure 1.5  Alvin Boyarsky, academic transcript, Cornell University, 1959 (grades redacted; Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University)

Figure 1.6  Zoning Study, from Alvin Boyarsky et al. *Auburn, General Plan: A Study by Graduate Students of the Department of City and Regional Planning, College of Architecture, Cornell University.* Ithaca, NY: Department of City and Regional Planning, Cornell University, 1958
Figure 1.7  Traffic Study, from Alvin Boyarsky et al. *Auburn, General Plan: A Study by Graduate Students of the Department of City and Regional Planning, College of Architecture, Cornell University*. Ithaca, NY: Department of City and Regional Planning, Cornell University, 1958

Figure 1.8  Alvin and Elizabeth Boyarsky in London, 1960s
Students are asked to design a new Royal Courts of Justice to replace the existing structure on the Strand. The object of the program is to enable the students to observe the operation of one of the many vital institutions to be found in the heart of a metropolitan region such as London, to observe the sympathetic pattern of land use which surrounds it, to come into contact with the various groups of people involved in the institution, to understand the present-day needs, and to anticipate the requirements in the foreseeable future both for an evolving institution and in terms of the larger context of the developing urban scene.

In addition to providing the opportunity of designing a building or complex of buildings of the scale and complexity required, students will also be asked to incorporate their knowledge of structures, acoustics, lighting and services. The project will serve as a basis for some of the advanced examinations in structures, services, materials, etc.

Procedure.

1. A committee of the clients, consisting of Master Jacob, of the Queen's Bench, Mr. Louis Blom-Cooper and Mr. Stanley Walseman, barristers-at-law, in the first instance will meet with the students from time to time as required in order to describe the structure of the Royal Courts of Justice. A committee of students has been selected and will undertake to act as representative of the year with the clients and to disseminate all relevant information to the rest of the year.

2. In addition to the introductory talk which took place on 13th November, 1964, a further meeting with the clients is scheduled tentatively for Friday, 27th November, at which time the clients will discuss in detail the Conceptus of Personnel and Accommodation at the Royal Courts of Justice.

3. Interim group meetings are scheduled for the week of 30th November to discuss site selection, analysis of circulation, etc.

4. Intermediate Jury 1 will take place during the week of 14th December, at which students will present their conception of a Royal Courts of Justice, including the organisation of circulation on and about the site.

5. Intermediate Jury 2 will take place during the week of 1st February, when students will present, in addition to their advanced sketch plans for the Royal Courts of Justice, structural models incorporating the major services.

6. Intermediate Jury 3 will take place during the week of 1st March, students will present, in addition to their advanced sketch plans, a courtroom complex in considerable detail with respect to furnishings, services, etc.

7. A Final Jury will be held during the week of 22nd March.

Alvin Boyarsky
17th November, 1964.

Figure 1.9 Alvin Boyarsky, “Royal Courts of Justice, London,” Autumn Term, 4th Year, 1964/65 (ABA)
Figure 1.10  Martin Godfrey, Battersea Urban Renewal Scheme, AA Fifth Year student project, 1965
Figure 1.11  Archigram (Ron Herron), Instant City, 1964

Figure 1.12  Archigram (Ron Herron), Walking City, 1964
Figure 1.13  Cedric Price, Section and Aerial Perspective, Fun Palace, 1959-1961
Figure 1.14  Alison and Peter Smithson, Golden Lane Estate, 1952

Figure 1.15  Alison and Peter Smithson, Cluster City, 1952-1953
Redevelopment of Millbank
Francis Duffy, 5th year, 1964

The scheme involved the redevelopment of a river-side block on Millbank, 6,000,000 sq ft of office accommodation was redistributed into three glass-open plan floors for the principal tenant and five towers of narrower space suitable for smaller tenancies.

In 1964, if you were up to date, the only kind of office space worth thinking about was office landscaping. It was something for native caution that not all the space was used on plan.

The image of different kinds of office accommodation on the same site raises certain questions which have yet to be answered satisfactorily. These are:

(a) For what kind of office work is office landscaping appropriate?
(b) What are the useful limits to the size of deep air conditioned office spaces?
(c) How does one design a speculative office building so that it can accommodate a range of tenants and departments of different sizes and different managerial styles?
(d) How do you know which range of tenant sizes and managerial styles you should plan to accommodate in particular developments?

The failure to address these questions in the thesis exercise is an indictment not only of my own lack of intellectual grip but also of the level of inquiry then considered acceptable at the AA.

Fortunately it was only a student scheme. Unfortunately today real buildings are being erected which react to every respect - size, organisational, use of space, glazing, and above all in great failure to understand the nature of office design.

Francis Duffy

1. axonometric
2. section
3. east elevation
4. car park floor
5. Typical floor plan

Figure 1.16  Francis Duffy, “Redevelopment of Millbank,” AA Fifth Year student project, 1964
Figure 1.17  Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, University of Illinois Chicago Circle Campus, c1966

Figure 1.18  Front page of Chicago Illini 4, no. 14, 1 February 1965
Figure 1.19  Photographs of Boyarsky at UIC with students and faculty, c1970 (ABA)
Figure 1.20  Alvin Boyarsky, order for 35mm Slides from Chicago Historical Society, May 24, 1968 (ABA)
Figure 1.21  Selections from Alvin Boyarsky’s postcard collection (ABA)
Figure 1.22  Selections from Alvin Boyarsky’s postcard collection (ABA)
Figure 1.23  Selections from Alvin Boyarsky’s postcard collection (ABA)
Figure 1.24  Selections from Alvin Boyarsky’s postcard collection (ABA)
Figure 1.25  Postcard from Mrs. L.R. Nuhn to Alvin Boyarsky, welcoming him to the Windy City Postcard Club
Figure 1.26 Postcard depicting Plato and Socrates (illustration from Jacques Derrida, *The Postcard*)

Figure 1.27 Postcard, “A Carload of Apples from California,” from Dennis Crompton to Alvin Boyarsky, postmarked Miami, 18 May 1972 (ABA)
Figure 1.28  Unfolded cover, “Chicago à la carte: The City as an Energy System,” *Architectural Design* (December 1970)

Figure 1.29  “Cut-away View of Chicago Subway” postcard from Alvin Boyarsky’s collection (ABA)
Figure 1.30  Alvin Boyarsky, title page from “Chicago à la carte,” *Architectural Design*, (December 1970)
Figure 1.31  Alvin Boyarsky, Page spreads from “Chicago à la carte,” *Architectural Design* (December 1970)
Figure 1.32  Jacques de la Villeglé, “Boulevard de la Chapelle,” 1965

Figure 1.33  Colin Rowe, title page from “Chicago Frame,” *Architectural Design* (December 1970)
Figure 1.34  Alvin Boyarsky, page spreads from “Chicago à la carte,” *Architectural Design* (December 1970)
Figure 1.35  Alvin Boyarsky, notes on Sant’Elia’s “Messagio,” for “Chicago à la carte” (ABA)
Figure 1.36  Alvin Boyarsky, concluding page from “Chicago à la carte,” *Architectural Design* (December 1970)
Figure 1.37 Damaged postcards from Boyarsky’s collection, reproduced in “Chicago à la carte,” *Architectural Design* (December 1970) (ABA)

The purpose of the essay is to take stock of the progress of what might be described as the great cycle of city building upon which Western society has been embarked more or less continuously since the last quarter of the 19th century, and which proceeds today at an ever-increasing rate of growth, scale of enterprise and complexity of organization. This activity has been attended by much social, economic and political debate. Architectural theories of the mid-20th century have become almost indistinguishable from those of building cities; and the relatively new profession of town planning; charged with the development of long-range plans for what has become virtually the total environment, is now integrated into the economic/political structure of the urban communities, complete with its own methodologies and traditions. Meanwhile, cities great and small have been transformed from their historically evolved archetypical forms of the mid-19th century in order to accommodate vast new populations, land uses and services, transportation, recreation, institutional and industrial facilities. Occasionally built fragments of the long-range plans and hypotheses of the theoreticians are to be found as part of the "archaeology"; devalued, adapted and transformed into the bric-a-brac and background of the constantly changing urban situation.

Bearing in mind the nature of the audience to which the book is addressed, and the range of ideas, images and background to be presented in order to portray this relationship between the theory and practice of building cities during this period, it is proposed that the organisation consist of a fusion of three parallel streams of mutually reinforcing information as follows:

1. The Idea of the City. An essay describing the images of the city as they have emerged from three successive generations, at the time de seicle, between the two World Wars, and during the last 20 years, stating their polarities, the history of ideas to which they subscribed and, where applicable, perhaps employing seminal case studies, such as, for example, Pariserberg by Camillo Sitte (1900), Chicago by Daniel Burnham (1910), St. Die by Le Corbusier (1945), Cluster City by Alison and Peter Smithson (1957) and, say, Plug-In City by the Archigram Group (1965), etc.

2. Urban Form. Employing simple black and white ink sketches and aerial photographs where possible, it is intended to analyse the evolution of the surprisingly few generic city types, both in Europe and America. In this way it will be possible to demonstrate the evolution of the ever historically layered city which was so much a part of the European general experience and nostalgia for which was to play such a large part in early city planning imagery. The ever-increasing size and complexity of urban places can also be shown in this...
way, and individual urban systems articulated and model solutions demonstrated.

5. Chronological Tables. A densely packed chronological account of the personalities, proposals, schools of thought, seminal projects, enabling legislation, etc. of the period.

In this way it will be possible to permit the reader to cross-reference and see different aspects of the same problem at a glance, in theory, in context and with comparative detailed information.

Figure 1.38 Alvin Boyarsky, “Proposal for an Illustrated Essay Entitled ‘City Building: A Study of the Immediate Past,’” c1968 (ABA)
CAMBODIA INVADDEEE!!
4 KENT ST. STUDENTS MURDEREED!!

IN THE LAST FEW DAYS, THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES HAVE BEEN SUBJECTED TO ONE OUTRAGE AFTER ANOTHER. ON THURSDAY THE WAR IN VIETNAM WAS EXTENDED INTO SOUTHEAST ASIA BY THE INVASION OF 8,000 AMERICAN SOLDIERS INTO CAMBODIA. TO THE SLAUGHTER OF MEN, WOMEN, AND CHILDREN IN VIETNAM HAS BEEN ADDED THE SLAUGHTER OF THE CAMBODIANS. EVEN THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE TERMED IT A "ILLEGAL INVASION OF CAMBODIA."

YESTERDAY, FOUR STUDENTS AT KENT STATE, TWO MEN AND TWO WOMEN, WERE BRUTALLY MURDERED BY THE OHIO NATIONAL GUARD. THEIR CRIME: PROTESTING THE EXTENSION OF THE AGGRESSION AND SLAUGHTER OF VIETNAM TO CAMBODIA.

OUR TASK IS CLEAR AND SIMPLE. WE MUST UNITE IN MASSIVE OUTFLOWING OF INDIGNANT PROTEST. THE ANTI-WAR MOVEMENT IS A MAJORITY MOVEMENT IN THIS COUNTRY. LET'S MAKE THAT CRYSTAL CLEAR TO THE NIXONS, AGNENS, MITCHELLS ET AL. COME TO THE MASS STRIKE MEETING TODAY TO PLAN A COURSE OF ACTION.

MASS STRIKE MEETING
TODAY 1 PM
AI LC

Figure 2.1  “Mass Strike Meeting” notice, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle Campus, 1970 (ABA)
Figure 2.2  Photograph of student strike/sit-in, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle Campus, 1970 (ABA)
Figure 2.3  Peter Cook, “A Scurrilous Comparison, The Architectural Scene New York – London,” Net, no. 2 (1976)
Figure 2.4   Open University student, at home

Figure 2.5   Telegram from Cedric Price to Alvin Boyarsky, 29 May 29, 1970, expressing disgust at rumor of IID funding from Skidmore, Owings & Merrill (ABA)
Figure 2.6  Cedric Price, Pottery Thinkbelt, 1964-1966
Figure 2.7 Archigram, Info-Gonks, 1968 and Plug-in University Node (Peter Cook), 1965

Figure 2.8 Spread from “Archizones,” Archigram, no. 9 (1970)
Figure 2.9 Advertisement for International Institute of Design Summer Session in Archigram, no. 9 (1970)
Figure 2.10  Envelopes from IID inquiries (ABA)
Figure 2.11  *In Progress* 1, 2 and 3 (1970) (ABA)
Figure 2.12 Letter from Anatole Kopp to Alvin Boyarsky, 26 May 1970, In Progress 2 (ABA)
Figure 2.13  Letter from Colin Rowe to Alvin Boyarsky, 9 June 1970, *In Progress* 3 (ABA)
Figure 2.14  Letter from Eric Dhulosch to Alvin Boyarsky, 3 June 1970, *In Progress* 2 (ABA)
12 May 1970
Alvin,

This should clarify our intentions for Summer Session ’70.

The seminar you are organizing in London will give us a chance to discuss, clarify and improve the project we are carrying on as a Graduate Thesis for the Urban Design Program at Harvard. This project aims to propose a strategy for developing the Central Area of Chicago; re-evaluating the City Planning Policy and formulating some recommendations for three-dimensional zoning, density and transportation.

Moreover, the new community study on the Illinois Central air rights and Ogden Slip areas is an attempt to establish an Urban Design methodology and to verify its physical, social and economic implementation. While in London, we would mainly work on the physical implications of our project to a more definite conclusion. Most important is the continued investigation of the urban design system, especially as it relates to housing, office space, recreation and movement.

We think the project will stimulate discussion of the problems of American Cities, and Roberto will be glad to put at you disposal his slides on the downtown areas of some major American Cities.

Figure 2.15 Letter from Roberto G. Brambilla, Kenneth S. Halpern and Fernando Jimenez to Alvin Boyarsky, 12 May 1970, In Progress 2 (ABA)
Figure 2.16  Sampson/Fether, International Institute of Design Summer Session stamps, 1970 (ABA)
Figure 2.17 Sampson/Fether, International Institute of Design Summer Session stamps, 1970 (ABA)
Figure 2.18  International Institute of Design Summer Session Diary, 1970 (Cedric Price Fonds, Canadian Centre for Architecture)
Figure 2.19  Peter Cook, “Letter to Warren Chalk,” *Architectural Design* (February 1971)

Figure 2.20  Richard Yeend, front and back covers, *Architectural Design* (April 1971)
Figure 2.21 Alvin Boyarsky, “In Progress IV,” *Architectural Design* (April 1971)
Figure 2.22  Sampson/Fether, International Institute of Design Summer Session, flyer, 1971 (ABA)
Figure 2.23  Sampson/Fether, International Institute of Design Summer Session, flyer, 1971 (ABA)
Figure 2.25  Sampson/Fether, International Institute of Design Summer Session, postcards, 1971 (ABA)
Figure 2.26  Sampson/Fether, International Institute of Design Summer Session, postcards, 1971 (ABA)
Figure 2.27  In Progress V, International Institute of Design Summer Session, 1971 (part 1)
Figure 2.28  In Progress V, International Institute of Design Summer Session, 1971 (part 2)
Figure 2.29  Adrian George, front cover of *Architectural Design* (April 1972), with portrait of Alvin Boyarsky

Figure 2.30  Covent Garden Workshop flyer, International Institute of Design Summer Session, 1971 (ABA)
Figure 2.31  International Institute of Design Summer Session 1972, ephemera (ABA)

Figure 2.32  International Institute of Design Summer Session Logo, 1972
Figure 2.33 Manhattan Workshop booklet, compiled by Archigram for International Institute of Design Summer Session, 1972 (ABA)

Figure 2.34 Front cover, *Architectural Design* (May 1973)
Figure 2.35  International Institute of Design Summer Session stationery, designed by Archigram, 1972 (ABA)
Figure 3.1  AA First Year Studio (student Peter Rich pictured), 1958/59 (photograph by Elizabeth Sakellariou)
Figure 3.2  Peter Fordham, AA First Year, Color Study, 1958/1959, Architectural Association Archive (AAA)

Figure 3.3  Peter Fordham, AA First Year, Proportion Study, 1958/1959 (AAA)
Figure 3.4  Peter Fordham, AA Second Year Project, Village Hall, Shoreham, Kent, 1959/1960 (AAA)

Figure 3.5  Peter Fordham, AA Second Year Project, Redevelopment of Shoreham, Kent, 1959/1960 (AAA)
Figure 3.6  Peter Fordham, AA Third Year Project, Youth Centre, Bury St. Edmunds, 1960/1961 (AAA)

Figure 3.7  Peter Fordham, AA Third Year Project, Youth Centre, Bury St. Edmunds, 1960/1961 (AAA)
Figure 3.8  Peter Fordham, AA Fourth Year Project, South Bank Housing, London, 1961/1962 (AAA)

Figure 3.9  Peter Fordham, AA Fourth Year Project, South Bank Housing, London, 1961/1962 (AAA)
Figure 3.10  Peter Fordham, AA Fifth Year Thesis Project, Perspectival Drawing, Museum of London, 1962/1963 (AAA)

Figure 3.11  Peter Fordham, AA Fifth Year Thesis Project, Model, Museum of London, 1962/1963 (AAA)
Figure 3.12  Curriculum diagram, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology in Kumasi, Ghana, 1966; and Illustration for Volta Resettlement project, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology in Kumasi, Ghana
Figure 3.13  “Bored at the AA?” poster; caption includes “vote students onto the AA council,” likely mid-1970s (AAA)
inside the elegant beehive

I can save you, but you can’t save me... ([name removed])

The appeal of authority has been that it would remain in front of the=AARse.

I only hope I am not cast in the role of Captain Bligh, ruling down from the cauldron of the dark and distant replicating the light... (unnamed)

Look, man -- let's play it really cool; play their game - put up a nice respectable show / get the bread & honey

OK, but why have none of you been to the conference?

What a lovely nun of nothing

Yes, and he can say it in Latin

You have never been any non-dogma

What's that? (unnamed)

Come on, we'll eat again.

There's some incident Balshin

Fool's gold? (unnamed)

Tamar, Ararat, and the High Plains of the Armenian Republic

Some404

Figure 3.14  David Wild, “Inside the Elegant Beehive (a tiny fart from your local AARse)” flyer, 1969 (part 1)
Figure 3.15  David Wild, “Inside the Elegant Beehive (a tiny fart from your local AARse)” flyer, 1969 (part 2)
Figure 3.16  “Middle School Survey” caricature of Elia Zenghelis, Middle School Unit 2 Tutor, AA Newsheet, no. 13 (Summer 1971/1972)
Piezoelectrics

Robin Evans, 5th year, 1969

Load-carrying structures need not be inert. Mechanical forces need not be transmitted and stored by solid matter alone: other, more general energy forms can be used for this purpose. One way in which this might be accomplished is by the utilisation of the piezoelectric effect. Certain materials exhibit the fact which transforms mechanical energy into electrical energy and, conversely, transforms electrical energy into mechanical energy. If, for instance, a force is applied to an element of piezoelectric material, causing it to deform in opposition, an electric potential will be generated along certain axes of the element; if, on the other hand, a tensile force is applied, then a potential of opposite sign will be generated. There is also a converse effect, which works with equal efficiency, by applying an electrical current, a strain is induced that sets up a mechanical force. The degree of sensitivity is substantial.

Clearly, a great deal of the possible relevance of this piezoelectric effect to structural engineering depends on transductive efficiency and on its adaptability to specific structural tasks. However, there is reason to believe that these are not insurmountable obstacles. In certain piezoelectrics, such as present in electrical components, the efficiency of energy transduction is as high as 45%. Another factor in favour of these fairly novel ceramic type piezoelectric materials is that they are manufactured in such a way that it is possible to choose the shape, size and properties of the end product within a wide range of possibilities, this was not the case with the original mono-crystalline piezoelectric materials such as quartz and Rochelle salt, opening up a whole range of new applications that have, as yet, not been explored.

Numerous structural applications suggest themselves. The materials could, for example, be used to sense deformations and stress concentrations in dynamic mechanical systems. Prototype piezoelectric strain gauges have already been produced. In the connection it is worth noting that the piezoelectric effect has been observed in a number of organic materials, among them wood, bone, tendon and skin and the argument has been put forward by Shamos and Laronz1 and others that the piezoelectric properties of these fibrous polymeric materials function as stress-sensing devices in living organisms and could account for the evolutionarily self-organising structural characteristics of living things. In wood, stress concentrations due to wind loads would produce an electric potential proportional to the stresses in any part of the tree, which might act as a growth signal, causing increased growth in the parts that are stressed most.

As a combined sensor-effect this device the possibilities are even more exciting. The most obvious is that of producing a compression structure with infinite stiffness. Professor J. E. Gordon has mentioned this possibility1, and if he followed this up with some suggestions. Such an infinitely stiff piezoelectric compression structure can be designed by making use of the extreme speed of response that can be obtained in piezoelectric systems, providing a kind of electronic balancing act. Each part of the structure would be continuously making small adjustments in tension, compression and shear in order to counterbalance the disturbing forces of the ambient environment. Given a moderately defined feedback system it would be a relatively simple matter to produce a structure in which no gross lateral deformations would occur. Strands in compression could support loads as if they were in tension.

Although all the available man-made piezoelectric materials are hard and quite brittle, the organic protein polymers that cause the effect in bone, etc., are often soft. It is by no means beyond the bounds of possibility that a synthetic material with properties similar to these could be produced. The significance of this would be that it could lead to the production of an engineering material with properties not unlike those of muscle... manipulative, dynamic, able to resist deformation when necessary, active structure. These are the possibilities of piezoelectric materials...

Robin Evans

Figure 3.17 Robin Evans, “Piezoelectrics,” AA Fifth Year project, 1969 (page from Gowan, AA Projects, 1946-1971)
Figure 3.18  Piers Gough, Diana Jowsey, Philip Wagner, “Motorolama,” AA Fifth Year project, 1971

Figure 3.19  Peter Crump and Grahame Caine, *Street Farmer*, nos. 1 and 2, AA Fifth Year project, 1972
Figure 3.20 Page from *Archigram* no. 3, 1963

Figure 3.21 John Frazer and Peter Colomb, “Unfolding Caravan,” AA Fifth Year project, 1969 (AAA)
Figure 3.22  Dolan Conway and Brian Mitchener, “Computer Community,” AA Fifth Year project, 1968
Figure 3.23 Enid Caldecott (AA Librarian), Alvin Boyarsky, and Marjorie Morrison (AA Slide Librarian) in reconstruction of AA Members Room at 36 Bedford Square, installed at the “AA 125” exhibition, Institute of Contemporary Arts, London, 1973, AA Photo Archive
Figure 3.24  AA First Year students with Peter Murray and the “AD/AA/Polyark” bus, 1973 (tutor: Stefan Szczelkun)

Figure 3.25  AA/AD/Polyark poster and Newsletter, 1973, Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA)
Figure 3.26 Illustrations from Gerald Foley, *Energy Question* (1976), featuring research by AA student John Seed
Figure 3.27   Period photographs from early 1970s
Figure 3.28  Rational Technology Unit 73-4, AA unit publication (1974)
Figure 3.29 Derek Taylor, windmill report, Rational Technology Unit, 73-4 (1974)

Figure 3.30 Wind generator, AA Windmill Workshop, 1975-76 (AA Projects Review)
Figure 3.31 Patricia Pringle and Jiri Skopek, methane digester report, *Rational Technology Unit, 73-4* (1974)
Windows as Solar Collectors (mini symposium)
R. Vale — Greenhouses
Dr. M. G. Davies — Glazed south walls, Wallasey School,
G. Kasabov — Orientation
A. Moorcraft — Insolation and Insulation.
Flat Plate Collectors (mini symposium)
Dr. J.C. McVeigh — Principles and Operation
Speaker to be announced — Manufacturing Problems.
G. Caine — Self-Build in Portugal
G. Brown — Cost & Energy Effectiveness of Solar Collectors.
Solar Houses (mini-symposium)
D. Hodges — Performance of Milton Keynes House
Royston Summers — Lewisham Scheme
K. McCartney — Dutch Solar Houses
Calculations (Solar Sums) — K. McCartney.
The symposia form part of the Diploma School,
T.S.S.U. Solar Energy Workshop, a series of films and
lectures. There will also be opportunity for participants
to become involved in experimental work. At the
time this is taking two forms: the construction
of flat plate water heaters and testing on the Percy
Street rooftop facility, and the simulation of the solar
process using a computer programme.

Figure 3.32 Solar collectors at the AA, c1975-76 (AA Projects Review)
Figure 3.33  Andy Brown and Oliver Cockell, rammed earth report, *Rational Technology Unit, 73–4* (1974)

Figure 3.34  AA earth block making machine, 1975-76 (*AA Projects Review*)
Figure 3.35  Andy Brown, Oliver Cockell and Dave Hodgson, soil report for BRAD (Biotechnic Research and Development) commune, *Rational Technology Unit, 73-4* (1974)
Figure 3.36  Radical Technology, edited by Peter Harper and Godfrey Boyle, 1976
Figure 3.37 Grahame Caine, Eco House, London, 1972

Figure 3.38 Stills from BBC programme on Eco House, 1973
Alex Ames has been working in private practice for a considerable number of years, particularly on public housing. His main project this year is a fundamental analysis of a real scheme, on which he has worked, with a view to discovering how it might be re-arranged and redesigned in order to minimise its energy running costs.

John van Rooym has worked with housing associations. He has a particular interest in the provision of low income housing; old people are the most vulnerable members of the community when the cost of domestic heating increases. He is working on an alternative design for a site on which housing has already been provided. The aim is to obtain an objective measure of the capital cost of providing a scheme with markedly superior running performance to that conventionally provided.

Figure 3.39  Student projects, Rational Technology Unit, Diploma Unit 10, 1975-76 (AA Projects Review)
Figure 3.40  Student projects, Rational Technology Unit, Diploma Unit 10, 1975-76

(IA Projects Review)
Intermediate School Unit 1

Unit Staff

Unit One has meant everything to me, as an architect, and the fact that it has been the birth of AEC, to which organisation the majority of the Unit belong, does not mean that Unit One is dead. If I have any say it Unit One will always be a breeding ground for idealists. The fires of idealism are largely reduced to ashes in our schools of architecture; until they are turned back to life the architectural profession and its pernicious adherents will continue to defounder the social, cultural and physical heritage of our society.

Throughout its four year history the members of Unit One have shown a real degree of courage in putting themselves on the line in the struggle for a better environment. For a struggle it has surely been, and I am proud to have been their comrade more than their under-teacher during these years.

In October 1971 I came to resist and anger from Covent Garden to Unit One; but worse, I came with the priests of man's worst disease, Cynicism, Architecture for me was dead, as an architect he was dead. The people of Unit One helped me to make an architect again. I salute them. The Unit finally owes a great debt to Alvin Boyarsky, for despite his radical disagreement with parts of our philosophy, without his aid the struggle would have been even harder. I salute him too.

BRIAN ANSON, AEC

Brian Anson

Jarij Lap

Hans Herrn
On day tutor. German architect-urbanist. Taught at many universities in America and Germany. Director at Community Projects Laboratory M.I.T. Research work on housing and community planning in Peru and Columbia. Fulbright Fellow. Winner of two major West German housing competitions. Originally trained as mason and bricklayer. Very experienced in community work.

Figure 3.41 AA Intermediate Unit 1, 1974-75 (AA Projects Review)
The basic style of the Unit followed logically from the previous four years of Intermediate Unit 1 in which we had our roots. Unit One was concerned with community action and particularly with how to involve lay people in the design process. It ultimately gave birth to ARC. Our base was equality, communitarian, a dislike of authoritarian politics and, beneath it all, a belief that architecture could benefit society.

It was inevitable that this year, as we matured in Diploma Unit B, and gained the confidence to produce more 'shown' schemes, we would come to reflect a wider range of political views, and that is exactly what has happened: those views cover the spectrum from hard-line Marxism through radical Reformism and on to Republicanism. Yet the major threat remains: a demoralization of Capitalism and a fervent belief that the potential of architecture must be for all, irrespective of egalitarian circumstances.

The past years of intense discussion, involvement, some successes and many false starts, have culminated this year in many projects covering a wide range of environmental issues, yet (sadly it is the main point) the majority of the work is still concerned with the struggle for 'community architecture'. However much we have begun to diverge politically, the constant conversation remains:

WHAT IS THE ARCHITECT'S ROLE IN SOCIETY?

We have not succumbed to the temptation to find an 'escape route' to the crisis in architecture by indulging in the writer and philosopher C. B. Wright's now so prevalent in architectural education.

Some of our work is illustrated and described briefly in the last pages, yet there has been much more than project work. For example we have made great efforts to establish a studio situation and atmosphere in Poynt Street, and this space has been used as a real link with the 'outside world' of lay people. Many community gatherings have occurred during evening sessions and at these we have attempted to design together by the use of slides, models and simple drawing.

In this way we felt we were spreading architecture into society.

The New Architecture Movement (NAM) which in one sense grew out of the Unit continues to hold its regular fortnightly meetings in our studio and in this way a useful link is forged between practising architects and the student body. Of course ARC continues to hold its meetings in the basement and its members, most of whom are practicing architects, and not students as is the myth, converge in Poynt Street from various parts of the country, in this way a link with the regions is established on a regular basis.

Our studio was the venue for a very revealing link-up with David Green's Unit when we worked intermurally on a one-day project. Sadly circumstances prevented us from developing this approach.

Clearly we have aimed at an 'involved' association but one not solely devoted to existence styles rather as a working link with the wider society.

When the Social Studies Group from Ridley high security prison asked the school to send speakers we wondered why our Unit was suggested. Nevertheless we went and experienced one of the most memorable events of the year. Again the occasion was:

'The architect in society' and the prisoners showed the same concern as we do over the damage done by the profession in our society. They have requested that we revisit them to continue the dialogue.
Figure 3.43 Architects’ Revolutionary Council (ARC) press conference, held in Architectural Association Communications Studio, decorated with ARC posters designed by Brian Anson, 1974 (Anson appears third from the left)
Figure 3.44 Architects’ Revolutionary Council posters, designed by Brian Anson, 1974
Structure
(Week 1) Seminar: 'why'

Part 1. The origin of the conflict. ('food for thought'). "The Environmental Precinct": Contradictions of space and contents and the invisible conflict. Definition of revolutionary concept with (hopefully) Henri Lefebvre, Manuel Castells, Hubert Tonka, Others. Fernando Monte.
(Week 2) Seminar: 'how'

Part 2. The form of the conflict. ('food for fun'). "The Insurgent Use of Space". A catalogue of 'détournement' within the formal properties of the city.
With (hopefully) E.J. Hobbsaw, Robert Ross, Martin Oppenheimer (but he tends to reside in Pennsylvania), Alex Schubert (German theorist in urban guerrilla warfare). Burke of BSI has been mentioned. And .... why not a week end in Belfast, also, if possible. 2 films: 'The Battle of Algiers', 'The Warsaw Insurrection'
(Week 3) Workshop on tactics.

(Week 4) Seminar: 'where to'

With (hopefully) Most likely a panel, to be discussed. Irish and Chilean models.
(Week 5) Workshop, Hypotheses and critique.

Argument
Part 1(a) The increasing gap between the industrialisation and urbanisation processes is one of the causes of the growing contradictions between Society structures and the everyday life of the urban dwellers.
(b) The concentration of the latter within specialised ghettos reveals planning as the expression of a segregating power structure that reinforces the status quo. (after Lefebvre).
(c) The resulting environmental and urban conflicts will lead the city to become the inevitable and only starting point of revolutionary change.

Part 2. (a) While cities' spatial characteristics have been diverse in the past and present, historically the formal structures of the city influenced insurgent tactics rather than insurgent behaviour.
(b) Recent revolutionary approaches tend on one hand to define new political strategies (ideology) in relation to the socio-economic and military context. (c) On the other hand they attempt to destroy or subvert the repressive urban systems (methodology)

Part 3. (a) The subversion of existing systems lies in their very nature: ghettos become insurgentary free areas. (b) While urbanisation extends, the contradictions between a hierarchical power concentration and a neutral urban fabric lead to new urban forms.

Figure 3.45 Bernard Tschumi, draft outline of "Urban Insurgency" seminar series for International Institute of Design Summer Session, 1972 (ABA)
Figure 3.46  *Chronicle in Urban Politics*, Diploma Unit 2, 1974 (tutor: Bernard Tschumi)
Figure 3.47  Nigel Coates, “Prison Park,” Diploma Unit 2, AA Fifth Year project, 1974 (tutor: Bernard Tschumi)
Figure 3.48  Dereck Revington, “Alkahest,” Diploma Unit 2, project, 1975 (tutor: Bernard Tschumi)
Figure 3.49  “Real Space” conference poster, 1976 (AAA)
Figure 3.50  Rem Koolhaas, Madelon Vriesendorp, Elia Zenghelis and Zoe Zenghelis, “Exodus, or the Voluntary Prisoners of Architecture,” collages, 1972
Figure 3.51   Kerstin Nilsson, Density Study, 1972/1973, from AA Intermediate Unit 6 “Housing Prototypes and Densities” booklet, published January 1973 (tutor: Elia Zenghelis; AAA)
Figure 3.52  Peter Wilson, “Non-Urban Space” (panel), Diploma Unit 9, AA Fifth Year project, 1974 (tutor: Elia Zenghelis)
FUNCTIONAL HOUSING. SQUARE I

Housing for the populace (except for the inadequate, desirable housing built in Greenwich) was provided in one dense solid mass, one km. by one km., which continually extended itself upward and downward.

The housing block was totally solid and totally homogenous. It was an extreme example of the compartmented bed sitter existence it replaced - but equal to 25 sq. km. of pre-fire bed sit West London.

Identical, anonymous living units provide a controlled standard of living. The myth of high intensity urban life became real because of the phenomenal density. All public social activities occur in a single central interior space, always active, providing glamour and excitement 24 hours a day.

The Thames, Kings Road and Fulham Road pass through the housing - the only concessions to its uniformity, they are reflected by forests on the upper surface of the housing.

A construction zone continually spirals its way up around a huge Corinthian column, which extends upward from the interior space containing all public amenities. The top of the column displays an eternal flame of gratitude to the fire for bringing this system into existence.

Strata lines of past surface levels are seen on the outer walls.

Figure 3.53 Peter Wilson, “Non-Urban Space” (panel), Diploma Unit 9, AA Fifth Year project, 1974 (tutor: Elia Zenghelis; AAA)
BUILT IN AN ATTEMPT TO COUNTER GROWING DISILLUSSIONMENT, IT WAS THE OPPOSITE TO THE CITY, I.E. THE IDEAL OR PRIMITIVE LANDSCAPE THE CITY REPLACED. THE HISTORIC INTERPRETATIONS OF THIS THEORETICAL CONCEPT HAVE BEEN NUMEROUS, THEY WERE ALL BUILT. DUE TO THEIR ARTIFICIALITY, THEY PROVIDED A WHOLE NEW DIMENSION TO URBAN LIVING RATHER THAN AN ALTERNATIVE OUTSIDE IT.

THE BATTERSEA POWER STATION AND EAST WALL CONTAIN A PLEASURE PALACE FOR ACTING OUT ESCAPIST FANTASIES. FROM THIS INDOCTRINATION ZONE THE DELIRIOUS OCCUPANTS WANDER OUT INTO THE NATURE OF THEIR CHOICE. HERE THEIR HALLUCINATIONS OF RURAL BACCHALIA, FAIRY PICNICS, AND PRIMITIVE EXISTENCE BECOME A REALITY.

FROM THE POWER STATION A FORMAL ARTIFICIAL LAKE, IN THE FRENCH RENAISSANCE STYLE, CROSSES THE SQUARE TO A HUGE DOME. THIS DOME HOUSES A HOMAGE TO NATURE, A MONUMENTAL ROCKSCAPE WITH A TINY FLICKERING FLAME (HOMAGE TO FIRE) CENTRALLY PLACED.

THE NORTH SIDE OF THE LAKE FALLS DOWN AS ROCKY CLIFFS AND A NIAGARA FALLS TYPE WATERFALL TO THE THAMES. OPPOSITE THIS RUGGED COASTLINE A RANGE OF SUBTLE AND MYSTERIOUS MOUNTAINS RISE THROUGH DRIFTING CLOUDS. THERE IS A VOLCANO AT THEIR BASE AND A TROPICAL ISLAND IN THE CENTRE OF THE THAMES.

TO THE SOUTH OF THE LAKE THE FORMAL GARDENS BREAK DOWN THROUGH VARIOUS AVENUES, MAZES, ORCHARDS, JAPANESE GARDENS AND MOUNTAIN STREAM TO A TRANQUIL LAKE. ACROSS THIS LAKE IS A LANDSCAPE OF FRIENDLY PATCHWORK FIELDS. RISING FROM ANOTHER SIDE IS AN OAK FOREST, MEADOWS, A MOUNTAIN PINE FOREST AND FINALLY A WINDSWEPT DESOLATED PLATEAU.

Figure 3.54  Peter Wilson, “Non-Urban Space” (panel), Diploma Unit 9, AA Fifth Year project, 1974 (tutor: Elia Zenghelis; AAA)
Figure 3.55  Peter Wilson, “Non-Urban Space” (“Commercialism Square” drawing), Diploma Unit 9, AA Fifth Year project, 1974 (tutor: Elia Zenghelis; AAA)
Figure 3.56  Office for Metropolitan Architecture, Roosevelt Island Competition Entry, 1975
ROOSEVELT ISLAND HOUSING COMPETITION

This competition calling for 1000 dwellings units held this spring in Manhattan was given as a subject simultaneously to three Units in the Diploma School and to the graduating year at Columbia University in New York, and a close system of collaboration was established between these four teams.

Figure 3.57 AA Diploma Unit 9, student projects, 1974/1975 (tutor: Elia Zenghelis; AA Projects Review)
Figure 3.58  Zaha Hadid, “Tektonik,” Diploma Unit 9, AA Fourth Year project, 1975/1976 (tutors: Elia Zenghelis and Rem Koolhaas, *AA Projects Review*)

Figure 3.59  Alex Wall, “Tektonik,” Diploma Unit 9, AA Fourth Year project, 1975/1976 (tutors: Elia Zenghelis and Rem Koolhaas, *AA Projects Review*)
Figure 3.60  AA Intermediate Unit 10, “Trafalgar Square” and “Block research” student projects, 1974/1975 (tutor: Léon Krier; AA Projects Review)
Figure 3.61 Notice for “Rational architecture” symposium at AA, *AA Events List*, Spring 1975, Week 8, 24-28 February 1975
Figure 3.62  AA Diploma Unit 2, “Quartiers” projects, 1975/1976 (tutor: Léon Krier; AA Projects Review)
Figure 4.1  Photograph of Alvin Boyarsky in lecture hall
(location and date unknown; ABA)

Figure 4.2  *Master Builders* catalogue, BBC, 1966 (ABA)
This programme should really be called “Le Corbusier the Mythological” because a Mythological figure is defined as a man with a violent passion for an unattainable ideal. Throughout his life, Corb confronted real situations with his own ideal conceptions.

For instance, he first sketched his concept of the ideal museum in 1920 (?) but this spiral form occurs in less than twelve (?) times over a period of thirty (?) years and was only built for the first time in 1956 at Tokyo.

Corb produced hundreds of projects in preparation for his master plan for the city of Chandigarh in which the architect as poet, form, light, space etc. etc. You can see in this programme at the end of the lecture how a man is made of the whole house in this plan, the idea have no venue. It

Figure 4.3  Alvin Boyarsky, script/outline for “Le Corbusier” episode of Master Builders, BBC, 1966 (ABA)
Figure 4.4  Alvin Boyarsky, script/outline for “Le Corbusier” episode of *Master Builders*, BBC, 1966 (ABA)
Figure 4.5 AA Information Centre, 1975 (AAPA)
### Events List for Week 25, Term 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Lectures/Organizer</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/6th</td>
<td>Sociology 5 (1st &amp; 2nd)</td>
<td>J. Bailey</td>
<td>PS 1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Urban Design 3 (1st Yr)</td>
<td>M. Reynolds</td>
<td>PS 1</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Soc</td>
<td>Design Competition</td>
<td>Critique of the entries. (in Care)</td>
<td>Judith Rymer</td>
<td>GS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Soc</td>
<td>Design Discussion</td>
<td>(in Care)</td>
<td>Paul Oliver (chair)</td>
<td>GD Flr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Starlight</td>
<td>Warren Chalk</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THURSDAY 11 NOVEMBER 1971</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Computer Use</td>
<td>John Starling</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>JURIS Loop Line - General</td>
<td>Peter Cook</td>
<td>5thSess</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Lighting and Windows</td>
<td>D. Farham/F. Gillieron</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Soc</td>
<td>World View and Value System</td>
<td>Values in Tribal Societies.</td>
<td>Paul Oliver</td>
<td>GS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Artificial Lighting</td>
<td>D. Farham/F. Gillieron</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>11.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/1st</td>
<td>AS I History of Architecture</td>
<td>Thomas Stevens</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUENTS UNION</td>
<td>between 1.00 and 1.30 p.m.</td>
<td>Fat Hammul</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Soc</td>
<td>Masopotamia - a visitor's guide.</td>
<td>Hazim Al-Shalchi</td>
<td>Hexagon</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Dynamic Integration: Thermal and Lighting.</td>
<td>D. Farham/F. Gillieron</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat</td>
<td>DMP Seminars</td>
<td>D. Farham/F. Gillieron</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Structure: Properties of Materials</td>
<td>Arup's</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A.P.A.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Private Meeting</td>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st/SS</td>
<td>DEPM-PRISHM: Ideas, problems, opportunities within B.E.C.</td>
<td>As notices</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syncooses</td>
<td>Weekly Seminar: Architectural Integration</td>
<td>Prof. Manfred Berlowitz</td>
<td>14 Gloucester Sq.</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRIDAY 12 NOVEMBER 1971</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/6th</td>
<td>History of Art &amp; Design 1915-20</td>
<td>Paul Oliver</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st/SS</td>
<td>Non Mechanical Resources</td>
<td>SS staff</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Jury: Loop Line - General</td>
<td>Peter Cook</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/6th</td>
<td>Modern Movement 1900-1940: 15th</td>
<td>Thomas Stevens</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>10.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Soc</td>
<td>The German Werkbund</td>
<td>Dennis Sharp</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Soc</td>
<td>Post-War: Responsive Environments</td>
<td>D. Croxton/Herren</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat</td>
<td>DMP Seminars</td>
<td>D. Croxton/Herren</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Depart Gatchik for DEPM-PRISHM (Amsterdam)</td>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T &amp; L</td>
<td>Private Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 4.6**  
*AA Events List, Fall 1971 (AAA)*
Figure 4.7  Axonometric of AA Information Centre, *Architectural Association School of Architecture Handbook*, 1968 (AAA)
Figure 4.8  AA Events List, Spring/Summer 1974, Week 14 (AAA)
Monday 28 January

First Year/Unit 1

The Architectural Street Environment/Introduction to Programme 15.00 Sharp Room 254

Intermediate/Unit 5

John Fowler

Topic: Presentation of projects in their current state of development.
10.30 Soft Room.

Extension Studies

Acken Robertson

Thames Anti-Project Group
10.30/11.30 Room 354

TSSU

Abbe Mitchell

Recent Concrete Sanitarex

The last of a series of talks.
11.30-12.30 General Lecture Room Seminar Room

Planning/First Year

David Trubner/Alex Key

Sociology Lecture 10.00/11.00 Distance Lecture Hall

Diploma/Unit 8

Gefff Payne

The Turkish Study Group Seminar to discuss arrangements. 10.30/11.00 Office

GGSU

Victorian Cities

Professor K.G. Dyer

Rutland London

Professor Dyer is the Professor of Urban History at the University of London. He is the author of "The Victorian Suburb: A Study of the Anomalies of the Nineteenth Century (1946)." Founder and editor of the "The Victorian Studies," he is also on the editorial board of "The Victorian Studies" and editor of "The Journal of Transport History." He is a member of the Council of the Economic History Society and the Executive Committee of the Victorian Society. He is now working on a book to be entitled "London 1800-1914: The World Metropolis for the History of London" series.

Diploma/Unit 1

Leonard Beaton

Research Seminar 11.00/12.00 Seminars 5

Diploma/Unit 2

Eugene Garfield

Italian Urban Policies

Polfi Deposta is with Archiouno. This his second lecture in a series. 11.00/12.00 Room

Diploma/Unit 9

Ludmila Semina

Equity Directory of the American Institute of Architects.
10.00 Graduate Lecture Hall

Tuesday 29 January

Diploma/Unit 1

Diploma/Unit 13

Architecture and Regime Land Use Delphoe's Office

Diploma/Unit 14

Gefff Payne

Economics for those not on the Turkish Project

Diploma/Unit 15

First Year Unit 1

John van Schalk Kate Morin

City Drawing
10.00 Room 354

First Year

John van Schalk/Kate Morin

City Drawing
10.00 Room 354

First Year

Gefff Payne

Brixton Architecture

Weymouth Garden City
10.00/11.00 Room 517

Graduate

Conservation of Landscape Design

Land Reclamation
10.00 Graduate Lecture Hall

GGSU

Robin Thomas

Urban History Series
10.00/11.00 Room

Wednesday 30 January

First Year/Unit 3

Mark Fisher

Tennis Structures

Tennis courts are usually situated on lawns, tennis courts and fields.
10.00/11.00 Room

Figure 4.9  AA Events List, Spring/Summer 1974, Week 14 (AA)
Figure 4.10  AA Events List, Spring/Summer 1974, Week 14 (AAA)
Figure 4.11 Various *AA Events List*, 1970s (AAA)

Figure 4.12 Bauhaus *Vorkus* diagram

Figure 4.13 TVAA announcement, *AA Events List*, Spring/Summer 1974, Week 14 (AAA)
Figure 4.14  AA Ground Floor Plan, c1975

Figure 4.15  AA Control Room, Communications Studio, c1975
Figure 4.16  AA Communications Studio, c1975

Figure 4.17  Still of Alvin Boyarsky interviewing Peter Eisenman in AA Communications Studio for TVAA, 1976, Architectural Association Video Archive (AAVA)
Figure 4.18  TVAA logo

Figure 4.19  Cedric Price, transcript of video commentary, AA/AD/Polyark Bus Tour, published in Architectural Design (April 1973)
Figure 4.20  Front cover, *Architectural Design* (April 1973)
Figure 4.21  Ant Farm, “Truckstop Network,” 1970
Figure 4.22 Front cover, *AA Events List, Autumn, Week 10, 3-7 December 1973*
Figure 4.23  Opening title, “Archi-mags,” TVAA, 1975 (AAVA)

Figure 4.24  Stills of Cedric Price hosting “Archi-mags,” TVAA, 11 March 1975 (AVVA)
Figure 4.25  Stills of “What the Papers Say”
Figure 4.26  Stills of Peter Murray hosting “Archi-mags,” TVAA, 13 February 1975 (AAVA)

Figure 4.27  Still of Godfrey Boyle interviewed on “Archi-mags,” TVAA, 29 April 1975 (AAVA)

Figure 4.28  Stills of Martin Pawley interviewed by Gus Coral, “Housing at the AA,” TVAA, May 1975
Figure 4.29  Ghost Dance Times, no. 1, Friday 18 October 1974
Figure 4.30  Ghost Dance Times, no. 5, Friday 15 November 1974
Figure 4.31  Ghost Dance Times, no. 12, Friday 31 January 1975
Figure 4.32  Martin Pawley, *Garbage Housing*, 1975
INTRODUCTION

The Projects Review booklet 1975/76 accompanies the End of Year Exhibition, which commences on 8th July, 1976 and which features the work of some 30 active teaching areas of the School.

Over the years it has been possible for various units and post-graduate areas to explore research, theoretical and specialized design issues in some depth, utilizing the service units within the School and the myriad network of contacts which the School and Association, located in Central London, enjoy.

The range and diversity of activities depicted offer the reader a fascinating overview of the work currently underway in the largest school of architecture in Great Britain, at a moment in time when the objectives of the profession as a whole remain uncertain.

Alvin Boyarsky
Figure 5.1   Zaha Hadid, *Planetary Architecture II*, AA Folio II (1983)

Figure 5.2   James Wines, *Frankfurt Museum of Modern Art*, AA Folio VII (1985)
Figure 5.3  John Hejduk, “The Collapse of Time,” installed on Bedford Square in conjunction with AA exhibition “Victims,” (25 September – 25 October 1986)
Figure 5.4  Jan Kaplicky and David Nixon, Future Systems, AA exhibition “Future Systems” (15 January–14 February 1987)

Figure 5.5  AA exhibition “Dimitris Pikionis Architect 1887-1968: A Sentimental Topography” (7 June–4 July 1989)
Figure 5.6  Poster for AA exhibition “Islamic Art and Architecture” (April 1976) (AAA)
Figure 5.7  Poster for AA exhibition “Social Housing in the Weimar Republic” (Oct-Dec 1978) (AAA)
Figure 5.8  Poster for AA exhibition “Original Drawings of J.J.P. Oud 1890-1963” (January 1979) (AAA)
Figure 5.9  Poster for Anthony Vidler AA lecture series, “The Writing on the Wall,” 1979 (AAA)
Figure 5.10 Eric Parry, “Necropolis,” Diploma Unit 1, AA student project, 1978 (tutor: Dalibor Vesely and Mohsen Mostafavi)
Figure 5.12  Photographs of juries and unit exhibitions at the AA, London, 1983
Figure 5.13 AA Diploma Unit 9, “Museum for the Akropolis, Athens,” student projects, 1977/1978 (tutors: Rem Koolhaas, Elia Zenghelis; sub-tutors: Zaha Hadid, Dimitri Porphyrios; *AA Projects Review*)
Figure 5.14  Installation photographs of “Deconstructivist Architecture” at Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1988
Figure 5.15  Alvin Boyarsky and colleagues reviewing AA student portfolios, 1983
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Alvin Boyarsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cookie Tour of London</td>
<td>Tony Dugdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Reception at Camden Arts Centre</td>
<td>Peter Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Session 70 Forum – all day</td>
<td>Participants’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Seminar – Urban Transportation</td>
<td>Brian Richards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Seminar – New Settlement</td>
<td>James Stirling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ad hoc seminars/workshops</td>
<td>Peter Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bluimp</td>
<td>Cedric Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phnom City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cinematography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>New Settlements Seminar</td>
<td>James Stirling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Runcorn-Liverpool visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Early English Modern Tour</td>
<td>Sam Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>&quot;Dispositions&quot;</td>
<td>Ional Schain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ad hoc seminars/workshops</td>
<td>Peter Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bluimp</td>
<td>Cedric Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phnom City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cinematography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Question/Answer/Question</td>
<td>Cedric Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>&quot;Conversation&quot;</td>
<td>Ional Schain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Public lecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**List of Events for July 20th, 1970**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Screen</td>
<td>Per Karvandik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Technical consultations</td>
<td>Peter Dunsmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ad hoc seminars/workshops Blimp Phan City Communications Education Housing Cinematography 8 mm Paris - Guerrilla Films Production</td>
<td>Peter Cook Cedric Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>&quot;Architecture de Gauche&quot;</td>
<td>Carl Vogtbein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>Anatole Kopp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ad hoc seminars/workshop Aquapad demonstration Gl.C. visit/fly/underground London</td>
<td>Peter Cova Ellis Hillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Communications Seminar</td>
<td>Sol Cornberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Official Reception (Cocktails) Council of Industrial Design, 28 Haymarket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Wednesday</strong></td>
<td>Anatole Kopp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>&quot;Russian Constructivists&quot;</td>
<td>Anatole Kopp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 a.m.</td>
<td>&quot;Design Methods&quot;</td>
<td>Horst Rittel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ad hoc seminars/workshops Seminar - Urban Transportation Seminar - Systems</td>
<td>Bryan Richards Roy Landau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>World Game Introduction</td>
<td>Michael Ben-Eli Michael Cutler Eyton Kaufman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Thursday</strong></td>
<td>Ben-Eli/Cutler/Kaufman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>World Game Seminar</td>
<td>Ben-Eli/Cutler/Kaufman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ad hoc seminars/workshop Central Chicago presentation</td>
<td>Bramville/Siminer/Halpern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Question/Answer/Question</td>
<td>Cedric Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>&quot;Collision City or Utopia&quot;</td>
<td>Colin Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Friday</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Seminar World Game Seminar Technical consultations</td>
<td>Colin Rose Ben Eli/Kaufman Frank Newby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ad hoc seminars/workshops Guadalcanic Housing</td>
<td>Eyton Kaufman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Now Settlement Seminar</td>
<td>James Stirling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Public lecture
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>&quot;U.S.A. a la Carte&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ad hoc seminars/workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>World Expo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blimp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karlheinz Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication/Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>&quot;Education of Architects&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Systems Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>&quot;Buffalo, New York&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ad hoc seminars/workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Seminar - &quot;Revolution&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>&quot;Archigram Presenta&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>&quot;Towards the Next Decade's Industrialisation&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ad hoc seminars/workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Birkenhead Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>&quot;The Wall&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>A Scott/Bugdale Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ad hoc seminars/workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The Amazing Antipodes&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Question/Answer/Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>&quot;Tartan City&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>&quot;The Games People Play&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Solving &amp; Environmental Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Condor Occupancy Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G.C.L. Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>New Settlements Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:00-11:00</td>
<td>Mid Session Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>&quot;On-Going Work&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10:00-11:00</td>
<td>Show and Tell – Mid Session Offerings by participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>&quot;The Primitiva Hut&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Illustrated lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ad hoc seminars/workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>&quot;Cuba Revisited&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>&quot;Evolutionary Systems&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>&quot;L.A.: The Structure of the Scene&quot; Illustrated Super 8mm Projector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ad hoc seminars/workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Question/answer/question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>&quot;Santa Monica Pier&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>&quot;Linden Dean-Tennis: Wilshire Boulevard and Euston Road Compared&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Ad hoc seminars/workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Health Care Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Urban Transportation Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>New Settlements Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 p.m.</td>
<td>trenchigam Party In Lower Hangzhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Phun City Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>High Density Public Housing Bus Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Presenter(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10.00 a.m. Illustrated lecture</td>
<td>Joe Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 p.m. Introduction to workshop</td>
<td>Nicolaas Hebraken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.30 p.m. &quot;Architect-Place-Making&quot;</td>
<td>Gunter Nitschke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10.00 a.m. Illustrated seminar</td>
<td>Joe Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15 p.m. Bucky Fuller on the World Game Videscope</td>
<td>Ben-Côtier/Cutler/Kaufman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 p.m. Ad hoc seminars/workshops</td>
<td>Hebraken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing workshop &quot;Finnish Education Scene&quot;</td>
<td>Bengt Lundsten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00 p.m. Illustrated lecture</td>
<td>Gunter Nitschke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.00 p.m. &quot;Underground London&quot;</td>
<td>Ellis Hillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.30 p.m. Mayfair Gallery - Cocktails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10.00 a.m. &quot;Perception and Communication&quot;</td>
<td>Jano Aberscerbis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 p.m. Ad hoc seminars/workshops</td>
<td>Hebraken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing workshop Seminar</td>
<td>Lundsten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00 p.m. Visits to Ove Arup Building Design Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yorko, Rosenberg &amp; Hardall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00 p.m. Illustrated lecture</td>
<td>Gunter Nitschke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.00 p.m. &quot;London Motorway Plan&quot;</td>
<td>Sylvia &amp; Sam Webb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Richards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Denton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Fulling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10.00 a.m. Ad hoc seminars/workshops</td>
<td>Hebraken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 p.m. Ad hoc seminars/workshops</td>
<td>Lundsten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing workshop &quot;Helsinki&quot;</td>
<td>Cedric Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question/Answer/Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.30 p.m. *Public lecture</td>
<td>Nicolossa Hebraken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10.00 a.m. &quot;Arcadian Musings&quot;</td>
<td>Peter Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 p.m. Ad hoc seminars/workshops</td>
<td>Hebraken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing workshop</td>
<td>Lundsten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>Robert Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00 p.m. &quot;Sweet Disorder and the Carefully Cared&quot;</td>
<td>David Groome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.00 p.m. &quot;The Electronic Family&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.30 p.m. Judith’s Gala Party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Public lecture
List of Events for Week of Graduation Monday, 17th August, 1970

Monday

10.30 a.m.  "Primitive Rambings"  Sean Stevens
2.00 p.m.  Ad hoc seminars/workshops
5.00 p.m.  "Japanese Whisperings"  Gunter Ritschke
6.30 p.m.  "Situation '70"  Cedric Price

Tuesday

10.30 a.m.  Ambling through A.A. Thesis Work - 1960-70  Peter Cook
2.00 p.m.  Ad hoc seminars/workshops
4.30 p.m.  "Tattooists - 16 mm sound film"  Scott/Myalda
6.30 p.m.  "A Fairy Tale with Tail"  Bengt Lundsten

Wednesday

10.30 a.m.  Session
2.00 p.m.  "Fouca City"  Richard Jones
3.15 p.m.  "Racing Cars"  Michael Bennett
4.30 p.m.  "U.S.A. from the Air"  Brombille
5.00 p.m.  "Offshore Platforms"  John Kirkpatrick
6.00 p.m.  "Los Angeles is not a Freeway"  Margaret Helfand

Thursday

11.00 a.m.  "Critique of a Criticism"  Bengt Lundsten
2.00 p.m.  Ad hoc seminars/workshops
3.00 p.m.  "Student Housing in Scandinavia"  Jen Soderlund
4.00 p.m.  "Question/Answer/Question"  Per Karlstad
5.00 p.m.  "The Truth About Everyone"  Katti Mac

Friday

10.30 a.m.  Session '70 Forum - all day  Alvin Boyarsky
6.30 p.m.  Aquapad Floats
Blisp Sears
Light/Sound Show

* Public lecture
MONDAY 12 JULY
9.30 REGISTRATION
14.00 SESSION 71 FORUM
Alvin Boyarsky
21.00 STREET PARTY
UNDERNEATH THE ARCHES
Multimatch

TUESDAY 13 JULY
10.30 GROUP MEETINGS
Cook, Oliver, Heron, Chalk, Jencks
14.00 INTRODUCTION TO
COVENT GARDEN
Chairman: Alan Colquhoun
TRAFFIC PEDESTRIANS
AND TRANSPORT
Brian Richards
BACKGROUND TO PLANNING
Brian Anson
BACKGROUND TO COMMUNITY
Jim Monohan
PLANNING IN ENGLISH
CONTEXT
Steven Mullings
HISTORY OF COVENT GARDEN
Graham Shane

WEDNESDAY 14 JULY
9.30 PARTICIPANTS FORUM
14.00 COVENT GARDEN WORKSHOP
INTRODUCTION
14.00 MEDIA WORKSHOP
PARTICIPATION
Dennis Crompton
14.00 SUPPORT STRUCTURES
WORKSHOP
Introduction by John Kirkpatrick
16.00 CULTURES UNDER PRESSURE
Introduction by Paul Oliver
18.15 AA DIPLOMA SHOW
Peter Cook

THURSDAY 15 JULY
9.30 CULTURES UNDER PRESSURE
THE HAUSA CULTURE
C. G. B. Ridley
11.30 MUSIC OF THE HAUSA
By Y King
14.00 COVENT GARDEN WORKSHOP
14.00 FOLLIES WORKSHOP
Peter Cook
15.30 LONDON PAPERCHASE INTRO
Warren Chalk, Ron Heron
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>EXTREME ENVIRONMENTS: INFLATABLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>COVENT GARDEN WORKSHOP: MARKET PLACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE AND POLITICS: Charles Jenks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>THE FUTURE OF THE PAST: Thomas Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>EXTREME ENVIRONMENTS: Introduction by Ed Curtis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>NO COST HOUSING: INDUSTRIALIZED SYSTEMS: Andrew Rabanek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>COVENT GARDEN WORKSHOP: INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR: Aldo van Eyck, Antonio Gramajo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>PUBLIC LECTURE: Robert Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>NO COST HOUSING: Public Lecture by Martin Pawley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>BERKELEY SCENE: Alan Forrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>THE BOUTIQUE TRAIL: Peter and Hazel Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>ALICE IN WONDERLAND: Ellis Hillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>EXTREME ENVIRONMENTS: Expedition briefing: Ed Curtis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>CULTURES UNDER PRESSURE: Mladen Mladenovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>THE AUNT OF THE IVORY COAST: Dr. Fritz Morgenstern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>HOUSE FORMS: Paul Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>CULTURES UNDER PRESSURE: AFRICAN: Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>CULTURES UNDER PRESSURE: AFRICAN: Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>CULTURES UNDER PRESSURE: AFRICAN: Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>PUBLIC LECTURE: Anatole Kooan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>MEDIA WORKSHOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>URBAN DESIGN: MANHATTAN: Prof Fred Koetter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>FOULNESS WORKSHOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>MARIJUKA: OF IRAQ: Aladus, Ahma, Jarib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>TURKISH: TENTED NOMADS: Peter Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>COVENT GARDEN WORKSHOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>SUPPORT STRUCTURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>MARIJUKA: OF IRAQ: Aladus, Ahma, Jarib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>TURKISH: TENTED NOMADS: Peter Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>NO COST HOUSING: LIGHTWEIGHT STRUCTURES: Keith Critchow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>EXTREME ENVIRONMENTS: Expedition briefing: Ed Curtis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>CULTURES UNDER PRESSURE: THE RETURN: A PSYCHOANALYTIC STUDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>PUBLIC LECTURE: Nicholas Mabarak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>FUTURE OF THE PAST: Thomas Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>FOULNESS WORKSHOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>SUPPORT STRUCTURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>CULTURES UNDER PRESSURE: UNCONTROLLED URBAN SETTLEMENT: Patrick Crooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>MARIJUKA: OF IRAQ: Aladus, Ahma, Jarib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>TURKISH: TENTED NOMADS: Peter Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>BERKELEY SCENE: Cont: J Alan Forrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>CHOICE IN INDUSTRIALIZATION: Fred Forrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>COVENT GARDEN WORKSHOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>MEDIA WORKSHOP: VIDEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>SUPPORT STRUCTURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>THE FUTURE OF THE PAST: Thomas Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>URBANISM SEMINAR: Introductory by Dalibor Vesely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>PUBLIC LECTURE: Yona Friedman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>PARTICIPANTS FORUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>CULTURES UNDER PRESSURE: URBANIZATION, MIGRATION, GROWTH IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: Patrick Crooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>COVENT GARDEN WORKSHOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>SUPPORT STRUCTURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>URBANISM SEMINAR: Patrick Crooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>PUBLIC LECTURE: Yona Friedman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WEDNESDAY 4 AUGUST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>EVOLUTIONARY ARTS - WE POLYTECHNIC GLAN LEEWIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>RIBA SEMINAR - IS THERE STILL ROOM FOR PROFESSIONALISM? Patrician Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>COVENT GARDEN WORKSHOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>SUPPORT STRUCTURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>FOLIENESS WORKSHOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>URBANISM SEMINAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>PUBLIC LECTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>THURSDAY 5 AUGUST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>CULTURES UNDER PRESSURE: SOUL IN THE CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE + POLITICS: Japans Construction Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>COVENT GARDEN WORKSHOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>SUPPORT STRUCTURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>URBANISM SEMINAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>PUBLIC LECTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TUESDAY 17 AUGUST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>CULTURES UNDER PRESSURE: TON SIOUX GHOST DANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>THE HOPI AND NAVAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE + POLITICS: Japans Construction Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>FOLIENESS WORKSHOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>STREET FARMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>PUBLIC LECTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>THURSDAY 12 AUGUST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>CULTURES UNDER PRESSURE: SUMMARY + DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>ROAC 747 VISIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>BALLSOPHIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>AN ITALIAN GENERATION: SUPERSTUDIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>ATLANTICIQUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>WELCOME JAPAN PARTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TUESDAY 17 AUGUST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>ALGERIAN REPORT: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>DEMOCRATIC DECISION MAKING: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>FOLIENESS WORKSHOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>COVENT GARDEN MARKET PLACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>PUBLIC LECTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>PUBLIC LECTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TUESDAY 17 AUGUST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>PARTICIPANTS FORUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>ITALIAN GENERATION ARCHIVIZM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>PUBLIC LECTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WEDNESDAY 18 AUGUST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>THE FUTURE OF THE PAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>SONG ON AND UNDERGROUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>COVENT GARDEN WORKSHOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>ITALIAN GENERATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>ARCHIVIZM OPERA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>THURSDAY 19 AUGUST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURE + POLITICS: Japans Construction Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>FOLIENESS PRESENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>COVENT GARDEN MARKET PLACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>PUBLIC LECTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>PUBLIC LECTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FRIDAY 20 AUGUST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>SESSION 7 FORUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>ITALIAN GENERATION ARCHIVIZM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>PUBLIC LECTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>PUBLIC LECTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY 24 JULY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>PARTICIPANTS’ F-OEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>LONDON WORKSHOP RETHINKING ROYALTY: AVOIDANCE OF FUTURE GLASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUESDAY 25 JULY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>LONDON WORKSHOP REHABILITATION OF ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>LONDON WORKSHOP BUILDING CONSTRUCTION OF FUTURE GLASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>LONDON WORKSHOP ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE IN THE 20TH CENTURY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDNESDAY 26 JULY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>LONDON WORKSHOP ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE IN THE 20TH CENTURY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>LONDON WORKSHOP REHABILITATION OF ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>LONDON WORKSHOP BUILDING CONSTRUCTION OF FUTURE GLASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>LONDON WORKSHOP ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE IN THE 20TH CENTURY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURSDAY 27 JULY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>LONDON WORKSHOP ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE IN THE 20TH CENTURY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>LONDON WORKSHOP REHABILITATION OF ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>LONDON WORKSHOP BUILDING CONSTRUCTION OF FUTURE GLASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>LONDON WORKSHOP ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE IN THE 20TH CENTURY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIDAY 28 JULY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>LONDON WORKSHOP ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE IN THE 20TH CENTURY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>LONDON WORKSHOP REHABILITATION OF ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>LONDON WORKSHOP BUILDING CONSTRUCTION OF FUTURE GLASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>LONDON WORKSHOP ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE IN THE 20TH CENTURY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATURDAY 29 JULY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>LONDON WORKSHOP ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE IN THE 20TH CENTURY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
ARCHITECTURAL ASSOCIATION
ACADEMIC STAFF LIST: 1973/74-1989/90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1973-1974 (as listed in <em>AA Prospectus</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST YEAR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grahame Shane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranulph Glanville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon Van Shaik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Monahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Heron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Mather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Fisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Stanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Millstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Anson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janja Lap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Mullin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Dixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sven Rindl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loren Butt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Francis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Kasabov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Frazer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britt Andreson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Critchlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Kowsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Tasker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waquidi Falicoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Goldstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Cullinan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Meller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon van Schaik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIPLOMA SCHOOL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalibor Vesely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Tschumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Fournier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Chalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Visiting Critic: Tony Dugdale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Outram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Cook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Unit 7
- Dick Hobin
- Anne Holmes
- Robin Sutcliffe

### Unit 8
- Omar Farouk
- Geoffrey Payne

### Unit 9
- Elia Zenghelis
- Thalis Argyropoulos
- Leon Krier
- Stuart Knight

### GENERAL STUDIES
- Anne Holmes
- Jasia Reichardt
- Thomas Stevens
- Charles Jencks
- Graham Shane
- Steve Merrett
- Hermione Hobhouse
- Dennis Sharp
- Bredan O'Regan
- Robin Middleton
- Royston Landau
- John Roberts

### COMMUNICATIONS UNIT
- Dennis Crompton
- Ron Herron
- John Walmsey
- Mike Myers
- Emanuel Sandreuter
- Gail Turner
- Roger Raef
- Jackie Cooper

### 1974-1975 (as listed in AA Projects Review)

#### FIRST YEAR
**Unit 1**
- Grahame Shane
- Leon van Schaik
- Ranulph Glanville
- Kate Heron
- Jim Monahan
- Dan Cruickshank

**Unit 2**
- Rick Mather
- Dale Benedict

**Unit 3**
- Mark Fischer
- Paul Green-Armytage
- Erik Millstone
- Don Gray

#### INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL
**Unit 1**
- Brian Anson
- Janja Lapp
- Hans Harms

**Unit 2**
- Su Rogers
- David Shalev

**Unit 3**
- Jeremy Dixon
- Fanella Dixon
- Chris Cross

**Unit 4**
- n/a

**Unit 5**
- John Frazer
- Brit Andressen
- Paul van Schaik
- Mick Kemp
- Philip Bagenal

**Unit 6**
- Tony Gwilliam
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Keitch Critchlow</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Barbara Goldstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Tasker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Harmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Kowsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waqidi Falicoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Organ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thalis Argyropoulos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Manousso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Ingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keith Cowell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Leon van Schaik</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Leon Krier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Meller</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Corrigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIPLOMA SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dalibor Vesely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bernard Tschumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don Genasci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Rykwert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leon van Schaik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Andrew Rabeneck</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Warren Chalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Town</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fred Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Deakin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robin Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dennis Sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Giorgio Verrechia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mike Gold</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Peter Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Shepheard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ingrid Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dick Hobin</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Geoff Payne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Elia Zenghelis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gerry Foley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thalis Argyropoulos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeanne Sillett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>John Turner</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Anne Holmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Woolley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hans Harms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL STUDIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward de Bono</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Rykwert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simon Digby</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dennis Sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerry Foley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tony Sutcliffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermione Hobhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robin Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann Holmes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rosemary Treble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Jencks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS UNIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Crompton</td>
<td>Emanuel Sandreuter</td>
<td>James Meller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walmsley</td>
<td>Gail Turner</td>
<td>John Hopkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Herron</td>
<td>Chrissie Trewick</td>
<td>Sue Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Cooper</td>
<td>Steve Gettler</td>
<td>Charles Elsesser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Rickaby</td>
<td>Gus Coral</td>
<td>Peter Buller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monique Hayat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1975-1976 (as listed in *AA Projects Review*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST YEAR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1</td>
<td>Chris Cross</td>
<td>Unit 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerry Foley</td>
<td>Rich Mather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranulph Glanville</td>
<td>Dale Benedict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>Mark Fisher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don Gray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1</td>
<td>Ranulph Glanville</td>
<td>Unit 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Stevens</td>
<td>Su Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Gage</td>
<td>David Shalev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>Jeremy Dixon</td>
<td>Unit 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 5</td>
<td>Brit Andresen</td>
<td>Unit 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 7</td>
<td>Keith Critclow</td>
<td>Unit 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Tasker</td>
<td>David Greene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Kowsky</td>
<td>John Frazer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 9</td>
<td>Doug Clelland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Libeskind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIPLOMA SCHOOL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1</td>
<td>Dalibor Vesely</td>
<td>Unit 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Libeskind</td>
<td>Leo Krier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don Genasci</td>
<td>Peter Allison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doug Clelland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>Andrew Rabeneck</td>
<td>Unit 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Town</td>
<td>Fred Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 5</td>
<td>Mike Gold</td>
<td>Unit 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Jones</td>
<td>Peter Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Shepheard</td>
<td>Ron Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 7</td>
<td>Dick Hobin</td>
<td>Unit 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Anson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 9</td>
<td>Elia Zenghelis</td>
<td>Rem Koolhaas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 10</td>
<td>Gerry Foley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 11</td>
<td>Tom Woolley</td>
<td>Hans Harms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL STUDIES**
- Robin Middleton
- Richard Harris
- Hermione Hobhouse
- Anne Holmes
- Charles Jencks
- George Michell
- John Roberts
- Dennis Sharp
- Thomas Stevens
- Rosemary Treble
- Peter Fowler
- Myles Burnyeat

**COMMUNICATIONS UNIT**
- Dennis Crompton
- Ron Herron
- Emanuel Sandreuter
- John Walmsley
- Gus Coral
- Sue Hall
- Gail Tandy
- Steve Gettler
- Dominique Murray
- Peter Buller
- Jackie Cooper
- Bridget Cooke
- Caryl Bradbury

### 1976-1977 (as listed in *AA Prospectus*)

**FIRST YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Chris Cross</th>
<th>Ranulph Glanville</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Rick Mather</th>
<th>Dale Benedict</th>
<th>Don Genasci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 3</th>
<th>John Frazer</th>
<th>Don Gray</th>
<th>Pedro Guedes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Ranulph Glanville</th>
<th>Thomas Stevens</th>
<th>Stephen Gage</th>
<th>Peter Jackson</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Su Rogers</th>
<th>Peter Allison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 3</th>
<th>Ingrid Morris</th>
<th>Tom Heneghan</th>
<th>Frank Pyle</th>
<th>Joachim Schock</th>
<th>Unit 4</th>
<th>Tony Dugdale</th>
<th>Bob Evans</th>
<th>Andrew Holmes</th>
<th>Mick Kemp</th>
<th>Paul Bell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 5</th>
<th>Brian Anson</th>
<th>Unit 6</th>
<th>Don Gray</th>
<th>Brit Andresen</th>
<th>Mick Keniger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Unit 7  Keitch Critchlow  David Greene
David Tasker
Carl Kowsky

Unit 9  Daniel Libeskind
Alberto Perez Gomez

DIPLOMA SCHOOL
Unit 1  Dalibor Vesely
Unit 2  Tom Woolley
Hugo Hinsley
Hans Harms

Unit 3  Andrew Rabeneck
Peter Town
Unit 4  Fred Scott
Bob Evans
Grahame Shane

Unit 5  Mike Gold
Paul Shepheard
Jeanne Sillett
Unit 6  Ron Herron
Peter Cook

Unit 7  Brian Richards
David Shalev
Patrick Hodgkinson
Unit 8  John Starling

Unit 9  Elia Zenghelis
Rem Koolhaas
Smitri Porphyrios
Unit 10  Mark Fisher

GENERAL STUDIES
Robin Middleton
Will Alsop
Miles Burnyeat
Peter Fowler
Richard Harriss
Hermione Hobhouse
Anne Holmes
Charles Jencks
George Michell
John Roberts
Dennis Sharp
Thomas Stevens
Nicholas Taylor
Rosemary Treble

COMMUNICATIONS UNIT
ACADEMIC
Co-ordinator  Dennis Crompton
Graphics  Emanuel Sandreuter
Photography  John Walmsley
Film & video  Gus Coral
Video  Sue Hall
TECHNICAL
Silkscreen  Steven Gettler
Darkroom  Gail Tandy
Video tech.  Peter Buller
Video studio  Jackie Cooper
Studio assist.  Bridget Cooke
Typesetting  Dominique Murray
Audio Visual  Ken Newman

1977-1978 (as listed in AA Projects Review)

FIRST YEAR
Unit 1  Chris Cross
Elspeth Cross
Ranulph Glanville
Unit 2  Dale Benedict
Crispin Osbourne
Sara Rossi
Unit 3
Pedro Guedes
Tom Heneghan
Peter Wilson

INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL
Unit 1 Ranulph Glanville
Unit 3 Ingrid Morris
Tom Heneghan
Unit 5 Mike Davies
Alan Stanton
Unit 7 Ronald Lewcock
Babr Mumtaz
Mkhonto Ozi Nkabinde
Sara Rossi
Unit 2
Gordon Benson
Unit 4
Tony Dugdale
Andrew Holmes
Mark Beedle
Unit 6
Don Gray
Mick Keniger
Unit 8
David Greene

DIPLOMA SCHOOL
Unit 1 Dalibor Vesely
John Burrell
Unit 3 Fenella Dixon
Jeremy Dixon
Unit 5 Mike Gold
Paul Shephard
Jeannie Sillett
Peter Wilson
Unit 2
Tom Woolley
Hugo Hinsley
Unit 4
Fred Scott
Bob Evans
Unit 6
Peter Cook
Ron Herron
Unit 7
Brian Richards
David Shalev
Patrick Hodgkinson
Unit 8
Brian Anson
George Mills
Unit 9
Elia Zenghelis
Rem Koolhaas
Zaha Hadid
Unit 10
Bernard Tschumi
Nigel Coates
Unit 11
Nigel Greenhill
John Jenner
Unit Pi
Stephen Gage
Lot 90
Jeanne Sillett

GENERAL STUDIES
Robin Middleton
Prof. Allen Brooks
Nicholas Bullock
Myles Burnyeat
Catherine Cooke
Caroline Elam
Richard Harriss
Hermione Hobhouse
Charles Jencks
Rem Koolhaas
Christina Lodder
John Maule McKeen
Jasia Reichardt
John Roberts
Andrew Saint
Grahame Shane
Dennis Sharp
Thomas Stevens
Nicholas Taylor
Anthony Vidler
Prof. Richard Wollheim

COMMUNICATIONS UNIT
Dennis Crompton
Emanuel Sandreuter
Gerry Whale
John Walmsley
Gail Tandy
Susan Horsman
Allen Barker
Jackie Cooper
Dominique Murray
Jackie Cooper
Steven Gettler
Mike Leonard
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Unit 3</th>
<th>Unit 4</th>
<th>Unit 5</th>
<th>Unit 6</th>
<th>Unit 7</th>
<th>Unit 8</th>
<th>Motif 8</th>
<th>Unit 9</th>
<th>Unit 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRST YEAR</td>
<td>Chris Cross</td>
<td>Dale Benedict</td>
<td>Pedro Guedes</td>
<td>Brendan Woods</td>
<td>Mike Davies</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Ronald Lewcock</td>
<td>David Greene</td>
<td>Ranulph Glanville</td>
<td>Elia Zenghelis</td>
<td>Bernard Tschumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elspeth Cross</td>
<td>Crispin Osbourne</td>
<td>John Andrews</td>
<td>Richard Woods</td>
<td>Alan Stanton</td>
<td>Graham Cain</td>
<td>Sara Rossi</td>
<td>Crispin Osbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rem Koolhaas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranulph Glanville</td>
<td>Sara Rossi</td>
<td>John Robins</td>
<td>Peter Colomb</td>
<td>Ian Ritchie</td>
<td>Richard Gooden</td>
<td>Ozi Nkabinde</td>
<td>Julyan Wickham</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zaha Hadid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeanne Sillett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Busfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL</td>
<td>Peter Wilson</td>
<td>Gordon Benson</td>
<td>Ingrid Morris</td>
<td>Brendan Woods</td>
<td>Mike Davies</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Ronald Lewcock</td>
<td>David Greene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jenny Lowe</td>
<td>Alan Forsyth</td>
<td>Tom Heneghan</td>
<td>Richard Woods</td>
<td>Alan Stanton</td>
<td>Graham Cain</td>
<td>Sara Rossi</td>
<td>Crispin Osbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doug Branson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rene Wiesner</td>
<td>Peter Colomb</td>
<td>Ian Ritchie</td>
<td>Richard Gooden</td>
<td>Ozi Nkabinde</td>
<td>Julyan Wickham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIPLOMA SCHOOL</td>
<td>Dalibor Vesely</td>
<td>Tom Woolley</td>
<td>Jeremy Dixon</td>
<td>Rodrigo Perez de Arce</td>
<td>Mike Gold</td>
<td>Peter Cook</td>
<td>David Shalev</td>
<td>Stephen Gage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Carl</td>
<td>Hugo Hinsley</td>
<td>Sven Rindl</td>
<td>Rene Davids</td>
<td>Paul Shepheard</td>
<td>Ron Herron</td>
<td></td>
<td>Piers Gough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mohsen Mostafavi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeanne Sillett</td>
<td>Christine Hawley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Terry Farrell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isi Metzstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GENERAL STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 11</th>
<th>Nigel Greenhill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Jenner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robin Middleton</th>
<th>William Curtis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor H. Allen</td>
<td>Caroline Elam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>Rose Lee Goldberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Bullock</td>
<td>Godfrey Goodwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myles Burnyeat</td>
<td>Robert Harbison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Cooke</td>
<td>Richard Harris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Jenner</th>
<th>Hermione Hobhouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Dixon Hunt</td>
<td>John Maule McKean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Jencks</td>
<td>Jasia Reichard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda Sonnabend</td>
<td>Nicholas Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Stevens</td>
<td>Anthony Vidler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey Goodwin</td>
<td>Heiner Hoffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Curtis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Elam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Lee Goldberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey Goodwin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Harbison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Harris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermione Hobhouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dixon Hunt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Maule McKean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasia Reichard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Vidler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heiner Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMUNICATIONS UNIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dennis Crompton</th>
<th>John Walmsley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Cooper</td>
<td>Varda Zisman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Tandy</td>
<td>Susan Horsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominique Murray</td>
<td>Deanna Petherbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June McGowan</td>
<td>Monica Epstein</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Gerry Whale     |                                      |
| Rony Rickaby Steve|                                  |
| Gettler         |                                    |
| Mike Leonard    |                                    |
| Heiner Hoffman  |                                   |

### 1979-1980 (as listed in AA Projects Review)

#### FIRST YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Christopher Cross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elsepth Cross</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Dale Benedict   |                                      |
| Penny Richards  |                                    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 3</th>
<th>Pedro Guedes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Minchin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Horne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Peter Wilson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Lowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Branson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Gordon Benson   |                                      |
| Alan Forsyth    |                                    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 3</th>
<th>Ingrid Morris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Foster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konrad Wos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Brendan Woods   |                                      |
| Julyan Wickham  |                                    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 5</th>
<th>Alan Stanton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Davies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Ritchie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Stephen Gage    |                                      |
| Jos Boys        |                                    |
| Charles Sands  |                                   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 7</th>
<th>Ronald Lewcock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mkhonto Ozi Nkabinde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Rossi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Norton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| David Greene    |                                      |
| Crispin Osborne|                                    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 9</th>
<th>Tom Heneghan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soteres Polydorou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Lyman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Walker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Motif 8X        |                                      |
| Ranulph Glanville|                                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Dalibor Vesely</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Robin Evans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mohsen Mostafavi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan Wimpenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Colomb</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>Jeremy Dixon</td>
<td>Unit 4</td>
<td>Rodrigo Perez de Arce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fenella Dixon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rene Davids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sven Rindl</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trevor Horne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 5</td>
<td>Mike Gold</td>
<td>Unit 6</td>
<td>Peter Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 7</td>
<td>David Shalev</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 9</td>
<td>Elia Zenghelis</td>
<td>Unit 10</td>
<td>John Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rem Koolhaas</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Lyall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zaha Hadid</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Lyall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colin Duns</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Lyall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Unit 12</td>
<td>Fred Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 13</td>
<td>Jeanne Sillett</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rodney Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Shepheard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Andre Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rex Wilkinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL STUDIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robin Middleton</th>
<th>W. Curtis</th>
<th>John Dixon Hunt</th>
<th>Vincent Scully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor H. Allen</td>
<td>Caroline Elam</td>
<td>Conrad Jameson</td>
<td>Dennis Sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>Kenneth Frampton</td>
<td>Rem Koolhaas</td>
<td>Gavin Stamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Beckwith</td>
<td>Robert Harbison</td>
<td>Neil Levine</td>
<td>Thomas Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myles Burnyeat</td>
<td>Richard Harris</td>
<td>Jasia Reichardt</td>
<td>Nicholas Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.M. Crook</td>
<td>Timothy Hilton</td>
<td>Joseph Rykwert</td>
<td>Anthony Vidler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Wollheim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNICATIONS UNIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dennis Crompton</th>
<th>Mike Leonard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Buller</td>
<td>June McGowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Dunn</td>
<td>Dominique Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Epstein</td>
<td>Deanna Petherbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Gettler</td>
<td>Tony Rickaby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Horsman</td>
<td>Barbara Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Huleu</td>
<td>Varda Zisman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FIRST YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>John Andrews, Tony Fretton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dale Benedict, Penny Richards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>David Gloster, Steve Lyman, Charlie Mann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Minchin, Trevor Horne, Athanasios Spanomaridis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jenny Lowe, Rodney Place</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gordon Benson, Alan Forsyth, John Cannon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brendan Woods, Julyan Wickham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alan Stanton, Mike Davies, Ian Ritchie</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stephen Gage, Jos Boys, Rob Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pedro Guedes, Ronald Lewcock, Maurice Mitchell</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chris Macdonald, Peter Salter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tom Heneghan, Soteres Polydorou, Mark Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DIPLOMA SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dalibor Vesely, Mohsen Mostafavi, Tim Ronalds</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Robin Evans, John Andrews, Peter Columb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rodrigo Perez de Arce, Rene Davids, Andrew Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mike Gold</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Peter Cook, Ron Herron, Christine Hawley, Mike Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>David Shalev, David Grey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Paul Shepheard, John Lyall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Zaha Hadid, Colin Duns</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nigel Coates, Antonio Lagarto, Richard Padovan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Frederick Scott, Andrew Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GENERAL STUDIES

Robin Middleton  
Richard Wollheim  
Myles Burnyeat  
Jasia Reichardt  
Steve Rogers  
Dalibor Vesely  
Andrew Saint  
Hugh Plommer  
Caroline Elam  
Richard Harris  
Charles Jencks  
Gavin Stamp  
Sam Stevens  
Dennis Sharp  
Bob Maxwell  
Nicholas Taylor

### COMMUNICATIONS UNIT

Dennis Crompton  
Peter Buller  
Peter Dunn  
Monica Epstein  
Steve Gettler  
Susan Horsman  
Christian Huleu  
June McGowan  
Deanna Petherbridge  
Tony Rickaby  
Christine Wallace  
Barbara Young  
Varda Zisman

### 1981-1982 (as listed in *AA Projects Review*)

#### FIRST YEAR

**Unit 1**  
John Andrews  
Tony Fretton  
Keith James

**Unit 2**  
Dale Benedict  
Penny Richards  
Kaveh Mehrebani

**Unit 3**  
David Gloster  
Steve Lyman  
Nick Timms

#### INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

**Unit 1**  
Jenny Lowe  
Bill Forest  
Oscar Palacio

**Unit 2**  
David Gray  
Neave Brown  
David Porter

#### DIPLOMA SCHOOL

**Unit 1**  
Peter Wilson  
Tony MacIntyre

**Unit 2**  
Robin Evans  
Peter Columb

**Unit 3**  
Jeremy Dixon  
Alex Wall

**Unit 4**  
Rodrigo Perez de Arce  
Rene Davids  
Andrew Walker

**Unit 5**  
Mike Gold

**Unit 6**  
Ron Herron  
Peter Cook  
Christine Hawley  
Mike Glass

**Unit 7**  
Gordon Benson  
Alan Forsyth  
John Cannon

**Unit 8**  
Paul Shepheard  
John Lyall

**Unit 9**  
Zaha Hadid  
Walter Naegeli

**Unit 10**  
Nigel Coates  
Tony Carruthers
### GENERAL STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robin Middleton</td>
<td>John Dixon Hunt</td>
<td>Neil Levine</td>
<td>Gavin Stamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Ades</td>
<td>Bob Evans</td>
<td>Hugh Plommer</td>
<td>Thomas Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Benton</td>
<td>Robert Harbison</td>
<td>Cedric Price</td>
<td>Nicholas Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Boucher</td>
<td>Richard Harris</td>
<td>Jasia Reichardt</td>
<td>Anthony Vidler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myles Burnyeat</td>
<td>Deborah Hodgkin</td>
<td>Nicholas Rowling</td>
<td>Richard Wollheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elspeth Cross</td>
<td>Charles Jencks</td>
<td>Frederick Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMUNICATIONS UNIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Crompton</td>
<td>Virginia Charley</td>
<td>Susan Horsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Barnett</td>
<td>Dan Crompton</td>
<td>June McGowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley Brooks</td>
<td>Peter Dunn</td>
<td>Deanna Petherbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Buller</td>
<td>Monica Epstein</td>
<td>Tony Rickaby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Carruthers</td>
<td>Steve Gettler</td>
<td>Christine Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Varda Zisman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1982-1983 (as listed in AA Projects Review)

#### FIRST YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Mann</td>
<td>Dale Benedict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Forsyth</td>
<td>Kaveh Mehrabani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iannis Zachariadis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 3</th>
<th>MQL Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Gloster</td>
<td>John Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Lyman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Timms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Lowe</td>
<td>David Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Palacio</td>
<td>Kisa Kawakami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Forest</td>
<td>David Porter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 3</th>
<th>Unit 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid Morris</td>
<td>Mohsen Mostafavi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Davidson</td>
<td>Homa Fardjadi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 5</th>
<th>Unit 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crispin Osborne</td>
<td>Stephen Gage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Summers</td>
<td>Rob Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Munkenbeck</td>
<td>David Connors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Randle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 7</th>
<th>Unit 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Minchin</td>
<td>Peter Salter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulrich Schaad</td>
<td>Chris Macdonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalliope Kontozoglou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 9</th>
<th>Unit 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Heneghan</td>
<td>Soteres Polydorou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Walker</td>
<td>Jon Wealleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicole Pertuiset</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DIPLOMA SCHOOL**

| Unit 1 | Peter Wilson | Unit 2 | Will Alsop  
|--------|--------------|--------|-------------  
|        |              |        | Art Schaller  
|        |              |        | Amanda Marshall  
|        |              |        | John Lyall  
| Unit 4 | Rodrigo Perez  
|        | Rene Davids  
| Unit 5 | Mike Gold | Unit 6/3 | Peter Cook  
|        |            |        | Christine Hawley  
|        |            |        | Jeremy Dixon  
|        |            |        | Special projects visiting tutors:  
|        |            |        | Frank O. Gehry  
|        |            |        | Adolfo Natalini  
|        |            |        | Daniel Libeskind  
|        |            |        | Pascal Schöning  
| Unit 7 | Gordon Benson  
|        | Alan Forsyth | Unit 8 | Ron Herron  
|        |              |        | Jan Kaplicky  
|        |              |        | Frank Newby  
| Unit 9 | Zaha Hadid | Unit 10 | Nigel Coates  

**GENERAL STUDIES**

| Robin Middleton | Paul Crossley | Sam Stevens  
| Dawn Ades | Richard Harris | Mark Swenarton  
| Charlotte Benton | Charles Jencks | David Thomas  
| Bruce Boucher | Hugh Plommer | Richard Wollheim  
| Nicholas Bullock | Nick Rowling | Diane Zervas  
| Miles Burnyeat | Gavin Stamp |  

**COMMUNICATIONS UNIT**

| Dennis Crompton | Peter Dunn | Deanna Petherbridge  
| Paul Barnett | Monica Epstein | Tony Rickaby  
| Peter Buller | Steve Gettler | Madelon Vriesendorp  
| Tony Carruthers | Susan Horsman | Varda Zisman  
|              |              | Zoe Zenghelis  

**1983-1984 (as listed in *AA Projects Review*)**

**FIRST YEAR**

| Unit 1 | Charlie Mann  
|        | Adrian Forsyth  
|        | Iannis Zachariadis  
| Unit 3 | Rodney Place  
|        | Susan Lewis  
| Unit 2 | Dale Benedict  
|        | Nicole Pertuiset  


INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

Unit 1  Jenny Lowe  Unit 2  David Gray
        Kisa Kawakami

Unit 3  n/a  Unit 4  Mohsen Mostafavi
        Homa Fardjadi

Unit 5  Crispin Osborne
        Peter Davidson  Unit 6  Stephen Gage
        Andrew Holmes
        William Firebrace
        John Randle
        Dick Knowles

Unit 7  Andrew Minchin
        Ulrich Schaad
        Kalliope Kontozoglou  Unit 8  Peter Salter
        Chris Macdonald
        Jeanne Sillett

Unit 9  Tom Heneghan
        Carlos Villanueva
        Brandt  Unit 10  Raoul Bunschoten

DIPLOMA SCHOOL

Unit 1  Peter Wilson
        Cornell Naff
        Neil Porter  Unit 2  Will Alsop
        Gareth Jones
        Amanda Marshall

Unit 3  Pascal Schöning  Unit 4  Rodrigo Perez

Unit 5  Mike Gold
        Paul Shepheard  Unit 6  Peter Cook
        Christine Hawley

Unit 7  Gordon Benson
        Alan Forsyth  Unit 8  Ron Herron
        Jan Kaplicky
        Frank Newby

Unit 9  Zaha Hadid
        Stefano di Martino
        Alex Wall  Unit 10  Nigel Coates
        Daniel Weil

Unit 11  Rene Davids

GENERAL STUDIES

Co-ordinator  Robin Middleton

Submissions  Robin Evans  Contributors:

Dawn Ades  Charles Jencks
Charlotte Benton  Antonia Phillips
Bruce Boucher  Nick Rowling
Nicholas Bullock  Gavin Stamp
Paul Crossley  Thomas Stevens
Rosalind Hall  Robert Jan van Pelt
Robert Harbison  Robert Williams
Richard Harris  Diane Zervas
COMMUNICATIONS UNIT
Co-ordinator: Dennis Crompton

Tutors
Paul Barnett  Susan Horsman
Peter Buller  Tony Rickaby
Tony Carruthers  Madelon Vriesendorp
Peter Dunn  Varda Zisman
Monica Epstein  Zoe Zenghelis
Gettler

1984-1985 (as listed in AA Projects Review)

FOUNDATION COURSE
Ken Turner  Helen Powell

FIRST YEAR
Unit 1  Neil Porter  Unit 2  Dale Benedict
  Steven McAdam  Teaching Assistant:
  Christina Norton  Dimitri Vannas

Unit 3  Mick Keniger
  Chris Macdonald

INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL
Unit 1  Jenny Lowe  Unit 2  David Gray
  Robert Mull  Kisa Kawakami

Unit 3  n/a  Unit 4  Charles Mann

Unit 5  Will Alsop  Unit 6  Stephen Gage
  David Greene  Andrew Holmes
  Gareth Jones  John Randle

Unit 7  Andrew Minchin  Unit 8  Dick Knowles
  Ulrich Schaad  Greg Penoyre

Unit 9  Tom Heneghan  Unit 10  Donald Bates
  Carlos Villanueva  Raoul Bunschoten

DIPLOMA SCHOOL
Unit 1  Peter Wilson  Unit 2  Mohsen Mostafavi
  Neil Porter  Kalliope Kontozoglou
  Lars Lerup  Homa Fardjadi

Unit 3  Chris Macdonald  Unit 4  Rodrigo Perez
  Peter Salter  Jean Sillett
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 5</th>
<th>Mike Gold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistants:</td>
<td>Greg Chrysler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katrina Rüedi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 6</td>
<td>Peter Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christine Hawley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 7</td>
<td>Gordon Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alan Forsyth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>Haadi Simaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 8</td>
<td>Ron Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan Kaplicky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 9</td>
<td>Zaha Hadid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alex Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 10</td>
<td>Nigel Coates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Weil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 11</td>
<td>René Davids</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL STUDIES**

Co-ordinator Robin Middleton

Thesis Co-ordinator Robin Evans

Contributors:
- Fenella Crichton
- Paul Davies
- Rosalind Hall
- Robert Harbison
- Charles Jencks
- Flavia Ormond
- Gavin Stamp
- Robert Williams
- Richard Wollheim
- Diane Zervas

**COMMUNICATIONS UNIT**

Co-ordinator Dennis Crompton

Tutors
- Paul Barnett
- Peter Buller
- Tony Carruthers
- Steve Gettler
- Susan Horsman
- Tony Rickaby
- Madelon vriesendorp
- Varda Zisma
- Zoe Zenghelis

**1985-1986 (as listed in AA Projects Review)**

**FOUNDATION COURSE**

Ken Turner
Helen Powell

**FIRST YEAR**

Unit 1
- Steve McAdam
- Christina Norton
- Neil Porter

Unit 2
- Dale Benedict
- Dimitri Vannas (Tutor)

Unit 3
- Guy Comely
- Matthias Sauerbruch
- Peter St John

Unit 4
- Tom Heneghan
- Pedro Guedes
- Carlos Villanueva
- Brandt (Tutor)
### INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Jenny Lowe</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>David Gray</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Mull (Tutor)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kisa Kawakami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ben Kern (Tutor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>Francisco Sanin</td>
<td>Unit 4</td>
<td>Stefano de Martino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alex Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 5</td>
<td>Will Alsop</td>
<td>Unit 6</td>
<td>Stephen Gage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gareth Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dick Knowles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Randle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 7</td>
<td>Andrew Minchin</td>
<td>Unit 8</td>
<td>Peter Salter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sima Farjadi (Tutor)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pascal Schöning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ulrich Schaad (Tutor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 9</td>
<td>Andrew Holmes</td>
<td>Unit 10</td>
<td>Don Bates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Firebrace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raoul Bunschoten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Greene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DIPLOMA SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Peter Wilson</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Mohsen Mostafavi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martyn Wiltshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kalliope Kontozoglou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Tutor)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Homa Farjadi (Tutor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>Chris MacDonal</td>
<td>Unit 4</td>
<td>Rodrigo Perez de Arce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Salter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara Weiss (Tutor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeanne Sillett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 5</td>
<td>Mike Gold</td>
<td>Unit 6</td>
<td>Peter Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christine Hawley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 7</td>
<td>Gordon Benson</td>
<td>Unit 8</td>
<td>Ron Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alan Forsyth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan Kaplicky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 9</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Unit 10</td>
<td>Nigel Coates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Weil (Tutor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 11</td>
<td>Rene Davids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GENERAL STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-ordinator</th>
<th>Robin Middleton</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Ades</td>
<td>Javier Castanon</td>
<td>Rosalind Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svetlana Alpers</td>
<td>Catherine Cooke</td>
<td>Robert Harbison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive Aslet</td>
<td>Fenella Crichton</td>
<td>Richard Harris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micha Bandini</td>
<td>Paul Crossley</td>
<td>Charles Jencks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haig Beck</td>
<td>Peter Davidson</td>
<td>Pascal Schöning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Bullock</td>
<td>Robin Evans</td>
<td>Robert Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Wollheim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**COMMUNICATIONS UNIT**

Co-ordinator  
Dennis Crompton

Tutors  
Paul Barnett  
Peter Buller  
Steve Gettler  
Susan Horsman  
Tony Rickaby  
Diana Salevourakis  
Madelon vriesendorp  
Zoe Zenghelis

**1986-1987 (as listed in AA Projects Review)**

**FOUNDATION**

Ken Turner  
Helen Powell  
John Andrews

**FIRST YEAR**

Unit 1  
Guy Comely  
Neil Porter

Unit 3  
Catrina Beevor  
Matthias Sauerbruch  
Peter St John

Unit 2  
Dale Benedict

Unit 4  
Tom Heneghan  
Carlos Villanueva-Brandt  
George Katodrytis  
(Tutor)

**INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL**

Unit 1  
Peter Salter

Unit 3  
Francisco Sanin  
Barbara Weiss (Tutor)

Unit 5  
Will Alsop  
Gareth Jones  
Tanja Ricciouos (Tutor)

Unit 7  
Andrew Minchin  
Sima Farjadi (Tutor)

Unit 9  
Andrew Holmes  
David Greene  
Don Gray (Tutor)

Unit 11  
Charlie Mann  
John Andrews  
Gary Butler (Tutor)

**DIPLOMA SCHOOL**

Unit 1  
Peter Wilson

Unit 3  
On sabbatical

Unit 5  
Mike Gold  
Robert Griffin (Tutor)

Unit 2  
Raoul Bunschoten

Unit 4  
Rodrigo Perez de Arce  
Ulrich Schaad (Tutor)

Unit 6  
Peter Cook  
Christine Hawley
### Unit 7
- David Gray
- Kisa Kawakami
- Ben Kern (Tutor)

### Unit 8
- Ron Herron
- Jan Kaplicky
- Andrew Herron (Tutor)

### Unit 9
- Zaha Hadid

### Unit 10
- Nigel Coates
- Robert Mull
- Carlos Villanueva-Brandt

### Unit 11
- Leon van Schaik
- Dalibor Vesely
- Alvin Boyarsky
- Peter Carl

### GENERAL STUDIES
- Co-ordinator: Robin Middleton
- Micha Bandini
- Nicholas Bullock
- Mark Cousins
- Fenella Crichton
- Robin Evans
- Rosalind Hall
- Robert Harbison
- Richard Harris Mary
- Hollingsworth
- Charles Jencks
- Philip Lidley
- Anthony McIntrye
- Gavin Stamp
- Michael Sullivan
- Terry Wright

### COMMUNICATIONS UNIT
- Co-ordinator: Dennis Crompton
- Tutors: Paul Barnett, Steve Gettler, Susan Horsman, Tony Rickaby
- Diana Salevourakis, Madelon Vriesendorp, Terry Wright, Zoe Zenghelis

### 1987-1988 (as listed in AA Projects Review)

### FOUNDATION
- John Andrews
- Dermot Curley (Tutor)
- Glenis Grieve (Tutor)
- Adrian Hemming (Tutor)
- Audrey Keong (Tutor)
- Lucy Voelcker (Tutor)
- Ada Wilson (Tutor)

### FIRST YEAR
- Unit 1
  - George Katodrytis
  - Chris Evans (Tutor)
  - Peter Beard (Tutor)
- Unit 2
  - Dale Benedict

- Unit 3
  - Catrina Beevor
  - Mark Prizeman
- Unit 4
  - Tom Heneghan
  - Carlos Villanueva-Brandt

### INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL
- Unit 1
  - Peter Salter
- Unit 2
  - William Firebrace
  - Martyn Wiltshire
| Unit 3   | Francisco Sanin          | Unit 4          | Stefano de Martino   
|         |                          |                | Alex Wall           
| Unit 5   | Will Alsop              | Unit 6          | Stephen Gage        
|         | Bruce McLean            |                | Dick Knowles (Tutor) 
|         | Tanja Riccius (Tutor)   |                | John Randle (Tutor)  
| Unit 7   | Matthias Sauerbruch     | Unit 8          | Pascal Schöning     
|         | Steve McAdam            |                |                    
| Unit 9   | Andrew Holmes           | Unit 10         | Don Bates           
|         | David Greene            |                |                    
| Unit 11  | John Andrews            | Unit 12         | Kas Oosterhuis      
|         | Sima Farjadi (Tutor)    |                |                    
| Unit 13  | Ben Kern                |                |                    
|         | Justyna Karakiewicz     |                |                    
|         | (Tutor)                 |                |                    
| DIPLOMA SCHOOL | Peter Wilson         | Unit 2          | Raoul Bunschoten    
|     | Thomas Müller (Tutor)   |                |                    
| Unit 3   | Chris Macdonald         | Unit 4          | Rodrigo Perez de Arce 
|         | Jeanne Sillett          |                | Javier Castanon (Tutor) 
| Unit 5   | Mike Gold               | Unit 6          | On sabbatical       
|         | Robert Griffin (Tutor)  |                |                    
| Unit 7   | David Gray              | Unit 8          | Ron Herron          
|         | Kisa Kawakami           |                | Jan Kaplicky        
|         |                          |                | Andrew Herron (Tutor) 
| Unit 9   | On sabbatical           | Unit 10         | Nigel Coates        
|         |                          |                | Robert Mull         
|         |                          |                | Carlos Villanueva- 
|         |                          |                | Brandt              
| Unit 11  | Christoph Langhof       | Unit 12         | John Frazer         
|         |                          |                | Melissa Koch        
|         |                          |                | Cedric Price        
| Unit 13  | Andrew Minchin          |                |                    
| GENERAL STUDIES | Dawn Ades              | Nicholas Bullock | Peter Davidson     
|     |                          |                | Yehuda Safran       
|     | Don Bates               | Raoul Bunschoten | Rosalind Hall       
|     |                          |                | Gavin Stamp         
|     | Bruce                   | Peter Cook      | Brian Hatton        
|     |                          |                | Peter Wilson        
|     | Boucher                 | Mark Cousins    | Charles Jencks      
|     |                          |                | Terry Wright        
|     | Peter Buchanan          | Fenella Crichton| Tony McIntyre       
|     |                          |                |                    |
COMMUNICATIONS UNIT  
Co-ordinator  |  Dennis Crompton
---|---
Tutors  |  Paul Barnett  |  Jessica Shamash  
|  Steve Gettler  |  Lucy Voelcker  
|  Susan Horsman  |  Madelon Vriesendorp  
|  Tony Rickaby  |  Terry Wright  
|  Diana Salevourakis  |  Zoe Zenghelis

1988-1989 (as listed in *AA Projects Review*)

FOUNDATION
John Andrews  |  Audrey Keong (Tutor)  
Dermot Curley (Tutor)  |  Lucy Voelcker (Tutor)  
Glenis Grieve (Tutor)

FIRST YEAR
Unit 1  |  George Katodrytis  |  Unit 2  |  Dale Benedict  
|  Chris Evans (Tutor)  |  |  
|  Peter Beard (Tutor)  |  |  
Unit 3  |  Mark Prizeman  |  Unit 4  |  Christina Norton  
|  |  |  |  Martin Benson  
|  |  |  |  Neil Porter  
|  |  |  |  Peter Fleissig (Tutor)

INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL
Unit 1  |  Frosso Pimenides  |  Unit 2  |  William Firebrace  
|  James Lambert (Tutor)  |  |  
Unit 3  |  n/a  |  Unit 4  |  Ada Wilson  
|  |  |  |  Katarina Rüedi (Tutor)  
|  |  |  |  Nic Bailey
Unit 5  |  Will Alsop  |  Unit 6  |  Stephen Gage  
|  Bruce McLean  |  |  John Randle (Tutor)  
|  Sand Helsel  |  |  Dick Knowles (Tutor)
Unit 7  |  Matthias Sauerbruch  |  Unit 8  |  Pascal Schöning  
|  Steve McAdam  |  |  
Unit 9  |  Peter Thomas  |  Unit 10  |  Mark Pimplot  
|  Peter Sabara  |  |  Tony Fretton (Tutor)
Unit 11  |  John Andrews  |  Unit 12  |  n/a  
|  Charles Mann  |  |  
Unit 13  |  Ben Kern  |  |  
|  Justyna Karakiewicz  |  |  

DIPLOMA SCHOOL
Unit 1  |  Wiel Arets  |  Unit 2  |  Raoul Bunschoten  
|  Wim van den Berg  |  |  

| Unit 3   | Chris Macdonald          | Unit 4                     | Rodrigo Perez de Arce       |
|         | Jeanne Sillett           |                           | Javier Castanon             |
| Unit 5  | Alex Wall                | Unit 6                    | Peter Salter                |
|         | Stefano de Martino       |                           | Mark Brearley               |
| Unit 7  | David Gray               | Unit 8                    | Ron Herron                  |
|         | Kisa Kawakami            |                           | Peter Cook                  |
|         |                           |                           | Andrew Herron (Tutor)        |
| Unit 9  | Andrew Holmes            | Unit 10                   | Carlos Villanueva-Brandt     |
|         | David Greene             |                           | Robert Mull                 |
|         |                           |                           | Nigel Coates                |
| Unit 11 | Christoph Langhof        | Unit 12                   | John Frazer                 |
|         | Thomas Deckker (Tutor)   |                           | Melissa Koch (Tutor)         |
|         |                           |                           |                             |
|         | **GENERAL STUDIES**      |                           |                             |
|         | Dawn Ades                | Catherine Cooke           | Charles Jencks              |
|         | Micha Bandini            | Mark Cousins Fenella      | Tony McIntyre               |
|         | Peter Blundell-Jones     | Crichton                 | Sandra Morris               |
|         | Bruce Boucher            | Ted Fawcett              | Julian Roberts              |
|         | Nicholas Bullock         | Rosalind Hall            | Alistair Rowan              |
|         | Joseph Connors           | Robert Harbison           | Yehuda Safran               |
|         | Peter Cook               | Brian Hatton             | Gavin Stamp                 |
|         |                           | Ian Jeffrey               | Anthony Vidler              |
|         |                           |                           |                             |
|         | **COMMUNICATIONS UNIT**   |                           |                             |
|         | Co-ordinator             | Dennis Crompton           |                             |
|         | Tutors                   | Paul Barnett             | Diana Salavourakis          |
|         |                           | Steve Gettler            | Jessica Shamash             |
|         |                           | Susan Horsman            | Madelon Vriesendorp         |
|         |                           | Tony Rickaby              | Zoe Zenghelis               |
|         |                           |                           |                             |

1989-1990 (as listed in *AA Events List*)

**FOUNDATION**
- Tom Heneghan
- Catrina Beevor

**FIRST YEAR**

Unit 1
- George Katodrytis
- Chris Evans

Unit 3
- Mark Prizeman

Unit 2
- Dale Benedict

Unit 4
- Peter Beard
- Mark Brearley
## INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Frosso Pimenides</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Selcuk Avci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>Steve McAdam</td>
<td>Unit 4</td>
<td>Ada Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christina Norton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Melissa Koch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 5</td>
<td>Sand Helsel</td>
<td>Unit 6</td>
<td>Dick Knowles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Randle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 7</td>
<td>Irene Scalbert</td>
<td>Unit 8</td>
<td>Pascal Schöning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marek Walczak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 9</td>
<td>Peter Thomas</td>
<td>Unit 10</td>
<td>Mark Pimlott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Sabara</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tony Fretton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 11</td>
<td>Louisa Hutton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthias Sauerbruch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DIPLOMA SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Wim van den Bergh</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Raoul Bunschoten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wiel Arets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>Chris Macdonald</td>
<td>Unit 4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeanne Sillett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Unit 6</td>
<td>Peter Salter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Brearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 7</td>
<td>David Gray</td>
<td>Unit 8</td>
<td>Ron Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kisa Kawakami</td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 9</td>
<td>Andrew Holmes</td>
<td>Unit 10</td>
<td>Robert Mull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Greene</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos Villanueva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 11</td>
<td>Christoph Langhof</td>
<td>Unit 12</td>
<td>William Firebrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 13</td>
<td>Jenny Lowe</td>
<td>Unit 14</td>
<td>John Frazer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Julia Frazer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cedric Price</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GENERAL STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robert Harbison</th>
<th>Professor Colin St. John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Dunster</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gergory des Jardins</td>
<td>Mark Cousins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Hatton</td>
<td>Bruce Boucher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yehuda Safran</td>
<td>Chris Macdonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeanne Sillett</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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