The method of teaching which approaches most nearly the method of investigation is incomparably the best, since, not content with serving up a few barren and lifeless truths, it leads to the stock out of which they grew.

(Burke)
"We built a structural plastic roof -- no steel, wood, or concrete -- that has a clear span of 38 feet. A few years ago, the only plastic item with which I was familiar was my comb."
ON PEOPLE AND THINGS

A speech given to the students and faculty of the Department of Architecture, Rice University, September 12, 1961.
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ON PEOPLE AND THINGS

Here is my Commencement Address. Wrong time of year? No sir! Just right. Commencement means beginning. As the new chairman of the Department of Architecture at Rice University, I am a commencer, just as you freshmen are commencers.

Actually none of us are really complete commencers -- either in architecture or the teaching of architecture. Certainly I am not a beginner in this education business, nor the architecture business. The two go together. During the 15 years of our firm's existence, we have spent thousands of hours each year, and many more dollars, trying to educate ourselves and our associates to become better professionals. My partner, Wallie Scott, often has said that CRS is a non-profit educational institution. You first year men and women are not "commencers" either in the true sense of the word. Architectural education does not begin at Rice University, nor will it end here. Though you may have decided to take architecture only recently, you have been preparing yourselves to be architects from the day you first made designs in your pablum. You were preparing yourselves to be architects when you picked up Oliver Twist and set it down with a deeper social consciousness. You came a little closer to architecture when you read Origin of the Species because you came a little closer to science, which is closely related to architecture. I would go so far as to say that the year you spent in high school playing
third chair-trumpet, you were learning the language of architecture. Satchmo Armstrong with his creative spontaneity could have played a mean architecture, if he had decided to be that kind of a cool cat. Yes, the education of an architect is endless. It started long before you came to Rice and will continue long after you leave.

I am new here -- this might present a question to some of you. What am I going to do? Frankly I can't tell you now because I don't know, but I can tell you what I think about people and things as they relate to the education of the architect. This will give you a clue about what I shall do in my capacity as chairman of the department. By this time next year I may have altered my views (that is a happy habit of mine), but this is the way I see things now:

ON THE WORLD SITUATION

Your taking architecture at this time is paradoxical.

You came to Rice to learn to build, to help make this world a more beautiful and efficient place in which to work, play, and worship. For what? to have the results of your endeavors destroyed by some maniac who only needs to push a button?

American people, want it or not, must assume world leader-
ship for other free peoples. Want it or not, it may mean that we must fight to be free, and to fight is to destroy. I saw Nagasaki shortly after we dropped the A-bomb. I saw architecture in accelerated reverse -- devastation. I certainly can understand the seriousness of the world situation.

Yet for the life of me, I cannot be pessimistic about the future. I think the future is yours. Why would I be at Rice today to try to help prepare young people for the future if I thought there would be no future? If I really believed that war was imminent, I would be back at the office this very minute designing myself a nice spatial fallout box to crate my family for shipment to the post-bombed world. But I came to Rice to educate a few people who might help make the world a better place.

Recently my wife and I took a trip around the world. I learned a big lesson: as a person travels around the world, if he starts out in one direction and keeps going far enough, he winds up where he started -- broke! My pockets came back empty, but my head and heart were chock-full of social consciousness. I came to realize that we must stop trying to build fences around the United States and start acting
more neighborly. I learned that color blindness is an asset. I learned, too, the value and the price of freedom. The 'round-the-world trip reminded me how Americans fought to improve things; how we traveled the oceans for religious freedom; how we fought for food in the wilderness; for clean homes; for the right to vote; for educational opportunity. I know now that our neighbors throughout the world, whether they worship Jesus Christ, Buddha, or Lord Krishna, will all fight for their rights, just as we did, in order to live with decency and dignity.

I stayed in India long enough to start a new plant for the American International School in New Delhi. This school is only for a select few. But what about the children whose parents are not the elite? India needs 200,000 schools. Who will build them? India? She is swimming in poverty and all she can do is barely keep her head above the water. Who then will help? Russia? Red China? The United States? Help must go beyond monetary aid. These people and other impoverished people throughout the world need technical help -- the kind architects can give them. Our professional responsibilities are world-wide.

During the Rice Inauguration in 1912, Dr. George Cary Comstock, from the University of Wisconsin, spoke of these
Here are two ideas that I would bring before you: that the institution in whose home we meet today has before it an extraordinary opportunity to serve humanity as one of its nerve-centers, and that it will be a stimulus to youth summoned hither from an area far wider than the prairies of Texas and placed under the influence of men awake to the needs and tendencies of the times and capable of giving will and heart to service that shall be as thorough and competent as it is devoted.

Richard Neutra in *Survival through Design* had an answer for some of the world problems in his book. Let me quote:

He (man) is a tinkerer. He tinkers with his habitat, while other animals hold peace with it...Man may perish by his own explosive and insidious inventions.

Neutra goes on to say (and here is the main point):

If he is to survive at all, it cannot be through slow adjustment. It will have to be through design more subtly considered and circumspect through more cautious planning in advance.

Survival through design -- a most stimulating concept! How wonderful to have our world designed for people to live free from filth and poverty and free from fear -- to trust their neighbors on the other side of the fence, tracks, or ocean. The scope of design is as broad as the world. Remember, design is the business of the architect. I would like to see Rice University become a fountainhead for fresh thinking and new architectural concepts that will make the world better.
ON THE UNIVERSITY

Rice is probably one of the most architecture-conscious universities in the Nation. Dr. Edgar Odell Lovett, the first president, in his Inaugural Address (1912) stated that the trustees had "no lower ambition than to establish on the campus of the Institute a group of buildings conspicuous alike for their beauty and for their utility." He went on to say that the trustees, as far back as 1891, believed that "the new institute should be housed in noble architecture worthy of the founder's high aim." They wanted the Rice buildings to be a "distinct contribution to the architecture of our country." Many argue that architect Ralph Adam Cram and his successors might not have achieved those lofty aims for some of the individual buildings, but no one can question the fact that the Rice campus has a spirit that enables the buildings to "dwell together in unity." It is a wonderful, inspiring place.

I suppose all of you know that the Department of Architecture at Rice was one of the four first departments organized at Rice. A five year course was offered based on a broad liberal arts background, not for "draftsmanship alone, but all courses should conspire to cultivation and constructive ability in
expression and design."

What do the present Rice officials think about our department and its future? Both Dean William H. Masterson and Chancellor Carey Croneis assured me before I accepted the leadership of the department that they would back us up in the building of a topflight school. So far they have, and with enthusiasm. Our new president, Dr. Kenneth S. Pitzer, is behind us, too. His letter to me, dated July 31, states, "I hope to see the Rice program in architecture develop to one of the very highest quality with respect to influence on academic architecture nationally and internationally." The Board of Trustees gave a vote of confidence on July 26 when it approved a generous appropriation which enables us to do the things that need to be done.

Next year we shall celebrate our 50th Anniversary as a Department of Architecture. It will be fun to look back, but more fun to look forward. I am more impressed with our potential than our past, glorious as it may be. Rice has the makings of a great school of architecture. We have the university officials behind us. It is now up to us.
ON BROAD AIMS

Since my appointment at Rice, I have been asked this question over and over: What are your plans? The answer is obvious: to develop better architects. To do this, the Department of Architecture, at Rice University, will have to be one of the topflight architectural schools in the Nation. This can be done. Some of the finest young people come to Rice. Houston is a good location for a great school of architecture.

The Southwest needs competent architectural leadership for it to grow and prosper. For that matter, the entire nation has need for more competent, dedicated architects to stem the trend towards fresh-made slums. Our job is clear: give young men and women the best possible training to make them capable of doing a better job than the architects of today. That is the long range picture.

What are the first steps? First, I must get to know the faculty and the students intimately. Then I must make a thorough examination and evaluation of the present curriculum. I hope to accomplish these elementary steps during the next few months.
President Lovett said, "The university has to do with the preservation of knowledge, with the discovery and distribution of knowledge, and with the making of knowledge-makers." I use this as my text for my broad aims: to teach architecture, to create concepts conducive to better architecture, to the application of these concepts by practitioners, and to produce more creative architects. We want our graduates to be "knowledge-makers" and "form-makers." If our great profession is to flourish, it must fulfill its obligation to society by developing the leadership to give this world a more beautiful, efficient physical environment. Such is our challenge at Rice.

ON THE SOUTHWEST

The Southwest, because of its tremendous potential, will have an increasing need for highly trained, deep thinking young men and women who can practice the art of architecture creatively, skillfully and intelligently. When young people of this caliber are produced by Rice and other institutions, our Southwest will start clearing out its slums, potential slums and other man-made garbage and start building a truly liveable region.
The Southwest (and South) cannot brag too much about its architecture. The early settlers did a far better job of producing an architecture indigenous to our region than present day architects. John Burchard and Albert Bush-Brown in their new book, *The Architecture of America*, listed only a few buildings in the Southwest and South (by only three Texas architects) that were worthy enough to be mentioned as examples of significant architecture. The list included a great many outstanding examples in the East, the Middle West and the West Coast, but only five in the Southwest. Frankly what we need are more architects in this region who can excel in their art.

What we will have in the Southwest tomorrow will depend on what we can give it today. I would like to see Rice give this region, and the world, the finest-trained and most competent architectural leaders.

**ON CURRICULUM**

Here at Rice we have a new kind of curriculum for teaching architecture. I recall the traumatic period in the early development of this program. It all started about four years ago while I was living in New York trying to establish an eastern office
for our firm. My good friend, Don Barthelme, a truly creative and probing personality, sent me reams of material which put on paper some of the deep thoughts springing from the preparation of this new curriculum.

At the time I was simply amazed at the seriousness and thoroughness of the Rice group in trying to find a better answer to architectural education. Of course, I had no idea that I would inherit the problem.

I am glad I have. It is vital and basic, but the proof of the pudding is in the eating. And I may have to eat it before I am through. We are going to do our best to make it work, realizing that, because of its experimental nature, it must have continual evaluation and be modified accordingly. Education, experimental or not, is dynamic. Changes are inevitable.

I have a lot to learn about our curriculum. Anything that Barthelme has had a hand in producing goes deep. On the surface I see these directives:

1. The curriculum calls for an integrated subject matter program.
2. It requires team teaching.
3. Interwoven in the fabric of the program as threads of the warf are theory and philosophy, design, communication, structures, and practice. The woof of the fabric consists of student problems that build up progressively in scope, concepts, and complexities as the student becomes more adept in his skills and has gained more insight in theoretical endeavors.

I have had considerable exposure to these educational concepts, but only one at a time. Twenty-three years ago I was involved in an integrated subject matter course. After three years of floundering, our staff abandoned the plan because it didn't work. Why? There were not enough super-teachers (Caudill not excluded) who could teach a variety of subjects such as design, plumbing, color theory, specifications, eyeballed perspectives, or what have you. This does not mean we can't make the integrated subject matter program work for us here. Education has come a long way in 23 years. For one thing, we now have the teaching team to help solve the problem. I am convinced that a first class teacher can handle the core or integrated subject with a high degree of effectiveness if he is backed by a strong team of specialists.
Before the school year is over, we shall be in a better position to see if our new curriculum works the way it should. It will depend largely upon how effective the old and new members of our staff can work together as a smoothly operating team.

**ON FACILITIES**

It takes space to teach architecture, and lots of it. But it doesn't have to be fancy. As I see it, we need two kinds of space: first, an unfinished, convertible space that the student can adapt from year to year; second, a highly finished, skillfully designed, permanent space that represents a high quality of interior design.

We need to have large, rough, uninterrupted barn-like spaces so the students can design and modify their own work-area to fit their current needs and desires. The human values of architecture relate closely to ownership. The best environment for the learner belongs to the learner.

It is my contention that in addition to the unfinished, easily converted space, we need finished "islands" that represent design at its best, because students should have the opportunity
of working in and feeling the crux of skillfully designed spaces. These "islands" might well be the highly specialized spaces (exhibition halls, lounges, audio-visual rooms and the library) which need not be changed from year to year.

At Rice we are short on space. We need a larger library, seminar rooms, small conference rooms, a lecture hall that will facilitate audio-visual education, and an exhibition hall for juries and large group criticisms. We also need wall space for students to hang their sketches and studies -- for evaluation and for atmosphere. Nothing to me is as dead as a bare drafting room. The University has promised us a substantial increase in floor area at the start of the second semester. It is a big step forward, but we shall still be short.

But more space won't solve our problems, but it will help. Too often teachers and students use the lack of space as an excuse, "If we had a new building, we would really go places." It does not take a new building to get moving.

A good number of years ago our firm was officed in very low quality space over the Southside Grocery in College Station. It was pretty bad, but as I look back on those years, I realize that despite the poor environment, we produced some creative,
beautiful buildings. But we had to move...the butcher kept getting our mail!

ON TEACHERS AND TECHNOLOGY

Today the teacher of architecture, if he is completely honest, must admit he knows not where he is going. Technology is moving so fast it is even difficult to know where he has been. But the teacher is not alone. The practicing architect doesn't know where he is going either, take it from me. In fact he hardly knows where he is. But is this bad? Here is the excitement of architecture!

This excitement reminds me of flying my little Aircoupe around a giant, towering cumulus. It is a magnificent sight, but you better not get sucked into it, or you will be so confused you won't know whether you are going up or down. There are a great many teachers and practitioners who have been engulfed in the stormy cloud of confusion and are in a state of architectural vertigo. When a person stays out of the cloud of confusion, the view is thrilling.

The materials and techniques we have at our disposal because of the rapid advance of technology are simply amazing.
This past decade has revolutionized the building industry, and CRS has tried to keep the pace.

1. We built a concrete roof on the ground and raised it up in the air by means of hydraulic jacks, and we saved a pot of money by eliminating forms and shoring.

2. We built a gymnasium, 125 feet across, and set it on only four legs.

3. We constructed a building on the Gulf Coast which controls the fresh, cool breeze by completely reversing its direction so that it cools the occupants of the rooms on the leeward side.

4. We built an interior partition that lets the air through but keeps the sound out.

5. We have designed buildings that do not depend on Mother Nature for visual and thermal comforts.

6. We built what the FORUM said was the first building designed for air conditioning, not the first air conditioned building -- there is a difference.

7. We built a structural plastic roof -- no steel, wood, or concrete -- that has a clear span of 38 feet. A few years ago, the only plastic item with which I was familiar was my comb.
Since this is only a partial listing of the things accomplished by one relatively small firm in the past ten years, I can hardly wait to find out what architects can do with the many wonderful things technology will give us in the next ten years.

It is impossible for teachers to keep up with all of the new materials and techniques of building. But that isn't necessary. My professors had no knowledge of lift slabs, of structural plastic, or of airflow around buildings, but they did teach me the design approach -- solving problems creatively and artistically with the materials at hand. It is the approach that counts -- not faddish solutions, glamorous new materials, or popular but vestigial forms. I would rather be caught stealing an old fashioned approach than be seen at the bottom of the cliché barrel.

I have hanging in my office two drawings -- one is a design problem I did when I was a sophomore at Oklahoma State University; the other, a design sketch of a recent CRS project. The contrast is unbelievable. The two architectures are not on speaking terms. They belong to different centuries, and I am not that old. When visitors come through my office, I point to the two drawings and say, "This is the way I was taught; this is the way I practice." My, but my profs must have been
stupid and short-sighted, teaching me to do all that stuff! But were they? How could they have known what architecture would be like two or three decades in the future? Yet today a good number of their former students are doing some top-notch, up-to-date architecture. Our teachers of today have no better vision of the future, but if they teach approach instead of forms and fads, they will be on safe ground.

What about the teaching staff at Rice? I will be frank. I doubt if we have any great teachers. We do have some good ones, maybe potentially great, if they really put out for the next few years. I suppose we have some weak ones, or so I am told. If this is true, they must improve so we can have a topflight teaching team at Rice. I am going to give everyone on the staff a chance to prove himself while I try to prove myself. And students, don't forget your teachers know a lot more than you do. Get from them all you can.

To the new students at Rice I want to add this: as you become better acquainted with our faculty, you will find a great diversity in architectural theology. Some profs will point to Mies as the Messiah, others will tell you Wright is right, and still others will tell you that Corbu is for you. Some will stress an organic architecture based on highly original concepts,
while others will stress refinement. This may be confusing at first, but it is healthful. I am glad we have diversity of thought among our teachers.

There is great strength in diversity. The student should be exposed to many points of view before he crystallizes his own thoughts (pray that never happens). Yes, as Gropius would say, "There is unity in diversity." No, I am not necessarily on a Gropius band wagon, but I love to listen to the music. I like his concept of the team, particularly as it applies to teaching. We need a smooth-working, effective teaching team. Give us a little time, and we shall have one.

You are now in the profession. Talk things over with your colleagues. Did you know that there is nearly as much learning taking place between one student and another as between teacher and student? Remember that when you get mad at your prof (And who doesn't at times?), get a classmate to criticize your work. Bounce some ideas off his noodle. Your fellow students make good teachers, too.

ON THE TEAM CONCEPT

Since the announcement of my appointment as chairman of the
Department of Architecture, Rice University, I have been
bombarded with questions as:

Are you going to fire all the staff?
Are you going to give the students hell?
Are you going to move out of Anderson Hall?
Will you abandon the present program that Barthelme started?
Will you specialize in school architecture?

Questions of this type are nice and easy to answer. It takes
just one word -- NO!

However, there is one question that makes me hedge a bit.
It is this: Will you apply the team concept, which character-
izes your firm, to the situation at Rice?

The concept of team dynamics is hard to explain. Many people
think of team action in architecture or in the teaching of archi-
tecture as individuals of a committee voting on the basis of
their prejudices. They back up their argument against commit-
tees with, "A committee could never have written one of Bach's
fugues or one of Beethoven's symphonies." That is true, but
this is also true: Most creative people need the stimulation
of other people. I know of many fine designers who have dried
up on the vine after they left school because they had no one
to spark them, to challenge them, to stretch their imaginations,
to criticize them and to give them feedbacks. Group dynamics, team action, or whatever you wish to call it, to me means that creative people of many interests get together and through discussion stimulate each other to do a better job than they could do individually. Through the team, decisions and actions are enriched by the knowledge, insights, and imaginations of various individuals. The creed of the "team man" in contrast to the "lone wolf" is that the former believes, "Together we can do a better job than we can separately.", while the latter says, "Leave me alone. I can do it better by myself."

My firm is committed to the team concept. When CRS first started, each partner was set on being another Wright, Le Corbu, Mies, or some other prima donna. I will not divulge the name of my dreamboat, but in those days I had often thought of wearing a cape. It did not take us long to find out the fallacies of these aims. In the first place, none of us had the stuff with which to make prima donnas of ourselves; in the second place, we concluded that the day of the prima donna was long gone and that this was the day of the team -- a group of topflight specialists working together in a dynamic group process.

Throughout our years of practice we have found that for us professional growth comes about more quickly through group action,
provided the individual is challenged and stimulated. We know from experience -- our experience -- that if we are going to have a great team, we must have some All Americans because the individual comes first, the team second. We know that many CRS people have stretched their capabilities by team action. We also know the opposite has happened for a few. These people have used the team as a crutch. In our case, however, the pros out weigh the cons, and we like the team -- it works best for us.

I know the team is wrong for some architects. The highly individualistic architects have and are making great contributions to architecture, and they simply cannot work on a team. They manage to get along magnificently, and I love them for it.

Therefore, despite the fact I strongly believe in the team concept for my firm, I think it would be quite foolish for us at Rice to educate our people for the team only. We want individualism to flourish -- team or no team. Our job is to teach the individual, not the group. It is the individual that counts, and he should be able to develop to his fullest capacity and not be held down by the group. Our concern must now and always be for the individual student.
One must remember though that the student is one thing, the teaching staff is something else. Because of the present program, we are committed to the team concept. The individual members of the teaching staff must work together as a smoothly operating team, line-backing each other and respecting the others' opinions, although they be diametrically opposed. But the team is composed of individual teachers, and individualism should not be stifled. We can do a better job of teaching architecture under the present program if we have a staff consisting of highly developed individuals working together in efficient teamwork. Working for whom? Not for me, for sure! Working for the red-headed student in the third year from Tomball who is convinced he is going to be an architect, and a darn good one.

ON LEARNING TO BE AN ARCHITECT

Architecture is an art. If a person wants to learn to be a skillful, competent architect, he must proceed the same way as to learn any other art, such as tennis, painting, surgery, or music.

How do you learn the art of music? Say, play the clarinet? The process can be divided into two parts -- the mastery of the theory and the mastery of the practice.
If you want to be a really proficient "licorice stick" player, you must first know the facts about the clarinet, about its large range, about its harmony, about its major role in orchestral and band arrangements, and its uniqueness in modern composition, about the historical aspects of its usage in the classics, about great composers and ad infinitum. But after you have acquired all this theoretical knowledge, you are by no means competent in the field of music. For one reason, you still can't play the clarinet!

I know many architects, young and old, who have mastered the theory but not the practice of architecture. They are highly trained architectural verbalists. They can talk a good architecture, but cannot produce it.

What we need is not only mastery of the theory of architecture, but also mastery of the practice of architecture.

The student of architecture can become a master of his art only after hour upon hour of practice in the design lab and in the practitioner's office -- not talking, doing!

According to Dr. Erich Fromm, eventually theory and practice are synthesized into intuition, "the essence of the mastery
of any art." * This point in development is the change from student to architect, but this does not necessarily coincide with legal recognition as a licensed practitioner. Once the student has mastered the theory and practice and possesses the power of knowing and doing without recourse to inference or reasoning, he becomes an architect — license or no license.

Learning the theory and practice and acquiring intuition goes a long way, but not far enough. These three factors must be backed with desire. To master any art, there must be nothing else in the world more important than the art. This is true for music, for medicine, or for a sport. Most certainly, desire is absolutely necessary to achieve mastery in architecture.

ON PEDAGOGY

There are many philosophies of what a school of architecture should be. And they don't agree. There are many opinions as to how an agreed upon subject should be taught, thus more disagreement. Most of us are probably wrong, but we are vocal. Let me sound off my opinions:

* Fromm, Dr. Erich, The Art of Loving.
1. I believe in teaching the individual, not the class.

2. I believe that a great teacher must have a deep understanding of his subject matter, but he must like to teach and like people, particularly his students.

3. I believe that learning occurs everywhere and not just in the classroom or lab.

4. I believe that there are certain learning experiences that can be done best in large groups, others in small groups, others with only teacher and student involved, or student and student, and still others by the student himself with a book, a recording, a picture, a teaching machine, or what-have-you.

5. I believe that bells that stop the learning process on the hour are nuisances.

6. I believe that design cannot start too soon nor continue too long. It is too late to learn to play the clarinet well after having spent four years earning a Bachelor of Fine Arts in music.
7. I believe a high I.Q. is not the sole yardstick for judging a potential architect. Motivation can't be measured, but it counts even more. Give me a not-so-smart but industrious student over a smart, lazy student any day. He will turn out to be a better architect.

8. I believe that the architectural student must face the fact that more time is needed to prepare himself than if he were in another profession. This is particularly true if he masters the art of design.

9. I believe that architecture is here to stay, but not in its present form.

10. I believe in people over methods.

Everyone with whom I talk tells me my new job is a tough one. Running a school of architecture, whether at Rice U. or Rangoon U., is most difficult, to be sure. No one seems to agree on what should be taught nor how to teach it. At this time my mind is open, so my first year will be relatively easy. My second year will be the tough one, because then I shall have started formulating strong opinions of my own -- right or wrong. Then
the action -- and resistance.

Frankly I don't worry much about the conflicting ideologies of architecture and its confused pedagogy. My greatest concerns now are how we can capitalize on the uniqueness of Rice University and what can I offer it. The following questions need answers:

1. Rice is small, but a strong institution for higher learning. It is a private school and enjoys freedom from outside political pressure and red tape. What can we do at Rice that could not be done at Texas University or Louisiana State? How can we make smallness goodness?

2. Every student who comes to Rice comes on a scholarship (about $1500). There is an extremely select student body, certainly different from most state schools. How can we capitalize on this selectivity?

3. I was brought to Rice to help build up the Department of Architecture, primarily because the Administration was convinced that a hard-nosed practitioner was needed to do the job. I am a highly competitive practitioner and I am proud of it. I plan to keep on practicing. If I help turnout good architects, it will not be because I
am a good sketcher or that I can be entertaining when I give a speech. It will be because I am an architect. I think I have a better chance of standing on solid ground if I have one foot in the office and one foot in the classroom, provided I don't do the splits. As a practitioner, I hope I can help the students develop professional maturity by blending scholarship and theory with practice. But how? That is the question I must answer myself.

4. The present program calls for the training of leaders. When Don Barthelme spoke at the A.C.S.A.-A.I.A. Seminar at Sagamore, he said, "It appeared reasonable to expect those who graduated from Rice to become leaders in the profession." Sounds logical. But how does one go about making a leader (an "Architectural Statesman," as A.I.A. President Phil Will puts it)? Should we load the student with courses in sociology? anthropology? philosophy? psychology? business administration? political science? and all the other "ologies" in the subject matter compartments that make up the whole structure of education? Sounds good! But when do we teach the student the saleable skills enabling him to earn a living until he becomes a leader?
The education of an architect will continue to be the subject of heated debates for years to come. Unfortunately we shall continually be jarred by jargon, simonized by semantics and messmerized by the mouthings of self-claimed messiahs, and we shall be just as confused tomorrow as we are today -- unless we stop talking and start doing.