

UNIVERSITY OF GREENWICH  
LIBRARY  
FOR REFERENCE USE ONLY

**INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL OF ARCHITECTURAL  
EDUCATION AND REGISTRATION 1834-1960**

Ms H M Startup BA (Hons)

Theses



UNIVERSITY OF GREENWICH  
LIBRARY  
FOR REFERENCE USE ONLY

This MPhil Thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for this degree.

December 1984

## ABSTRACT OF THESIS

### INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL OF ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION AND REGISTRATION: A HISTORY OF THE ROLE OF ITS PROFESSIONAL AND STATUTORY BODIES 1834-1960

Henrietta Miranda Startup

This thesis examines the history of architectural education and professionalism in Britain from the foundation of the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) in 1834 to the Oxford Conference on education held by the RIBA in 1958. Between these dates, it investigates with primary source material drawn from the RIBA and the Architects Registration Council (ARCUK), the nature and development of these institutions in relation to one another in the evolution of an educational policy for the architectural profession. The scope of the work embraces an exploration both of the controls placed by the profession on education and of the statutory limits to professional control promulgated by the State. The thesis sets out, first, to analyse the links made between the formation of the RIBA and its search for an appropriate qualification and examination system which would regulate entry into the RIBA. It then considers the ways in which the RIBA sought to implement and rationalise this examination system in order to further educational opportunities for its members and restrict architectural practice. This is followed by an account of the means by which the profession began to achieve statutory recognition of its own knowledge and practice. This section also assesses the difficulties of holding the profession to account by lay opinion. An evaluation of the singular nature and practice of the RIBA Visiting Board then forms the basis for an analysis of the principal ways in which the profession sought to regulate standards within schools of architecture. Finally, an appraisal of the considerable influence of the Oxford Conference is made with reference to the adjustments of the architectural profession to the changed conditions imposed on practice and education by post-war Britain. Conclusions are then drawn in which the writer summarises the significance of the material in relation to the future of architectural education policy for the profession.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	-	
Preface	p.1	
Acknowledgements	p.7	
Abbreviations	p.10	
<u>CHAPTER 1:</u>	<u>The Formation of the RIBA and its</u>	
	<u>Educational Policy 1834-1887</u>	pp.11-25
	(i) The Early Years	pp.11-14
	(ii) Architecture, Design and the State	pp.14-21
	(iii) Compulsory Architectural Education	pp.21-25
<u>CHAPTER 2:</u>	<u>Professionalising Architectural</u>	
	<u>Education 1882-1923</u>	pp.26-44
	(i) The Work of the RIBA Board of Examiners 1882-1910	pp.26-33
	(ii) The Foundation of the RIBA Board of Architectural Education	pp.33-36
	(iii) The Work of the RIBA Board of Architectural Education 1904-1923	pp.36-44
<u>CHAPTER 3:</u>	<u>The Movement for Registration</u>	
	<u>1924-1938</u>	pp.45-62
	(i) The 1924 RIBA International Congress on Architectural Education	pp.45-48
	(ii) The Origins of the ARCUK 1924-1929	pp.48-53
	(iii) ARCUK and Accreditation 1931-1939	pp.53-62

<u>CHAPTER 4:</u>	<u>The RIBA Visiting Board</u>	
	<u>1923-1960</u>	pp.63-75
	(i) The Creation of the Visiting Board	pp.63-65
	(ii) The Work of the Visiting Board 1924-1960	pp.65-75
<u>CHAPTER 5:</u>	<u>The Oxford Conference of 1958 and its Consequences for Architectural Education</u>	
		pp.76-92
Conclusion		pp.93-95
End Notes to Preface and Chapters 1-5		pp.1-20
Bibliography - Primary Sources (including guide notes to the RIBA's archives on architectural education)		pp.21-28
Bibliography - Secondary Sources		pp.29-38

## PREFACE

The education of the architect has been the subject of many passionate debates within the profession for the last 150 years. There is, nevertheless, a paucity of authoritative published work specifically on this subject available to architects, historians and the general reader. While general histories of the practice of architecture do exist they assume that there is a 'natural' state of architectural practice, unaffected by specific historical conditions.(1) These histories tend to see architectural practice as a static concept. They examine the 'roots' of professional practice from a twentieth-century perspective and view "the rise of the architect" as a discreet event in history happening in the early nineteenth century when the RIBA was set up as a professional association of architects in 1834.(2) The history of the practice of architecture has therefore often assumed its own kind of *teleology*.(3) This research has called into question some of these traditional historiographic approaches to the history of architectural education. Far from being secure professionals, architects, as I hope to demonstrate, saw themselves as rather insecure. They sought to find a way of reasserting their knowledge and skills in relation both to other skilled occupations and trades and in relation to artists and designers. The links between the formation of a professional association of architects, in 1834, and the pursuit a decade later of an educational strategy which could regulate entry into the Institute (the RIBA) was a critical measure towards securing the architect in new professional circles.

The purpose of this research has been to analyse how and why architectural knowledge has been maintained by the profession and to examine the connections between the way problems within the profession have been perceived and the way they have been understood by statutory bodies responsible for architectural education on behalf of the State. The intention is not to examine what architects have been learning over the last century; rather, to describe and assess the role of those national institutions which

have had responsibility for educational policy, namely the RIBA and ARCUK.

Archive material on architectural education policy by both the RIBA and ARCUK demonstrates the ways in which that policy was defined and developed in order to control what was taught, where it was learnt and how it was to be examined and put into practice. Whilst primary source material is often cited as its own form of justification for a thesis subject, I hope to indicate that a study of these records is crucial if one is to understand the singularly delicate negotiations undertaken by the RIBA on its own behalf and through ARCUK to demonstrate the nature of that control. At the time of writing, the archival holdings of the RIBA are in the process of being re-located, accessioned and catalogued. Documentation on the history of the ARCUK has been collected by its secretariat into minute books and other committees' record books. Access to post-war records was requested on my behalf by members of ARCUK's Council in 1982-83 and was only granted, after eighteen months of correspondence, with specific conditions attached. This untimely delay in the granting of permission meant that further research into the activities of the ARCUK from 1945-1960 could not be undertaken in the time available for the research.

For the most part, primary source material has been drawn from the minutes of meetings held by the RIBA and ARCUK on architectural education and registration. The minutes of the RIBA were drawn up by members of an educational secretariat from the late nineteenth century onwards. As many of the members of the secretariat were architects and members of the RIBA, their attitudes to the shaping and direction of policy cannot be regarded as disinterested. There are, therefore, considerable problems when trying to evaluate retrospective appraisals of architectural education policy. The pronouncements of RIBA committee members and those of representatives of the profession from schools of architecture at conferences and in meetings were as much a reflection, in this period, of genuine professional needs as they were comments or proposals for educational initiative. In addition to this, members

of the RIBA in this period tend towards the assumption that all architects and architectural students were men. In fact, women were admitted to the Institute as architects by 1895. As the governing bodies who regulate entry into the profession, the RIBA and ARCUK are still deeply committed to the idea of professionalising architectural knowledge and they have vigorously promoted this. The purpose of this thesis is to elucidate why this has taken place and to account for its effects on educational policy between 1834 and 1960.

As early as 1840, educational provision for architectural assistants was exhibiting some academic traits but as a discipline (a method of learning skills and applying them with reasonable competence) it was not always associated with schools of architecture as is now the case. If one was interested in becoming an architect in the early nineteenth century there were a number of ways in which one could begin. A university education in another subject could be chosen, followed by articled pupillage to a master at the age of 21. Alternatively, one could become articled at 15 or 16 straight from school. An effective apprenticeship system however depended, as it would today, on practitioners who were committed to it as a form of architectural education beyond the task of taking on pupils for the income they received from fees. Widely differing standards and levels of competence were acknowledged as a characteristic of articled pupillage in the mid nineteenth century. The architect, George Wightwick, was articled at 18 to the architect-surveyor Edward Lapidge. In his memoirs, according to Saint, Wightwick wrote:

"No instructions, not even to the course of my artist-study, were ever given; while the miscellaneous and unsystematized character of the mere office business left me uninformed as to the introductory knowledge necessary to its full apprehension. I expected to find a tutor; I found only an employer ... I found, in short, that I had paid my premium for the opportunity of self-instruction - for the advantage of the 'run of the office' - for the privilege of serving my master and picking up such information as might lie in my way."(4)

Pupils themselves were treated to a sarcastic description of a pupil-master by Charles Dickens in the opening chapters of 'Martin Chuzzlewitt', when the reader is introduced to a Mr Pecksniff:

"The brazen plate upon the door (which being Mr Pecksniff's could not lie) bore this inscription, 'PECKSNIFF, ARCHITECT', to which Mr Pecksniff, on his cards of business, added, 'AND LAND SURVEYOR'. In one sense, and only one, he may be said to have been a Land Surveyor on a pretty large scale, as an extensive prospect lay stretched out before the windows of his house. Of his architectural doings, nothing was clearly known, except that he had never designed or built anything; but it was generally understood that his knowledge of the science was almost awful in its profundity.

"Mr Pecksniff's professional engagements, indeed, were almost, if not entirely, confined to the reception of pupils; for the collection of rents, with which pursuit he occasionally varied and relieved his greater toils, can hardly be said to be a strictly architectural employment. His genius lay in ensnaring parents and guardians and of pocketing premiums. A young gentleman's premium being paid, and the young gentleman come to Mr Pecksniff's house, Mr Pecksniff borrowed his case of mathematical instruments ... and turned him loose in a spacious room on the two-pair front; where, in the company of certain drawing boards, parallel rulers, very stiff-legged compasses, and two, perhaps three, other young gentlemen, he improved himself for three or five years, according to his articles in making elevations of Salisbury Cathedral from every possible point of sight; and in constructing in the air a vast quantity of Castles, Houses of Parliament, and other Public Buildings."(5)

No agreed minimum standard of ability for prospective pupils was formulated by architects within the RIBA when it was founded in 1834. Pupil-masters were, it seems, equally anxious about the levels of competence that pupillage seemed to produce:

"Some find their way to learn and work; others, who have joined the profession as an item of their own respectability, pursue their architectural studies in the intervals between dress occasions and pleasure parties, and in combination with billiards, shirt collars, and the 'right thing' in boots and trousers."(6)



One factor which usefully accounts for the dissatisfaction with articulated pupillage might be that any definition of what constituted an architect in the early nineteenth century was ambiguous. Skills of measuring, surveying, design and specification were assumed by patrons and by the State to be the skills of an architect, surveyor or builder alike. By the 1820s, building contracts were changing to contracts 'in the gross' where general contractors, like Thomas Cubitt, would tender for work. Architects, according to their evidence given at the 1828 Parliamentary Select Committee on the Office of Works, were overwhelmingly against the practice of general contracting for it meant that the area of control in both the financial and design aspects of architectural work, shifted from the architect to the contractor-builder.(7) The RIBA, from 1834 onwards, offered those who practised architecture a means of avoiding comparison with other skilled occupations such as contracting and surveying. One of the primary means at its disposal as a professional association was to reassert standards and levels of competence that could be assessed by the professional members of the Institute alone. These could be deployed to regulate entry into the profession. Its purposes as an Institute were defined in its Royal Charter of 1837. These were for "the advancement of Civil Architecture and for promoting and facilitating the acquirement of the various arts and sciences connected therewith".(8) It was assumed that it was for the architectural profession alone to decide on the educational needs of its members. The legitimising of architectural knowledge as part of professional policy developed, in this period, in order to ensure the profession's exclusive right to an area of social knowledge. I have sought to examine the connections between how architects within the RIBA and outside it have perceived themselves as a group within society and how they set about tackling their needs with all the legislative means at their disposal.

At present, the profession's debate about architectural education is conducted in the wider context of discussions about the size of the profession and calls for continuing professional development. These have become significant factors in reviewing the nature of

architectural practice. At the time of writing, there is evidence to indicate that some leading members of the profession believe it no longer has the power or the resources to maintain its own patronage.(9) It has been my intention to examine the history of architectural education in Britain in the light of an institutional control exercised by the RIBA and ARCUK. An account of the relationship between the RIBA and its Allied Societies would be an important subject to pursue in relation to architectural education history. It would also be useful to have a better understanding of the links between schools of architecture and the RIBA. I have not been able to pursue this as my main area of research and while it serves as an important feature of the material in the chapter on the RIBA Visiting Board, it deserves a study which would go into greater depth than that attempted here. It is hoped that this research will contribute to a widening of the 'chapters on the history of the profession' and offer material evidence for those who wish to pursue it further.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research has benefitted from the advice and support of many people. As the thesis has been some time in the making, those who have helped me may well have forgotten doing so. This is certainly untrue for my supervisors. I should like to express my gratitude to Dr Jacques Paul, Head of the School of Architecture and Landscape, at Thames Polytechnic, for his scholarly approach, his attentive comments and thoughtful advice. Throughout, he has been steady and consistent in his praise and in his criticisms and I am very grateful for the facilities made for me at Thames Polytechnic to pursue this research with his support. I should also like to thank Dr Anthony Quiney, Senior Lecturer at Thames Polytechnic for his useful lectures on the history of architecture and for his unfailing encouragement in the writing up stages of my research work. In addition to these, my principal supervisors, I would like to acknowledge Professor Robert Macleod who was my external supervisor. He helped to focus my attention early on in the research, to material about the Memorialists which forms part of the discussions in Chapter Two. I should also like to thank Professor Alan Lipman for helping me to examine the history of the architectural profession in relation to other disciplines. His references to the history of professionalism and to historical methodology have been invaluable in the course of this study. Without the unstinting encouragement of these four people, this research would, at times, have seemed an impossible task.

Many architects and teachers involved in architectural education both in the past and in the time span of this present study have offered me their time, their recollections of and their insight into architectural education. I have been extremely fortunate to discuss the history of architectural education with them and I would like to acknowledge their offers of documentary material and their considerable experience of the field. There are almost too many of them that I can acknowledge individually. I hope that in the following list that they will recognise their contributions and accept my thanks: Sir Philip Dowson, Professor

Andrew MacMillan, Maxwell Fry, Jane Drew, David Rock, Allen Cunningham, Stephen Groak, Gordon Priest, Mark Wells, Ken Martin, Michael Darke, James Howrie, George Hall, Geoffrey Broadbent, Mike Jenner and Ray Moxley, Reginald Cave, Wilson Briscoe, Hugh Clamp, Peter Bicknell, David Bowler, Arthur Drought and Alex Daykin, Jack Moore, Robert Paine, Percy Johnson-Marshall, Adrian Gale, Peter Jewkes, E J Carter, John Smith, Michael Crux, Hugh Morris, Ronald Franks, John Bickerdike, Professor Newton-Watson, Sir Frederick Gibberd, John Partridge, James Bath, David du R. Aberdeen, Alex Gordon, Roy Stout, Patrick Litchfield and finally, Ralph Tubbs. I am particularly indebted to Frank Chippendale for his work on the history of the RIBA and educational policy. In addition to these people, many of whom I interviewed in the early stages of the research, I would like to add Claire Frankl, Stuart Sutcliffe, Jane Darke, Tom Woolley and Denzil Nfield for their personal archival material on the history of architectural education.

I owe a considerable debt to the meetings of the Architectural Research Study Group which was formed in 1982 as a self-help group for research students. This included Marion Roberts, Ian Cooper, Tom Woolley, Chris Cripps and Anne Delaney. My warmest thanks to all of them in times of calm and crisis.

I would also like to acknowledge the inspiration and work of a group of historians: John Brandon-Jones, Peter Banham, Rodney Mace, Simon Pepper, Patrick Goode, Mark Swenarton and lastly but far from least Adrian Forty. Also, I want to express my thanks to Ruth Owens, Judi Loach, David Breakell, Nec Teymur and Jane Abercrombie for their help and discussion at the end of the period of field work. The Librarians at the RIBA kindly supplied me with access to the archives of the Institute. My special thanks go to Mrs Angela Mace, Archivist at the RIBA and to Adrian Alan, Archivist at Liverpool University Archives Department. Their unflinching patience and considerable knowledge of archival material were invaluable to me. Two further special acknowledgements must be made. First, to the members of the RIBA Education and Professional Development Committee, their <sup>Vice-</sup>Chairman, Professor

John Tarn, and its Secretary Peter Gibbs-Kennett for the privilege of listening to their meetings in 1981-82. While she was still in office, Mrs Elizabeth Layton was extremely helpful in locating the more recent archives of the RIBA Board of Architectural Education. Secondly, I would like to extend my warmest appreciation to Claire Herniman, who typed several drafts of the thesis, and to Sylvia Thorne who undertook to type the final manuscript.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and my friends in and outside architectural schools who have offered their unfailing support and encouragement at many stages in this research: to Joyce Lowman, Alex Allardyce, Philip Gordon, Jim Bryson, Geoff Haslam, Amanda Potts, Mark Herbert, Jane Mace, Debbie Vowles, Cath Gibson and Brian Finnimore I owe much more than a formal acknowledgment.

## TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

ARIBA	Associate of the Royal Institute of British Architects
AJ	Architects Journal
AA	Architectural Association
AP	Architectural Press
AR	Architectural Review
ARCUK	Architects Registration Council of the United Kingdom
BAE	Board of Architectural Education (ARCUK)
BD	Building Design
BOAE	Board of Architectural Education (RIBA)
CNAA	Council for National Academic Awards
EASA	External Architectural Students Association
FRIBA	Fellow of the Royal Institute of British Architects
ILEA	Inner London Educational Authority
OUP	Oxford University Press
RIBA	Royal Institute of British Architects
SAC	Schools of Architecture Council
SCMM	Special Committees Minutes of Meetings (RIBA)
SIAD	Society of Industrial Artists and Designers
SRHE	Society for Research into Higher Education

## CHAPTER I

### THE FOUNDATION OF THE RIBA AND ITS EDUCATION POLICY 1834-1887

"... battles upon the subject of professional education have been rare, and indeed, it has been hardly thought worthy of a fight. There should, however, be no more hesitation ... the watchword of all who have its interests at heart should be 'I humbly think, Education! and again Education! and for a long time only Education!'"

William White (1)

#### I. The Early Years

In June 1834, the Institute of British Architects was founded, dedicated to securing "uniformity and respectability of practice in the profession".(2) Its constitution and aims followed on, broadly, from those of an earlier institution, the Architectural Society. This society had been founded in 1834 "to promote the advancement and diffusion of architectural knowledge".(3) In 1837, the Institute received its Royal Charter and became the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA). T L Donaldson was its first President. A constitution establishing a council of members and a competitions committee was proposed and a register of architects seeking or offering work was then drawn up. The Institute itself devised a qualification procedure for the pupils of its senior practitioner members. These ideas were related to the Institute's forms of membership. Fellowship (FRIBA) was granted to architects with at least five years of experience, and Associateship (ARIBA) granted to those who had passed an examination testing "the theory and practice of design, the theory and practice of construction (and) the usual and customary practice of business".(4)

These distinctions between ARIBA and FRIBA status were rudimentary indeed, and did not have the effect of dispelling criticisms of architectural pupillage as the customary means to obtain either title as symbols of professional standing. Donaldson himself admitted in The Builder , that:

"It has hitherto been too much the practice of young men in this country to neglect a systematic elementary course of education and to rely upon experience of actual practice to carry them through their arduous career."(5)

His doubts that any new kind of educational provision would supersede office training are interesting in view of the summary to his inaugural address as Professor of Architecture given at University College London in 1842. In this lecture he states:

"We are wandering in a labyrinth of experiment and trying by an amalgamation of certain features in this or that style of each and every period and country to form a homogenous whole with some distinctive character of its own, for the purpose of working it out to its fullest development and thus creating a new and peculiar style."(6)

His statement referred directly to the lack of a consensus in the teaching of architectural design, but the comment may have alluded also to an ambiguity about professionalism amongst architects at the time. Whilst practitioners of the day might be fully aware of the implications of their own intentions as designers, according to Donaldson, they seemed diffident of allowing themselves a dominant role in controlling and regulating any application of standards in practice.(7) In 1852, Donaldson's anxieties about the problems of 'style' and design pedagogy were echoed in a prize essay by a student at the Architectural Association.

This association had been set up in 1842, and was then known as the Society of Architectural Draughtsmen. The Society held meetings at Lyons Inn Hall, on the Strand, and acted as a forum for struggling architectural assistants and pupils. It had a book club, a register of architects, and a drawings collection. In 1847, it opened a School of Design and became known as the Architectural Association. A report in The Builder commented that there were:

"more than one hundred gentlemen present, walls and tables displayed an interesting collection of architectural drawings and other works of art ... twenty one gentlemen were proposed as members ..." (8)



Robert Keir, who had published his 'Newleafe Discourses' in The Builder in 1846 had clearly encouraged pupils into thinking that self-education and self-reliance were realistic educational objectives if the RIBA was not going to support educational reform of the system of articulated pupillage. Reading from his essay to an audience of Architectural Association and RIBA members, the prize essayist, James Knowles, stated:

"To an architect who is an artist and not a tradesman, the review of his profession is sad in the extreme. There is no esprit de corps; indeed, there is no corps for the esprit to animate. There is no public or united energy, feeling or sympathy in it. But that which should take rank among the noblest of pursuits is an undefined, a scattered, disjointed business, here and there, and where not, in all places, in all or any hands."(9)

He went on to criticise the system of articulated pupillage and to argue that an examination system would guarantee more respect for the title 'architect', protecting the profession from charlatans and quacks:

"A young man entering an architect's office as a pupil, would feel assured that he must do something more than tattoo the desks, fight the clerks, snub the visitors or scribble for magazines. He would feel assured that the time of preparation given by his term of pupillage was none too long to master so much of the sciences, arts, and fine arts, as should be required of him at the examination ... In this manner the profession should be weeded of quacks and ignorance - in this manner the scandalous appropriation of the word 'architect' should be prevented from undertakers, carpenters and builders, and most important of all, in this manner the public would be led gradually, by the contemplation of sounder taste and purer judgement to a preference for wholesome beauties to noisome ugliness ..." (10)

Knowles' view won support from the AA's President, Alfred Bailey. At a meeting of the Architectural Association's Council in October 1855, Bailey proposed that a draft for a 'Diploma in Architecture' be set in motion. Sir William Tite was present, and as a Fellow of the RIBA, took these proposals to RIBA Council, suggesting there that the Institute itself should accept the Association's idea:

"for the establishment of an examination which would eventually serve as a basis for the issue of such a diploma as shall certify that the holder thereof is fully qualified to practise as an architect."(11)

As the earliest demand for a formal qualification policy, this illustrates the RIBA's desire to establish the profession's claims to prestige and status within the building and construction industries.

As a monopoly interest in design skills was argued as the overriding concern of architects at this time, it was seen as imperative that the monopoly be protected from quacks and amateurs; those that Knowles and others after him were to dismiss as 'mere builders'. While the RIBA began to recognise the ideological advantages of a more formal training and qualifying structure for architects in the 1850s, other institutions continued to dwell on the disadvantages of a lack of clarity in design teaching in Britain. The issues of qualification and professional status are linked both to the debate about 'style' and the teaching of design in Britain in the 1850s and 1860s. Many of the leading critics in these debates were to further educational policy within the RIBA itself after 1852.

## II. Architecture, Design and the State

In 1836, the Report of the Select Committee on Arts and Manufacturers was published by the Government. The Committee was chaired by William Ewart, MP for Liverpool. He was a Whig reformer, in favour of a free libraries system and the abolition of capital punishment. The Committee's terms of reference had been:

"That a select committee be appointed to enquire into the best means of extending a knowledge of the arts and of the principles of design among the people of the country; also to enquire into the Constitution, management and effects of Institutions connected with the Arts."(12)

The findings of the Report seem to throw light on the wider context of a debate about the teaching of architectural design at this time.

Lack of legal protection for design work was thought to injure the chances of commercial enterprise in Britain. The Royal Academy School was criticised in the Report for being a privileged society that evaded its responsibilities on this count. The Report recommended that provincial Schools of Design should be set up on the model of the Government School of Design, first sited near Somerset House and then at South Kensington, London. In 1842, Manchester was granted £150 from the Board of Trade to establish a design school, and other cities were soon to follow its example, notably Birmingham and Liverpool.

The Director of the Government Department of Sciences and Art, governing the School of Design, in London, until 1838, had been J W Papworth. Rather than laying strong emphasis on elementary geometric drawing, Papworth's pupils had been encouraged to draw outlines of architectural ornament in the School of Design. It was Papworth who took up the issue of architectural education again, in December 1855, in a lecture given at the RIBA. This lecture summarised previous suggestions for a voluntary examination and the award of a diploma in architecture. There was some opposition to the idea when the Council of the RIBA approached its local Allied Societies.(13) But F C Penrose, Vice President of the RIBA, reassured the Allied Societies that the examination should confine itself to a test of practical subjects such as science and building materials, not attempting to "trespass into the mysteries of design".(14) A resolution was passed accordingly, that:

"this Institute ... takes upon itself the labour of constituting an examination tending to promote a systematic professional education."(15)

Although introduced in 1863, the Voluntary Architectural Examination was never popular. In eighteen years (1863-1881), only twelve examinations were held and these were assessed by a Board of Examiners set up by RIBA Council in 1862.(16) This Board of Examiners was also responsible for setting and marking the examinations for the posts of District Surveyor, set out under the

Acts of Parliament relating to the Metropolitan Board of Works in 1855.

Certificates for candidates who passed the Voluntary Architectural Examination do not survive and it is almost certain that in fact the RIBA Council refused to issue them in order to placate the fears of RIBA architect pupil-masters.(16) The advent of an examination was still regarded as a loss of income to masters through the fees from pupils. The RIBA Voluntary Examination was largely a test of what were thought to be measurable skills, as far as its promoters were concerned, and it was intended only as a test of any understanding of design skills insofar as this separated out that which was 'testable' from that which was deemed not to be 'measurable'.

An RIBA Committee, chaired by J W Papworth, was set up in 1860:

"to consist of the Council, the Board of Examiners under the Metropolitan Building Act of 1885, and T L Donaldson FRIBA ... to consider the subject of Architectural Examination."(17)

The examiners were authorised by Council to consider any diplomas or certificates that candidates for the Voluntary Architectural Examination had already received from the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge or London (Kings College and University College). They consulted examination papers set by the legal and medical professions and those adopted at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris.

Papworth was replaced as the Director of the Government School of Design, in 1842, by William Dyce. Dyce had been sent by the Board of Trade to Germany and France to make reports on art education in these countries. He had presented his findings in a Board of Trade report, published in April 1838. Dyce's allegiances to design teaching were in accordance with the German practice of relating the teaching of design to the needs of commerce and industry, although his views also stemmed from religious beliefs about how artisans should be trained to worship God through their design work. Behind such seemingly innocent prescriptions for

design education lay a pragmatism dictating the demand for a better awareness amongst students of design of the real economic needs of industry and commerce.

T L Donaldson had also been a member of the Select Committee on Arts and Manufacturers, representing University College London where he was Professor of Architecture. At University College Donaldson divided the syllabus into 'Architecture as an Art' and 'Architecture as a Science'. He led the students on visits to buildings under construction and occasionally invited craftsmen into the School for practical demonstrations.(18) Donaldson was invited to take part in the discussions of the 1860 RIBA Committee on architectural education. Papworth chaired these meetings but, given the paucity of educational practice from which to draw evidence, it is difficult to grasp how this committee was to assess architectural education policy. Apart from the AA School of Design and the University College architectural course, articulated pupillage was still the most prevalent mode of architectural training. Papworth invited John Ruskin and the RIBA President-Elect, Beresford-Hope to make representations to the Committee. The Committee also consulted architects who were to present lectures on the subject at the RIBA in 1864. One respondent, George Gilbert Scott, wrote to the Committee admitting that he thought it was "a subject on which we are all grievously at fault" and suggested that the atelier or pupillage system had failed to introduce an apprentice into the fine art elements of design:

"It is therefore clear that the student ought to have some means readily accessible to him, of supplying this want, which must exist but which is more palpable and more injurious in proportion as the feelings of the day tend to render architecture more of a mere profession and less of an art."(19)

Scott did not understand art to mean ornament or decoration. He proposed:

"To make good pictures of bad designs is obviously injurious, as it misleads employers and often even the

architect himself ... while to make good pictures of good designs may have the beneficial effect of promoting their adoption."(20)

While the RIBA Committee considered these views on architectural education, there were some interesting developments in educational philosophy elsewhere in design schools. In 1856, the new director of the Royal Academy School, Sir Charles Barry, proposed a two-year evening course on architectural design. In the first year, mathematics, hydraulics, hydrostatics, chemistry, optics, acoustics, geology, mineralogy, mechanics and construction were to be taught, in conjunction with classes in life drawing, the drawing of the Orders and the modelling of Ornament. In the second year, these subjects were to be applied to the exercise of submitting design work for architectural competitions. A study of the Fine Arts was to be undertaken, taking account of:

"The omission of all that interferes with convenience and durability in the old and recognised styles or that may be incompatible with modern habits, fashions and requirements or unsuitable to the climate of the country in urban and suburban districts."(21)

Barry advised strongly against any student attending the Academy if they had not already followed elementary courses in Architecture at University College London or the Government School of Design. But Barry's proposals were never put into practice; the only change in teaching policy was that from 1856 onwards eminent architects were invited to act as visiting critics in the studios of the Royal Academy Schools.

In 1869, the RIBA Committee presented its recommendations. Students were required to have a better grasp of structure in design and a more informed understanding of massing and organic form. Clearly, Papworth's earlier views on design education had changed and were now in accordance with those of Donaldson's. Gilbert Scott's advice that students in their drawings should record and interpret more from nature is strongly Ruskinian. Indeed, Ruskin had lectured on this subject at the RIBA in 1865. Recalling London's "offensive" buildings, he remarked the following:

"These buildings, in which the mere cast of a flower, or the realisation of a vulgar face, carved without pleasure by a workman who is only endeavouring to attract attention by novelty, and then fastened on, or appearing to be fastened on, as chance may dictate, to an arch, or a pillar, or wall, hold such relation to nobly naturalistic architecture as common sign-painter's furniture landscape to painting, or commonest wax-work to Greek Sculpture."(22)

He went on to state that a student of architecture should be:

"thoroughly acquainted with the natural forms and characters of the objects he had to treat, and then to exercise him in the abstraction of these forms."(23)

Written recommendations or prescriptions for the teaching and execution of good architectural design were arguably far in advance of buildings themselves in this period. It is significant that Ruskin's views were challenged after his lecture by the architect, G E Street. Street's Royal Courts of Justice project, on the drawing board at the time, was perhaps an illustration of the issues raised by Scott, Ruskin and Donaldson. The Builder printed an editorial in 1869 which suggested that existing trends in building design, as illustrated by the Royal Courts of Justice project could be eradicated through a better educational philosophy for the profession:

"if, as it appears, the large and costly building of the courts of law is again to be antiquarianism ... it is not unlikely that the reaction, inevitable as it is against this exaggerated mediaevalism may assert itself to a degree unpleasant to the feelings of the architect, even before his building is completed. We recommend our rising architects to look more to the future, less to the past. If more time were spent in considering what are the real building problems peculiar to modern times, and how to deal with them, less time on acquiring merely an archaeological knowledge of former buildings, we should probably build to more purpose and to the more permanent use and enjoyment of those who will succeed us."(24)

However, when the buildings were completed in 1882, the journal 'Building News' commented that their opening was:

"an event of itself sufficient to make 1882 an epoch in the architectural history of the century ... In no other building ... has so vigorous and austere a form of Gothic architecture been carried out in its integrity, and if it is the last, it will probably remain the boldest the most uncompromising work of the Gothic revival we possess."(25)

The Royal Courts of Justice seem to have been entirely designed by Street, although Philip Webb, Norman Shaw and William Morris were all working in his office at the time.(26)

While The Builder argued for a new methodical approach to both architectural design and the teaching of design and construction, there remained a large body of opinion dedicated to decorative solutions to contemporary building problems. This dialogue contributed to the difficulties of examining architectural drawing and technical studies as the means through which to achieve professional status.(27)

Street died in 1882, only a year after he had been elected as President of the RIBA. The new President, Sir Horace Jones, architect to the City of London, was satirised by architectural students at the AA on his new post. In a drawing by W Maw Egley for a soiree at the Architectural Association in 1882, Jones was characterised as 'The Sweet Stuff Man' tempting young men into the profession with prizes if they passed the RIBA examinations.(27a) Shady dealings are illustrated in the drawing, taking place at the back door of 9 Conduit Street, then the home of the RIBA. Notices pinned to the main door in this drawing included "Committee Reports artfully altered and ignored", a reference to one of the RIBA Committee resolutions of 1869 to assist the Architectural Association in setting up a drawing school which came to nothing. Although an early student of the AA had called for the RIBA to reform educational policy, there seemed to be some resistance to the Institute imposing a qualification system on pupils in this way.

While the Institute's educational policy was associated with the Voluntary Architectural Examination, its own Committee, set up to consider the future of architectural education, seemed to find



difficulties in assessing and interpreting the views of its associates and critics. Any test of the success of the voluntary examination would be uncertain because of the small number of people willing to sit it. The recommendations of the Committee were, as already stated, published in 1869. Like the resolution to assist the Architectural Association, many of these recommendations were never put into practice. The issuing of certificates for candidates who had passed the voluntary examination came into this category. Candidates had to fall back on their indentures as proof of their completed apprenticeships. Other recommendations included a commitment to publish a text book or pamphlet pointing out where and when, in addition to office training, courses of lectures for pupils could be attended. The book was to include a list of recommended reading. It was never published. Only one of the four resolutions received attention, that which resolved that RIBA Council inaugurate a compulsory Preliminary Examination.

### III. Compulsory Architectural Education

The holding of a compulsory examination by the RIBA had been discussed tentatively by the Committee on Architectural Education. The Preliminary Examination was to be open to all students and to pupils who had been in articles for at least a year. Pupils who wished to sit the Voluntary Examination were informed that the new Preliminary Examination would not be compulsory.

This policy had the effect of changing the syllabus of the Royal Academy School. In 1870, its director, R Phéné Spiers, recommended that students should submit a set of measured drawings, drawings from the Orders and freehand drawings from casts before they could be accepted on the seven-year part-time course. Once admitted, a student was asked to re-draw the work and complete a sciagraphical analysis of the building chosen for a full measured drawing survey. This was put into practice to help students meet the RIBA Preliminary Examination with more confidence.

The emphasis on technical competence in Spiers' new course illustrates the aims of the compulsory RIBA examination. Like its predecessor (the Voluntary Examination), it did not attempt to test design skills, but required evidence of measuring skills and drawing ability. This was a conceptual view about the nature of design and how design could be taught. However, as enshrined in the new examination, the concept seems to have become the victim of other battles of loyalty to professionalism or the 'art of architecture'.

The Institute's educational policy was shelved after 1869 and Council's energy was directed towards the ordering of other pressing issues, such as the first RIBA Conference, held in 1871, which drew up recommendations for a systematic scale of charges for its members. In 1875, a special Committee of RIBA Council recommended that the Presidents of the RIBA's Allied Societies, who had until now operated almost as independent bodies, should have seats on RIBA Council. A policy on training and qualification surfaced again in 1877 and, as before, stemmed from a complex amalgamation of many other unresolved issues for the profession. The passing of Byelaw XIV by RIBA Council in 1877 put into practice the recommendations of the compulsory examination, as laid down in the report of the RIBA Committee on Architectural Education of 1869.

This was possibly the first attempt to use educational qualifications as a way of regulating entry into the architectural profession. In 1861, census returns for London indicated that out of a population of 2,800,000, there were 1,439 'architects', 749 surveyors and 3,845 builders, although it is well to be wary of the census figures for architects at this time.(28)

Byelaw XIV was an exercise in professional control, using compulsory examinations as the qualification for membership of the Institute. RIBA Council resolved that:

"All gentlemen engaged in the study and practice of civil architecture before presenting themselves for

election as Associates, shall, after May 1882, be required to pass an examination before their election, according to a standard to be set from time to time by the Council."(29)

The examination was to last five days and included an oral examination. No candidate was allowed to submit an application before the age of 23. The Board of Examiners was reactivated in November 1880 to supervise the last voluntary examination and to prepare for the first compulsory examination to be held in 1882.(30) The Board of Examiners was now called The Board of Examiners under Byelaw XIV.

At an RIBA Conference in May 1887, the compulsory examinations were the subject of much debate. An associate member, Arthur Cates, proposed that standards within the profession would be raised by introducing a three-tiered progressive examination system leading to qualification and RIBA membership. He suggested that:

"... the guidance and direction of the education of those entering the profession should be undertaken by the RIBA ... that such a system should comprise, first, a Preliminary Examination for pupils entering the profession. Those passing this were to be Probationers RIBA. Second, an Intermediate Examination, for pupils in their third year of apprenticeship, or earlier, for the general principles of art and construction. Those passing this were to be students RIBA. Third, a Final Examination, to qualify for ARIBA."(31)

The Builder reported Cates' proposals at the Conference and drew the following conclusion from his speeches:

"And when, in future years, the standard could be raised, he [Cates] anticipated from such Obligatory Examination, the happiest results in advancing the status of the profession."(32)

The Annual General Meeting of the RIBA in 1887 amended Byelaw XIV to coincide with Conference's resolutions on the Examination in Architecture. The Board of Examiners under Byelaw XIV changed its name to the Board of Examiners in Architecture, and Cates was elected as its first chairman. Under the auspices of this Board, candidates who applied to sit the RIBA Examination in Architecture

were first asked to submit probationary work. The Board of Examiners in Architecture would then consider whether or not the candidate should be recommended for the compulsory examinations. First a candidate would sit a Preliminary Examination to qualify for membership as a Probationer.(33) Then the candidate, if successful, would sit an Intermediate Examination to qualify for membership as a Student. A Final Examination qualifying a candidate for Associate Membership (ARIBA) would then be taken.(34)

Details of any probationary work (later entitled 'Testimonies of Study') were required by the Board of Examiners in Architecture before candidates were recommended to sit either the Intermediate or the Final Examinations. A Special Examination, catering for those candidates who were exempt from the new system of examinations on the grounds of other qualifications or previous experience, was to be held periodically.

It is to be noted at this stage that architectural education was never conceived by the Institute as a subject to be taught widely and independently in schools of art and design. Full-time architectural training, as offered by the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris from 1717 onwards was never assumed to be an appropriate model of practice in England. In Britain, articled pupils and assistants could make use of the facilities of drawing schools,(35) or attend the Royal Academy and receive tuition on two mornings every week. Lectures were offered occasionally, but it was only when John Soane became Professor of Architecture at the Royal Academy in 1806 that a public lecture programme began in earnest.(36)

If the definitions and status of 'the architect' were vague and even confused, the nature and objective of any educational provision or philosophy was even more unclear. It has been acknowledged that articled pupillage frustrated the growth of formal architectural education in the 19th Century.(37) Restrictive parliamentary legislation, combined with a lack of corporate identity, did nothing to encourage a reassessment of the pupillage system. In this period "it was neither particularly clear what an architect was, nor easy to become one".(38) It seems appropriate

to recall here that the very notion of corporate identity or collective association had been regularly challenged by government legislation at the turn of the 19th Century. With the passing of the Anti-Combination Acts of 1799 and 1800, existing anti-trade union law was codified, including the prohibition of combination by both employers and labourers.(39)

Calls for formal architectural education in the mid 19th Century in Britain therefore came not from the State, or the lay community, nor from institutions of education and scholarship, but from architects and pupils themselves. A new system, they thought, would redress the disadvantages of articulated pupillage; it would seek to define educational provision and policy in relation to the needs of its own membership, through the agency of the RIBA. Standards and levels of competence would be raised and maintained by a Board of Examiners drawn from the membership of the Institute. This system would thereby provide internal guarantees of self-regulation and competence, offering architects within the RIBA the professional status to which they aspired.

## CHAPTER 2

### PROFESSIONALISING ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION 1882-1923

This chapter will consider the work of the RIBA Board of Examiners in Architecture and examine the procedures it developed to 'recognise' architecture courses in existing schools of art and design. It seeks to account for this policy and examines the ways in which recognition was conferred on some schools and not on others.

#### I. The Work of the RIBA Board of Examiners 1882-1910

The RIBA is not and never has been a teaching institution in its own right; it is an 'agent' for the profession's educational needs. Any evaluation of the procedural and constitutional nature of its control of architectural education is therefore only possible when, as a body, it began to evaluate and 'recognise' the examinations (and, indirectly, the syllabuses) of other educational and teaching institutions. Criticisms made in this period of the RIBA's policies on matters concerning education, recognition and qualification are important co-ordinates in relating its work, as a body, to the development of a philosophy of design teaching.

The RIBA Board of Examiners in Architecture was preceded by an earlier body in the Institute, the Board of Examiners under Byelaw XIV. This Board met from May 1881 to January 1895, but its work was quickly absorbed by the Board of Examiners in Architecture in 1882, due to the introduction of the first compulsory examinations of the Institute. The means available to both supervise and administer the new examination system were rudimentary. Apart from the terms of reference of the old Board of Examiners under Byelaw XIV, the RIBA had only one other precedent for an examinations secretariat. This was the Statutory Board of Examiners, constituted under the Metropolitan Building Act of 1855, with the responsibility, determined by RIBA Council, to conduct and assess the performance of candidates

sitting RIBA examinations for the posts of District Surveyor in London or Building Surveyor in other Metropolitan Authorities.(1)

As well as the marking and setting of examinations which was the responsibility of all three examining Boards, the Board of Examiners in Architecture (hereafter the Board of Examiners) contained a smaller committee known as the Board of Moderators. Like its parent body, its membership was drawn entirely from RIBA Council Members, and from 1887, the representatives of the newly elected provincial and allied societies. The membership of the Board of Moderators was constituted annually and it was obliged to report to the Board of Examiners after each session of the obligatory examinations had been held. As invigilators, moderators were expected to monitor the performance of candidates sitting the exams, and to file a report to the Board of Examiners.

From 1882, the work of the Board and its committees became more complex because the first compulsory examinations were held in this year. The Board was convened each month to consider examination question papers,(2) and to organise the holding of the examinations in London. It also had to deal with any correspondence on educational matters sent to the RIBA, via the secretary of RIBA Council. From 1885, it had to organise the holding of examinations outside London. The Board included many long standing Council members. Arthur Cates was elected Chairman, and other active members were George Aitchison and Alfred Waterhouse. The obligatory examinations system had been largely Arthur Cates' 'brainchild' and he was to serve as Chairman of the Board for many years.

Discussions recorded in the minutes of meetings of the Board focused, in the early years, on requests from the allied provincial architectural societies and educational institutions to hold the RIBA examinations locally so that candidates were not obliged to travel to London. The Board only agreed to these requests if there were a sufficient number of candidates sitting the examinations and if the local committee of any Society of Architects administering

the examinations was 'balanced' by a group of Fellows of the RIBA who were to report on the session to the Board of Examiners. The first requests from institutions to be granted this privilege were Glasgow's Institute of Architects in 1883-4 and Manchester's Technical College in 1885.

As a Board, these architects were, of all RIBA members, most closely in touch with the work of candidates sitting the Examinations in Architecture, as defined by Byelaw XIV and subsequently, by the 1887 Supplementary Charter. While they were in a position individually to assess the nature of architectural education in educational institutions and architectural societies elsewhere, it remained the Board's decision as to whether a provincial city could hold the RIBA's examinations in the vicinity rather than sending its candidates to London. Many of the examination papers set by the Board at this time included such topics as the History of Architecture, Mouldings, Materials and Construction, Plans and Sections, and Specifications.(3) In 1885, candidates were requested by the Board to provide details of their education. Such demands were prompted by letters from anxious parents to the Secretary of the Board asking the Board of Examiners to suggest ways in which their children might improve their chances in the RIBA examinations. The Board suggested that the Architectural Association was the most suitable place for a pupil to improve in terms of architectural ability.(4)

By 1886, the number of candidates had risen dramatically, necessitating two sessions of examinations held annually in March and in November. At this time, it is worth recording a significant admission made by the Board of Examiners in a report on their work in 1883. This Report concluded:

"The Board desire to record their opinion that the majority of candidates have derived this advantage from the examination, namely that they have perceived some of the deficiencies of their education."(5)

For a pupil to spend several years trying to pass compulsory examinations in order to qualify for membership of the RIBA only



to discover that the RIBA considered the existing facilities for training outmoded or deficient, was an elaborate exercise in bad faith on the part of the RIBA's Board of Examiners. However, the Board had few models from which to draw on in devising an effective organisation for the new compulsory examinations for RIBA membership. It had only the structure and methods of working adopted by the Statutory Board of Examiners and the Board of Examiners under Byelaw XIV to assess, when formulating its own terms of reference and constitutional framework. In this respect, the Board was very unsure of its ground in the early years of its administration of the compulsory examinations. The advent of exemption (and later, recognition) of courses in educational institutions offering architectural training in London and elsewhere prompted the need for a strategy of control of the wider policy issues in architectural education as such. It is no coincidence that this process should have begun at a time when the RIBA was forced into the position of defending its examination system from critics outside the RIBA; in doing so, the RIBA opened wide the debate about educational and examination policies for the 1880s and 1890s.

In 1885, William White, Secretary of the RIBA Council, gave a paper to the Leeds and Yorkshire Society of Architects. He tried to defend the RIBA's 'educational' policy in the following manner:

"The difficult question of professional education is the most perplexing one of the present time, for it is astonishing how much secret and indirect opposition exists to the establishment of any thorough system, and how many highly respectable practitioners regard even the examination for membership of the Institute as an error or a misfortune."(6)

White's defence of the RIBA rested on the proposals for a Supplementary Charter of 1887 which would, he believed, allow the RIBA to develop its examinations and to further professional education. White believed that this Charter would "be productive of important results", (7) although he did not go on to describe in detail what these results would be for the RIBA

or for the profession generally.

Six years later, in 1891, John Slater, a member of the Board of Examiners in Architecture, addressed the Bristol Society of Architects on the same matter:

"Now a considerable amount of cheap shallow criticism of the Institute has been indulged in on the ground that it does nothing for education, but only for examination. I fully admit that examination is not education, but I assert without fear of contradiction that it furnishes an enormous incentive to education ... Before their establishment [the Board of Examiners in Architecture] architectural students were as sheep without a shepherd ..." (8)

In the same breath, Slater denounced the Society of Architects (9) for attempting to promote the statutory registration of architects through parliament. (10)

William White had been criticised after his lecture in Leeds for "this apparent attempt to exalt the profession above the art of architecture". He was accused of seeking refuge in the view that the development of an architectural examination could test measurable skills and that:

"the artistic part of it, as things now go, may be safely left to take care of itself for many years to come." (11)

As a defence of the RIBA's policy, this view was fiercely challenged throughout the 1880s and 1890s. Small coteries of architects, artists and surveyors, like those comprising the Society of Architects, had established themselves by this time as alternative groups from the RIBA. To these disparate groups of people, the issues of education were linked to wider debates about professionalism and adequate registration for all those purporting to practise as architects. One of these 'associations' was known under the collective title of 'The Memorialists'. Two members of this group who entered the education debates were Richard Norman Shaw and T G Jackson. Norman Shaw, who taught at the Royal Academy

Schools, ran a large office and many of his employees, including Lethaby, were also associated with the Memorialists. Jackson and Shaw together edited a collection of essays by the Memorialists entitled 'Architecture; a Profession or an Art?' in 1892. This represents possibly the most cogent argument to be made against the RIBA's examination and qualification policy at this time. The book offered a rigorous critique of the Institute, arguing that if the RIBA sought to define architectural education as professional education, protectionism would lead to a neglect of the art of architecture:

"In England, says Mr White ... 'the genius of the people is commercial. They like to have not always the best of everything, but what is thought at the time to be the best; and as the lives of most men in this country are busy ones, they have not time to think for themselves in any matters with which they are not personally identified'. Here, according to Mr White, is an opening for someone who will undertake the useful office of saving society the trouble of thinking for herself in matters of art, and of supplying her with articles on the genuineness of what she may rely. There is no lack of persons who are willing to take this office upon them, and offer their services to protect society from the consequences of her own carelessness. There is the Society of Architects which comes forward and offers to issue the British Public a class of sterling architects all duly stamped and warranted, if they can only get the monopoly of the trade. 'Take our registered architect' they seem to say 'and you can't go wrong'."(12)

"In regard to the public, the Institute (the RIBA) takes up two contradictory positions. On the one hand it professes that this examination is intended to show the bare minimum of knowledge necessary to enable a man to practise architecture, but on the other, it holds out as an inducement to students that those who have passed this examination will be able to come before the public as only certified architects, as 'practical men' stamped and declared to be such by the Institute."(13)

The Society of Architects also began an attack on the RIBA and tried to press for statutory registration of all architects. It called attention to the figures in the 1881 census returns which recorded 6,908 architects nationally and suggested, in a letter to the RIBA allied societies that many of the people calling themselves 'architects' were probably builders or surveyors. The

Institute reacted to the letter by publishing an article in The Times, which stated that the RIBA itself was considering the issue of registration. This failed to forestall the campaign, and the Society of Architects went ahead with the presentation of a Bill before Parliament in 1889. The RIBA was forced to lobby MP's to block the development of the Bill to a second reading.

The Society of Architects and the Memorialists were not united in the nature of their criticisms of the Institute. For the Memorialists, issues of registration and education were of a moral nature, establishing how and where a 'gentleman-architect's' conscience should lie on the quality of professional ethics and artistic integrity; it would seem that their attacks stemmed from one of the last ditched definitions of the architect as someone who 'really knew how to handle a pencil'. Their criticisms of statutory registration appear to rest on a particularly passionate belief in the art of architecture and on a reasoned understanding of the nature and purpose of that art. An architect, to the Memorialists, was both a professional and an artist; the idea, therefore, of examining a student, or of registering as an architect, was both irrelevant and perhaps, even irreverent. Their views on this were stated in 'Architecture; a Profession or an Art' (1892):

"Legislation has at last reached the domain of Art, and it has been seriously proposed to charge Parliament with the duty of providing the public with good architecture and properly qualified architects."(14)

Their accusations, here, were directed towards the Society of Architects. However, their statement could also be construed as an indirect criticism of the RIBA itself. The institute was seen to be using examinations to promote an educational policy but these examinations were also being used as a qualification policy leading to RIBA membership.

In 1894, Leonard Stokes, a teacher at the AA, stated that the RIBA examinations were:

"a kind of embrocation, which only required to be largely advertised and well rubbed in to produce education."(15)

In 1900, the architect, Beresford Pite wrote that the RIBA examinations tested very little that was actually about design:

"If you want to learn architecture, you must study architecture; that is, architectural construction; not the gymnastics which will overleap the building act. You must pry into the material. You must learn the actual 'I know' of the workman."(16)

In 1902, Pite was persuaded by Lethaby, also a 'Memorialist', to become the Professor of Architecture at the Royal College of Art.(17) Another Memorialist, Reginald Blomfield, resigned from the RIBA in 1891 arguing that the examinations were not necessarily a test of comprehensive knowledge of design at all:

"Can it be taken as evidence of anything but so much book-knowledge, crammed up for the occasion and incontinently lost? ... The amount of time which the student has to devote to the acquisition of this book-knowledge leaves him no leisure for work or actual buildings, and renders impossible that arduous yet delightful apprenticeship of sketching and measuring which undoubtedly did give to those who have gone through it some sense of the scholarship of architecture, some insight into the qualities which give enduring vitality to work which has outlived the centuries."(18)

Blomfield intimated that one of the ways of bringing about public recognition of the role of the architectural profession was:

"to see to the training that we provide for our students and to ensure that they, at any rate, shall master the great art of building."(19)

## II. The Foundation of the Board of Architectural Education

By 1903, the RIBA was forced to consider these criticisms both in relation to education and registration.(20) The new President,

in 1902, was Sir Aston Webb. He suggested that the RIBA was not in a position to administer training and discuss examination issues without the co-operation of the 'Memorialists'. In 1903, RIBA Council set up the Architectural Education Committee. This had powers from Council to add members wherever and whenever it felt it was appropriate to its tasks, which were described in the minutes of the Committee as follows:

"to ascertain existing schemes of architectural education and their relation to the system of pupillage; to consider how these schemes could be co-ordinated to consider a syllabus and the possibility of constituting an Advisory Board of Architecture."(21)

Aston Webb chaired the inaugural meeting of the committee on 16 July 1903 and presided over a group of members who had, in earlier years, been opponents on matters of educational policy for the architectural profession. Members of the committee included John Slater, a past Secretary of the RIBA, John Belcher, Thomas Collicutt, Beresford Pite, Walter Millard, F M Simpson, Reginald Blomfield, Mervyn McCartney, William Lethaby, Halsey Ricardo, Basil Champneys, Leonard Stokes, H T Hare and T G Jackson. Sidney Webb was called upon to represent the London County Council Architects Department.(22)

The range of facilities available to apprentices who wished to sit the RIBA examinations was the widest in London. Apart from the course, set up by Stokes, at the Architectural Association which specifically catered for those who wished to sit the RIBA examinations,(23) the Central School of Arts and Crafts and the Royal Academy Schools also offered architectural courses to full and part time students. University College London, under Professor T R Smith also offered an architecture course, as did Kings College, London under Banhister Fletcher and James Bartlett. This was a full-time course lasting three years.(24)

Architectural associations established in other cities on the model of the London Architectural Association also offered classes and design prizes for architectural assistants. Birmingham's

Architectural Association was founded in 1868 and this laid the foundations for a part time architectural course, beginning in 1878 at the Municipal School of Art. Prizes were offered in Geometry and Building Construction from 1878 and a prize for Architectural Design, from 1881. In 1893, the course was restructured when the School of Art became the School of Design and Handicrafts. It was intended to provide training for those builders who wished to qualify as architects; students attended in the evenings and during the afternoon and could prepare for the RIBA examinations in the third year of the four year course, which was part-time.(25)

Of all the provincial facilities for architectural education, Liverpool is documented most fully, but Manchester and Glasgow were also early examples of cities which were to establish formal architectural training. Both were granted improved status as the first cities which acted as regional RIBA Examination centres.

The Architectural Education Committee's first meeting records the 'Draft Proposals for Architectural Education' drawn up by Reginald Blomfield. These called for a combination of the ideas about design training practised in schools of art, the Polytechnics of North London and Regent Street and from pupillage as well.(26) A sub-committee, comprising Stokes, Lethaby, Blomfield, Belcher and H T Hare, was appointed. On 20 October and 27 November 1903, this sub-committee met to discuss how the full committee should begin to set about its task of making the study of architecture a subject of higher educational status. It was resolved to ask Council to set up a new Board of Architectural Education:

"with a view to the co-ordination of the various schemes of architectural education throughout London and the country generally, to draw up and submit to this Council an approved scheme of architectural education and to approach the recognised institutions of architectural training with a view to its adoption."(27)

The Board of Architectural Education was to have power to conduct its own negotiations for the purpose of compiling this report.

It was to consist of 16 members representing appropriate bodies, with no less than 10 members of the Institute. Others were to be appointed by Council on the recommendations of the Board. There were also advisory members of the Board representing the Royal Academy, the LCC, the University of London (University College and Kings College) and the architectural schools of Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, Birmingham, Edinburgh, Dublin and Cardiff. The Architectural Association was represented by one person and so was the Government Board of Education.

### III. The Work of the RIBA Board of Architectural Education 1904-1923

The first meeting of the RIBA Board of Architectural Education (hereafter RIBA BOAE) was held on 14 January 1904. Blomfield's draft proposals were discussed and the terms of reference of the new Board were recorded. At the second meeting, on 20 July 1904, the drafting of a questionnaire was agreed. This was to be sent to all educational institutions offering architecture courses, to ascertain the extent of existing provision. The questions ranged from the standards of secondary education expected of the pupils, to the extent of professional training through pupillage or elsewhere, and the length of the institutions' courses. The one subject thought to be indispensable, was drawing.(28) On 9 November 1904, a draft syllabus was minuted.(29)

There were disagreements, especially between Lethaby and Blomfield, over this syllabus and about the kinds of facilities that should be offered to architectural assistants. A deleted section of the revised syllabus recorded Lethaby's long term thinking on the orientation of the syllabus:

"Mr Jackson, Mr Champneys and Mr Stokes consider that study in buildings in progress is a sufficient substitute. Mr Pite advocates an extended and organised use of large building yards and existing engineering schools. The majority of members are, however, in favour of laboratories ... supplemented by a museum of models for each school. Mr Lethaby considers the laboratory or workshop the most important



part of the whole scheme as a means of enabling the student to acquire first hand experience of building methods. He says, 'It is hardly realised how many well-appointed shops in masonry, brickwork, carpentry, plumbing, plastering etc., are being conducted under the LCC. These could at once be made use of for architectural purposes and it is already understood that architects may enter all building classes. Besides the necessity for teaching of a more or less elementary and routine character, which I believe will be found to be fully provided for step by step as architects make use of it and make their requirements felt. There should be kept in view the necessity of raising up experts who will undertake research work in building science. We want to train expert constructors, engineers of building, men of initiative and daring.'"(30)

Blomfield had to admit that Lethaby's ideas "might seem impractical, even fantastic to ordinary men of affairs, but his mind ranged far and free".(31)

The new syllabus prompted a new ad-hoc committee, called The List of Books Committee. This was set up to revise the list of books recommended in the RIBA calendar to candidates wishing to sit the RIBA examinations. It had not been reviewed since 1883.(32) While the new list did include some references to engineering and craftsmanship, the emphasis in the bibliography, was reflected in the Syllabus Report of 1905:

"The object of the course should be to familiarise the student with the tools and materials of his trade, to concentrate his attention not so much upon paper work as on the actual facts of the problem which he will have to encounter in practice. The student should however be taught that architecture is something more than engineering, that, while the engineer is concerned with scientific instruction, it is the architect's province to see that his construction is not only scientifically sound but aesthetically beautiful. The student should therefore be trained in the selection of form and in the study of mass and proportion. His attention should early be directed to the study of abstract form as fulfilling definite functions."(33)

Lethaby wrote in rather compromised tones to Charles Hadfield about the syllabus in 1907:

"I have joined with some others in this education movement hoping that at last we may get some common lines laid down, and I am content to call it 'science'. Indeed the best hope I can see is that we might convince the authorities that the young architect needs sympathetic training a good deal like engineers - the days for 'picking things up in the office' have passed ..."(34)

Minutes of the meetings of the BOAE from 1907 were bound in separate volumes.(35) On 11 June 1907, a Joint Committee of the BOAE and Board of Examiners in Architecture was convened, to co-ordinate the work of both. In March 1909, at the Annual General Meeting of Council, both the BOAE and the Board of Examiners were dissolved, on the basis of the resolutions of this Joint Committee and a new homogeneous Board was appointed by Council to deal jointly with all educational policy. It was ostensibly called the Board of Control (Education and Examination), although meetings continued to be held under the old title. The Board was constituted with representatives from institutions offering architecture courses but there were also members of the Board who were called upon to represent the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and the LCC. The secretariat of RIBA Council was invited to attend, if it wished, but the Secretary of the Council was co-opted as a full member. Sub-committees were again appointed to consider aspects of general policy. The ad-hoc practice of 'exemption' was considered by a Joint Committee of BOAE members and representatives from the Schools of Architecture at Birmingham, Manchester and Bristol (The Royal West Academy) in 1909. This practice had been adopted by the old Board of Examiners in Architecture when the architectural course of an institution was 'recognised' as being commensurate with the RIBA Examination in Architecture. The University of Liverpool's architecture course, like that at the AA and at the Glasgow School of Art, had already been granted exemption from the Intermediate Examination of the RIBA in 1902, and 1904 respectively.(36) On 27 June 1910, the work of this sub-committee was brought under the terms of reference of the full Board of Control.(37)

On 1 May 1913, a new Committee of Examiners was appointed by Council.(38) This formed part of the main BOAE but met separately

as a committee in its own right. The RIBA Preliminary Examination was discontinued in 1916, and a letter was sent from the Examiners Committee to the Headmasters Conference in May of that year, advising all candidates that they would be asked to produce evidence of their general education (letters from their teachers, headmasters' reports and school certificates) so that Council might be satisfied by their ability to sit for the RIBA Intermediate Examination.

This pressing matter of exemption and recognition of courses preoccupied the BOAE until, and during, the Great War. As a consequence, courses were increasingly tailored to fit the cloth of the RIBA syllabus and examinations system. An emphasis on construction rather than on design, and on history rather than archaeology at both Kings College London and at the Central School of Arts and Crafts can be seen as evidence of this shift in teaching. However, exemption was refused where students had attended the Royal College of Art under Beresford Pite, or at the Regent Street Polytechnic, under Robert Mitchell. The Central School course where Lethaby was the principal lecturer from 1909 was never recognised by the RIBA BOAE, although Lethaby himself was a member of the Board. The procedure for exemption and recognition was therefore curious.

Many of the Board's members were representing schools of architecture which had already gained or were seeking exemption from the RIBA examinations. While the BOAE was not in its own right, a teaching institution, it did, on the one hand, assume the role of a School of Architecture, while on the other hand, it attempted to represent widely different attitudes to the pedagogy of both design and construction in existing educational institutions. These roles seem to have produced a considerable degree of conflict. It was particularly problematic for Liverpool School of Architecture, when Charles Reilly took over as Roscoe Professor of Architecture in 1904. His School won exemption from the BOAE when a Department of Town Planning was added in 1909. A Chair of Civic Design (funded by Lord Lever) was founded in 1912. In 1910, Reilly wrote to Blomfield, as Chairman of the BOAE, suggesting that the methods of

teaching at Liverpool, based on the teaching programme of the Ecole des Beaux Arts, be adopted as the general principle of the recognition of architecture courses nationwide by the BOAE:

"I am sorry you are not very hopeful about the Schools as a whole, but I am glad to see that you make us an exception. Don't you think that the fault partly lies in the fact that there is not, apart from this place, any very serious attempt at the systematic teaching of design? To be quite frank I think this may be due in some measure to the Board's own separate syllabus, which laid such strong emphasis on the teaching of construction and hardly mentioned design. At the time the syllabus was drawn up this was the natural and right reaction from the copying of plates which was practically all that went on in the Schools. Besides, the Board itself at that time could hardly have made any definite pronouncement on design; it was the meeting ground of so many schools of thought. Since then though thanks largely to your 'Mistress Art' and other lectures most of the keen people are turning to bigger scaled more monumental stuff, which having a basis in classical architecture can, up to a point, be taught. Don't despair in the end of your converting all the Arts and Crafts people, even Ricardo, Lethaby and Prior, and when this has happened, the Board can openly preach Monumental Architecture."(39)

It has been suggested that Reilly's estimation of the development of schools of architecture was correct,(40) although the new emphasis on the teaching of design was not as widespread as Reilly would have wanted his colleagues to believe. Teaching at the Central School of Arts and Crafts continued to be adapted to the needs of those students engaged in building work. Classes were offered in drawing, architectural design, building construction, colour, decoration, furniture design, metalwork and textiles.(41) The same approach applied at the Brixton School of Building.(42) The RIBA BOAE did not grant Brixton exemption from the Intermediate Examination until 1961. The schools, generally, were almost empty before and during the First World War. At Cambridge University, an architecture course was begun in 1911 where there was only one student, Kenneth Cross (who later became President of the RIBA in 1956). Lethaby was appointed as the Professor at Cambridge in 1912 and gave a series of lectures. In 1914, the RIBA BOAE granted the school exemption from the Intermediate Examination. This was a curious gesture in view of the BOAE's

decision to withhold exemption from both Brixton and the Central School, as it would appear that the course at Cambridge ran on the same lines as those in the Brixton School of Building and at the Central. It is significant that in 1926, twelve years after Intermediate exemption had been granted, that the approach of the school had changed dramatically. The main studio tutor Harold Tomlinson was, according to students at that time, "a Beaux Arts man who demanded a very high standard".(43) At this time, the Director of the School, Theodore Fyfe, was elected to sit on the RIBA BOAE.

These events illustrate that the BOAE was now considering Beaux Arts principles of teaching as the main criteria for continuing recognition in schools of architecture. The early acceptance of the course at Cambridge was, it seems, an unusual example of a school "passing through the net". After the War, Reilly served on the BOAE and was able to push through exemption for Liverpool for the RIBA Final Examination in May 1920. Cambridge was exempted from the RIBA Final Examination in 1923. Lethaby was disgusted with the draughtsmanship seen in application for the RIBA prizes and scholarships in these years. He argued that the work submitted seemed to be moving explicitly towards the teaching and design philosophy of the Ecole des Beaux Arts,(44) and he wrote to the Secretary of the Board of Architectural Education with these criticisms:

"I write to suggest to you that some sort of experiment might be made this year to make the subjects as practical and modern and real as possible - when I saw those same old paper dreams on the walls it made me both sad and savage ... Unless something is soon done, we shall have to get over Americans for all our real work."(45)

Lethaby's reference to the Americans is significant. He was referring to a new generation of architects there who were absorbed in the development of large and rationalised offices, supported by engineers and teams of draughting technicians. The idea of 'design management' having a commercial viability that did not ignore the contractor or the builder seems to have

interested Lethaby as an alternative method of practice from the 'art-architecture' adopted by English practices in the same period.

Apart from Lethaby, other architects had noticed the change in direction and emphasis of students work in British schools of architecture. As early as 1914, at an exhibition of students' work at the RIBA, H G Ibberson, from the RIBA Journal, asked:

"Do all these young men really love the same lady, or has our President [Blomfield] with his pen made her the mode? Cannot we be honest pirates, for once give up doing what we are told we ought, and save our souls by doing what we like?"(46)

The BOAE set up a sub-committee on 8 January 1920 to consider the future Constitution of the Board. Kenneth Cross, Beresford Pite, Charles Reilly, and Maurice Webb served on the committee and presented its draft report on 25 March 1920.(47) Every school of architecture whose final certificate, degree or diploma had been granted exemption by the RIBA BOAE was now to have the right to nominate a representative to sit on the new Board with full voting powers. Generally:

"The reference from the Council relative to the constitution of the Board revives the long felt impression that steps should be taken to enlarge and raise the status of the Board towards a realisation of its position as the central body controlling the architectural education of the kingdom."(48)

The constitution, therefore, embraced a wider representation of both the State as an educating force and the "Higher seats of architectural training".(49) Each head of a school of architecture was to be a practising architect. On 17 May 1920, Council ratified these changes and noted:

"The enlargement of its (BOAE) personnel would naturally follow, and as a consequence, the Board would be compelled to devote its attention as a Board rather to general administrative questions than to points of detail - which

latterly would, by a natural devolution, be remitted to committees and sub-committees."(50)

The Board was to consist of 35 or more members appointed by RIBA Council, representing a wide range of educational institutions and government bodies. A Schools Committee, Examinations Committee, Board of Moderators, Prizes and Scholarships Committee were set up in 1925,(51) along with an RIBA Visiting Board.(52)

Before turning to the issues of registration, and the work of this new body, the RIBA Visiting Board, it will be apparent that the recognition of courses in this period was closely linked to debates in the BOAE about the teaching of design and construction and a conflict of ideas and interests concerning the nature and purpose of architectural design. Lethaby, Ricardo and E S Prior were silenced by other members of the BOAE, especially by Charles Reilly and Reginald Blomfield (RIBA President in the critical years of 1912-1914). Some associates of 'The Memorialists', like T G Jackson and F M Simpson, never agreed to sit on the RIBA BOAE, perhaps, because they saw that its views were changing to suit a model of academic status which was not, in their opinion, appropriate to the teaching or practice of architecture. This change is reflected in the Board's decision, in 1921, to recommend that Council exempt holders of the Ecole des Beaux Arts 'Diplome' from the RIBA's Intermediate Examination. While there were schools whose courses gained exemption by "passing through the net", like Cambridge, there were others, like the Central School and Brixton School of Building who, under the terms of reference of the 1905 RIBA Syllabus, should have warranted more acknowledgement by the Board. Such inconsistencies of treatment beg many questions. The Board had not reached any commonly held understanding of what the teaching of design and construction might involve, in this period, and it is possible that this enabled the design convictions of certain members of the Board to establish their own sympathies as the main criteria for recognition.

While the Board was engaged in the development of procedures which, arguably, conferred professional status upon future members of the RIBA, it is significant that these procedures for recognition could only operate on this basis while there was ambivalence amongst the members of the BOAE as a collective body. This lack of clarity seems to have contributed to the assumption that schools pursuing a Beaux Arts programme were qualitatively different from those choosing a syllabus which brought together architectural design and building construction. There was evident discrimination against those schools whose main object was to bring about a reconciliation in the teaching of building and design as integral disciplines in the practice of architecture. The BOAE sought to replace this approach to design teaching by singling out schools who practised a policy of distinguishing between architecture as a 'professional' and academic discipline, from building construction, as a commercial trade. Assessments about the quality of educational provision in schools of architecture were therefore linked to the pursuit of a professional practice which elevated the architect to a position above the builder or skilled craftsman through the power of design as an autonomous, and academically rigorous process. Calls for the statutory registration of the title 'architect' were to reveal deeply estranged attitudes to this policy. As Britain began its recovery from the First World War, the business of guaranteeing the practice of architecture in the public interest through legislation brought with it many of these contradictory issues.



## CHAPTER 3

### THE MOVEMENT FOR REGISTRATION 1924-1938

"... the five orders are packed away in a cupboard ...  
we are playing with new toys now, rather hard and  
cornery, but sensible and strong."

H S Goodhardt-Rendel

This chapter considers the proposals for architectural registration in the 1920s and then examines the measures to promote it through Parliament from 1924-1938. Debates about registration had begun in architecture circles before the War and reference to these discussions has already been made in the previous chapter. What this chapter examines is the effect of those preliminary debates upon the legislative and constitutional arrangements for the setting up of the Architects Registration Council of the United Kingdom (ARCUK) in 1932. ARCUK's responsibilities for architectural education stemmed from statutory powers, but the exercise of its powers were to be circumvented by anomalies which prevented it having any firm control of policy in the pre World War II years. Indeed, ARCUK's role in administering education on behalf of the State, was determined by a struggle between the RIBA and other institutions for control of the architectural profession as a whole. In some cases, the tactics were a question of survival for associations or bodies such as the Incorporated Association of Architects and Surveyors (IAAS). It is therefore a characteristic of ARCUK's records that few direct references are made to educational policy in this period. One of the concerns of this chapter is to give some account for the reasons why ARCUK was never in a strong position to carry out its statutory responsibilities for architectural education between 1924 and 1938.

#### I. The 1924 International Conference on Architectural Education

By 1923, the RIBA Board of Architectural Education (BOAE) had just consolidated its own compulsory examination system as the means to qualify for membership of the RIBA, by the foundation of its

Visiting Board.(1) However, this coincided with an acknowledgement by several prominent members of the RIBA BOAE that the RIBA's administration and direction of architectural education was losing ground in relation to changes in design teaching and architectural theory.

When the first International Congress on Architectural Education was held in 1924 at the Institute in London, the Chairman of the RIBA BOAE, Curtis Green, voiced some misgivings when he introduced the proceedings with the following remarks:

"... the feeling was very generally expressed that all is not well with things as they are; it remains to be seen whether the causes of our present discontent are within the compass of our power to determine or whether they are so much part of the social ills of the time to be beyond our control."(2)

Curtis Green's comment is interesting and unusually perceptive; it attributes the cause of discontent not just to the internal debates of the profession but to the context within which professional concerns had to operate.

His comments were echoed more specifically by other delegates to the Congress. In sections of the report published after the Congress, A E Richardson, Professor of Architecture at University College London, remarked that the exhibition of students' work held at the Congress was "a spectacle for architects and not for the public".(3) He added that few contributors of design work had been sufficiently ambitious, in a technical sense, and that many students had neglected questions of form and massing in their schemes.

A review of the history of the RIBA's education policy at the Congress was given by Lionel B Budden, from Liverpool University School of Architecture. Budden conceded that there had been problems in controlling policy since 1883, when RIBA Council had decided to decentralise examination centres. Budden felt that this alone justified the setting up of the Visiting Board in 1923.(4)

Lethaby also attended the Congress, as a member of the RIBA's BOAE. It was in the BOAE that he had originally voiced his criticisms of architectural education, before the Congress deliberations had even started. As early as 1920, he suggested in a meeting of the BOAE that the projects in the RIBA Prizes and Scholarships briefs should be "as practical and modern, and real as possible".(5)

This point was reinforced at the Congress when he argued that an effective educational strategy should provoke a direct experience of building construction and materials amongst engineering, architectural and building students alike.(6) The cause for concern in the devising of RIBA Prizes and Scholarships briefs rested, in Lethaby's view, with competition from architects abroad.

Similarly, Sir Reginald Blomfield argued that the profession's lack of knowledge of modern construction was lamentable and that this encouraged "the mere adventurer" to step in and claim to be as competent as an architect belonging to the RIBA. His suggestion for remedying the situation was "to put our own house in order" thereby proving to the public that buildings designed only by architects were what was really required. Furthermore, he intimated that one of the ways of bringing about public recognition of the role of the architectural profession was "to see to the training that we provide for our students and ensure that they, at any rate, shall master the great art of building".(7) While evidence of the work of architecture students suggested to Board members of the RIBA that architectural training and examination were inadequate, to those architects not associated with the RIBA at this time, the RIBA's role in determining architectural education at all was considered questionable.

In 1892, 'The Memorialists' had published a set of essays on the issues of education and registration for the architectural profession. Their criticisms were levelled at the RIBA, at The Society of Architects, and at any attempts made by architects to promote formal professional education at the time. Their concern for the future of the architectural profession is not directly

linked with the moves for registration in the 1920s and 1930s, but evidence suggests that their arguments were still resonant at this time.

## II. The Origins of the ARCUK 1924-1929

From 1922, the RIBA itself discussed registration, and reluctantly it seems decided to promote it through statutory means. Of course, from the beginning of the Institute's history, the idea of a register of architects had not been contrary to the aims of the Institute. What had been problematic to people such as 'The Memorialists' and the Society of Architects was the question of which body, if not the Institute itself, could reasonably be considered responsible for administering and monitoring such a register.

This question was not voiced explicitly in the meetings of the RIBA's Registration Committee where it was tacitly assumed that no other body except the RIBA could carry out such a duty. On this basis, the RIBA accepted the challenge of registration so long as statutory powers would uphold its own position as the sole body to administer registration. In 1925, a liaison with the Society of Architects was effected, and the Society was amalgamated with the RIBA itself. It seems significant that this amalgamation should have been made at a time when membership of the RIBA was falling in direct proportion to the growth of the membership of the Society of Architects.

Although there is no strong documentary evidence to suggest that the RIBA's responsibility for architectural education should have encouraged the Institute to reconsider the advantages of registration, there does seem to be a significant overlap of events which might indicate connections between the issues of education and registration in this period. References made to registration in the RIBA BOAE at this time are not recorded despite the many anxieties expressed by its members about architectural education, generally at the International Congress.

However, minutes of the meetings of the RIBA's Registration Committee do record the proposals which led to the introduction of an RIBA promoted Parliamentary Registration Bill. This Bill differs, and must be seen as distinct, from the Registration Bills presented by the Society of Architects in 1903, 1904, 1905 and 1906. They had framed their intentions about registration without any reference to the RIBA and their case rested on the fact that:

"... it is expedient that persons requiring professional aid in architecture should be enabled to distinguish qualified from unqualified practitioners."(8)

Before any comparisons can be made between the 1927 Bill and the earlier Bills, it must be added that such justifications on the grounds of expediency are important in themselves. Why it was that the Society of Architects considered it 'expedient' and in whose interests this expediency was to serve are questions more properly considered elsewhere. In the 1927 Bill, the definition of registration rests simply on the importance of the registration of architects by a council, which is already defined in the Bill, as the Council of the RIBA. While the 1906 Bill called for the inauguration of a General Council of Architectural Education and Registration of the United Kingdom, the 1927 Bill, proposed to expand the duties of the existing institution's Council, the RIBA, in order to keep a register of architects.

The constitution of the independent council as described in the 1906 Bill, drew its representatives from a wide range of bodies and institutions.(9) It was considered expedient that this General Council should act on certain issues through representation to the Privy Council. One of these activities involved the chance:

"... to confer on any college, university or other body in the United Kingdom, not being one of the constituent bodies of the time being of the general council, and being in the opinion of the general council of sufficient importance to be worthy of such a privilege, the power of returning a member to the General Council, either separately or collectively with any other body or bodies in the same part of the United Kingdom."(10)

Where a registered architect's actions were considered "infamous in a professional respect," the 1906 Bill gave its Council the power to remove that architect's name from the register by order of a court of competent jurisdiction. The 1927 Bill made it possible for this kind of procedure to remain in the sole hands of the RIBA, without statutory legal constraints.

Clearly definitions of what registration entailed in this period were ambiguous, although in the terms of reference of all Bills to date (1927), the definitions referred to something more substantial than the idea of the names of architects simply being listed in a book. This had been the conception of the RIBA in 1837; by 1927, the appellation of the word 'architect' had embraced some vague notion of a protected legal title. The scope of judicial control, however, was not defined and seemed to lie under the aegis of the RIBA itself, and its own solicitors or legal advisors. Hence, the role of the State's Privy Council was summarily defined in the RIBA Bill of 1929 and the principal sections of the Bill refer solely to the Council of the RIBA, viz:

"It shall be the duty of the Council within six months from the passing of this Act, to set up and maintain a register to be called 'the register of architects' to cause to be entered therein the name, address, and qualifications of every registered person, and to cause to be removed therefrom the names of all registered persons who shall have died, or have been declared by a competent court to be lunatics, or any names which the Council in accordance with the provisions of this Act are entitled to have removed from the register or any names or particulars inaccurately entered therein ... The Council shall from time to time by regulations prescribe the qualifications necessary for registration ..."(11)

The 1927 Bill then outlines the ways in which these regulations would be administered by another Board of Architectural Education, and an Admissions Committee. The First Schedule of the Bill dealt specifically with the composition of this new Board of Architectural Education (BAE); its composition is almost identical to the RIBA's BOAE, as reconstituted in 1925.(12) The RIBA BOAE contained 12 members to be nominated by RIBA Council on the recommendations of the new Board of Architectural Education (BAE).

The Registration Bill's First Schedule also specified 12 members from the Register of Architects administered by the proposed Council.(13)

In all other respects, the members of the new Board of Architectural Education were constituted in exactly the same way as the RIBA's own BOAE. One exception was that in the constitution of the BAE, the Registration Bill did not include the London County Council's Director of Education. While the 12 unnamed members of the 'new' BAE were to be registered architects, they could not be registered with any institution other than the RIBA; they were 'ipso facto' RIBA members who were appointed, for it was under the jurisdiction of the RIBA Council (in the terms of the Bill) to decide who was qualified to be registered or not. Furthermore, it was to the RIBA Council that the duty of administering examinations was entrusted. This practice could not be revoked without the approval of the Privy Council.

The critical difference between the 1906 Bill and the 1927 Bill rests on the level of State interference through the mediation of the Privy Council. The 1906 Bill had proposed a role for the Registration Council which was limited by the more dominant terms of reference of the Privy Council. In the 1927 Bill, the apportioning of power between these two bodies endorsed the controlling influence of the RIBA Council, and the RIBA was protected, to a certain extent, by the Privy Council. The only proviso to the passing of the Bill through its first reading in the House of Commons was that the RIBA, as promoters, would agree to the word 'registered' as a prefix to the word 'architect'.

With their consent on this matter, the Bill passed through its second reading and into Select Committee in 1927.(14) The Committee asked for contributions from a wide range of bodies.(15) This Select Committee published a report on 26 July 1927 suggesting that the Bill should not proceed to a third reading. Many of the bodies consulted were unable to return the Bill to the House of Commons, including the IAAS.(16) The Committee argued thus:

"... in view of the fact that the clauses of the Bill had been amended by the Committee in the light of the evidence submitted, and that the final vote of 5 to 4 not to report the Bill to the House does not represent the views of the Committee of eleven members as a whole, your Committee hope that an early opportunity will be given to the House next session of considering a Bill formed on the lines of this Bill, as amended."(17)

The RIBA, in its evidence to the Committee appears to have contradicted their earlier concession on the prefix 'registered'. In Committee, Sir Harry Barnes, Chairman of the RIBA Registration Committee, had argued that:

"... a great many people may be content to go on using the word 'Architect' and may have no desire to go upon the register ..."(18)

A new Bill(19) was introduced in the House of Commons on 9 February 1928, by Walter Raine MP. In its second reading, the debate was counted out and the RIBA decided to petition the House of Lords. In 1929, the Bill in a revised form(20) returned to the House of Commons, only to be halted yet again by more pressing parliamentary business. In 1930, as the country went to the polls in a general election, the Bill was re-introduced by T L R Moore MP. As a National Government was brought to power to deal with emergencies arising from a run on the pound and the fall of the gold standard, the Architects (Registration) Bill of 1928 passed to a second reading and into committee stage in November 1930.(21) This committee specified further public safeguards. The constitution of the Board of Architectural Education was to be appointed by an independent body to be known as the Architects' Registration Council of the United Kingdom (ARCUK) drawing on wider representation of the lay electorate, which included the LCC's Director of Education, and representatives from institutions with a direct interest in the fields of education, the construction industry and the relevant trade unions or associations.(22)

In this form, the 1931 Architects (Registration) Act became law on 1 January 1932. ARCUK's functions were outlined as follows in the Act: "... to set up and thereafter maintain a register to



be called 'The Register of Registered Architects'...(23) with powers to decide on those applicants suitable for registration. ARCUK's Board of Architectural Education (BAE) was to be appointed annually by ARCUK's Council, and its duty was to recommend to Council:

- "(a) the recognition of any examinations in architecture the passing of which, in the opinion of the Board, to qualify persons for registration under this Act, and
- (b) the holding of any examinations in architecture, which ought, in the opinion of the Board, to be passed by applicants for registration under this Act ... and to hold examinations in architecture in accordance with this Act."(24)

Applicants wishing to apply for registration were, and still are, provided for under Section 6(1)c, or Section 6(1)d of the Principal Act.

## II. ARCUK and Accreditation 1931-1939

The terms of reference for ARCUK Council and for its BAE in the Principal Act of 1931 were to prove the most complex and ambiguous elements of all its regulations. As soon as ARCUK's Council began to meet in the summer of 1932, it was beset by problems. According to an independent but short-lived body known as the Institute of Registered Architects, few people outside the profession were felt to be sufficiently conversant with the legal proceedings to know what the difference was between an 'architect' and a 'registered architect'. In a pamphlet sent to ARCUK Council on 25 September 1933, this body insisted that while the business of registering architects rested with ARCUK, the business of making the status of those admitted to the register comparable with that enjoyed by the legal and medical professions rested with the registered architects themselves.(25)

The pamphlet is drafted in a manner which suggests that a recruitment campaign independent from ARCUK was developing.

Nonetheless, it seems germane to cite its arguments for they give credence to those as yet unresolved concerns described by 'The Memorialists' in their debates, now over sixty years old.

Confident statements had been made at the first meeting of ARCUK's Council on 11 March 1932, held at the Royal Society of Arts.(26) Major Harry Barnes, MP and an associate member of the RIBA, took the Chair at the meeting and spoke of the importance of establishing the new Council as an officially recognised statutory body providing "the uninstructed public with a safeguard".(27)

Indeed Barnes voiced the opinion, at the same meeting, that:

"nobody can challenge conclusions and raise any objection at all to what we have done."(28)

By the summer of 1932, the tone of Council meetings had changed, with members now foreseeing the problems of the Act's terms of reference. The practice of verbatim minute-taking, which had been conducted in committee until now, was, by resolution, to continue, illustrating the anxiety of Council members over their duties.(29) In June 1932, the Council appointed a new Committee not specified in the Act. This was a Finance and General Purposes Committee.(30) In the following autumn, an Amending Act Committee was set up by ARCUK Council, whose main brief was to make alterations to the Principal Act in the course of receiving suggestions from any of ARCUK's committees.(31)

It was ARCUK's Board of Architectural Education which was to prove the main committee to liaise with the Amending Act Committee. The BAE's constitution provided for representation from bodies who also sat on the RIBA's BOAE. Charles Reilly represented Liverpool School of Architecture, Reginald Blomfield represented the British School at Rome, Curtis Green the Royal Academy of Arts, and Howard Robertson the Architectural Association.(32) All were, or had in the past, been members of the RIBA BOAE. Other members of ARCUK's BAE included Adshead and Lanchester, members of the RIBA

BOAE, and John Slater, the RIBA Board of Examiners Secretary.

Such a close affinity between the individuals on ARCUK's BAE and the RIBA's BOAE is problematic, given the terms of the First Schedule of the Principal Act, which suggested that this would have been ruled out of order. But the similarity was to prove the rule rather than the exception in terms of the nominating institutions, and illustrates the uncertain grounds for nominating institutions as specified in the Principal Act. Of the 73 nominating bodies, which included 24 persons registered and chosen by the ARCUK's Council, the ARCUK's BAE was to be made up of a number of other nominating bodies' representatives which did not need to be persons associated with the RIBA. However, nominating bodies such as the Royal Academy proposed members of their own who were also RIBA members, and these people were often the same people placed on the RIBA's BOAE.

While the terms of the Act, in theory, made it legal for non-RIBA members to outweigh professional domination on ARCUK's BAE, in practice, this possibility was obviated. The reasons behind this extraordinary development can be explained by examining the records of RIBA Council meetings in the same period. In December 1932, Raymond Unwin, the President of the RIBA, thought it desirable to influence ARCUK's educational and professional strategies by suggesting that RIBA members should register with ARCUK. A letter to his members welcomes the advent of the newly formed Council, but adds:

"... the fact remains that by the Statutory recognition of all architects whose names are on the register, the general status of the profession will ultimately be advanced if the controlling influence in matters of policy remains in the hand of representatives of the RIBA and its allied and associated societies."(33)

Unwin went on, in the same letter, to stress that the Principal Act would require amendments, and he suggested that:

"... the only way in which amendments can be secured for the benefit of our members and of the profession in general

is for as many of our members as possible to seek registration, and thus ensure that the controlling influence upon that body (ARCUK) which will have to be responsible for any Amending Bill remains in the hands of the representatives of the RIBA and its allied and Associated Societies."(34)

An analysis of the deliberations of ARCUK's BAE from 1932 to 1938 indicates that the RIBA used its controlling influence in the BAE, and on other Committees, to veto discussions which sought to open up educational policy for discussion outside the professional body of the RIBA. ARCUK's BAE had been asked by ARCUK Council in July 1932 to invite 'constituent' architectural bodies and schools of architecture to submit details of their examinations and courses. In the course of receiving submissions, the BAE were to find that there were significant ambiguities in the Act which confused the terms of reference of the BAE with that of ARCUK's Council. These ambiguities precluded ARCUK accepting any examination or course in Architecture that was not already 'recognised' by the RIBA's BOAE or considered 'exempt' from its own Examinations in Architecture.

The BAE recommended that 'nine architecture schools' diploma examinations should be approved by the ARCUK; these were examinations which already had recognition from the RIBA BOAE.(35) ARCUK's BAE also approved the RIBA's Final and Special Final Examinations. There were, however, proposals made by bodies other than the RIBA for examinations in architecture to be approved by ARCUK's BAE. The proposal from the Incorporated Architects and Surveyors (IAAS) was received by ARCUK's Council in December 1932; it was not able to nominate representatives onto ARCUK's BAE and could not make representations to it. However, it was represented on Council, the Admissions Committee, the Amending Act Committee, and the Professional Purposes Committee. The IAAS had a Direct Associate Examination, which could have been accepted by ARCUK's BAE under Section 6(1)c of the Act, but at the sixth meeting of Council on 16 December 1932, its resolution on the agenda was ruled 'ultra vires' on the ground that Council was not thought to be competent to recognise as qualifying for registration examinations except as and when recommended by its BAE.(36) One of the IAAS's representatives on

Council, Sir Robert Tasker, suggested that the matter should be referred to the Amending Act Committee. The Chairman of this committee is minuted, at this stage as having refuted the case on the grounds that it was not within the terms of reference of the Amending Act Committee. An anonymous contributor then asked for information regarding the procedure of the BAE's work; this was ruled out of order by the chairman of the Council, Sir Harry Barnes.(37)

The case for the IAAS was taken up again by Major Athoe and rested on the status and constitution of ARCUK's Council over and above that of its BAE. While Athoe's institution had no voice on this body, it was represented on the Professional Purposes Committee (apart from the Admissions Committee). Indeed Athoe sat on this Committee for three months as Vice-Chairman before resigning on the grounds that the Committee had no 'locus' for debate or existence. He continued to press for recognition of the IAAS examination in Council and on the Amending Act Committee. In April 1933, the details of the examination, including examples of papers and drawings were submitted to the General Purposes Committee of the BAE, where it was subjected to rigorous scrutiny, a tactic not used with the submissions recognised by the RIBA's BOAE.(38) The examination's status was considered to be "below the standard which the Board of Architectural Education (ARCUK) considered necessary for qualification for registration," and the submission was rejected by the special meeting of Council in 1934.(39)

This long and complex case was to continue until the passing of the Architects (Amendment) Act in 1938. At no time in the ARCUK's records is reference made in this period to what constituted "the standard which the Board of Architectural Education consider necessary for qualification for registration".(40) The statements suggest that standards were accorded indirectly using those courses which were recognised by the RIBA BOAE as models for acceptable criteria and judgement. Athoe's case also illuminates the confusion between the terms of reference for ARCUK's Council and that of its Board of Architectural Education,

whose members in the Act were appointed annually by the ARCUK. As such, Athoe's attempts to halt the procedure of the Amending Act Committee were wholly sensible even if, by doing so, his institution fell victim to a "numbers game" logic outlined by ARCUK Council:

"The Council do not deny that the Petitioners [the IAAS], may consist of about 2,000 members but they [Council] understand that of these members some 1,113 only are architect members. The RIBA consists of some 6,078 members all of whom are architect members and the number of members of the Provincial Associations affiliated to the RIBA, but who are not members of the RIBA, is 1,540. The architect membership of the Faculty of Architects and Surveyors is 700, and the architect membership of the Association of Architects, Surveyors and Technical Assistants is approximately 500. The membership of the Architectural Association is 1,411. It does not appear to council that any two bodies can properly be described as the leading electoral bodies."(41)

In February 1934, a sub-committee of ARCUK's Council was formed to deal with the dispute, followed in 1935 by legal proceedings against ARCUK by the IAAS.(42) The plaintiffs' argument rested on the terms of the Principal Act which ruled that the Board of Education's duty was:

"to recommend to the Council the recognition of any examination in Architecture the passing of which ought in the opinion of the Board to qualify for registration."(43)

This had been countered by verbal opinions in Council that it was not entitled to recognise examinations other than those recommended by the BAE (ARCUK). On the other hand, Section 6(1)c of the Act had stated that a person shall be registered if he or she had passed any examination in Architecture for the time being registered by the Council.(44)

While Athoe suggested that the work of the Amending Act Committee be held up until its terms of reference had been defined more closely,(45) the sub-committee of ARCUK Council formed to deal with the dispute ruled that it should not be necessary for the IAAS to lay down evidence of its examinations (as these

constraints had not been imposed on other bodies), "the more so as the Council had not laid down any standard which examinations had reached in order to be recognised".(46)

In November 1936, Athoe suggested in a meeting of the Amending Act Committee that there was no reason why the Board of Architectural Education should not hold its own examinations in Architecture (despite a similar suggestion having been rejected by Council in 1933). He added that if such a step were taken, the RIBA examinations need no longer offer the sole qualification for registration.(47) He went on to argue that the constitution of the Board should be widened further to include representation from provincial architectural associations, such as the Edinburgh Architectural Association, the Council of South Wales Institute of Architects, and the Nottingham, Derby and Lincoln Architectural Society. These proposals caused some alarm in the Amending Act Committee and were rejected,(48) which prompted Athoe to write directly to the House of Lords, during the month of January 1937, when the draft of the Amending Bill was in first reading, asking for their opposition to its passage through Parliament.

The contents of this letter made explicit the underlying significance of his case:

"Briefly, this amendment, if agreed to by Parliament would eventually put the control of the architectural profession in the hands of one body, a state of affairs which was not contemplated by Parliament when the Act of 1931 became law. No monopoly is good for the public and this Amending Bill would undoubtedly open the door to a monopoly of control."(49)

As the Bill passed through its second reading to the House of Lords, Athoe received a reply from Lord Dufferin which stated that his fellow members of the House of Lords would not pledge themselves in favour of the Bill. Lord Dufferin's comments about the Bill were then circulated to IAAS members. He was quoted as follows:

"The whole subject was highly controversial and that the Government could not promise any facilities for the progress of the measure."(50)

Athoe's case had been strengthened the previous year when a legal judgement was concluded between the IAAS and ARCUK's solicitors. The ARCUK BAE were considered to be the education experts:

"but [that] Parliament had a very definite mistrust of experts and it was plain to him [IAAS solicitor] that the Council was left free to recognise examinations other than those recommended by the Board by the virtue of Section 6(1)d, by making such other examinations prescribed qualifications."(51)

The advice went on to state that if ARCUK Council:

"thinks fit to recognise the Plaintiff's examination they can do so ... the Council should not be the slave to the Board ... from the arguments advanced by the Defendants' Counsel one would imagine that the Council was pleading to be placed in chains by the Board. The Council is free to recognise exams independent of the Board."(52)

These events provoked the Chairman of the Amending Act Committee, Sidney Tatchell, to write to the House of Lords saying that the IAAS only represented ten per cent of all registered architects and that Athoe was not to be taken too seriously.(53) He then had to state, since the IAAS was represented on ARCUK, that the IAAS's criticisms of the Committee were "totally inaccurate".(54)

By October 1937, Athoe was no longer eligible to remain on the Amending Act Committee and it could be suggested that at this stage this scarcely hindered the passage of the Bill through Parliament. Wider public concern over the German occupation of the Rhineland, the crisis of the Spanish Civil War and the first evidence of Hitler's persecution of the Jews, might also be cited as causes of the Bill's slow progress through the customary parliamentary channels. It seems that Parliament could not spare the time to consider a relatively small matter of domestic policy.

Nonetheless, Athoe made a last attempt to change the clauses of the Bill by submitting a series of amendments to the Committee on 16 February 1938. These were unanimously rejected and a proviso was made that in future it rested with the Chairman of the Amending Act Committee to consider any further amendments to the Bill at this



late stage. In June 1938, the Bill passed its Third Reading stage and received the Royal Assent.(54)

Council in the meantime had decided at its own discretion and against the legal judgment reached earlier that it was not entitled to accept as qualifying for registration examinations other than those recommended by the Board of Architectural Education. No members of Council are minuted as questioning the use of the RIBA's examinations as the measuring stick from which a minimum standard could be assessed, apart from Major Athoe and Sir Robert Tasker. Other representatives, against accepting the IAAS examination, were RIBA members, few of whom, as Robert Tasker pointed out had even passed an RIBA examination in their lives.(55) While Tasker was clearly ignorant of some members' lengthy progress through the RIBA's progressive and compulsory examination process(56) he did qualify his statement as relating to the class of RIBA membership and there is evidence to suggest that many practising architects were still being trained through pupillage or unrecognised architecture courses at this time.(57)

Clearly, the struggle for registration was closely related to the self-regarding policies of the RIBA, although it seems that this was only apparent to a minority of people at the time. To this minority, the registration issue was a crucial step towards the creation of important legislative definitions about educational policy and professional practice.

The terms of the Architects (Amendment) Act of 1938, changed the title of 'Registered Architect' to 'Architect'. One amendment was considered which proposed that as regards the appointment of members of Council by Constituent Bodies:

"all persons appointed as representatives under these paragraphs should be registered architects."(58)

This amendment was adopted, and necessarily, Athoe was obliged to record his dissent, for under such terms, his qualifications as an

architect would not have been adequate for his own registration. He may have voiced this point as an anomaly but there is no recorded evidence of this or the reaction to such a point. Instead, provision was made for the representation of unattached architects who were entitled to nominate one of their membership onto Council.(59)

From 1932 to 1938, ARCUK Council and its Board of Architectural Education were able to modify their terms of reference as defined by government legislation, through the predetermining existence of the RIBA. Furthermore, the complex legal and administrative framework of ARCUK in these years enhanced the possibility of control by the RIBA of both educational and professional policy as a whole. In the only published work specifically on the history of the RIBA to date(60) the Chairman of ARCUK's Council, Harry Barnes, contributed the following comments in the chapter on Registration:

"ARCUK stands at the gateway of the realm of architectural practice, but within that realm the affairs are best administered by those voluntary associations to whom he [the architect] has allied himself and over the actions of which he has complete control."(61)

It seems that occupational protectionism and professional self-interest were allowed to surface in the course of ARCUK's early history. This inhibited any discussion about educational policy from taking place within the very forum which was intended to shape the future of architectural education from its birth in 1932. Although connections between the registration issue and educational policy were acknowledged by ARCUK, its procedural and legislative apparatus, set up to clarify these connections, was, it seems, a blunt instrument which could be manipulated to the advantage of RIBA members alone.

## CHAPTER 4

### THE RIBA VISITING BOARD 1923-1960

The RIBA Visiting Board, was created in 1923 by the new constitution of the Board of Architecture Education (BOAE). This 'Board' has assumed a quasi-institutional nature all of its own since its inception; certainly, members of the BOAE at the time of its inauguration felt it to be the most vigorous instrument of control in matters of future educational policy. This chapter describes its formation and then seeks to define the connections between the problem of validating courses in architecture and the procedural and administrative means created to deal with their recognition.

#### I. The Creation of the Visiting Board

The earliest documented reference to the Visiting Board is to be found in the Minutes of the RIBA BOAE, in a report of 1922 of the Travelling Board of Assessors. This 'Board' began to meet in 1862 as the Board of Assessors.(1) Varying numbers of assessors had been appointed by the Board of Examiners in Architecture to represent the Institute on visits to schools of architecture applying for, or 'enjoying' exemption from the RIBA Examinations for membership, after 1882. In 1922, a sub-committee of the Travelling Board of Assessors met to discuss the duties and emoluments of assessors. They then published a report based on their deliberations which recommended that there should now be three assessors, accompanied by the Secretary of the BOAE, paid to visit the schools of architecture. These were to be the ex-Chairman of the BOAE, a present officer of the BOAE and a teaching member of the BOAE, with an additional ex-officio assessor. They were to be appointed by the BOAE annually but "in order to keep some continuity" these officers were eligible for re-election.(2)

Their 'duties' were to visit the schools, an exercise which was

expected to cost two hundred to two hundred and fifty pounds per year. Visits were to be paid to each school once every two years and in cases of schools asking for exemption, a visit was to be paid before exemption was granted. The report went on to state:

"Owing to the increasing number of architectural schools which are 'recognised' by the RIBA, the Board of Architectural Education feel that the existing system of external examiners appointed by the schools is hardly adequate, and that in future, the Board should appoint its own representatives, independent of the external examiners, to assist and report upon all schools applying for, or enjoying exemption from the Royal Institute examinations."(3)

The justification for a new 'Board' therefore rested on the growth in the number of schools enjoying exemption from the RIBA Examinations; the 'recognised' schools of architecture. Where a school of architecture within its parent body made use of its own external examiners as a method of internal review and commendation, the RIBA Education Board now proposed a new set of external assessors, appointed not by the academic institution concerned, but by the professional body itself: the RIBA. The proposals for this Visiting Board were then put to RIBA Council in the following way:

"The teaching members of the Board (BOAE) are of the opinion that such an arrangement will help the schools by making it possible for the Board to bring pressure when necessary upon the school authorities to make good any deficiencies of staff and equipment."(4)

It was admitted that the exercise of control of schools of architecture could not be done adequately through the schools' own external examiners as they were (and still are) appointed by the school and not by the RIBA. As each school had different external examiners, the Board also admitted that it found it difficult to ensure that the standards required for exemption were being judged to be a similar quality in all the schools of architecture. The Visiting Board system was ratified by Council in 1923. Its first officers were Charles Reilly (Roscoe Professor of Architecture at Liverpool University), Maurice Webb

(a member of the RIBA BOAE), Curtis Green (Chairman of the BOAE) and H M Fletcher. Martin Briggs, His Majesty's Inspector for Architecture, was also called upon to assist the members of the Visiting Board. In the following year, there was only one change in the membership of the Board.(6)

One of the first recommendations of the Visiting Board was their insistence, ratified by Council, that all students of architecture in the fourth or fifth year of their courses in schools of architecture should spend six months on a building site and/or working for a building firm, approved by the school of architecture. This period of time was to be considered as the equivalent of two out of six months time spent in an architect's office.(7) This recommendation might be interpreted as a concession to the education philosophy of 'Memorialists' like Lethaby and Blomfield rather than an essential tenet of the views of the members of the Visiting Board. As members of the RIBA Board of Architectural Education (BOAE) Lethaby, and initially Blomfield, were the only architects to argue for an educational philosophy which would provoke a direct experience of building construction.(8)

## II. The Work of the Visiting Board 1923-1960

The school of architecture at Birmingham Central School of Arts and Crafts was one of the earliest schools to be visited. This took place in April 1923 after the school had written to the full BOAE asking to be exempted from the RIBA Intermediate Examination.

According to contemporary sources, the head of the school, George Drysdale, was distinctly autocratic, conceiving and evaluating all the design projects set in the school himself. Programmes would be assessed on a Friday when Drysdale would travel up to Birmingham from his London office to address the whole school with a review of each student's work.(9) As an ex-student of his recalled, "Response was neither invited or allowed; no one else was ever permitted to give a whole school crit".(10)

H M Fletcher, one of the four members of the Visiting Board, compiled a report on the work of the school, which had a part-time Day School of fifteen students, after he had spoken to the head of the school. In his discussions with Fletcher, Drysdale pointed out that the course would be more attractive to potential students if it was granted exemption. Fletcher stipulated that this could only be offered if the students in the third year of the course became full-time. On this basis, the RIBA Visiting Board agreed to the exemption from Intermediate and as a result the course did indeed attract more students.(11) The advantages of Intermediate exemption increased the number of full-time students at the school to twenty-one by 1925. The school was visited again in 1925 by another member of the Visiting Board, Curtis Green, and there was some dismay recorded at the school's slow accumulation of students in a city of over a million inhabitants.(12) Curtis Green recommended that "the local architects support the school as the means of training students instead of taking articulated pupils into their offices".(13)

Birmingham's experience of the exemption and recognition procedures of the RIBA BOAE could hardly be described as the actions of a Visiting Board. There is clear evidence that it was through the opinions of one assessor or another to grant or continue to uphold exemption, irrespective of the seemingly collaborative work of the Board. The tone of Fletcher's report suggests the resolution of a gentleman's agreement, later ratified in a meeting of the full BOAE. The informal and 'gentlemanly' nature of these negotiations is characteristic of other visits to schools and the discussions of recommendations by the BOAE in the inter-war period.

Between 1923 and 1927 a large number of schools were visited in the same manner. In May 1923, Cambridge was granted exemption from the RIBA Final Examination and in the same month, the Royal West of England Academy (Bristol) applied for exemption from the RIBA Intermediate Examination. Although this course was part-time, the Visiting Board did not press for it to run its courses full-time (unlike Birmingham) and recommended that it should 'enjoy' exemption forthwith.(14)

Cardiff Technical School was also visited at this time and was advised to run its lectures in construction concurrently with the structural aspects of design projects. Having already gained exemption from the Intermediate Examination, Cardiff was offered exemption for its fourth and fifth year students preparing for the Final Examination.(15) Visits were made to Liverpool in 1923 and 1924 to monitor the progress of the school (it already had exemption from both the Intermediate and Final Examinations granted in 1902 and 1920 respectively). The University School of Architecture at Manchester was also visited in 1924, as was Edinburgh College of Art School of Architecture and the Architectural Association. Sheffield University School of Architecture, already exempt from the Intermediate Examination, was visited in June of that year. Like so many other schools visited in these years, the Visiting 'Board' told these schools to encourage their students to do measured drawings in their spare time and during vacations.(16)

Many of these visits had been made by members of the Board of Architectural Education who were later to attend the first International Congress on Architectural Education, held at the RIBA in July 1924. While the reports had been favourable on the whole, with the exception of the report on Regent Street Polytechnic, the introductory report to the Conference by the Chairman of the BOAE, Curtis Green, was far from optimistic.(17) Beresford Pite, the Director of the Brixton School of Building, suggested that the architectural world was much larger and wider than the ambit of any architectural school or architectural practice.(18) Some schools were given credit for the teaching of design where it ran concurrently with construction classes. Amongst these were the Architectural Association, Manchester University, Liverpool University and the Royal West Academy (Bristol). On the whole, conference delegates like Voysey, C R Ashbee, Blomfield, Lethaby and Edwin Lutyens felt that schools of architecture were too preoccupied with the beguiling effect of drawing skills. Despite the evidence set before Conference of design in schools of architecture no one accused the Visiting Board at this time of a careless supervision and control of architectural

education. However, as a result of a new constitution for the BOAE drawn up in 1925-1926 the work of the Visiting Board was to be submitted first to a Schools Committee, and then to the Board of Architectural Education as a whole.(19)

The new constitution of the BOAE was drafted into supplementary Bye-Laws of the RIBA's Charter(20) and its raison d'etre differs little from the principles outlined in RIBA Council in May 1920 about the purposes of the BOAE in general.(21)

"The principle underlying the scheme was the necessity of enlarging and raising the status of the Board to enable it to discharge its functions as the central body (under the RIBA Council) controlling architectural education in the Kingdom. Its constitution as such a body should involve its being fully representative and closely in touch with all other bodies whose interests are either dependent upon it or able to be of service to it."(22)

The text suggests more than a controlling influence on the examination work of schools of architecture 'recognised' or seeking exemption from the RIBA examinations. Regulation of educational policy was seen as a matter for the architectural profession alone to determine; some state intervention was tolerated but this was tempered by the criteria that state involvement was 'dependent' upon the Board of Architectural Education or could "be of service to it". There was no inference that the BOAE or the Visiting Board could be dependent on or of service to the state; a vigorous indication by the RIBA of their implicit view that autonomy of any profession is safe, so long as its interests are free from any evaluation by the State.(23)

While the constitution of the BOAE included "the state, as an educating force, and the Higher Seats of architectural training" the Visiting Board only cast its membership net as wide as the chairman of the BOAE, a Vice-Chairman, the Honorary Secretary of the BOAE and a teaching member of the BOAE. With the exception of X Martin Briggs, HMI for Architecture at the time, there were rare cases of lay people being approved as members of the Visiting Board. Charles Reilly was the Visiting Board's first Chairman and



he was Roscoe Professor of Architecture at Liverpool School of Architecture.

Because of the growing status attached to schools which had received exemption from the RIBA examinations, there was tendency for schools to develop on similar lines throughout the 1930s: to omit anything from the syllabus might mean that the school in question could be seen as inferior to other schools. Despite this general trend towards uniformity of syllabi, it seems that schools of architecture were not assessed critically in relation to one another about the quality of teaching but were merely granted exemption or not in an ad hoc manner. Just before the outbreak of the Second World War in May 1938, the school of architecture at Southend-on-Sea was visited, by the Visiting Board. Despite a report which criticised the school for its lack of good construction teaching and defective history tuition, the RIBA BOAE recommended that the school's three year full-time course be exempted from the Institute's Intermediate Examination.(24) This state of affairs may have been instrumental in the resolution by the BOAE to set up a Special Committee on architectural education "to consider the present state of architectural education and to make recommendations", in 1939.(25)

The procedures adopted by the RIBA Visiting Board were not thought to be within this Special Committee's terms of reference. The Committee was made up of 16 members of RIBA Council.(26) After thirty-four meetings had been held, the Committee produced a report, in June 1945.(27) Representations had been sought from RIBA Council, the BOAE, Heads of Schools of Architecture, the HMI, the Visiting Board, and the Schools Committee. Enclosure 'A', to the Report did, however, refer to the RIBA Visiting Board:(28) "The Visiting Board of the RIBA, in its purpose, if not always in its procedure, corresponds to the Visiting Board of the General Medical Council".(29) Its duties were to "... periodically inspect the recognised schools, and, after reviewing their staffing, equipment, curricula and examinations, report upon their fitness to continue to be recognised as qualifying institutions".(30) The Special Committee's report went on to state that the Visiting Board represented the

RIBA's most appropriate and effective instrument for ensuring that basic standards were maintained in the recognised schools, not only on the issue of examinations, but also in other areas of their work. Finally, the report stated that it was satisfied that the schools at present recognised by the RIBA were "... the only educational institutions fitted to undertake the task of preparing students for admission to the profession".(31) In order to preserve the number of recognised schools, the Committee suggested, in no uncertain terms, that this number should not be seen to rise:

"The Committee considers it imperative that the Institute's policy of granting recognition only to regional schools on the conditions hitherto observed should be upheld in the London and Home Counties area as elsewhere in the country. Between the position of London and that of Birmingham, Cardiff, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle and Nottingham, the difference is one of degree only: the principle remains the same. If Croydon, West Ham, Walthamstow, Kingston, Sutton, Epsom, Guildford, and Rochester were encouraged to develop full-time courses and to be accorded recognition, the RIBA could not logically object to other provincial towns ... from building up small, inefficient schools of their own and claiming the same privileges. Coventry and Wolverhampton might detach themselves from Birmingham; Newport and Swansea from Cardiff, Bradford and Huddersfield from Leeds; Birkenhead, Wallasey, Southport, Bolton and Salford from Manchester. The leading recognised schools in the provinces would then be permanently impoverished and all the benefits which have accrued from the policy of Regional Distribution, so long and so successfully maintained, would be irrevocably lost."(32)

Recognised schools were asked, in the report, to recruit more students, ostensibly to match the growth in numbers of the skilled building and construction trades. In view of the Special Committee's position as quoted above, the RIBA may also have wished to recruit prospective students who were demanding more local educational and training provision. In spite of the post-war building boom, the education of the architect was to develop on a regional basis, rationalised into the maintenance and recognition of a few large schools; full recognition was to be limited only to these schools.

In this light, Kingston's request for exemption from the RIBA Intermediate Examination was refused. After a visit from the Visiting Board had been made in 1947, the RIBA refused to grant exemption to the department of architecture and the decision prompted comments from Charles Reilly, then retired:

"... how foolish the visiting members of the Board of Architectural Education were, in my opinion, in not recommending recognition, even up to the Intermediate Examination, to the Kingston School of Architecture at the Kingston School of Art ... There was a definite break with Beaux Arts tradition and a return to fundamentals in the relation of design to construction, often illustrated by models which was very refreshing and seemed to me more than comparable to the break I engineered at Liverpool 43 years ago from the Victorian Gothic revival stuff then being taught."(33)

Reilly's remarks suggest that the decision to grant exemption or not to a school of architecture was now not based on the quality of work at the school and the comments of the Special Committee's report support the idea that the criteria for exemption rested instead on notions of a Regional Distribution policy. In spite of this, some smaller schools of architecture were granted Intermediate exemption in the post-war years (i.e. Dundee, Hull, Southend, Brighton and Southampton at Portsmouth) in the hopes that the students who passed would then sit for the Final Examinations in Aberdeen, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, the Bartlett, the AA, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, Leeds, Newcastle, Nottingham or Sheffield.

The RIBA Committee seems to have had a dual position which might easily be thought of as contradictory. Having taken with one hand over the issue of recognition, they then took with the other, on the issue of the qualifying examinations. These examinations were thought to be necessary in view of the possibility of students not being able to attend recognised schools of architecture. Implicitly, policy was aimed at withholding recognition to schools which were part-time and therefore deemed to have lower academic esteem:

"... until the facilities and advantages of the Recognised Schools are available to every serious student of architecture, the centralised examinations must be maintained to serve the needs of those who have not taken a qualifying school course. It remains then to consider how far they [unrecognised schools] fulfil their purposes and if it would appear that they might be improved, to make recommendations to that end."(34)

The RIBA examinations can therefore now be seen as a 'clearing house' system whereby students could be examined for membership in a 'mopping up' exercise outside the recognised schools of architecture. As the RIBA was so reluctant to extend the recognition procedure through the agency of the Visiting Board, it would seem that the Institute wished to preserve a 'players and gentlemen' system of architectural education; one envisaged through 'training' or indeed pupillage, culminating in a student taking the RIBA examinations externally, and another path through the established academic channels where full-time courses in architecture would be 'recognised' by the RIBA's BOAE. These institutions held examinations in architecture which were, in themselves, considered by the RIBA Visiting Board to be worthy of exemption from the RIBA Examinations; the criteria for recognition seemed to rest on these examinations, although they were only maintained for those students not 'fortunate' enough to attend recognised schools. The Special Committee's report then went on to pull the rug from under the feet of their own Board of Architectural Education members with the following admission:

"The RIBA has long recognised that no system of examination detached from an educational context, however well organised that system may be, can equal in value one which is entrusted to a sustained course of full-time study (where) a student's progress is closely observed and recorded at every stage of his course ... It is not possible for the Institute's examiners to possess a like knowledge of the true quality of the candidates who come before them ..."(35)

This admission gave little support to the notion that RIBA members were legitimate assessors of educational standards. Recommendations made in the report on examinations were few. On the whole, the Committee considered that its members were satisfied with the provisions and indeed, even in the standards set by the BOAE; it is curious that what these standards were was never

outlined in the Report. The 'quality' of the RIBA Examinations was the only measuring stick consistently applied throughout the Report and here, there seems to be evidence that even the Special Committee did not have an especially high regard for the demands it made on a student's level of knowledge and ability in architecture.

The reaction of the RIBA Allied Societies to the report is interesting in this respect. They considered that:

"In view of the present difficulty of entry of students to day classes, immediate action should be taken by The BOAE to give full recognition to courses of study available at evening classes in conjunction with practical office training."(36)

Officers of the BOAE, who met separately from the full BOAE in February 1934, were the quasi-Board who received Visiting Board reports after the war when they were no longer submitted to the full BOAE. They refused to support this resolution and recommended that RIBA Council should not consider it any further.(37) The conflict over part and full-time modes of study became the subject for an Ad Hoc Committee on Architectural Education, appointed by Council on 12 December 1950 to study the problems arising from the controversial issue of part-time education.(38)

The report of this committee, chaired by Kenneth Cross who was later to become President of the RIBA (1956-58) resolved that the recognised schools were trying to teach too much and that there were some subjects that could be studied after a student had left a school of architecture.(39) Practitioners were asked to visit recognised schools. In conjunction, the BOAE was asked to prepare a list of independent external examiners for Heads of Schools. One examiner had to be an architect in practice. The Heads of Schools were now required to submit the names of their external examiners to the BOAE from a list to be drawn up annually by the BOAE itself.(40)

A new Committee was appointed in April 1952 to enquire into architectural education arising out of the recommendations of the

Ad Hoc Committee. This new committee was known as the Architectural Education Joint Committee, and was composed of officers from the Examiners and Schools Committee, chaired by Donald MacMorran.(41)

It was to make a report, under the following terms of reference:

- "1. To investigate the various means of attaining the qualifications for Associate Membership and to prepare an advisory memorandum to give guidance on (a) the various methods of training, (b) the minimum standard of knowledge and attainment considered necessary, and (c) the means by which such minimum attainment can be achieved by the various methods of training.
- "2. To consider under what conditions courses based on part-time, office and school attendance can be accorded recognition for exemption from the RIBA Final Examination."(42)

On May 4 1953, the first Interim Report of the Committee was published, proposing that candidates submitting for the RIBA Associate Membership (Intermediate and Final Examinations) should all pass examinations in the same subjects.(43) This led the Committee to look further into its terms of reference and after another eighteen meetings, a second report was published in August 1954.(44) Here, the duties of the Visiting Board were summarily described:

"The Visiting Board has the responsibility of inspecting the work of recognised schools, or schools applying for recognition. Members of the Board should have clearly before them the minimum standards of knowledge and attainment required for Studentship (Intermediate) and Associateship (Final), as defined by the programmes, syllabuses and question papers issued by the Royal Institute. They should ensure that comparable minimum standards are maintained through recognised school courses and examinations; they should have regard to the numbers of students; the accommodation; the numbers, qualifications and professional experience of the teaching staff; and the arrangements for co-operation with architects working in the neighbourhood. It is desirable that the Visiting Board (and not only the officers as at present) should be responsible for inspecting the exhibition of studio work from recognised schools which is held annually by the Royal Institute. These duties of the Visiting Board should be more clearly defined."(45)

In essence, the recommendations of the MacMorran Report on the issue of recognition differed little from those upheld in the Report of the 1945 Special Committee on Architectural Education; the only change was that "greater emphasis" be given "on efficiency than on geographical location" in the recognition of schools of architecture.(46) Internal examinations in recognised schools of architecture were thought to be more important than the RIBA examinations taken externally.(47) No description of what these 'minimum standards' were was given on the MacMorran Report, except to say that it "should be established, as far as practicable, by an agreed marking system". There is then no description of how this marking system for examinations should operate in the report or elsewhere at this time. It still seems to be unestablished at the time of writing.

## CHAPTER 5

### THE OXFORD CONFERENCE AND ITS CONSEQUENCES FOR ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION 1945-1964

This chapter considers the adjustments made both by educational policy makers in the RIBA BOAE and in schools of architecture in the light of the changed conditions imposed on the architectural profession by the Second World War. In the immediate post-war period, the strains of industrial reconversion from war-time production and the shortages of labour and materials combined to make the tasks of reconstruction difficult ones for both the Government and the architectural profession. Nevertheless, once these immediate difficulties were overcome, the economy entered a period of sustained upswing which provided the material conditions under which a massive social building programme, in housing and education particularly, could be undertaken. These conditions were accompanied by changes in the architectural profession's outlook and in its methods of practice. Malpass discusses the way in which the post-war profession saw architectural practice as an ethic of public service and as a primary means of achieving social progress.(1) One of the central claims of the architectural profession after the War was its promotion of the idea that the architect had a social role as the purveyor of specialist skills.(2) The idea of the architect as technical expert was undoubtedly reinforced by the profession's willing involvement in a sustained reassessment of building technology of which system building is perhaps the most conspicuous feature.(3) These changes in the perception of the architect's role and the introduction of new building materials and new technologies was accompanied by the incorporation of a major part of architectural practice within the state machine.(4)

This chapter focuses on the events leading up to the Oxford Conference of 1958 and argues that the central element of the RIBA's post-war educational policy was to make architectural training full-time. This was one of the main recommendations of the Oxford Conference and it was expected that a substantial proportion of architectural education would be carried out in universities or in institutions which were considered to be of



equal academic standing. After an investigation of the effects of these recommendations on educational policy between 1958-1964, the chapter concludes with the events leading to the foundation of the Council for National Academic Awards in 1964. This Council was empowered to award degrees in non-university institutions of higher education.

Before examining the events leading up to the Oxford Conference in 1958, some review is necessary of the constitution and personnel of the RIBA's BOAE. In 1945, the BOAE was made up of nine RIBA members of Council, two representatives from the RIBA Allied Societies, the past Chairman of the BOAE and four representatives from schools of architecture 'recognised' as exempt from the RIBA Intermediate Examinations. There were, in addition to the BOAE, several boards and committees for educational policy drawn from membership of the BOAE itself. These were a Schools Committee, an Examinations Committee and a Visiting Board, now comprising five members of the RIBA BOAE. Only the officers of the full BOAE were allowed to receive copies of the Visiting Board's reports on schools of architecture visited between 1945 and 1962. Despite the fuller role of the State in commissioning architects to work in the public sector, it is noticeable that there were few representatives of Government or the lay public on any of these education boards or their committees.

In 1945, the Final Report of the RIBA's Special Committee on Architectural Education, formed in 1939, was published. This Report has already been examined in relation to the role of the RIBA Visiting Board in the previous chapter. As far as educational policy as a whole was concerned, the Report's recommendations, as Gardner has commented, were a statement of "progressive intent", rather than of approving existing practice.(5) It recommended that the minimum length of architectural courses should be five years with six months practical training. It came down strongly in favour of a system of full-time education in 'recognised' schools of architecture. It also advised that there should be better supervision in unrecognised schools for those applicants taking the RIBA examinations externally and it called for post-graduate specialisation in recognised schools. It also

recommended that teachers in schools of architecture should be full-time and that attention should be devoted there to training them in the theory and practice of design teaching.

The policy of the RIBA BOAE in the post-war years therefore favoured full-time education in 'recognised' schools of architecture and can be seen to be consistent with the BOAE's desire to transform architectural education into an academic discipline, distinct from either training or pupillage. But in spite of the efforts of the Board, there was still a vigorous demand by members of the RIBA for part-time educational facilities both before and after the Second World War.(6) These demands for part-time education are an interesting feature of the problems facing the profession in the post-war period. These calls for educational facilities for re-training after demobilisation were not, it seems, thought by the RIBA BOAE to be appropriate in academic terms if they were assumed as a demand for the continuation of a system of part-time education. This issue continued to preoccupy RIBA members, particularly from the Allied Societies, and led to a joint meeting to discuss part-time education by the RIBA Council and the Allied Societies. In December 1950, an Ad Hoc Committee on Architectural Education, chaired by Kenneth Cross, was appointed by Council to study the discussions of those who had participated in this joint meeting. The appointment of this committee coincided with an increasing number of articles in the architectural press on how architecture schools might respond to the changed conditions of the post-war years. In 1948, one reviewer noted in an article on the Birmingham School of Architecture:

"While it is obvious that the purpose of a School of Architecture is to train architects, it is less obvious what sort of person the architect should be. He must be at least a man of parts; he must be administrator, organiser, technician, philosopher, and, if he is to be something more than a competent builder or engineer, he must have some of the qualities of a poet. But who can say in this rapidly changing world what part he will play in society: and who can say ... that the architect of tomorrow is to be the same person as the architect of today?"(7)

The Ad Hoc Committee, in its report published three years after this review, interpreted such statements with the observation that schools of architecture were:

"trying to teach too much and that there [were] some subjects which a student [could] well study after leaving his school."(8)

In 1952, the RIBA set up the Architectural Education Joint Committee. It was asked by Council to investigate the various means of training and to examine the minimum standard of knowledge and attainment required by those applicants preparing for membership of the RIBA. It was also asked to consider the problems caused by the continuation of part-time courses in architecture. In 1954, the Final Report of this committee was presented to the RIBA BOAE. It was entitled 'Training and Qualification for Associate Membership of the Royal Institute of British Architects' and is more commonly known as the MacMorran Report.(9)

The MacMorran Report welcomed the enlarged range of subjects being taught in schools of architecture; it demonstrated that the formation of the architect's role was to be a matter for the profession alone to determine by changing educational policy in schools of architecture; this would in turn provide a new occupational identity for members of the profession. Its recommendations have already been discussed in relation to the role of the RIBA Visiting Board in Chapter Four. In view of the RIBA BOAE's requests that it should not confine its findings to the Visiting Board alone, it made a number of other recommendations which were to affect the curricula in schools of architecture. First, it recommended that, as from January 1960, the minimum period of practical training should be two years, of which at least one year was to be spent in an office after passing the RIBA Final Examination. It then reiterated the recommendations of the 1945 Special Committee on Architectural Education concerning the qualifications and experience necessary to teach architecture in recognised schools. It then went on to argue:

"The objects of any school are to impart knowledge, to add to knowledge and to create respect for knowledge. Within these general terms, the staff of a school of architecture will instruct and guide students in the principles of planning and construction and help them to apply these principles in the unifying process of design. They will also teach the history of architecture and the legal and administrative aspects of professional practice."(10)

Finally, the Report expected that:

"The total length of the training period might ... be as much as seven years, but during part of this time the student would be earning, and there would be the inducement to seek architectural work in vacations instead of spending time in casual employment unrelated to architecture or building."(11)

All the Report had to say about unrecognised schools was that they were "at the disadvantage of being compelled to adapt their curricula to fit the present requirements of the External Examinations of the Royal Institute".(12) It was assumed that the demands for education in these unrecognised schools, often those providing part-time or evening courses, would be brought "within the sphere of the system of recognised schools", (13) by making arrangements for a day-release scheme through local consultation between architect-employers and teachers.(14) Overall, it was argued that:

"The system of recognition of school courses and examinations is based on the conception that education is more important than mere qualification."(15)

The MacMorran Report enforced a prescriptive approach to educational policy by regulating the means of entry into the profession. As ARCUK had never held its own examinations and had refused to recognise any examinations not recognised by the RIBA, the means of entry into the profession and the opportunities to practice as a 'registered architect' (as laid down in the 1938 Architects (Registration) Act) were now controlled exclusively by the RIBA BOAE. In addition to these recommendations, the Report made provision for the possibility of a multi-

disciplinary approach to design teaching by arguing that the training of the architect should be linked with training for management in the building industry.(16) It was recommended that the RIBA should promote a conference with the objective of closer liaison between builders, surveyors, engineers and architects in training matters. This recommendation eventually gave rise to a number of meetings of the Noel Hall Committee of the RIBA which published a report on Training and the Building Industry in November 1964.

Between 1954 and 1956, there were a number of important changes in the personnel of the RIBA BOAE which were to affect the shaping and development of the RIBA's educational policy as defined by the MacMorran Report. Apart from the Secretary of the BOAE, Everard Haynes, who had been appointed by Council to the Board before the War and continued to serve on it until after the Oxford Conference, there were few representatives who continued to serve on it, after 1956. By this time, the BOAE had begun to consider holding an annual RIBA conference on architectural education. There were only three existing members of the BOAE co-opted to the new Committee on the Oxford Architectural Education Conference, appointed in 1956. These were E M Rice, a representative from Hammersmith School of Building where he was Head, Michael Pattrick, a lecturer from the Architectural Association, and D M Beaty-Pownall. This new committee was chaired by Leslie Martin, the newly appointed Professor of Architecture at Cambridge University. Martin had been associated with the British Modern Movement in architecture since his involvement in the 1930s with the English CIAM group, MARS. He had worked as an architect under W H Hamlyn for the London and Midland Railways Board before the war, and after the war, worked closely with Robert Matthew in the London County Council's Architects Department.

As the minutes of the meetings of this committee appear to be missing from the relevant volumes of BOAE minutes, it has been necessary to examine other documentary evidence which will account for the holding of the Oxford Conference in April 1958. According to an appraisal of the conference by Leslie Martin himself:

"The discussion dealt with the development of architecture as a public service and what the public expects of the architect. It touched the changing nature of architectural practice and the technical standards that were now required. These demands and standards were in turn related to the standards of entry and training and to the ultimate and desirable level of performance of the profession. It was repeatedly stressed that the profession should attempt to improve its standards of competence at all levels."(17)

The discussions at Oxford attempted to relate the recommendations of the MacMorran Report to a fuller debate about professional practice as a public service. Architectural practice was understood as a discipline which would match the existing academic courses in universities and in other educational institutions of an equivalent standard. This conception was demonstrated by the recommendation, unanimously adopted by conference, that entry into schools of architecture should be restricted to a minimum of two 'A' Levels. Courses based on the RIBA Examinations alone were thought by delegates to be restricting and they recommended that these courses should be progressively abolished by the RIBA BOAE. Ultimately, schools of architecture which were deemed capable by the RIBA BOAE and its Visiting Board, of providing the required 'recognised' courses were to be situated in universities or in institutions where courses of a comparable standard had developed; for instance in the Colleges of Advanced Technology, some of which were later to be designated as Polytechnics.(18) Courses in these institutions were recommended to continue only on a full-time basis. The Conference also endorsed a policy of developing post-graduate and research-based courses, which was to have considerable influence in schools of architecture between 1958 and 1964.

It was assumed by Conference delegates that standards of entry into the profession would be raised by the adoption of higher examination requirements for those students entering schools of architecture after 1958. However, it is evident from figures released by the RIBA, in 1962, that this recommendation had not satisfied such changed criteria. By September 1961, out of 842 students admitted to

'recognised' schools, 618 had two 'A' Level passes, but only 206 students found places in universities; 51 found places in Colleges of Advanced Technology, in Cardiff and Glasgow, and 72 were admitted to the Architectural Association or the Royal West of England Academy. The remaining 289 (almost 50%) were accepted in colleges of art or technical colleges, few of which were 'recognised' by the RIBA BOAE as exempt from the RIBA Final Examinations. Clearly, there were not enough university schools of architecture who were recognised by the RIBA offering places to these students with two 'A' Level passes. These students were, unwittingly, forced to train in other schools where it was more difficult to take the relevant examinations needed to be a registered architect. The recommendation appeared to make it harder for those students whom the RIBA Oxford Conference most wanted as future members of the profession; those with higher academic qualifications and levels of proficiency to an 'A' Level standard.

At the first meeting of the RIBA BOAE, after the Conference, in May 1958, reports from delegates at the Conference were not minuted as items for discussion. It was requested that they be kept confidential and secured in the office of the Secretary of the BOAE, Everard Haynes.(19) The rest of the meeting was given over to the resolution by members of the BOAE to renew its constitution. Two new committees were set up. The Advisory Council on Architectural Education was constituted and included many of the members of the existing BOAE. A new committee was suggested, with a membership of 12-15 members. It was decided that these members were to be appointed by and report direct to RIBA Council. It was to have executive powers to implement the recommendations of the Oxford Conference and had recourse to hear evidence from any relevant sub-committees of RIBA Council or the RIBA BOAE. It is to be noted that, in spite of the decision to let Council appoint the members of the new RIBA Board, the members were chosen at this meeting of the BOAE without RIBA Council appointing them.

The new committee was referred to as the RIBA Board, in a paper ratifying the reconstitution of the BOAE in 1960.(20) The

new Board was chaired by Leslie Martin and the other members were William Allen, George Grenfell-Baines, D M Beaty-Pownell, Kenneth Campbell, Frank Chippendale, Anthony Cox, Robert Gardner-Medwin, Donald Gibson, Richard Llewellyn-Davies, Robert Matthew, Michael Pattrick, R J Potter, E M Rice and Richard Shephard. The meeting of the BOAE in May 1958 which discussed these critical changes in personnel is minuted as lasting one and three-quarter hours.

There were ten meetings of this new Board. In June 1959 a copy of its Final Report was inserted in the minutes of the old BOAE and this stated that it had:

"Resolved to report to the Council that the Board were in sympathy with the aims of the Committee (the RIBA Board) but had not reached agreement on possible methods of giving effect to them."(21)

The Report was not shown, as agreed in the BOAE meeting in May 1958, to the newly constituted Advisory Council on Architectural Education. It was presented to RIBA Council in October 1959 and with their support, it was finally publicised in the RIBA Journal in November of that year. Given the resolution quoted above, it was not a report which carried with it any commonly held understanding of how the Report's recommendations were going to be implemented. It may be inferred at this stage that a noticeable shift had taken place in the RIBA BOAE and that a small executive body had claimed for itself the powers necessary to implement and develop the recommendations of the Oxford Conference. The new Advisory Council was appointed ostensibly to mediate between Council and the other education committees although it appears that as it was not consulted, its role was somewhat unclear. Some of this sense of disorder can be illustrated by the evidence that minutes from the first meeting of the Advisory Council, in September 1960, do not appear to have been recorded.(23) It is interesting to note that several members of the new Executive Board were also members of the Advisory Council. These were Richard Gardner-Medwin, Kenneth Campbell, Leslie Martin and Robert



Llewellyn-Davies.

Before and after the Oxford Conference, the architectural press endeavoured to monitor the work of the RIBA in relation to the Oxford Conference recommendations. One commentator, John Smith, in a series of articles on Schools of Architecture, wrote in 'The Architect and Building News':

"Few will question the importance of the Conference and its findings and Sir Leslie Martin is to be congratulated on the speed with which he prepared the report and presented it to Council."(24)

He went on to make the following admission:

"Now it is probably true that one of the reasons why the report was adopted with such apparent ease lay in the fact that the meeting at which it was submitted by Sir Leslie was held on the afternoon preceding the annual general meeting, when the storm which was to break was obviously anticipated. At such a time it is understandable that opposition to a movement for reform would be subdued at least temporarily. This fact is not without significance, for it would be foolish to consider that because the findings of the report have been accepted nominally by the Council, the battle for educational reform has been won. In point of fact, the real battle may be yet to come. For one by one the advocates of each and every archaic and anachronistic system of education will make themselves heard. Out will come all the pet theories and in the climate of confusion despite demands for action nothing may be done."(25)

In July of the same year, J M Scott, Principal of the Southend School of Architecture wrote in the Architects Journal:

"No picture of the form that architectural education should take (as distinct from the institutions in which it should occur) emerges from the report nor any indication of the standards by which an architectural training should be judged. These are not points of detail unsuitable for consideration at the conference. No assessment of any course of architectural training can be made until these standards exist."(26)

These views were followed in 1963 with a review of part-time

education by William Kretchmer in the Architects Journal. He claimed:

"It is astonishing that four years after the profession decided that architectural education should be full-time (or in sandwich courses) there are still 110 students enrolled in part-time or evening courses recognised by the RIBA. If we really believed in what we said, surely we should have withdrawn recognition of such courses by now. We cannot do anything about the 158 students who enter part-time or evening courses in schools that are not recognised but we could at least deal effectively with schools that are."(27)

It is unclear how members of the Advisory Council were to deal with criticisms such as these. Two further changes to the constitution of the BOAE, in 1960, may be regarded as significant in the light of these criticisms. The Visiting Board was enlarged to consist of representatives from all those schools recognised to Final and Intermediate exemption,(28) and a new Schools Committee was formed of the heads of schools recognised for Final or Intermediate exemption.(29) A new Statutory Board of Architectural Education was formed which effectively dismantled the old BOAE. This Statutory Board had fourteen members, eight of whom were also members of the Advisory Council and one of whom was also a representative on the new Schools Committee.(30) In his capacity as a member of the new Statutory Board, Leslie Martin spoke of the importance of establishing a new policy for the RIBA Visiting Board in the hopes that no further recognition would be granted until the future work of the Visiting Board had been considered.(31) A reference to a report entitled 'Duties of the Visiting Board' is minuted in the first meeting of the Statutory Board but the document itself does not appear until April 1961. In his capacity as the only representative of the Schools Committee, the Advisory Council, the Statutory Board and the 'RIBA Board', Gardner-Medwin was in a unique position to offer a defence of the RIBA's educational policy at this time. He made the following reply to John Smith's articles:

"Your number on the schools was bold and sometimes rash. You spoil it ... by not backing up your

shocking verdict with reasoned argument and well-weighted evidence. Your accusations were so much abbreviated that they sounded irresponsible."(32)

He concluded:

"There is the sting of truth in many of your conclusions and criticisms, and personally, I don't find them outrageous ... But unfortunately, you leave your readers with the impression that all we have to do is abandon our academic habits and get back to 'real architecture' as the method of training ... Just like the good old apprentice days?"(33)

John Smith responded with the following remarks:

"As for who is to blame for the present state of 'chaos' I agree that the RIBA as a whole is ultimately responsible, but the Board of Architectural Education does, or rather is supposed to, control training. When things go wrong, buck passing is inevitable. I rather feel that the Professor, as a distinguished member of the Board is looking for the Portland Place counterpart of the dear old Potsdam cat."(34)

The arguments about the Oxford Conference recommendations rested, according to John Smith, on the assumed role of the RIBA Education Boards as the agent responsible for architectural education policy. He implied that they should have worked strenuously for that end. It appears that changes in personnel between 1954 and 1960 in the RIBA Boards of Education exposed a new strategy for architectural education. The 'academic' references of the 'new blood' representatives, such as Robert Gardner-Medwin, Sir Leslie Martin, Richard Llewellyn-Davies and William Allen are illustrative of a marked change of emphasis in the discussions and defence of educational policy. These representatives, however, seemed unable to make the appropriate procedural and administrative structure of the RIBA work towards putting the Oxford Conference recommendations into practice. Their new outlook on the profession was eloquent and sophisticated. It was spelt out in the inaugural address of Llewellyn-Davies when he became Professor of Architecture at the Bartlett School, University College, London. In this lecture in December 1962,

he spoke of the opportunities in architecture for bridging the gaps between 'science' and 'art' subjects. This separation, in his view, had "split our concept of the architect down the middle".(35) He argued that by following a predominantly 'Beaux-Arts' curriculum, schools of architecture had produced qualified architects who had little grasp of the technical and managerial aspects of working in practice. He hoped that schools would now:

"re-establish the architect as an all-rounder,  
the uomo-universale of the Renaissance."(36)

William Allen made similar statements on his election as Principal of the Architectural Association in May 1960.(37)

There, therefore, appear to be two reasons for the disparity between the intended effects of RIBA educational policy and their critical reception by other members of the architectural profession. Firstly, the analysis of architectural education and the future of the profession shared by Allen, Martin, Gardner-Medwin and Llewellyn-Davies was not an analysis which other members of the profession either shared or even understood. This powerfully inhibited any concerted and coherent implementation of Oxford Conference policy. Secondly, it seems apparent that there was considerable confusion over the procedural means by which responsibility would be seen to be put into practical effect. The elaborate structure and constitution of the Institute's education committees between 1959 and 1965 (when they were, again, reviewed) and the lack of written discussion about how each committee was accountable to any other committee or outside body made the implementation of policy an extremely difficult task. There is also evidence of a rather casual approach being taken by these committees to the consequences of the Oxford Conference recommendations. An illustration of this took place in 1961 when the Advisory Council found evidence of low standards of entry into schools of architecture. Its defence rested on the following statement:

"The object of education and training is to enable students to understand the principles and practice that are needed in the design and erection of good buildings. The Board believes that architectural courses in this country are increasingly doing this."(38)

Rather than intervening directly, the principal way in which the RIBA sought to raise standards of entry was by the publication of papers on aspects of educational policy, on research, specialisation, diversification and the integration of disciplines. These were intended as a means of improving architectural courses in the hope that they would then attract students of a higher academic calibre.

One of the most far-reaching recommendations of the Oxford Conference had been to promote post-graduate research in recognised schools of architecture. In a paper on Post-Graduate Training, written anonymously in 1960, it was noted that there was evidence of an increased interest in higher degrees by architects employed in government agencies and large firms.(39) The paper went on to suggest that a Master's Degree might provide an appropriate qualification to those architects intending to teach or engage in research.(40) But the paper concluded with a significant admission:

"But it will only be possible to provide appropriate courses of study in schools of architecture where active research is in progress, and where the relevant branch of the subject is being advanced. It is absolutely essential that the establishment of ongoing research should precede the establishment of post-graduate courses. At present there are few projects in progress in British schools of architecture which are capable of sustaining post-graduate teaching. It will therefore be better to discourage the establishment of courses for Master's Degrees except where supporting facilities are available."(41)

The shift to university-based architecture courses was therefore a decision which, in this light, owed much to the efforts of teachers within schools themselves. The publication of the Robbins Report by the Government in 1963 highlighted the concern expressed by officials in the higher education sector over the

lack of university places for sixth formers and called for six new universities and ten upgradings in Colleges of Advanced Technology. There were four non-university schools of architecture which the RIBA Board thought would be ready for university incorporation in July 1958. These were Nottingham, the Royal West of England Academy (Bristol), Sheffield and Edinburgh.(42) The University Grants Committee recommended the following statement in relation to the funding of university schools of architecture in 1960:

"Building represents so large a proportion of the nation's investment, and architecture has so universal and inescapable an influence on the life of the community, that for universities to exclude their study could be regarded as an evasion of responsibility."(43)

It was this statement that was echoed in the internal memorandum of Sheffield School of Architecture

in 1964. In March, the new Department of Architecture published its own interpretation of this statement from the Government's University Grants Committee:

"Very critical doubts have long existed in university minds as to the suitability of Architecture to be regarded as a discipline. This was due to the desire to train a student in such a way that, not only was he supposed to be educated in the principles of his Art but also fitted to earn his living immediately upon graduation as a draughtsman or very minor assistant. Until World War II this was reasonably feasible. The growth since that time of the intellectual and technical content of Architecture courses, has been such that the question of its validity as a discipline should no longer arise ... It would therefore seem logical and desirable on the above counts, that the vocational content of the course should decline as the teaching of basic principles increases. Infact, there is a natural trend in this direction as the general competence of the student entry increases, together with the encouragement towards greater specialism that modern conditions exert."(44)

This chapter has examined the increasing incorporation of architectural training into institutions of higher education, and

in particular, has described the significance of this departure in terms of the profession's educational and professional policies. It has investigated the extent to which the RIBA Education Boards were prepared to promote the recommendations of the Oxford Conference well into the next decade. Having failed to prepare in advance for suitable educational facilities for both a generation of more highly qualified entrants into the profession and for a supply of sophisticated architecture courses and research work, the RIBA turned its attention to related debates about the size of the profession and the subject of diversification. In 1964, the programme of work for the RIBA BOAE acknowledged the foundation of the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA), set up in July,(45) a body which was granted a Royal Charter to award university-standard degrees in other educational establishments apart from the universities. The CNAA grew out of the Government White Paper on Higher Education, known as the Robbins Report. As well as highlighting the concern over the lack of university places, the Report suggested that a new type of educational institution might be desirable or necessary, given the number of qualified students unable to obtain entry to the universities.

The first meeting of the full CNAA Council was held in September 1964, although a previous meeting had been held in July of that year to constitute the Subject Boards which would be controlled by the Council.(46) Professional bodies and teachers' organisations were invited to nominate a proportion of the members of each Subject Board. The Architecture Board, set up in 1965, was accommodated in the Committee for Science and Technology. The RIBA nominee to the Architecture Board had to be a university teacher. Although the Board discussed the possibility of joint validation and recognition procedures with the RIBA BOAE, it was assumed, at this stage, that the process would be of an informal kind.(47) In a letter from Elizabeth Layton, Under-Secretary of the RIBA BOAE, to the Registrar of the CNAA in June 1965 the reasons for delaying formal links between the two bodies was outlined. According to the BOAE, it had two objectives:

"On the one hand it                    very anxious to raise the standards of architectural education as quickly as

possible. On the other it to ensure that a much higher proportion of architectural students educated in universities."(48)

This suggested that, while diversity was to be welcomed, the RIBA BOAE, was:

"Anxious that the standards set by the Council for National Academic Awards should be rigorous and that any degrees in architecture it may award should be genuinely comparable in range and quality with those in universities."(49)

This letter corresponds with the views of the RIBA BOAE, who requested, in a meeting on March 1965, that the CNAA's activities be "kept carefully under review".(50) At the same meeting, members recorded an agreement that:

"It would be most unfortunate if the Council's operations were to run counter to the RIBA's policy on the integration of architectural education in universities."(51)

It seems evident that, while the RIBA BOAE welcomed the foundation of the CNAA, it was uncertain that the opportunity to apply degree-level standards of entry into the profession across the board would continue to operate in its own interest.



## CONCLUSION

Architectural education has been one of the central means by which members of the profession have been better able to measure the development of their own standing and identity in relation to other skilled occupations. This has been demonstrated by accounting for the effects of the foundation of the RIBA on educational thinking. The Institute developed a membership policy which, both apparently and objectively, sought to reconcile an examination system, certain educational precepts and a qualification procedure. This was evidently a policy of professionalisation; the RIBA determined its own standards of competence and knowledge and drew on its own membership to organise an examinations system and determine educational policy. At the same time as restricting architectural practice, it was, in theory, free from lay evaluation and control.

The RIBA Board of Examiners from 1882 to 1923, and the Board of Architectural Education from 1904 onwards experienced regular challenges to this policy of professionalisation. This involved an engagement in debates about style, assessment of 'canons' of architectural theory and a conflict of ideas about design and construction teaching. The creation of administrative and constitutional procedures for organising examinations, recognition and visits to schools of architecture proved to be inelegant structures for accommodating ideas about design teaching, within the context of an examinations and qualification system. I would suggest that such adjustments proved to be significant in the development of a policy of control of architectural education. What appears to be critical was the assumption by the RIBA that by regulating entry into the profession they could, at the same time, give equal scrutiny to the educational objectives of an architect's training.

As architectural education shifted from that of a vocational training through apprenticeship, to that of an educational discipline, associated with the "higher seats of learning and scholarship", in the inter-war years, members of the RIBA BOAE and its Visiting Board believed that they could measure their

professional standing in relation to academic discourse. This shift coincided with the enlargement of the RIBA's educational secretariat and the proliferation of boards and committees appointed by the Institute to control educational policy.

Some members of the profession argued that Beaux-Arts design principles were a coherent body of theory and practice which could effectively demonstrate academic and professional competence. Put more simply, this seems to have been an argument about the 'trade-off' between what could be taught and what could be examined by the adoption of commonly-held ideas about design theory and the teaching of design. The principles of the Beaux-Arts were questioned, chiefly by Lethaby and by other architects associated with the Memorialists and it was precisely these different interests which were used within the RIBA BOAE as the basis for varying the criteria for recognising examinations and syllabuses in schools of architecture. Attitudes towards design teaching were argued over within the BOAE at the same time as these discussions themselves were deployed as instruments of assessment. It was this 'overlap' between educational theory and professional policy which distinguished architectural education from other traditional disciplines taught in higher educational institutions.

In the post-war years, this infringement of boundaries between professional and educational thinking exacerbated the problems of an already unwieldy committee structure of executive and legislative powers within the RIBA. Some of these problems were similarly faced by the committees of the ARCUK in its early years. Whilst Parliament was very reluctant to allow a monopoly interest in registration policy, it is significant that an equally complex and misconstrued constitutional machinery could allow the making of policy to drop into the lap of the RIBA. Statutory powers were circumvented by the RIBA and further frustrated by a lack of accountability to lay control.

The recommendations of the Oxford Conference in 1958 did not address these issues. Once again, it was the infringement of educational policy by professional interest that can be seen to account for the

problems of implementing the recommendations of the Oxford Conference in practical terms. While architectural education was argued for, by 'new blood' within the RIBA BOAE, as a unique academic discipline, it was not, ultimately, the quality of educational thinking which interested the Institute. Concern was occasioned, instead, by a desire to raise the status of architectural practice.

The history of architectural education, as seen in the light of institutional control, demonstrates the difficulties of an attempt to reconcile professional and educational interests. From the first decades of the twentieth century, if not before, this 'double think' was acknowledged by the RIBA's most vociferous critics. The concept of architectural education as both a professional and academic pursuit lead to discrimination in the recognition of courses which sought to reconcile, not academic and professional links, but, instead the relationship between building design and construction in architectural training. It is for this reason that the RIBA were keen to absorb and silence the claims of the Memorialists in the 1890's and those, who in the 1920's, argued similarly for an educational philosophy which upheld the 'art' of building. It was these conflicts which re-emerged in the debates after the Oxford Conference in the architectural press. Calls for the continuation of part-time and evening courses were interpreted as a direct challenge to the 'new blood' view of architecture as the practice of academically-minded professionals. A profession 'fit for gentlemen' was not, it seems, one which easily embraced links with the building and construction industries.

FOOTNOTES : PREFACE (pages 7-9)

1. Jenkins, F. Architect and Patron (1961).  
Barrington-Kaye, R. The Development of the Architectural Profession in Britain (1960).
2. Wilton-Ely, J. 'The Rise of the Professional Architect in England' in Kostof, S. (ed.) The Architect: Chapters in the History of the Profession (1977).
3. Forty, A. Problems in the History of a Profession: Architecture in Britain in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries (unpublished paper).
4. Saint, A. The Image of the Architect (Yale, 1983).
5. Dickens, C. The Life and Adventures of Martin Chuzzlewit (1844) Chapter 2.
6. Saint, A. op. cit. p.83.
7. Port, M. H. The Office of Works and Building Contracts in Early Nineteenth Century England Economic History Review 2nd Series Vol.XX (1964) pp.94-110.
8. Barrington-Kaye, R. Early Architectural Societies and the Foundation of the RIBA RIBA J 57 (1955) p.497 ff.
9. Startup, H. "Education in Crisis" RIBA J Vol. 90 No.11 November (1983) pp.47-49.  
Review of Professor John Tarn's position paper for the RIBA Conference "Lifelong Learning: Changing Policies" November 29 1983.

FOOTNOTES : CHAPTER 1 (pages 11-25)

1. White, W. The Past, Present and Future of the Architectural Profession (1885) pp.30-31.
2. Barrington Kage, R. The Development of the Architectural Profession in Britain (London 1960) p.80.
3. Ibid.
4. Report of the Society of British Architects April 1983, London. There are no records of these examinations.
5. The Builder 1842 p.33.
6. Donaldson, T L Preliminary Discourse ... on Architecture (1842) pp.28-31.
7. For a fuller discussion of Donaldson's ideas about architecture and professionalism, see J Mordant Crook "Architecture and History" in "Design and Practice in British Architecture: Studies in architectural history presented to Howard Colvin" Architectural History Vol.27 (1984) pp.555-563.
8. The Builder October 1847.
9. Knowles, J.T.A Prize Essay on Architectural Education Presented to the RIBA in 1852-53 (Thomas Bosworth, London 1853) Prologue P.V.
10. Ibid pp.9-11.
11. RIBA Council Minutes Series November 1855. RIBA Proceedings New Series II 148.
12. Ashwin, C. Art Education: Documents and Policies, 1768-1975 (SRHE, London 1975).
13. Allied Societies were provincial societies attached to the RIBA as a London Institute.
14. RIBA Council Minutes Series: Special General Meeting 14 January 1860 and 25 June 1860.
15. Ibid.
16. All Committee Meetings Minutes (RIBA) Vol.1 27 April 1847 - 27 April 1869 (ACMMI) p.158 25 February 1860.
17. Ibid.
18. For a detailed description of the University College School of Architecture, see Powers, A. Architectural Education in Britain c.1880 - c.1914 (PhD Thesis) p.22.

19. Scott, George Gilbert Thoughts and Suggestions on the Education of Architects (RIBA periodicals, Reserve Collection SR 72:37) p.1.
20. Ibid p.4.
21. Cunningham, A. "The Genesis of Architectural Education"(unpub. paper).
22. Ruskin, J. An Enquiry into some of the Conditions at Present Affecting the Study of Architecture in our Schools. Presented to an Ordinary Meeting of the RIBA 15 May 1865. RIBA Council Minutes Vol.1 p.139.
23. Ibid p.147.
24. Collins, P. Changing Ideals in Modern Architecture 1790-1950 (Faber, London 1960) p.104.
25. Building News Vol.XLIV (1883) p.1.
26. Amery, C. and Stamp, G. Victorian Buildings of London 1837-1887 (Architectural Press, London 1980) p.12.
27. For a more detailed analysis of the issues raised by the "Battle of the Styles", see Saint, A. The Image of the Architect (Yale, 1983) pp.61-63 and pp.65-68. Such issues also receive careful treatment in Ian L. Toplis' PhD Thesis The Foreign Office: an Architectural History (CNA, Thames Polytechnic 1983).
- 27a. Powers, A. op.cit. p.13.
28. Kelly's London Directory gives the addresses of 638 architects, 209 being members of the RIBA at this time.
29. RIBA Council Meetings Minutes March - April 1875.
30. RIBA Archives - Minutes of Meetings of RIBA Council. Council Minute Book April 1875 - July 1879.
31. RIBA Board of Examiners under Byelaw XIV May 1891 - January 1895: RIBA Archives - Series IV - A rough minutes book of the meetings of the Board of Examiners in Architecture (distinguished from the Statutory Board of Examiners set up in 1855 to administer the examinations of London District Surveyors), discussing the administration and implications of Byelaw XIV, along with the draft minutes of the meetings of the Board of Examiners after 1887.
32. The Builder 7 May 1887 pp.702-3.
33. This Preliminary Examination embraced the structure of the earlier Preliminary Examination under Byelaw XIV (1877) and was more commonly referred to as the RIBA Testimonies of Study. See RIBA Archives, Board of Examiners in Architecture Minutes of Meetings Vol.1 21 June 1882 - 19 February 1892.

34. Bound volumes of candidates' application forms are held in the RIBA Archives. These volumes are bound and classified as follows:
- (1) RIBA Obligatory Examinations: Candidates Applications (February 1882 - May 1904) Series III.
  - (2) RIBA Qualifying Examinations (Associate): Candidates Applications (March 1882 - November 1915) Series V.
  - (3) RIBA Intermediate Examinations (Student): Candidates Applications (October 1895 - April 1909) Series IV.
  - (4) RIBA Final and Special Examinations: Candidates Applications (May 1902 - May 1907).
  - (5) RIBA Preliminary Examinations (Probationer): Candidates Applications (October 1895 - April 1909).
35. Other drawing academies opened in London throughout the 18th and 19th Centuries, among them William Shipley's Academy in the Strand. Shipley had also been responsible for setting up the Royal Society of Arts, established in 1754. James Gandon, architect of the Customs House in Dublin, was a student at Shipley's Academy and he was to remark:
- "I had every opportunity of acquiring ... a theoretical knowledge of architecture, and my drawings ... obtained some notice, particularly my architectural drawings ..."
- The St. Martins Lane Academy was opened in 1720 by two artists named Cheron and Vanderbeck. The Academy offered life drawing classes to pupils for a fee, but only lasted until 1753 when its treasurer embezzled the funds. Among those who attended this Academy were architects like James Paine (b. ? - 1789). He was to refer to his early study of architecture here as one begun "under the tuition of a man of genius". Paine never had the opportunity to travel or study abroad, believing that this was only essential to the education of a fine gentleman, not a fine architect. Nevertheless, he was entrusted, at the tender age of 19, with the designs for Nostell Priory in West Yorkshire.
36. These lectures were published in 12 volumes in 1829.
37. Barrington-Kage - The Development of the Architectural Profession in Britain p.67.
38. Gardner, R. - An Account of Architectural Education in the United Kingdom. ARCUK, 3rd International Congress Report p.14 reprinted in Architects' Journal 9 October 1974 pp.873-881.
39. Thompson, E.P. The Making of the English Working Class (1963) p.551.

FOOTNOTES : CHAPTER 2 (pages 26-44)

1. RIBA Archives Series I. Examinations under the Metropolitan Building Act (1855); Recommendations for Certificate 29 January 1856 - 20 October 1905. These volumes contain certificates of competency and give details of each candidate's training from 1874 onwards. Details of the meetings of the Board are bound separately.
2. The sources here record no disagreement over the setting of papers.
3. RIBA Archives. Board of Examiners Minutes of Meetings. Minute Book June 1882 - February 1892 pp.10-16, and pp.20-50 passim.  
The Board recorded a statement of the purpose of the RIBA examinations in the RIBA Kalendar as an opening to a list of recommended reading for the different papers set in these years (RIBA Kalendar, 1886-1887) pp.64-67.
4. RIBA Archives - Board of Examiners Minute Book of Meetings May 1885 p.80.
5. RIBA Archives - Board of Examiners Meeting 10 April 1883 from Minute Book June 1882 - February 1892.
6. White, William - The Past, Present and Future of the Architectural Profession (London, 1885) p.24.
7. Ibid p.25.
8. Slater, John - A Note on Architectural Education (London 1891) p.24.
9. The Society of Architects was founded in 1884 and its membership was drawn largely from ex-RIBA members, after 'Building News' had published an anti-RIBA campaign run for the Society. Their work grew out of criticisms of the RIBA's inactivity, on the issue of voting rights of ARIBA members and it was very active in the provinces. In 1885, the Society promoted a bill through Parliament for the registration of architects but the Bill was never passed due to the fact that RIBA members lobbied MP's to see that it never had a first reading. At the turn of the century, the Society was still attempting to win the battle for registration through Parliament, a tactic which continued in relentless fashion until the RIBA set up its own Registration Committee in 1922. (Cf. Chapter 3).
10. Slater, op. cit. p.25.
11. White, op. cit. pp.28-29.
12. Jackson, T G and Norman Shaw, R - Architecture; a Profession or an Art?



Essay No.13 "On True and False Ideals in the Education of the Architect" p.211.

13. Ibid p.51.
14. Jackson, T G & Shaw, R N op. cit. Introduction.
15. Architectural Association Notes IX (1894) p.131.
16. Pite, B - Some Thoughts on the Modern School of Architecture (RIBA, 1900).  
Pite was, despite this view, a rather fanciful designer. His Soane Medallion prize design in 1882 was a West End Club House in a romantic Gothic Style and was a controversial award.
17. In 1905, Pite moved to a new appointment as the Director of the Brixton School of Building where he stayed until 1928, although he also lectured at the School of Architecture at Cambridge University from 1912 to 1931.
18. Jackson & Shaw op. cit. pp.48-49.
19. Ibid p.49.
20. The RIBA set up a number of committees to discuss registration. The first committee was known as the 'Unification and Registration Committee' which met from July 1920 to May 1982. The second, the 'Registration Committee', met from July 1922 to October 1938 and then again from July 1960 until October 1964. There was also a 'Joint Architects Reorganisation Committee' comprising the Council of the AA and representatives of the Professional Employment Committee of the Society of Architects, which met until 1925.
21. RIBA Archives: Special Committees Minutes (SCMM Vol.4) p.66.
22. The Architects Department of the LCC was set up in 1889. The Millbank Housing Estate was built between 1897-1902. The LCC was also instrumental in founding the Central School of Arts and Crafts in 1898, and its first director was Halsey Ricardo.
23. Jenkins, Frank - Architect and Patron p.175.
24. The Regent Street Polytechnic founded by Quentin Hogg in 1882, also offered courses in building construction and design. In 1894, a Day School of Architecture was established under Robert Mitchell and Alfred Waterhouse became its President in 1896. T P Bennett was a student at the Day School. He later became a member of the RIBA BOAE and Head of the Northern Polytechnic School of Architecture in 1926.
25. Powers, Alan - PhD Thesis op. cit. pp.71-74.

26. RIBA Archives SCMM Vol.4 p.14.
27. Ibid p.14.
28. Ibid p.101-102.
29. Ibid p.119-122.
30. RIBA Archives, SCMM Vol.4 p.104.
31. Ibid.
32. BOAE Minutes Vol.1 p.34-35.
33. SCMM Vol.4 p.104.
34. RIBA Hadfield MSS (83), Lethaby to Hadfield, 10 June 1907.
35. Board of Architectural Education Minutes:

Leather Bound Volumes (1-5):

15 Feb 1907 - 6 Feb 1913
20 Feb 1913 - 3 Jun 1919
18 Jul 1919 - 17 Jan 1924
21 Feb 1924 - 22 Sep 1926
21 Jun 1926 - 25 Jun 1930

Binders Volumes (6-13):

16 Jun 1930 - 8 Jan 1934
5 Mar 1934 - 7 Mar 1938
20 Jun 1938 - 22 May 1950
30 Oct 1950 - 25 Oct 1954
14 Feb 1955 - 10 Feb 1958
19 May 1958 - 14 Jun 1960
12 Jun 1960 - 7 Dec 1961
25 Jan 1962 - 5 Jan 1966

These are the signed minutes of the meetings of the Board of Architectural Education (BAE), manuscript from 15 February 1907, to 28 July 1921, typescript from 13 October 1921 to 3 November 1965 with inserted printed reports from 1962. The first volume records a note that all meetings of the Board prior to this date (15 February 1907) are minuted in \*the Special Committee Minutes Books (SCMM Vol.4).

36. BOAE Minutes Vol.1 10 February 1909 p.70.
37. Ibid.p.110.
38. Minutes of the new Committee of Examiners are bound separately from the BOAE Minutes. They consist of 5 bound volumes of minutes dating from October 1913 to July 1959 and are chronological except in Vols. 2 and 3.

Board of Architectural Education : Minutes of Examiners Committee:

Vol. 1	Oct 1913	-	June 1927
Vol. 2	July 1927	-	Nov 1934
Vol. 3	Jan 1926	-	June 1931
Vol. 4	Oct 1931	-	Oct 1957
Vol. 5	Feb 1953	-	July 1959

The first meeting was chaired by John Slater, a past Secretary of the old Board of Examiners in Architecture. 33 passes out of 96 were recorded for the Final Examination, 62 passes out of 100 were recorded for the Intermediate, and 83 passes out of 120 were recorded for the Preliminary Examination.

39. RIBA Journal 3rd Series XVIII (1911) P.767.
40. Powers, A op. cit. p.110.
41. Architects Compendium (1909) Liverpool University Archives.
42. This school was founded in 1904, as the Brixton Technical Institute, by the London County Council, under its Education Committee. Under the terms of the 1903 Education (London) Act it was to train junior members of the building trades, foremen and clerks of works in the arts of construction and working drawings, and to train architectural assistants in the principles of construction and those aspects of their profession in contact with the rest of the building team. By 1909, the School of Architecture had 98 students attending full-time. In 1910, it became a 5-year course, and a junior and senior Technical Day School were established by 1912. The course was open to architects, quantity surveyors and builders alike.
43. Interview with Peter Bicknell (Hughes & Bicknell Partners) Cambridge 22 April 1981.
44. In an article in The Builder (CLVIII p.531) in 1946, H S Goodhardt - Rendel commented:

"The English version of the Beaux Arts system missed most of the merits of the original, it produced architects who mistook the means for the ends and who allowed the school restrictions made in the interest of concentrated study to influence their subsequent practice. They made pedantic compositions of the Orders, not only on paper at school, but in stone and wood in after life. When his eye and his mind have been trained by these means, the French architect usually attains to complete liberty, the English architect tends to hug his chains."
45. RIBA BOAE, 20 January 1920 p.36-7.
46. RIBA Journal 3rd Series XXI (1914).
47. RIBA BOAE Minutes 21 April 1920.
48. RIBA BOAE Minutes 25 March 1920 p.66.
49. Ibid.
50. RIBA BOAE Minutes, 1925 pp.271-272.

51. RIBA BOAE Archives - Prizes and Scholarships Committee:  
Vol. 1 January 1926 - May 1934  
Vol. 2 October 1934 - June 1958  
Schools Committee:  
Vol. 1 October 1933 - October 1957  
Minutes of Committees:  
8 Vols. December 1910 - January 1956
- 52 Cf. Chapter 4 - The RIBA Visiting Board 1923-1960.

FOOTNOTES : CHAPTER 3 (pages 45-62)

1. Cf. Chapter 4 - The RIBA Visiting Board 1923-1970.
2. Introduction to "Proceedings of the First International Congress on Architectural Education" (RIBA 1924).
3. Ibid Section 9.
4. Introduction to "Proceedings of the First International Congress on Architectural Education" 1924 Section.
5. RIBA Archives - BOAE Minutes of Meetings 1920 p.36.
6. Proceedings op. cit.
7. Blomfield, R. Architecture & the Royal Institute of British Architects in Norman Shaw, R. and Jackson, T.G. "Architecture: a Profession or an Art?" (1892) pp.33-35.
8. Architects (Registration) Bill 1906 p.1. Public Records Office Archives (Kew) Ref. ZHC1/6896 (6.EDW.7.) pp.161 f.f.
9. Constitutions of the General Council of Architectural Education and Registration of the UK:
  - 5 persons nominated by the King, with the advice from the Privy Council: 3 from England and Wales, one from Scotland and one from Ireland.
  - 5 architects nominated by the RIBA (3 English, 1 Scottish, 1 Irish).
  - 1 delegate from the Royal Academy of Arts.
10. Ibid p.5 (p.167) d.1906 Bill Section 10(6).
11. Architects (Registration) Bill. A Bill to provide for the Registration of Architects 1927. House of Lords Library/HMSO Publication pp.2-3 (Accession No.(9)1.39).
12. RIBA Archives - BOAE Minutes Vol4 (21 February 1924 - 25 June 1930) pp.271-2.
13. Architects (Registration) Bill 1927. op. cit. pp.9-10.
14. The Select Committee was chaired by Sir Clement Kinlock-Cooke and the nominated members were Mr Gardner, Sir Alfred Hopkinson, Mr Lindley, Sir Murdoch MacDonald, Colonel T L R Moore, Mr Tasker, Captain Wallace, Dr Watts, William Hirst and Sir Frederick Rice.
15. Contributions were sought from (i) the RIBA, (ii) the AA, (iii) the Institute of Civil Engineers, (iv) the Institute of Municipal and County Engineers, (v) the County Council Association, (vi) the Institute of Builders and (vii) the Parliamentary Committee on the Co-operative Congress.

16. The Select Committee minutes record strong objections from the IAAS about what the appellation 'architect' defined in any specific sense. Select Committee Proceedings (1927) pp.72 f.f.
17. Select Committee Proceedings 1927. Public Records Office (Kew) Ref. ZHC1/8375 (105) V.1.
18. Ibid.
19. Architects (Registration) Bill 1928. Public Records Office (Kew) (3) 1.147.
20. Architects (Registration) Bill 1928-29. Public Records Office (Kew) (44) 1.43.
21. Standing Committee A. 1930-31. Public Records Office (Kew) v.653.
22. These lay bodies included the Ulster Society of Architects (Incorporated), the Association of Headmistresses, the National Federation of Building Trades Operators, the Union of Educational Institutions, a nominee of the National Society of Art Masters and 24 registered persons nominated by ARCUK's Council.
23. Architects (Registration) Act 1937 HMSO p.2.
24. Ibid. Hereafter referred to as the Principal Act (following the practice of ARCUK publications).
25. ARCUK Archives - Minute Book No.1 September 1933 p.354-5.
26. Ibid pp.1-25.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid.
29. ARCUK Archives - Minute Book No.1 September 1933 p.103.
30. This committee is not to be read as the similarly titled committee set up by the BAE, known as the General Purposes Sub-Committee.

The Finances and General Purposes Committee was to be made up of no less than 15 and no more than 20 members of the Council and had similar duties to the ad-hoc Committee of Ways and Means, set up both to administer the paying of registration fees and to find the ARCUK premises. Until 1934, ARCUK met at the RIBA headquarters in Conduit Street. The task of the Finance and General Purposes Committee was considerable, as, by May 1934, ARCUK's Admissions Committee had received 13,000 applications for registration. The RIBA agreed to underwrite an overdraft facility to the ARCUK of £1,500 to its Ways and Means Committee, despite its

- recent defeats in Parliament.  
(ARCUK Archives - Minute Book No.1 3rd Meeting of Council).
31. ARCUK - Archives - Minute Book No.3 Amending Act Committee Minutes of Meetings.
  32. Howard Robertson was attacked on many occasions by Maurice Webb, the Chairman of the RIBA BOAE for his espousal of Modern Architecture. A Jackson, in "The Politics of Architecture" argues that Webb felt Robertson was a pernicious and corrupting influence on students and the profession in general. Webb's views were echoed in a contemporary review of Le Corbusier's "Vers une Architecture" by Harold Tomlinson (Architects' Journal LXVI 1937 p.378):
 

"... it will be interesting to watch the effects of the translation on our schools of architecture. Of late, even in this country, students have begun to show their dislike for the dreary routine of the 'Orders' and are suspicious of the threadbare statement of their teachers, that 'the orders are the only means of learning propertion'. It is not unnaturally suspected that 'the Orders are all we know' would be nearer the truth. 'Why' says the student, 'when you have a perfectly good building cover it up with that muck?'"
  33. RIBA Archives - Council Minutes December 1932 p.262. Marked "Private and Confidential".
  34. RIBA Archives - Council Minutes December 1932 p.262. Marked "Private and Confidential".
 

It is worth noting that in the same year as this letter was written to members of the RIBA, Council set up an "Architects Registration, Amending Act Committee". One Minute Book of Meetings 1932-1938.
  35. They were the following: Robert Gordon's College of Technology Aberdeen, Birmingham School of Architecture in the Central School of Arts and Crafts, The Welsh School of Architecture, Edinburgh College of Art School of Architecture, Glasgow University School of Architecture, Leeds College of Art School of Architecture, The Liverpool School of Architecture, The AA, The Bartlett School of Architecture University College London and Manchester University School of Architecture.
  36. ARCUK Archives - Minute Book 1 Council Minutes for December 1932.
  37. Ibid.
  38. ARCUK Records - Minute Book 1 p.367 and p.387.
  39. ARCUK Records - Special Meeting of ARCUK Council 15 February 1934. Verbatim Minutes p.7 (Minute Book 2 pp.9-82 f.f.).

40. Ibid.
41. Ibid pp.15-16.
42. ARCUK Records - Minute Book 2 p.366.
43. Architects (Registration) Act 1931 (op. cit.) Section 5(2)a p.3.
44. Ibid p.4.
45. ARCUK Records - Minute Book 3. Parliamentary Committee Minutes pp.7-8.
46. Letter from W C Eaton to ARCUK's Registrar concerning the IAAS Direct Association Examination, filed with the Report of the ARCUK Council Sub-Committee 3 February 1934. Marked "Confidential".
47. ARCUK Records - Minute Book 3. Parliamentary Committee Minutes p.16.
48. ARCUK Records - Minute Book 3. Parliamentary Committee Minutes p.16.
49. Letter from Athoe, Secretary of the IAAS to Lord Dufferin dated 28 January 1937. ARCUK Records.
50. Letter from Athoe to IAAS members dated 25 February 1937 - ARCUK Records.
51. ARCUK Records - Council Minutes for 1936.
52. ARCUK Records - Minute Book 3. Parliamentary Committee Minutes p.22.
53. Ibid p.24.
54. ARCUK Records - Minute Book 3. Parliamentary Committee pp.24-71 f.f.
55. ARCUK Records - Special Meeting of Council. Verbatim Minutes. op. cit. (Footnote (40)) p.57.
56. RIBA Archives - Qualifying Examination (Associate) Applications. March 1882 - November 1915. The RIBA Intermediate Examination Applications October 1895 - April 1909. The RIBA Preliminary Examination Applications October 1895 - April 1909.
57. Interview with Sir Frederick Gibberd 8 July 1981.
58. Standing Committee C. 17 Dec. 1937. PRO (Kew) 1937-38 (79) v.673 ZHC1/8692.
59. ARCUK Records - Amending Act Committee Minutes 9 July 1936 (Reference EA/132/6).



60. Gotch, J A The Growth and Work of the Royal Institute of British Architects 1934.
61. Ibid p.84.

FOOTNOTES : CHAPTER 4 (pages 63-75)

1. Cf. Chapter 2.
2. BOAE Minutes 16 April 1922 pp.264-266.
3. op. cit. pp.269-270.
4. Ibid.
5. RIBA Archives - Council Minute Books May 1921 - April 1923 and April 1923 - November 1924.
6. Robert Atkinson, a tutor at the Architectural Association, replaced H M Fletcher.
7. BOAE Minutes - Minute Book March 1924 - June 1926 pp.58-73.
8. Architecture; a Profession or an Art? op. cit.
9. Interview with Mr Oscar Naddermier, Deputy Head of Birmingham School of Architecture on 16 January 1981.
10. Ibid.
11. BOAE Minutes 19 April 1923 pp.361-364 (Report inserted pp.1-2).
12. RIBA Archives - BOAE op. cit. Report p.2.
13. RIBA Archives - BOAE Meeting 24 September 1925 p.242.
14. RIBA Archives - BOAE Meeting 17 October 1924 pp.72-102 esp. pp.81-83.
15. Ibid.
16. Visit to Northern Polytechnic 8 May 1925 p.202 BOAE Minutes of Meetings.  
Visit to Regent Street Polytechnic 30 September 1925 - inserted report on pp.299-300 BOAE Minutes.  
Visit to Bartlett School of Architecture 27 May 1925 c.f. BOAE Minutes pp.188-9.  
Visit to Architectural Association 5 June 1924 c.f. BOAE Minutes pp.114-5.
17. Cf. Chapter 3.
18. Proceedings of the First International Congress on Architectural Education op. cit p.9.
19. RIBA Archives - BOAE Minute Book March 1924 - June 1926.
20. BOAE Minutes November 1925 pp.271-2.
21. RIBA Council Minutes 17 May 1920.

22. BOAE Minutes November 1925 p.271.
23. Johnson, T "The State and the Professions: Peculiarities of the British" p.2.
24. BOAE Minutes Vol.8 May 1938 Enclosure C.D/397/8.
25. BOAE Minutes 9 January 1939 (Vol.8).
26. These were Darcey Braddell (Vice President of the RIBA), Anthony Minopiro (Hon. Sec. of the RIBA BOAE), Joseph Addison (Head of the Regent Street Polytechnic School of Architecture), W Holford (Liverpool School of Architecture, Chair of Civic Design), Jellicoe (AA), Hubert Lidbetter (Chairman of the BOAE 1938-41), F S Orme (Incorporated Association of Headmasters), Stanley Ramsey (BOAE 1941-44), T E Scott (Head of the Northern Polytechnic School of Architecture), C G Sontar (representing the RIBA Allied Societies), Basil Sullivan (from the RIBA BOAE), Sylvester Sullivan (Hon. Treasurer of RIBA) and C S White (Hon. Sec. of RIBA BOAE 1941-5).
27. BOAE Minutes Vol 8 4 June 1945 (inserted in minutes).
28. BOAE Minutes Vol. 8 pp.49-50 (D652/45).
29. References to other professional bodies qualifying procedures and institutions has been discussed by Johnson, T in The Professions and Power (Longman 1978) and in The State and the Professions: Peculiarities of the British (University of Leicester June 1981).
30. op. cit. p.13.
31. op. cit. p.65.
32. op. cit. p.71.
33. Reilly, C "Architect and Building News" 25 July 1947 (from Liverpool University Senate Archives, ref.D207/8/2).
34. BOAE Minutes Vol.8 p.76.
35. Ibid.
36. BOAE Minutes Vol.8 Enclosure .L. D290/47.
37. op. cit. p.3-4 Report of the full Board by Officers of the BOAE.
38. BOAE Minutes Vol.9 Insert A. D850/51.
39. Ibid. The Special Committee for Architectural Education (1945) had recommended that the following subjects should be taught: design, presentation, theory, history, construction, services, quantities, estimates, specification, surveying, town planning and professional practice.

40. Ibid p.3.
41. The members were D H Beaty Pownall, C H Chackett, J K Hicks, J E Ralph, C S White, F E Green, M Pattrick, J R Tolson, E M Rice and S Walsh.
42. BOAE Minutes Vol.9 1952.
43. BOAE Minutes Vol. 9 Enclosure A. D653/53.
44. Ibid Inset 8. D1300/54.
45. BOAE Minutes Vol.9 p.13-14.
46. Ibid p.14 and p.6.
47. Ibid p.24.

FOOTNOTES : CHAPTER 5 (pages 76-92)

1. Malpass, P. "Professionalism and the Role of Architects in Local Authority Housing" RIBA J 82 June 1975.
2. Ibid.
3. Finimore, B. PhD Thesis (unpublished) University College, London "The Industrialisation of Building: Building Systems in Post-War Social Housing 1945-1970".
4. "The Architect's Dilemma", article in The Economist (CLXVII) 1953 p.240 ff.
5. Gardner, R. "The Development of Architectural Education in the UK" Architects Journal 9 October 1974 p.875.
6. Barrington-Kaye, R. op. cit. p.160.
7. "Schools of Architecture I. Birmingham" Architect and Building News May 28 1948 p.474.
8. RIBA BOAE Minutes of Meetings Vol. 9 Inset A (D850/51) p.2.
9. RIBA BOAE Minutes of Meetings Vol. 10 (D1300/54).
10. Ibid p.8.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid p.15.
14. Ibid pp.17-18.
15. Ibid p.24.
16. Ibid p.26.
17. Gardner, R. op. cit. p.878.
18. Colleges of Advanced Technology had no degree-giving powers or any other privileges of university status, but many were in the process of changing and upgrading their faculty recruitment policies in the 1950's. Teachers in CAT's, according to contemporary sources, came from lower class origins than those at universities and tended to be younger, having been educated at 'red-brick' universities. 15% of all teachers in universities in 1964 were professors compared with only 4% in CAT's. Many more teachers in universities across all disciplines came from Oxford and Cambridge than those in CAT's.

19. RIBA BOAE Minutes of Meetings Vol.11 May 1958 D/069/58 Item 6(a).
20. RIBA BOAE Minutes of Meetings Vol.12 D464/60 p.3.
21. RIBA BOAE Minutes of Meetings Vol.11 1960 D500/60.
22. The reports were inserted as appendices D498/59 and D964/59 in the Minutes of the BOAE for June 1959.
23. RIBA BOAE Minutes of Meetings Vol.11 1960 D500/60.
24. Smith, J. "Education: The Oxford Conference" Architect and Building News, June 1958 p.330.
25. Ibid.
26. AJ 31 July 1958 p.152.
27. AJ 4 December 1963 p.562.
28. Representatives were drawn in the following manner for the years 1960-1962. One representative was drawn from each school recognised for Final exemption and one representative for each school recognised to Intermediate exemption. Two representatives were drawn from the RIBA 'listed' schools involved in full-time preparation for the RIBA External Examinations. One representative was drawn from the Cheltenham School of Architecture at Gloucester School of Art. One representative was drawn from the School of Architecture of Manchester's Regional College of Art. One representative was allowed from the Ministry of Education, one from the London County Council Architects Department and one representative from the National Society for Art Education.
29. This new Schools Committee had Gardner-Medwin as its Chairman.
30. The new statutory BOAE was made up of Leslie Martin, Bryan Westwood, D L Bridgewater, C S White, Kenneth Campbell, Whitfield Lewis, Llewellyn-Davies, Eric Brown (Kingston), Robert Paine (Canterbury), Chessor Matthew (Dundee), Charles Bath (Polytechnic of North London), E M Rice (Hammersmith), Donald Notley (Nottingham) and Michael Pattrick (AA). Under 'a gentlemen's agreement' E D Mills and Dennis Clarke-Hall were also appointed by Council. Basil Spence was its President, and the Chairman was E D Mills. Vice-Chairman was Dennis Clarke-Hall. The Ministry of Education was represented by A A Dont and the Scottish Education Department by F M M Gray. Eight members constituted a quorum. Members of both the Advisory Council and the Statutory RIBA BOAE were E D Mills, Dennis Clarke-Hall, Bryan Westwood, Eric Brown, Kenneth Campbell, Whitfield Lewis and Leslie Martin. Gardner Medwin sat on both the Schools Committee and the Advisory Council.

31. RIBA Archives - BOAE Minutes of Meetings Vol.11 14 June 1960 (D1335/60).
32. Architect and Building News op. cit. p.141.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid.
35. Llewellyn-Davies, R. "The Education of the Architect" AJ December 1960.
36. Ibid p.3.
37. Allen, W. "The Profession in Contemporary Society" RIBA J May 1960.
38. RIBA BOAE Minutes of Meetings Vol.12 14 May 1961 Insert E (D835/61) p.1.
39. RIBA BOAE op. cit. D608/60 pp.1-2.
40. op. cit. p.3.
41. Ibid.
42. RIBA BOAE Minutes of Meetings Vol.12.July 1958: Memorandum regarding the points raised by the University Grants Committee.
43. Memorandum entitled "University Grants Committee and Architectural Education" - "Transfer of Recognised Schools to Universities" file from Edinburgh University School of Architecture Archives, 1960.
44. Memorandum "The Nature and Aims of a Department of Architecture within a University" Sheffield University School of Architecture Archives March 1964 p.3.
45. Hansard 2 July 1964.
46. Ibid.
47. CNA A Archives - Committee for Science & Technology Minutes of Meetings (1978) p.2.
48. Letter from Elizabeth Layton to Mr F R Hornby, 22 June 1965 (RIBA Archives).
49. Ibid.
50. RIBA BOAE Minutes of Meetings Vol.12 March 23, 1965 Item 10.
51. Ibid.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### 1. PRIMARY SOURCES

#### a. ARCHIVES OF THE ARCUK

##### Minute Book I

Professional Purposes Committee	January 1934 - June 1938 December 1938 - May 1939
Amending Act Committee	September 1932 - November 1938 (1934 and 1937 missing)
Minutes of ARCUK Council	March 1932 - December 1933

##### Minute Book II

Professional Purposes Committee	June 1939 - February 1949
Minutes of ARCUK Council	February 1934 - December 1935

##### Minute Book III

Professional Purposes Committee	May 1949 - February 1959
Admissions Committee	1943-1976
Disciplines Committee	1943-1966
Finance & General Purposes Committee	1936-1976 (records incomplete)
Minutes of ARCUK Council	October 1956 - March 1977
Parliamentary Committee	October 1936 - June 1938

##### Board of Architectural Education

Minute Book 1932-1939

#### b. ARCHIVES OF THE RIBA

##### (i) Examinations Records

###### Series I:

###### Examinations under the Metropolitan Building Act (1855): Recommendations for Certificate

Date: 29 January 1856 - 20 October 1905

Quantity: three bound volumes

Arrangement: chronological by year

These three volumes contain the certificates for competency under the regulations of the 1855 Metropolitan Building Act. Each certificate records the name of the candidate, date of birth and other personal details. They are arranged by year, chronologically and at the beginning of each volume is an alphabetical index of names of candidates. The certificates are signed by the (Statutory) Board of Examiners, set up under the recommendations of the Metropolitan Building Act to conduct the examination for certificates of



competency by candidates wishing to act as District Surveyors in London and as Building Surveyors in other authorities. The certificates give details of each candidate's 'professional education' from 1874 onwards, either in the form of articulated pupillage or where and when they attended classes in technical and art schools. Some of the candidates are listed as ARIBA members and they give a list of designed and built work.

Series II:

(Statutory) Board of Examiners Minutes

Date: 22 December 1855 - 18 October 1907

Quantity: 1 volume of signed minutes, December 1855 - October 1907

1 volume - book of draft minutes, 25 April 1879-85 and October 1895

Arrangement: chronologically with an alphabetical index of meetings interspersed with subject's discussions

Minutes of meetings of this Board record applications made for the certificates of competency. The constitution of the Board comprised three members of RIBA Council, together with a Chairman and a Deputy Chairman, who also had to be drawn from the RIBA. The representatives were appointed before each examination session to draw up examination questions. In April 1886, examination questions were discussed and drawn up for the posts of District Surveyor and Building Surveyor on the basis of separate examinations.

Series III:

Board of Examiners in Architecture Minutes of Meetings

Date: 21 June 1882 - 14 July 1910

Quantity: 4 bound volumes

The Board of Examiners in Architecture was appointed to supervise the compulsory examinations for membership of the RIBA. The voluntary examination was held under the aegis of this Board in 1881. As a result of the RIBA Annual General Meeting in 1887, the Board of Examiners in Architecture became responsible for organising the examinations and controlling admission procedures for the Institute.

The minutes record correspondence to and from the Board about educational policy; lists of membership of the Board; lists of successful and unsuccessful candidates for ARIBA membership from Britain and the Commonwealth; some discussion of the issue of relegation, recommendations for examination questions and suitable examiners. Addenda to the RIBA examination regulations are included, along with statements offering advice and bibliographical

material for intending candidates for the compulsory examinations.

As well as these topics, the minutes also record applications for RIBA prizes and awards. They contain records of important negotiations by letter between the Board of Examiners in Architecture and the Allied Societies of Architects over the issue of regional examinations (first reference - Minute Book 1, June 1882 - February 1892 pp.2-3).

Examination results are tabled in the minutes after each examination session has taken place (bi-annually after March 1886). These results usually follow a report by the Board of Moderators and a notification of new appointments to the Board of Examiners in Architecture.

The four volumes also include various reports of ad hoc Sub-Committees of the Board, such as the Testimonies of Study Sub-Committee and the Sub-Committee on the Revision of a Syllabus.

Series IV:

Board of Examiners: Bye Law XIV

Date: May 1881 - January 1895

A book of draft minutes of the meetings of the Board of Examiners in Architecture discussing the implications of Bye Law XIV (1887) along with draft minutes of the meetings of the Board of Examiners in Architecture after 1887.

Series V:

Qualifying Examination (Associate)

Date: March 1882 - November 1915

Quantity: 2 volumes (bound)

Arrangement: chronologically with some overlap between Volumes I and II

List of names of applicants for the Qualifying Examinations (Associate) by year of application.

Series VI:

The RIBA Intermediate Examinations Applications

Date: 10 October 1895 - 30 April 1909

Quantity: 5 bound volumes

These volumes contain excellent autobiographical information on students of architecture and articulated pupils.

Series VII:

RIBA Final and Special Examinations:

Candidates applications and recommendations to the Board of Examiners in Architecture

Date: 26 May 1902 - 24 May 1907

Quantity: 3 bound volumes

These volumes also contain useful material on the educational development of articulated pupils.

Series VIII:

RIBA Obligatory Examination under Bye Law XIV:

Candidates applications and recommendations of the Board of Examiners in Architecture

Date: 16 February 1882 - 25 May 1904

Quantity: 11 bound volumes:

Vol.1 16 February 1882 - 4 November 1887

Vol.2 3 November 1887 - 8 November 1889

Vol.3 8 November 1889 - 27 February 1891

Vol.4 27 February 1891 - 16 March 1893

Vol.5 17 March 1893 - 8 February 1894

Vol.6 10 February 1894 - 10 October 1894

Vol.7 26 October 1894 - 1 November 1895

Vol.8 26 October 1895 - 26 May 1898

Vol.9 5 November 1898 - 17 October 1900

Vol.10 27 October 1900 - 30 May 1902

Vol.11 28 May 1902 - 25 May 1904

These volumes contain application forms from candidates and are useful for autobiographical material on architects' educational history. Application forms give details of how articulated pupils spent their time in pupillage and indicate the extent of the candidate's executed work.

Series IV:

The RIBA Preliminary Examination Applications

Date: 18 October 1895 - 27 April 1909

These volumes contain the application forms of candidates for the Preliminary Examination, begun after the resolution of Bye Law XIV of 1887. Where appropriate, a candidate is shown to be 'exempted' from the Preliminary Examination in view of the RIBA Board of Architectural Education if her/his other previous educational qualifications and/or experience permitted it.

(ii) Board of Architectural Education Records

The Board of Examiners in Architecture was dismantled by 1910 by RIBA Council. Its duties were subsumed within the Board of Architectural Education set up in 1904; minutes of meetings of the Board of Architectural Education (BOAE) are not recorded until 1907.

The minutes of these meetings of the full BOAE form essential reading for any research on the history of British Architectural Education. The BOAE not only preserved and continued to control

the work of the old Board of Examiners in Architecture, it also extended the work of the representatives. More information was requested by the BOAE from educational institutions offering architectural courses and examinations in order that other institutions could be granted exemption from the RIBA examinations in Architecture.

Series X:

Board of Architectural Education Minute Books

Date: February 1907 - January 1960

Quantity: 13 bound volumes:

- Vol.1 February 1907 - February 1913
- Vol.2 February 1913 - May 1919
- Vol.3 July 1919 - January 1924
- Vol.4 February 1924 - September 1926
- Vol.5 June 1926 - June 1930
- Vol.6 June 1930 - January 1934
- Vol.7 March 1934 - March 1938
- Vol.8 June 1938 - May 1950
- Vol.9 October 1950 - February 1954
- Vol.10 February 1955 - February 1958
- Vol.11 May 1958 - June 1960
- Vol.12 June 1960 - December 1961
- Vol.13 January 1962 - January 1966

Minutes of meetings after January 1966 are not held in the archives of the RIBA Library but are kept in the offices of the RIBA Education and Professional Development Committee.

Series XI:

Board of Architectural Education Special Committees Book

Date: September 1919 - October 1932

Quantity: 1 volume

Reports of the Special Committees appear in the main body of BOAE Minutes.

Series XII:

Board of Architectural Education Committee Minutes Book

Date: December 1910 - July 1962

Quantity: 9 bound volumes

Series XI and Series XII do not include the minutes of meetings of the officers of the BOAE. These generally are found inserted in the minutes of meetings of the full BOAE until February 1934. After then, they form:

Series XIII:

Board of Architectural Education: Officers of the Board Minute Books

Date: February 1934 - April 1960

Quantity: 4 bound volumes

NB: No series number of BOAE Letter Book 1912-1913 exists

(iii) RIBA Council

49 bound volumes of minutes of meetings of RIBA Council December 1834 - February 1964.

(iv) Documentation relating to the Internal Reviews of the Visiting Board's Work

The constitution of the BOAE of November 1925 formally established the Visiting Board, although it had been meeting regularly since 1922. Forthwith, inserted copies of the annual reports of the work of the BOAE and applications for exemption from the RIBA's examinations from schools of architecture appear in the minutes, along with the first printed reports of the Visiting Board's visits to schools of architecture. It is to be noted that there are no minutes of meetings of the RIBA Visiting Board.

One of the first extensive reports issued by the BOAE as reconstituted was "Action taken by Schools of Architecture recognised by the RIBA for the purpose of exemption from its Intermediate and/or Final Examinations and reported upon by the RIBA Visiting Board upon recommendations made in reports of the Visiting Boards" (Vol.4 BOAE Minutes, 21 February 1924 - 22 September 1926, p.300). From this time until February 1934, minutes of the meeting of the Officers of the BOAE precede the minutes of the full BOAE. After 1934, these meetings of the Officers of the BOAE are recorded and bound in separate volumes. After World War II, copies of the Visiting Board's reports from visits to schools of architecture are no longer inserted in the main body of BOAE minutes. Instead they are found in the volumes of Minutes of Meetings of the Officers of the BOAE. It is not until 1962 (Vol.13 of BOAE Minutes) that fuller Visiting Boards reports find their way back to the minutes of the meetings of the full BOAE and extensive discussions about the size, and number of schools of architecture are then minuted, along with related discussions on part-time architectural education and the inauguration of the CNAAL.

Series XIV:

The only other sub-sections of the BOAE's administration to have a separate volume devoted to its affairs and minutes of meetings were the Prizes and Scholarship Committee (2 volumes (1) January 1926 - May 1934 and (2) October 1934 - June 1958) and the Schools Committee (2 volumes (1) January 1926 - May 1934 and (2) October 1933 - October 1967).

Series XV:  
Examinations Committee

For which extant volumes date from October 1913,  
and form two separate volumes.

Series XVI:  
BOAE Committee of Examiners Minute Books

Date: October 1913 - November 1934

Quantity: 2 bound volumes:

Vol.1 October 1913 - June 1927

Vol.2 July 1927 - November 1934

Series XVII:  
BOAE Examinations Committee Minute Books

Date: January 1927 - July 1959

Quantity: 3 bound volumes:

Vol.1 January 1927 - June 1931

Vol.2 October 1931 - October 1952

Vol.3 February 1953 - July 1959

c. ARCHIVES OF SCHOOLS OF ARCHITECTURE

Leeds Polytechnic School of Architecture

(1) Minutes of the Board of Studies:

Vol.1 September 1949 - October 1952

March 1957 - to date

Vol.2 April 1968 - March 1970

(2) Examination Records:

Vol.1 1949-1963

Vol.2 1964-1974

Vol.3 1975-1980

(3) Prospectuses.

(4) Students' work under W A Eden (1950 only)

Leeds Central Reference Library

Leeds and West Yorkshire Architectural Association:  
Green Books

Manchester University School of Architecture

(1) Prospectuses 1923/24 - 1981

(2) Student Drawings 1930 to date

(3) Course Programmes for 1935-6 and 1936-7

(4) Photographs of Students' Work 1950 to date

John Rylands Library

Manchester Architectural Association Papers

Cambridge University School of Architecture

- (1) Minutes of Meetings of the Faculty Board of Fine Arts:  
July 1929 - September 1933  
September 1930-1933  
September 1933 - July 1937  
October 1941 - November 1951
- (2) One book of miscellaneous letters and minutes of meetings:  
October 1924 - June 1929
- (3) Reports and minutes of meetings of the School of Architecture comprising:  
Minute Book of Board of Architectural Studies  
October 1924 to date.  
Minutes Book of Faculty Board of Fine Arts  
(Department of Architecture) October 1926 to date.  
Course documents donated by Claire Frankl.

Glasgow School of Art

Prospectuses, Minutes and Drawings located in the Library of the Glasgow School of Art.

Glasgow Architectural Association

Minutes of Meetings of the Glasgow Architectural Association

Liverpool University Archives

Letter Books D207/1/1-2 - D207/11/8. Budden Papers.

Liverpool Recorder 1979 No.1

Architects Compendium (1909)

d. INTERVIEWS

Interview with Peter Bicknell (Hughes & Bicknell Partners)  
Cambridge, 22 April 1981.

Interview with Sir Frederick Gibberd, 8 July 1981.

Interview with Oscar Naddermier, Deputy Head of Birmingham Polytechnic School of Architecture, 16 January 1981.

## 2. SECONDARY SOURCES

### a. BOOKS AND MONOGRAPHS

- ABERCROMBIE, M.L.J.,  
HUNT, S. and  
STRINGER, P.      Selection and Academic Performance  
of Students in a University School  
of Architecture  
(SHRE, London, 1969)
- AMERY, C. and  
STAMP, G      Victorian Buildings of London  
1837-1887  
(Architectural Press, 1980)
- ARCUK      Report on the Third International  
Conference on Architectural  
Registration, Aalborg, Denmark  
(ARCUK, London, 1974)
- ASHBEE, C.R.      Should we stop teaching Art?  
(Batsford, London, 1911)
- Memoirs  
(MSS, Victoria & Albert Museum,  
National Art Library, 1938)
- ASHWIN, C.      Art Education: Documents &  
Policies 1768-1975  
(SRHR, London, 1975)
- ATKINSON, R. and  
BAGENAL, H.      Theory & Elements of Architecture  
Vol. I, Part I  
(Ernest Benn Ltd, London, 1926)
- BANHAM, R.      Theory and Design in the First  
Machine Age  
(Architectural Press, London, 1960)
- BAYER, H. and  
GROPIUS, W.      Bauhaus 1919-1928  
(Secker & Warburg, London)
- BILL, E.G.W.      University Reform in 19th Century  
Oxford; A Study of H.H. Vaughan  
1811-1885
- BRIXTON SCHOOL OF  
BUILDING      The First Fifty Years 1904-1954  
(LCC, London, 1954)
- BROADBENT, G.      Design in Architecture (London, 1964)
- BUDDEN. L.B. (Ed.)      The Book of the Liverpool School  
of Architecture  
(Liverpool University Press, and  
London, Hodder & Stoughton Ltd,  
1932)
- Inaugural Address  
(Liverpool University Press, 1934)



- BUTLER, L. The Responsibilities of Education  
(Longman, London, 1968)
- BUTLER, C.M. The Society of Architects  
(London, for the Society of Architects, 1925)
- COLLINS, P. Changing Ideals in Modern Architecture 1758-1950  
(London, Faber & Faber, 1965)
- COLVIN, H.M. Bibliographical Dictionary of English Architects 1660-1840  
(London, 1954)
- CONRADS, U. (ed.) Programmes & Manifestos in 20th Century Architecture  
(Lund Humphries, London, 1975)
- DONALDSON, T.L. Preliminary Discourse upon the Commencement of a Series of Lectures on Architecture  
(London, 1842)
- DREXLER, A. (ed) The Architecture of the Ecole des Beaux Arts  
(London, Secker & Warburg, 1977)
- EDWARDS, T. Good and Bad Manners in Architecture
- ESHER, L A Broken Wave: The Rebuilding of England 1940-1980  
(Allen Lane, London, 1980)
- FISHMAN, R. Urban Utopias in the 20th Century  
(New York, 1977)
- FLETCHER, Bannister Architecture and its Place in a Liberal Education  
(B.T. Batsford, London, 1905)
- FRY, E.M. Autobiographical Sketches  
(London, 1975)
- GIDEON, S. Space, Time and Architecture  
(London, 1941)
- GOTCH, J.A. The Growth and Work of the Royal Institute of British Architects 1834-1934  
(London, RIBA, 1934)
- GOWAN, J. (ed.) A Continuing Experiment: Learning and Teaching at the Architectural Association  
(Architectural Press, London, 1975)

- HOUFE, A. Sir Albert Richardson: The Professor  
(London, 1980)
- JACKSON, T.G. Recollections of Thomas Graham Jackson 1835-1924  
(arranged and edited by Basil H. Jackson, OUP, London, 1924)
- JENCKS, C Modern Movements in Architecture  
(London 1973)
- JENKINS, F. Architect and Patron  
(London, 1961)
- JONES, H.C. and THORNLEY, D.C. Conference on Design Methods  
(OUP, London, 1963)
- JORDAN, F. Victorian Architecture
- KERR, R. The Newleaf Discourses or the Fine Art of Architecture  
(London 1846)
- KAYE, R. BARRINGTON The Development of the Architectural Profession in Britain  
(London, 1960)
- KITSON-CLARK, G The Making of Victorian England  
(London 1962)
- KOSTOFF, S (ed.) The Architect: Chapters in the History of the Profession  
(OUP, London, 1977)
- LAWRENCE, E. The Origins and Growth of Modern Education  
(London, 1970)
- LINSTRUM, D. Cuthbert Broderick - Victorian Architect  
(RIBA Drawings Collection)
- MALLOWS, E.W.N. Teaching or Technology  
(Johanesberg, S.A., 1965)
- MACDONALD, S. The History and Philosophy of Art Education  
(London 1970)
- MACLEOD, R. Style and Society: Architectural Ideology in Britain 1835-1914  
(RIBA, London, 1971)
- MAUFE, E.B. The Final Examination of the RIBA: An Egotistical Event  
(MSS, RIBA Library)

- MIDDLETON, R. The Beaux Arts and 19th Century French Architecture  
(London, 1982)
- NAYLOR, G. The Arts and Crafts Movement  
(London 1971)
- NEWMAN, J.H. The Idea of a University
- NEWSOME, D. Godliness and Good Learning
- NUTTGENS, P. The Landscape of Ideas
- OPEN UNIVERSITY PRESS History of Architecture & Design 1890-1932  
(Edited by Benton, T.)
- PEVSNER, N. An Outline of European Architecture 1st Edition (1943) and 7th Edition (1963)  
Pioneers of Modern Design: From William Morris to Walter Gropius  
(London 1977)
- PEVSNER, N. and RICHARDS, J.M. (ed.) The Anti-Rationalists  
(London 1973)
- POWERS, A. Architectural Education in Britain 1880-1914  
(PhD Thesis, Cambridge University, 1982)
- REID, D.A.G. The School of Building Story  
(London, 1979)
- REILLY, C. Scaffolding in the Sky  
(London 1930-4)
- ROBERTSON, H. The Principles of Archhitectural Composition  
(London 1924)
- RUBENS, G. The Life and Work of William Richard Lethaby  
(PhD Thesis, London University, 1978)
- SAINT, A. Richard Norman Shaw  
(Yale, 1976)  
The Image of the Architect  
(Yale, 1983)
- SHARP, D. (ed.) The Rationalists  
(London, 1975)

- SHAW, R.N. and JACKSON, T.G. Architecture: A Profession or an Art?  
(London 1892)
- SULLIVAN, L Kindergarten Chats  
The Autobiography of an Idea
- SUMMERSON, J. The Architectural Association 1847-1947  
(London 1947)
- SWENARTON, M. Homes fit for Heroes  
(London, 1981)
- TAYLOR, A.J.P. English History 1914-1945  
(Oxford History of England)  
(London, 1965)
- THOMPSON, E.P. The Making of the English Working Class  
(London, 1963)
- TRAVERS, W.I. Architectural Education  
(London, 1908)
- TRIGGS, D.L. A History of the Arts & Crafts Movement  
(New York, 1971)

b. JOURNALS AND PRINTED PAPERS

- ANSELL, W.H. Architectural Education  
RIBA J, 1936, April 4, pp.565-79
- ALLEN, B.R.S. Science in Schools of Architecture  
RIBA J, August 1953
- BOLTON, A.J. Architectural Education a Century Ago  
RIBA J XXX, (1922-3), pp.56a-74
- BRIGGS, M.S. The Training of an Architect  
Board of Education: Educational Pamphlets No.118  
(London, HMSO, 1943)
- The Architect in History - His Training, Status and Work  
RIBA J XXXII, pp.571-84  
pp.604-613  
pp.630-639
- Architectural Education  
RIBA J, June 1951, pp.301-6

- BRANDON-JONES, J                    The Education of Architects  
Architect & Building News 1952  
April 17, April 24, May 15 and  
May 18
- BUDDEN, L.B.                        The Future of Architectural Education  
RIBA J, 1945 July, pp.249-58
- BERESFORD-PITE                    A Review of the Tendencies of  
Architectural Education  
RIBA J, May 10 1924, pp.423-30
- The Registration of Architects  
RIBA J XI, pp.221-34
- The Place of the Study of Building  
Construction in Architectural Education  
British Architect LXXVI, p.222
- CAMPBELL, I.,  
COOPER, I. and  
DELANEY, A                         Control of ARCUK by the Public  
Building Design (BD) No.421, 1978  
November 10, p.44
- CARR-SAUNDERS, A.M.               The Function of Universities in  
the Modern World  
Social Review XXXII, (1940), p.137-158
- CURTIS GREEN, W.                   Architectural Education in the  
Present in England  
RIBA J, August 1924, pp.587-9
- CLARKE HALL, D.                    A Point of Contraflexure:  
Architectural Association on  
Architectural Education  
Architect and Building News, 1958  
November 5, pp.606-7
- COONEY, E W                         The Origins of the Victorian Master  
Builders  
English Historical Review - 2nd  
Series VII, 1955
- DRYSDALE, G                         Ideals and Methods in Schools of  
Architecture: Birmingham School  
of Architecture  
RIBA J XXXV, 1928, p.604-9
- GARDNER, R                         The Development of Architectural  
Education in the United Kingdom  
AJ, 9 October 1974
- GORDON, A                            Professors and Professionals  
The Darwin College Colloquium,  
Cambridge, January 1978
- HARPER, D                            A New Educational Framework  
RIBA J, June 1960

- HUGHES, Q. Before the Bauhaus: The Experiment at the Liverpool School of Architecture and Applied Arts  
Architectural History XXV, p.102  
Education and the Architectural Profession in Britain at the Turn of the Century  
Journal of Arts Design Education I, No.1, p.135
- INCORPORATED ASSN. OF ARCHITECTS AND SURVEYORS A History of the Incorporated Association of Architects and Surveyors  
Donated by W.J. Clarke, Hon. Sec. of IAAS  
(IAAS n.d.)
- JOHNSON-MARSHALL, P Education for Environmental Design  
RIBAJ, January 1965
- JACKSON, T.G. Some Thoughts on the Training of Architects  
(Pamphlet published by Liverpool University Press, 1895)
- KNOWLES, J.T. On Architectural Education: A Prize Essay of the RIBA  
London (1853)
- LAYTON, E. The Practical Training of Architects  
(RIBA Publications, 1962)
- LETHABY, W.R. Education in Building  
RIBAJ VIII, p.385
- LIPMAN, A The Architectural Belief System and Social Behaviour  
British Journal of Sociology Vol.20 No.2, June 1969, pp.190-203
- MARCUS, T. Vetting Schools  
BD No.400, 1978 June 16, p.27
- MALPASS, P.N. Professionalism and the Role of Architects in Local Authority Housing  
RIBAJ, 82, June 1975
- MARSHALL, T.H. The Recent History of Professionalism in Relation to Social Structure and Social Policy in MARSHALL, T.H. Sociology at the Crossroads and Other Essays  
(1968) pp.150-170
- MARTIN, L. Sir An Architects Approach to Architecture  
RIBAJ, January 1967

- MARTIN, L. Sir Conference on Architectural Education  
RIBA J, June 1958, p.279
- MUSGROVE, J and  
HUNT, S. Schools of Architecture and the  
Profession  
AJ Vol.167, No.24, June 14 1978,  
pp.1153-1158
- MIDDLETON, R. The Beaux Arts:  
Lectures in Conference on the Ecole  
des Beaux Arts, Architectural Associat  
Architectural Design XLVIII, Nos.11-12  
1978
- MACMORRAN, D.H. Report of the Architectural Education  
Joint Committee on the Training and  
Qualifications for Associate  
Membership of the RIBA  
RIBA J, February 1955, p.156-64
- NEWBERRY, F.H. On the Training of Architectural  
Students  
(Glasgow, 1887)
- PIE, B. Some Thoughts on the Modern School  
of Architecture  
(RIBA, 1900)
- PORT, M.H. The Office of Works and Early 19th  
Century Building Contracts  
English Historical Review - 2nd Series  
Vol.XX, 1967
- PEARCE, D. and  
WISE, D. The Marking of an Architect  
RIBA J Vol.85, No.3, March 1978,  
pp.79-80
- PAPWORTH, J.W. A Diploma in Architecture (1855)
- PRIOR, E.S. The Education of the Architect  
(London n.d.)
- RICHARDSON, A.E. Papers Read at the Architectural  
Teachers Conference  
RIBA J, September 1951, pp.430-5  
The Place and Practice of the  
History and Theory of Architecture  
in the Curriculum  
RIBA J, September 1951
- RITTER, P Architectural Education: A New  
Approach  
AJ November 22 1956, pp.738-42
- ROBERTS, J.M. Short Hints to the Student in  
Architecture  
(RIBA Archives, London 1852)

- ROBBINS, Lord Higher Education: Report of the Committee on Higher Education (HMSO, London 1963)
- RIBA International Congress on Architectural Education Proceedings, 1925
- The Future Pattern of Architectural Education: a paper for the Joint Meeting of the RIBA and the UGC, 1 March 1965
- Papers on Architectural Education - RIBA Library Reserve Collection
- Report of the Special Committee on Architectural Education  
RIBAJ, September 1946, pp.504-6
- Comments on the RIBA Education Report  
RIBAJ, May 1947, p.389
- Report of the RIBA Committee on Artistic Architectural Education  
The Builder XXVII, p.404
- RIBA General Conference of Architects  
The Builder LII, 1887
- RUSKIN, J An Enquiry into some of the conditions at present affecting the Study of Architecture in Our Schools (RIBA) 1865
- SCOTT, G.G. Thoughts and Suggestions on the Artistic Education of Architects (Architectural Association Archives for 1864)
- SLATER, J A Note on Architectural Education (RIBA Pamphlet, 1891)
- SIMPSON, F.M. The Scheme of Architectural Education started at University College Liverpool (Liverpool University Press pamphlet, 1895)
- Architectural Education and a School of Architecture  
The Builder LXXI, p.539
- SIMPSON, J.W. The Art of Architecture and the Profession of the Architect RIBAJ XX, pp.673-6
- Statutory Registration of Architects: Report and Recommendations of the Council  
RIBAJ XXI, pp.80-92



- SUMMERSON, J                    Bread-and-Butter Architecture  
Architect and Building News,  
25 December 1942, pp.193-5
- TITE, W.                         The Apprenticeship System  
RIBA Sessional Papers, 1855-6  
An address delivered at the first  
meeting of the RIBA in the new  
rooms in Conduit Street, on  
Monday November 7 1859  
(RIBA Pamphlet, 1859)
- WEBB, M.E.                    The First International Congress  
on Architectural Education  
RIBAJ, August 16 1924, pp.585-6
- WHITE, W.H.                   The Past, Present and Future of  
the Architectural Profession  
(London, 1885) RIBA Pamphlets