

https://dspace.org/

South African Architectural Record: Journal of the Transvaal, Natal and Orange Free State Provincial Institutes of South African Architects and the Chapter of South African Quantity Surveyors

1937

Institutes of South African Architects and the Chapter of South African Quantity Surveyors

http://hdl.handle.net/10539/18844

South African Architectural Record; Journal of the Transvaal, Natal and Orange Free State Provincial Institutes of South African Architects and the Chapter of South African Quantity Surveyors. vol 22:1-12 p 1-544

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

● Cover. The Tower of Light

3 The Year in Review

6 The Congress

15 Architectural Education

25 Our Building Contract

34 Architectural Publicity and Propaganda

43 Professional Co-operation

46 Franklin Kaye Kendall

50 Professional Notes and News

Hon. Editors Professor G. E. Pearse
Rex Martienssen

Secretary A. S. Pearse

The editors will be glad to consider any mss. photographs or sketches submitted to them, but they should be accompanied by stamped addressed envelopes for return if unsuitable. In case of loss or injury they cannot hold themselves responsible for mss. photographs or sketches, and publication in the Journal can alone be taken as evidence of acceptance. The name and address of the owner should be placed on the back of all pictures and mss. The Institute does not hold itself responsible for the opinions expressed by contributors.

Annual subscription per post £1 - 1 - 0 direct from the Secretary.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN ARCHITECTURAL RECORD

The Journal of the Transvaal, Natal and Orange Free State Provincial Institutes of South African Architects and the Chapter of South African Quantity Surveyors.

5, Kelvin House, 100 Fox Street, Johannesburg. Telephone 33—1936.

Volume Twenty ~~One~~ Two Number ~~One~~ One, January Nineteen Hundred and Thirty Seven



The Empire Exhibition at Night

photo, J. L. Smith

THE YEAR IN REVIEW

The past year has not been particularly eventful as far as the professions of architecture and quantity surveying are concerned.

Considerable controversy took place, earlier in the year, over certain articles which were published in this journal. These articles, which were strongly resented by members of the Central Council, voiced the opinions of a large section of the profession not only in the Transvaal but also at the Cape. We were surprised to find that some of the statements made were misinterpreted by certain members of the profession.

In referring to malpractices, it was remarked that an unscrupulous architect could obtain a plan from a municipality and use it to his own advantage. This was taken as a reflection on municipal officials, and strong exception, we are informed, was taken to it by members of one of our allied professions. It is unfortunate that such an interpretation should have been given to the statement, but we are glad to know that our architectural colleagues in some of the leading municipalities did not place this interpretation upon it.

On making enquiries in various centres, we find that it is possible for an architect to obtain a plan from a municipality without reference to the author of the plan, and we appeal again to the Central Council to endeavour to prevent what, in our opinion, constitutes a malpractice.

No important competitions were held during the year, and we feel that this is largely due to apathy on the part of the profession in not urging Government and municipal authorities to give members, and particularly the younger members, of the profession, further opportunities to compete for the large public works which are being undertaken.

It is realised that recent competitions have not been altogether satisfactory in their results, both from the competitors' and promoters' points of view, and it is felt that something should be done to overcome these difficulties.

The Minister of Public Works has stated that the building programme of the Government amounts to something like £5,000,000, and that his Department has the greatest difficulty in carrying it out. It has also been stated by the Mayor of Johannesburg that their yearly programme amounts to some £200,000.

Surely an effort could be made to distribute some of this work amongst practitioners. It has been stated by the Minister that prominent firms have not entered for the competitions which have been held, but has anyone asked the reason why?

There is little or no doubt that the principle of having a single assessor is all wrong, and the profession should voice its views on the subject in no uncertain manner.

It is unfortunate that statements with regard to competitions and derogatory to the profession should be made in the public Press and not be challenged.

The town planning movement has taken a great step forward in the Transvaal during the past year, and the preliminary report under the Transvaal Ordinance, which was fully published in our October issue, reflects the highest credit on all those concerned.

This movement, which was largely due to the architectural profession, will no doubt have its influence on the other provinces in the Union. It is regrettable that a certain amount of opposition to the report should have come from members of the profession, which indicates a lack of that spirit of co-operation which we had hoped to achieve with the passing of the Act.

The Empire Exhibition, which was held in Johannesburg during the latter part of the year, was a wonderful advertisement to the city, which was celebrating its fiftieth anniversary.

The setting and the gardens were a remarkable achievement, but architecturally the Exhibition was a heterogeneous collection of buildings lacking in harmony or unity.

This is a pity, as an architectural competition was held for the project, but either the promoters or the assessors were to blame for not seeing it through. It seems strange that most British exhibitions fail from an architectural point of view when compared with those held on the Continent or in America.

The Fine Art section at the Exhibition created considerable interest, being visited by some thirty to forty thousand members of the public, but the architectural portion was particularly weak and not by any means representative of the Union.

The second Union Architectural Congress was held in November, and is reported in this issue. It could hardly be called a success, but this is probably due to the shortness of notice and lack of interest displayed by members of the profession.

One cannot help feeling as a result that we have still a long way to go before we can take our place amongst the learned professions.

Little or no interest was taken in the papers which were contributed, and two of the most important were hurriedly dealt with on the morning of the last day. We refer to those contributed by Mr. C. P. Walgate, of Capetown, and Mr. Norman Eaton, of Pretoria.

Apart from these, no papers of scientific or literary value were presented, and little or no interest was displayed by the public Press in the proceedings.

It is high time that matters such as conditions of contract and professional fees, on which there appears little hope of reaching agreement, should be relegated to the respective provinces, and that the Central Council, whose delegates, as one member stated, represent the cream of the profession, should tackle the bigger issues which architecture presents, and which are ably outlined by Mr. Walgate in his paper.

The building activity in Johannesburg continues at a remarkable rate, and architects appear to be hard put to it to obtain assistance. A somewhat serious matter is the large influx of architects and assistants from the Continent. Not that anyone grudges their coming and the opportunities which this country offers to them, but one notices that they are being admitted to membership shortly after their arrival, and that, in some cases, once admitted, they do not appear to worry very much about the affairs of the Institute or the ethics of the profession. It might be as well to consider adopting the same procedure on admission as that adopted by the R.I.B.A. or by certain leading professions in this country.

We take this opportunity of wishing all our readers and advertisers a prosperous New Year.

THE CONGRESS

The second Congress of the Institute of South African Architects was held in Johannesburg from Monday, November 23rd, to Thursday, November 26th, 1936.

The Congress was officially opened on Monday morning by the Mayor of Johannesburg, Mr. D. W. Mackay. Mr. H. J. Brownlee, President-in-Chief, presided, and with him on the plaftorm were Senator C. F. Clarkson, Minister of Public Works; Professor L. F. Maingard, Acting Principal of the University of the Witwatersrand; Mr. E. M. Powers, Vice-President-in-Chief; Mr. Robert Howden and Mr. J. S. Lewis, the Registrar.

Mr. Mackay, in the course of his speech, said that Johannesburg had already earned the title of the Golden City, but it was also becoming known as a city of beautiful buildings. The public of Johannesburg, and certainly the City of Johannesburg, took a keen civic pride in architecture. This pride and the fine development of South African architecture generally was, he thought, to a large extent directly traceable to the professional organisation embodied in the Institute of South African Architects and its Chapter of Quantity Surveyors.

Since the passing of the Architects' and Quantity Surveyors' Registration Act in 1927, a great fillip had been given to professional education, a matter with which the City Council of Johannesburg closely associated itself.

At the University of the Witwatersrand the number of students of architecture enrolled last year was 125. This was a very encouraging feature which could only react to the great benefit of the building industry and the city as a whole. Particularly would this be so when it was borne in mind that the present intense building activity was likely to continue for some years to come. It was a matter for sincere congratulation to know that South African university training in architecture was fully recognised by the Royal Institute of British Architects. The holders of the South African degrees in architecture immediately qualified for the much-prized initials "A.R.I.B.A." Similarly, with regard to quantity surveying, the degree in quantity surveying of the University of Pretoria had been fully recognised by the Chartered Surveyors' Institution of Great Britain.

The City Council had from time to time encouraged architecture, first, by throwing open to competition most of its large buildings, such as the City Hall and Municipal Offices, the Public Library and the Central Fire Station, while Sir Edwin

WITS UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
JC164033



The Main Avenue Empire Exhibition. photo : J. L. Smith

Lutyens was the architect for the Muncipal Art Gallery, Mr. R. Howden being his local representative. During its last financial year the Council let out to contract about £220,000 worth of building work, while during the 1932-3 depression every endeavour was made to maintain its building activities and so decrease employment in the building trade.

" One frequently hears," said the Mayor, " that the skyline of the city is rapidly changing, and it is interesting to note how rapidly this change is being effected. Since 1931 the annual value of the buildings approved has increased from three millions to $8\frac{3}{4}$ millions in the year 1935-36, while it may confidently be anticipated that during the present year the value of building plans approved will total ten million pounds."

The Government's difficulty in keeping pace with the demand for public buildings in South Africa was referred to by Senator C. F. Clarkson, Minister of Public Works.

He congratulated the Institute on the progress which it had made in professional association since it secured its charter in 1927. The full benefits of this forward step would be enjoyed



United Kingdom Pavilion. Empire Exhibition photo W.D.H.
Howard Robertson, Architect

by generations to come. Through the ages, from before the Christian era, fine buildings had been erected, and they remained as an inspiration to the architects of to-day.

The Public Works Department fully appreciated the importance of the architectural profession. Architects were hard put to-day to cope with the work on hand. The Government had the same experience and some of the public buildings which were sanctioned three years ago were only being started to-day.

No one had anticipated that the centre of Johannesburg would be altered in the short space of three years. In 1933 it was announced that Johannesburg would have a new magistrate's court. Actually the foundations had not yet been completed. The Government had an authorised building programme involving £5,000,000, but the buildings could not be completed according to schedule. Apart from the building programmes in regard to small centres, important works had been undertaken in all the large towns of the Union. He wished to pay a tribute to the municipalities of the cities and towns for their co-operation in



United Kingdom Pavilion. Empire Exhibition photo S.A.R.

enabling the Government to give the communities concerned buildings which they really deserved.

In Johannesburg, with the co-operation of the City Council, buildings were being demolished and open squares created, and future generations would bless the far-sightedness of the city fathers in making provision for open spaces. He hoped that the co-operation between the Public Works Department and the municipalities and good relationships between the department and the architects and quantity surveyors would continue to the benefit of all concerned. In carrying out its building programme, the Government had employed some twenty-five firms of quantity surveyors in different parts of the Union, and the Government proposed to continue with the practice of employing private firms. It would be wrong unduly to increase the strength of the department in this respect, for in the event of another depression there would be no work for too large a staff.

Criticism had been levelled against the Public Works Department concerning the quality of work which it insisted on having. Yet the buildings which private firms were erecting for

the public were not cheaper than those designed by the architects of the department. It was proper that the Government should set a high standard.

Professor L. F. Maingard, Acting-Principal of the University of the Witwatersrand, recalled the establishment of the Chair of Architecture at the University during the Principalship of Mr. J. H. Hofmeyr. The department started with three or four students and last year the enrolment had grown to 125. The Institute had on its register 73 students who had qualified at the University and the University was not yet turning out a sufficient number of students yearly for the demands of the profession.

Provision was made for students to develop along either an aesthetic or a structural basis. The University lay stress on the aesthetic side, so that there might be handed down to posterity those ideas of beauty which architects enshrined in their minds. But stress was also laid on the structural side. The profession was not merely one of aesthetic taste or structural training, but architects were also business men, and he would like to see in the syllabus a course of lectures on legal subjects.

The University provided the academic side to the best of its ability. The Act of 1927 was the Magna Charta of the profession and made it their duty to see that the professional side was not neglected.

He dwelt on the necessity for maintaining a close contact between the Institute and the two universities training architects, Witwatersrand and Capetown.

Mr. H. J. Brownlee delivered the address from the chair and made the following comments in regard to the Registration Act of 1927: " It is now nine years since we were called upon to move and have our being under the control of this Act, and although it falls short of what we looked for and expected, it is, on the whole, a very sound measure.

" Perhaps we desired too much. Possibly some of us expected to find in registration a panacea for all professional ailments, and some of us may have been inclined to look to it as a harbinger of a new era of professional prosperity. I think, however, it is commonly accepted that we are infinitely better off than we were before the Act came into force.

"I would like to point out, however, that when we approached Parliament with the Bill some nine years ago we were not a South African Institute, duly constituted, as we are to-day. We were but Provincial Institutes, acting in our separate capacities, but forming something in the nature of a federation, for the purpose of placing the common causes of architecture and quantity surveying before Parliament.

" Now, as a powerful Institute, grown to maturity and strengthened by years of useful experience, we are in a position to approach Parliament again, if and when the Central Council considers it desirable, to secure amendments, if necessary, to the Act.

" It is to be regretted that the Act, when it finally emerged from the legislators' hands, was shorn of one of its most vital provisions—namely Clause C (3)—which sought to debar non-registered persons from performing architectural work for remuneration. The professions and the public have alike suffered incalculable harm through the elimination of this clause. Unqualified and incompetent individuals are still allowed to disfigure our towns and suburban areas with monstrosities in the name of architecture, followed by the usual financial muddle.

" It must be apparent to everyone that the ' pirate ' architect, with his complete lack of knowledge in design, construction and quantity surveying, is a menace to the public weal. His work is ineffective and extravagant, devoid of aesthetic value, and invariably represents a liability and not an asset. His accomplices are the jerry builder and supplier of inferior materials. The pity of it is that his victims are generally humble home builders, the men who invest their all in striving to secure places to call their own. I do submit, with all the emphasis at my command, that it is against the common sense and the interests of the country as a whole to allow this kind of thing to go on indefinitely.

" The Provincial Institutes and the Central Council are brought into touch, almost daily, with instances of despairing owners applying for relief from the machinations of the ' pirate ' architect and the jerry builder. It can surely only be a matter of time until the Government will recognise the present state of affairs as being inimical to the best interests of the State and take such measures as may be deemed beneficial in this vital matter to the health and happiness of the public."

Mr. J. S. Lewis, Registrar of the Institute of South African Architects, in a comprehensive paper, reviewed the circumstances which led up to the passing of the Registration Act of 1927, and the progress of the Institute since its inception. He stressed the fact that architects, as a body, enjoyed no direct representation in Parliament, and mentioned some of the drawbacks suffered by the profession in view of the failure of Parliament to protect the practice as well as the title of architects.

The ensuing discussion centred mainly around the same points, and one member threw out the suggestion that it would be in the interests of the profession to foot the expenses bill of



Rock Gardens photo S.A.R.

any recognised architect who saw a chance of getting into Parliament. In regard to the Registration Act, it was pointed out that the famous Clause C (3) (which permits unregistered persons to draw and sell plans provided they do not call themselves architects) was shipwrecked mainly through the activities of the " Three Musketeers " in Parliament, that Parliament generally could be regarded as being sympathetic to the interests of the profession, and that the time was ripe to move for the amendment of the Act in the direction of protecting practice as well as title.

On Monday evening a banquet was held at the Empire Exhibition, at which the following toasts were proposed: " The Union of South Africa," by Mr. H. J. Brownlee, replied to by Mr. J. H. Hofmeyr, Minister of the Interior, Education and Public Health; " Art and Industry," by Mr. E. M. Powers, replied to by Dr. H. J. van der Byl, Chairman of the Electricity Supply Commission; " Our Guests," by Mr. Gerard Moerdyk, replied to by Mr. Frank Boustred, President of the Witwatersrand Master Builders' Association, and Mr. J. Fotheringham, Deputy-Mayor of Johannesburg.



Chamber of Mines Pavilion
K. E. F. Gardiner, Architect

photo W.D.H.

In replying to the toast of " The Union of South Africa," Mr. Hofmeyr said that he believed architecture had a threefold message for the nation at the present time.

We lived in an age, he continued, in which idealism was in retreat, in which spiritual factors were submerged by the rising tide of realism. The first thing worthy of note was that architecture arose from a spiritual impulse—man's effort to build a temple worthy of God. He would like to see present-day architecture wage a more spiritual warfare against despiritualising tendencies in engineering.

The second part of the message was that architecture had a great conception amidst adversity of purposes and factors. It had a unifying aim amidst diverse factors and operations. In South Africa there was no lack of diversity. These diversities of gifts operating in the country should be tolerated as long as they were moved by the same spirit. The third part of the message of architecture was that an architectural conception was realised slowly and laboriously.

" Think of the great South African artificers of our Constitution. They had a great conception of beauty, strength and unity. They set that grand common aim before the nations.

They made the plans. We have not yet completed the structure. Too often we, the craftsmen, have failed. In recent years there was a speeding up of activity, and the wheels moved with a quickened pace. But to-day there was again a reaction. The wreckers were again at work."

But, added Mr. Hofmeyr, the ideal still stood and could never be obliterated. Its realisation might sometimes be slow, but it was sure. The ideal of a united nation must not be lost sight of. By drinking to the toast, those present, he believed, pledged themselves not to forget the aim of the Constitution and not to rest satisfied until it was no longer a dream but an actuality.

Mr. H. J. Brownlee, who proposed the toast from the chair, said the Union of South Africa, going through the present period of prosperity, was admired and envied throughout the world. They, as architects, thought it would be a good thing to establish bursaries that would enable students to go and study overseas at the cradle of architecture. They also wished to be of public service and wished to be remembered by the one basic fact that they represented the professional side of the great building industry.

The first day's proceedings were held at Kelvin House, and thereafter in the Conference Room at the Empire Exhibition.

On Wednesday evening a civic reception and dance were held in the ballroom at the Empire Exhibition. This was attended by about fifteen hundred guests.

From a social point of view the Congress was very successful, but it is regrettable that the proceedings were so sparsely attended by members and that very little in the way of discussion was added to the papers which were presented. We publish below some of the more interesting papers contributed to the Congress.

We are indebted to the "Star" for the reports of the speeches.

ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION

By F. K. KENDALL, F.R.I.B.A.

These remarks do not attempt to dispose of the subject of architectural education, but merely to raise a few salient points for discussion.

I have been asked to make a comparison between the old time custom of pupilage with the more modern method of a University course. Which attains the better result? Which is more suited to modern conditions? Naturally, each has its advantages and disadvantages. In actual result I believe that in the most favourable circumstances the older method was superior. But the favourable circumstances demanded that the architect to whom the pupil was articled must be one of the shining lights of his day (Norman Shaw, Alfred Waterhouse, Ernest George, Aston Webb, etc.). Here a pupil would be induced or compelled to work hard, and to include in his studies such courses of instruction as were available at the Royal Academy, Architectural Association, King's or University College, probably a school of art on certain evenings of the week; while Saturday afternoons and most holidays would be spent in sketching and measuring. Frequent visits to buildings (in the course of erection and otherwise) and museums were also made. An intense keenness in all things architectural was then engendered—but it was not all in the pursuit of fine art. A taste of the bitter pills which form an inevitable part of an architect's diet would sometimes come his way. He would discover the existence of the parsimonious client who declined to pay for the proposed extra wing to his building, the irate builder who was still waiting for his details, and "what was the meaning of Clause G, Page 67, in the specification?"—and the hundred and one irritations which encumber the progress of almost any building—the administration of which forms a large part of a practitioner's life, but which are strangers to a University course. In the offices of any such as these, a pupil had very exceptional opportunities, and should certainly acquire an almost unique sense of taste and method which would go far to ensure his success in after life.

Objectors may readily claim that the traditions of such an office must be restricted to the predilections of that master, and therefore be somewhat biased—but it must be conceded that, even so, the traditions were not merely those of a well-established mind, but of a master mind which had fought its way through to eminence. Or if, may be, some personal peculiarity occurred which was open to criticism, this was capable of elimination by

the pupil in the development of his own methods—and was bound to be obvious if it should be in the least objectionable. There can be no question that frequent association with a master mind must result in the acquisition of something of its lustre—a priceless quality which nothing else can supply. I think that most, if not all, of the architects of recent generations who can write "R.A." after their names owe the foundation of their attainments to their early chiefs—who in their turn have been among the luminaries of their day.

A modern critic may rightly say: "All that may be perfectly true—but how many of these shining lights are there available, and how many pupils can each accommodate at a time, and what premium would he ask? There is the rub. The number of such luminaries must be very limited. Some of them do not want to be bothered with pupils at all—or will only take a very few; and the premiums they look for are perhaps beyond the reach of the majority. Thus the opportunities of the very best education are severely restricted. Pupilage among the lesser lights was a more doubtful quantity, and varied amazingly. This cannot be wondered at when we regard the heterogeneous types that are included in our profession. While a fair proportion personify some of the finest, most illustrious and high-minded of mortals, others—possibly in less fortunate circumstances—have little claim to our consideration

I think it must be patent to all of us that the profession as a whole is sadly lacking in homogeneity—to the extent that amongst practising architects there is divergence even as to the aim of an architect when setting about his work—is it art, science or pure business? The very target for one is so different from that of another. Moreover the many different types of modern buildings automatically breed different types of legitimate specialists within the ranks. The field is so wide that it is well nigh impossible to secure unanimity of opinion on some of the fundamental principles.

There can be no doubt whatever to my mind that the profession should be solidified. The R.I.B.A. as the leading society of the British race—has done giants' development work in this direction. It initiated the system of examinations and for many years the single qualifying voluntary examination held good. After a time three examinations (Preliminary, Intermediate and Final) were held contemporaneously, and by degrees substituted for this; but until a more compulsory Act can be passed through Parliament it still remains voluntary in Great Britain. We are a degree better off in the Union of South Africa where at least the title of architect is protected—but we certainly hope for a greater degree of protection in the near future.

In the meantime two of our Universities have instituted chairs of architecture, holding examinations which require equal —or slightly higher—qualifying standards than those of the R.I.B.A. By this means a fair number of students can be put through the five year course—thus meeting the democratic demand of the day more successfully on the whole than the older method of pupilage.

It is true that the University system has met with some recent criticism. I think this is not surprising, nor should we allow it to discourage us. The change over from the old system to the new—particularly in the case of a complicated syllabus covering so wide a field—is bound to take some time before anything like perfection can be reached, and criticism may be levelled from several different angles. It would seem that the natural tendency is for the directors to lay down a course on the lines of theory rather than practice, and we sometimes see evidence of this. The wonderful and varied opportunities of developing fanciful designs and draughtsmanship have much in their favour, but personally I am inclined to think that the castles are apt to be built too high in the air. As a practical matter in training, would it not be better to avoid such stupendous schemes in design and give more study to real working drawings, more thoroughly worked out and more thoroughly criticised? The schemes themselves are often on such a scale that examiners cannot even go through the names of all the parts of a building with due consideration, and their opinions are necessarily too general for the students to get more than a cursory criticism. The inevitable tendency of the system is for the student to regard the drawings as the end to be attained, whereas in the practice of architecture the drawings should be diagrams, the means only to the end which is the building itself. It has sometimes been remarked to me that the best designers are not necessarily the best draughtsmen. I know of some buildings erected from the most perfect drawings which leave very much to be desired in reality.

While it is a matter of some difficulty to get pupils to realise the practical as opposed to the theoretical, even in an architect's office, it is more difficult still to attain this in a University course, as the students cannot often be brought into personal contact with actual buildings except during that period spent in an office. They are told to be " practical," but they mostly become practical only in theory! I certainly think that every University course should keep in touch with the profession as closely as possible, taking every reasonable opportunity of outside collaboration.

While sketching and measuring are encouraged to some extent, I am inclined to think that this might further be emphasised with advantage, though naturally a new country does not offer the same advantage in this respect as an old one with many historic buildings.

Much has been said about modernism in architecture and the inducement to forget about classical proportions and traditional methods. To many it seems as if the very soul of beauty is being squeezed out of our great art. The tendency nowadays is for an architect to sacrifice his frozen music for a form of engineering. Machinery, mass production, new materials and patents have been showered upon us in an irresistible sort of air raid against which nothing is sacred. A new fashion has been created and, in the tottering state of the world to-day, has been largely accepted by a population hungry for new buildings. So ravenous, in fact, that the quickest possible form of construction is an easy winner from all other kinds.

While there is much to condemn in this wholesale iconoclasm, there is fortunately also much in its favour which makes for genuine progress. So long as we can improve on old methods we are justified in doing so. The fatal mistake is in assuming that every change from tradition is necessarily an advancement, and I would hold up a warning finger in particular to the rising generation to exercise their discrimination very warily. A revolution may carry all before it in the heat of the battle, but when results are counted in the cool deliberation of the morrow, it is found that much needless and wanton destruction has taken place which saner moments would never have permitted. Aesthetically speaking, I firmly believe that in a few years' time many of our most modern buildings will be the first to be regarded as obsolete monstrosities. Some materials and methods are untried—quite experimental—and will fail in the acid test of experience. It would be easy to enlarge on this question, but time does not here permit. The point I wish to emphasise, however, is that students should not be encouraged to run wild in this elusive field of modernism. They should not be allowed to think that " The Modernist " is a developed style. They must not think that all the " short cuts " it permits are going to serve them always. Any so-called architectural style in history has taken centuries to develop and, even allowing for a quicker moving world to-day, we must not pin our faith to mob law. It must be evolution, not revolution. No matter to what advanced stage modernism may be developed, an intimate knowledge of the styles of the past must remain the **A B C** of an accomplished architect's education.

I have read with great interest Professor Pearse's survey of the problem of education in various countries, in which he concludes that there is a considerable variation of outlook. While this may be true, I am inclined to think that, having regard to (a) the very wide field that an architectural education must cover, (b) the comparatively short time that systematic education

has been in vogue in most countries, and (c) the number of different countries compared—the wonder is that they have so much in common. This I take to be an encouraging sign, as there seems to be a general agreement on the main points. The conditions of different countries and peoples will naturally call for variation in detail. That need not perturb us.

But a further practical difficulty now presents itself. If the Universities absorb the whole of the rising generation of architects, where are practitioners to look for junior assistants? I mildly suggest the following, although it might interfere with existing arrangements and is not likely to meet with universal approval, but it might be worth discussing.

Let students take the first two years of the University course much as at present, on the completion of which they would write their preliminary examinations. They would then be familiar with the elements of their work and have acquired some facility in the use of instruments, etc. After this, let them have two whole years in an architect's office at a nominal salary. Then let them return to the University after passing an intermediate examination, and have another year there with a thesis and final qualifying examination.

It is conceivable that after their experience in an architect's office some students might prefer to continue as mere draughtsmen without further qualifications, and look for a salary increasing in proportion to their capabilities. The effect of this would be to put some limit on the number of practising architects, and also to provide a separate class of paid assistants who do not aspire to enter into practice.

In opening the discussion of Mr. Kendall's paper, Professor Pearse said:

I am sure you have all heard with very great interest what Mr. Kendall has had to say. I have been asked to open the discussion; at the same time, I notice from the agenda that I have been asked to review the position. I propose to take Mr. Kendall's paper under different headings and then discuss them in detail.

First of all, I would like to point out that Mr. Kendall is a very old friend of mine. I intensely dislike disagreeing with him, but on many points in his paper I find that we are in disagreement. I would like to take his paper and summarise it as follows: (1) Articled pupilage versus University training; (2) Homogeneity of the profession; (3) University training; (4) Modernism; (5) Junior assistants; and (6) Combined office and University training. It sounds rather formidable, but I promise not to take very long.

With regard to the first point, the question of articled pupilage under the old system, I think we may consider that as a thing of the past. I have had experience of it myself, and, whilst my principals did the best they could for me under their limitations, I still look back upon those years as largely a waste of time.

If an architect is comfortably off, is well established in practice, has a well equipped library, and is prepared to devote some part of every day to the training of his pupils, something might be done; but one must remember that the " shining lights " that Mr. Kendall refers to had very limited resources. In those days one made a close study of either classic or mediaval architecture and applied it as a frontispiece to every type of building, whether it was a hospital, a school, a railway station, a factory or a theatre.

Methods of building construction were comparatively simple and were easily grasped. To-day it is very different. Modern mechanical appliances, lifts, escalators, electrical equipment, air-conditioning, broadcasting and talkie apparatus, radiators, refrigerators, acoustics, etc., were unheard of thirty or forty years ago. Materials such as steel, reinforced concrete, glass and its substitutes, veneers and the various products of the machine, were almost unknown.

One cannot ignore the scientific developments of the present day, and it is well nigh impossible for any architect to supply all this knowledge to a pupil unless he has had a very sound grounding in its principles. A University endeavours to do this and to equip its students to meet all these problems in practice.

It is largely owing to the fact that architects have not kept abreast of modern scientific development that they have lost favour to a certain extent with the public.

Mr. Kendall refers to " the intense keenness in all things architectural being engendered under the old system." I think I can safely say that the modern University student is just as keen and certainly more enquiring and analytic than the old pupil; and as for working hard, the keen competitive spirit of a school is an incentive towards doing almost too much work.

" Frequent association with a master mind," Mr. Kendall says, " must result in the acquisition of something of its lustre—a priceless quality which nothing else can supply." There is no doubt about this, if only there were a few master minds which would take a personal interest in the work of the schools. What we really need here are visits from practitioners, papers contributed by them, which, with the ensuing discussion, would have a marked effect upon our training.

The value of the magic letters " R.A." is questionable, but there is every likelihood of the products of the schools achieving this distinction in due course. Mr. Kendall must admit, I think, that this award is usually made to men in their sixties or seventies, and the University schools have not been in existence very long.

On the second point I agree with Mr. Kendall, that is, the lack of homogeneity in the profession. I feel, however, that with the increasing number of University trained men, the position will be improved, and, as a result, a wider public interest in architecture will be created.

Coming to the third point, that is, the question of University training, I feel I should only bore you if I were to reiterate what I have said before. At the last Congress, eight years ago, I submitted a paper in which I outlined our system of training. We have not changed it very much since then; but since the last Congress I have had the good fortune to visit America and Europe, through the generosity of the Carnegie Corporation, and I was able to visit the leading schools of architecture in those countries and to see what they were doing.

I was pleased to find that their problems were much the same as ours, as far as methods of training were concerned, but where they scored over us was in the fine spirit of co-operation which existed between the profession and the schools. I met most of the outstanding architects in America—I need not mention their names: they are almost household words to many of you; and I found that without exception they were University-trained men.

Mr. Kendall talks about theory, about building castles in the air, about stupendous schemes in design, and mentions that not sufficient study is given to real working drawings. I think you

will agree that a large amount of theory is necessary to-day to equip an architect for practice, but I can assure Mr. Kendall that the practical side is far from being overlooked. This has been borne out by the tributes which have been paid to our graduates by leading practitioners in architecture and quantity surveying, by building contractors, and by laymen who have employed them.

As for building castles in the air and carrying out stupendous schemes in design, these are largely things of the past, and were only carried out to meet the requirements of professional bodies and practitioners themselves. I quite agree with Mr. Kendall that the best architects are not necessarily the best draughtsmen, but accuracy in the preparation of working drawings, I think he will agree, is very essential in these days of hurry and bustle.

A good deal of criticism has been levelled against the practical side of the University course recently, but in most cases without a sufficient knowledge of what is actually being done. This criticism can be applied to many other professional courses, and we are fully alive to the fact. Our avenues for practical training are very limited indeed, as there are only a few offices available in which we feel that a student can really get this training at the moment.

Every effort, however, is made to give our students a good working knowledge of our problems in practice. Visits are made to important industries, to buildings under construction, to workshops and, in addition, at least a full year is spent in an architect's office during the course. The reports we have had from practitioners upon these students are very gratifying.

With regard to the next point—modernism—I do not propose to say very much. After all, architectural design is largely a matter of taste. I think you will agree that, on analysis, modern architecture is far more logical than the work of say fifty or one hundred years ago; and one cannot overlook this fact. No modern architect worthy of the name is a wholesale iconoclast, as Mr. Kendall suggests; far from it: he is far more appreciative of and has a greater respect for what is best in the past than the so-called stylist in architecture. He cannot see why such elements as the Greek Orders should be mutilated and indiscriminately applied as wall decorations to every type of building. Similarly he sees no reason for using to-day the laurel leaves and garlands which decorated the Roman buildings and had either a religious significance or symbolised a Roman emperor's triumph.

" The most difficult thing in architecture," says Gaudet, " is to be simple," and the finest architecture of the past is that in which good proportion, simplicity and restraint are evident. These are the underlying principles in contemporary architecture.

However, Mr. Kendall does admit that there is something in favour of modern architecture, and says that " so long as we can improve on old methods we are justified in doing so." That is what the modern architect who knows his job is doing to-day. Mr. Kendall also mentions that " students must not think that all the short cuts that it (modern architecture) permits are going to serve them always." This criticism applies equally well to the decadent periods of the Renaissance, when innumerable books on the elements of classic architecture were produced. These works have been used as " short cuts " for so many centuries that architecture has become dull and stereotyped as a result.

The fifth point, the problem of obtaining junior assistants, is one which is constantly cropping up. It can only be solved, in my opinion, when we have a really satisfactory working arrangement between the schools and practitioners. Our present system of three years' full time, followed by one year in an office, should provide practitioners with all the assistance they require under normal circumstances.

As for the advisability of training draughtsmen who are content to remain as such, I have little to say, but must leave it to the profession to decide on the wisdom or not of such a policy.

With regard to the sixth point, combined office and University training, I have always held that this is the best system, but it is quite impossible until we have closer co-operation between the profession and the schools.

Finally, I would like to refer to a question which is constantly cropping up, namely, the overcrowding of the profession by the schools. In my opinion this is not being done. Every effort is made by the schools to discourage students who show no real aptitude for the work; but in nearly every case where a student has failed to attain a satisfactory standard and has left the University, he is absorbed by the profession, and drifts on for years.

From the inception of our school in 1921 to the end of 1935, twenty-three degree students have qualified, and of these only eight are practising, the remainder being in employment. But when we turn to the diploma or part-time course things are very different. It has never been a very satisfactory course, owing to the difficulties of combining office training with classes, and also the lack of interest displayed by practitioners in their own students. Such students do a minimum of work and are severely handicapped. It is only when a keen student is employed by a competent architect that we get the best results.

In my opinion, therefore, any overcrowding of the profession is entirely due to practitioners employing men who are unfitted, in many cases, for the work, and who, once they have embarked on the course, find it difficult to give it up.

I should like to thank you for the patient hearing you have given me, and to emphasise that, in spite of what I have said, I do not consider that we have yet reached the ideal in architectural training. When we discussed the question of architectural education eight years ago, there were no South African University graduates in practice. To-day there are several, and I look forward to hearing their criticisms as a result of their training and experience.



University of the Witwatersrand Exhibit. Empire Exhibition. photo J. L. Smith

GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

The main object in having a building contract is to define the responsibilities and obligations of each party so that there is a clear understanding between the parties to the contract.

Buildings can be and have been erected on verbal understandings, and also on home-made and incomplete agreements. Such a procedure, however, leads to disputes and unpleasantness and in many cases finishes up in the Law Courts.

Nearly all the books written on building contracts, and most judgments given, deal with positions where either no contract existed or an incomplete contract was used; naturally in each case the Courts had to apply the common law and interpret such law as it applied to such building cases. Such being the case, it is difficult for laymen, architects and quantity surveyors, and even lawyers, when a good contract is prepared, to realise that one thing, and one thing only, matters, and that is the interpretation of the terms of such contract. All the Hudsons, Cresswells, Rimmers and other writers do not come into the picture in a sound and clear contract, and the fact that little if any litigation has resulted from our new contract is clear evidence of its capabilities of being easily and indisputably interpreted.

When we are told that some of the leading brains in the legal profession of England were responsible for the framing of our contract, one realises that in very few cases can we render any assistance in its improvement.

ARCHITECT NO LONGER ARBITRATOR.

In common law and in most, if not all, contracts previous to the one under review, the architect was a quasi-arbitrator: that is, his decision on most matters was final and binding on both parties to the contract. But our contract has contracted out of common law and made the architect no longer a quasi-arbitrator, but purely and simply the agent of the employer; that is, that any instructions or decisions he gives are to be taken as given as agent of the employer, and instead of same being final and binding the contractor has the right to query same, and his side of the question is of just the same importance as the employer's side given through his agent, the architect. Provision is therefore made that in the event of the contractor disagreeing with the decision of the architect as agent of the employer in any matter whatsoever, then the matter can be arbitrated on by an impartial arbitrator.

PARTIES TO THE CONTRACT.

The one outstanding feature in connection with our building contract and which it is imperative should be appreciated before attempting to discuss its details, is that there are only two parties to the contract. At first sight this does not mean to imply very much, but as one delves into the different clauses one is amazed to find the necessity of continually referring to this fact. The two parties are the only persons that matter; they have contracted and they only can de-contract—so much so, that they can amend, alter or even destroy their contract any time they may think fit, providing they mutually agree.

The most interesting parallel to this position is found in a joint will where the parties are married in community of property. My wife and I, being married in community of property, decide to have a joint will, otherwise a contract; we both agree to leave our money, say, to a Cats' Home. In due course my wife is scratched badly by a cat and she says she wants the money left to a Dogs' Home. I, nevertheless, do not agree, and still favour the Cats' Home, so therefore the contract cannot be altered. But in due course I am scratched by a cat, and we then both mutually alter our will from Cats' Home to Dogs' Home, in spite of the fact that the directors of the Cats' Home were aware of our mutual contract. But as time goes on we are both involved in a dog fight, and we definitely decide to have nothing to do with cats or dogs, and tear up our contract and have a new one.

Now, metaphorically speaking, the employer and the contractor represent the married couple, and all architects, quantity surveyors, clerks of works, arbitrators, etc., mentioned in the building contract, are the cats and dogs.

In a recent contract where a large amount of extras was in dispute, the employer and builder got together, and by tossing coins and bargaining settled the amount, and each was satisfied. In due course the quantity surveyor came along and said: " You cannot do that. It states in the contract that all variations shall be measured and settled by me, and I demand that that shall be done." But before very long he found that he was only one of the cats and dogs and, not being a party to the contract, had no standing whatever.

ARCHITECT'S POWERS.

A good deal of ignorance exists as to the position and duties of the architect in this and, in fact, in most contracts.

An architect has, as other professional men such as doctors, lawyers, etc., certain powers, duties and responsibilities, but these powers and responsibilities are only such as his professional status gives him.

Such powers do not include the spending of his employer's money nor the alterations of the terms and conditions, plans and specifications of a contract between his employer and a contractor, who are the only parties to the contract.

Any clause mentioning that the architect has absolute discretion to vary the drawings, specifications, etc., is there for one purpose, and one purpose only—that is, to protect the contractor in that he need not have to get the employer's confirmation of what the architect orders.

The contractor must carry out the instructions of the architect as the employer's agent, assuming, but only assuming, that the architect is carrying out the instructions of his employer. If the architect exceeds his authority as agent for the employer, that is no concern of the contractor, and the employer must pay the contractor, whether he instructed the architect or otherwise. The employer's redress is from his architect as his agent, and not from the contractor.

One might be disposed to say: " But how simple it would be to give the architect the right in the contract to vary the contract within limits." Such right or power cannot be given to an architect in a contract between two other parties; it would be ultra vires. If an employer wishes to give his architect his power of attorney, he can do so, but not in a building contract of which the architect is not a party to the contract.

The position, therefore, in a nutshell is that the powers of an architect do not permit him to vary in the slightest, for any reason whatsoever, the plans, specifications or terms of the contract entered into between the employer and the contractor.

I have endeavoured to bring home to every architect the exact legal interpretation of this clause, but I do not suggest for one moment that the architect in every case should adhere strictly to the legal position. Every case should be treated on its merits. If an architect feels that his employer has every confidence in him, and would consider him a nuisance to be bothering him for authority to make variations which are bona fide in the employer's interest, there my advice is: Take the risk and vary the work accordingly, knowing, however, in doing so he is exceeding his authority as agent to the employer. On the other hand, if one feels the employer is such that he may claim his pound of flesh, take no risks and obtain authority every time before varying the slightest thing in the contract.

ARCHITECT'S RESPONSIBILITIES.

The question of the responsibility and liability of the architect as a professional man frequently crops up. On this question one hears quite a diversity of opinion. No professional



The Tower of Light Empire Exhibition photo J. L. Smith

man can escape the results of negligence, incompetence or error of judgment. The only persons who enjoy any degree of protection against these matters are magistrates and judges.

If a magistrate or judge should give a judgment based on an error of judgment, and which is reversed on appeal, the magistrate or judge does not suffer, nor the Government of which they are servants, but the poor litigant has to pay for all the costs entailed in the court in which he won his case. But an error of judgment in any other profession makes the professional man liable for all damages suffered or incurred.

Architects little realise the risks and responsibilities they bear in their professional work, and the claims their employers are entitled to for any negligence on their part in their professional duties. This is infinitely more so since the architect no longer appears as a quasi-arbitrator, when, providing his decisions, though wrong, were bona fide, they could not be questioned; but now as agent for his employer he has no protection and is liable for any and every of his actions.

NOMINATED SUB-CONTRACTORS.

Provisional sums and nominated sub-contractors seem to be two items that most architects go astray with. After the architect has obtained tenders from sub-contractors, and nominated the lowest or any tenderer to the contractor, thereafter any relationship between architect and sub-contractor ceases. The nominated sub-contractor becomes practically an ordinary sub-contractor of the contractor, and the contractor is responsible for his work, his payment and any defects in his work during or after the contract.

It is distinctly wrong for an architect to issue a certificate to any sub-contractor; in fact, if the employer met such certificate and the contractor subsequently went insolvent, his creditors could claim money paid by certificate to the sub-contractor. There is only one contractor in our contract, and he, and he alone, is responsible for the carrying out of that contract.

That the contractor should enter into a contract with the nominated sub-contractor goes without saying, but that is his funeral and outside the architect's province.

PRICED BILLS OF QUANTITIES.

The question of bills and quantities and priced bills of quantities as appearing in our contract is somewhat involved, and still more so by the fact that our Contract Committee were influenced by the quantity surveyor members in inserting a clause to the effect that the priced bills of quantities should be verified before the signing of the contract.

The R.I.B.A. never intended that the priced bills of quantities should be a contract document, and there was no obligation on a contractor to submit his priced bill until the contract was signed, and it is doubtful, even with the insertion of the clause above referred to, whether we are doing the right thing in including the priced bill as a contract document.

BUILDER'S LIEN.

The builder's lien is a matter very little understood, and though contractors are more concerned than architects in this matter, it is nevertheless imperative that an architect should be familiar with the subject.

A builder's lien is of no value to a contractor if the employer is solvent and in good standing.

When a building is completed, it matters not how much may be in dispute; the contractor must hand over the keys. All he can demand is a banker's guarantee up to the amount of his claim to meet any moneys that may be due to him after the courts or arbitration have made their award, but such banker's guarantee is superfluous if the employer be in good financial standing.

If, therefore, a contractor refuses to hand over the keys till his account in dispute is paid, then the architect, on behalf of the employer, must send a banker's guarantee for anything up to the amount claimed to be settled by arbitration or otherwise, and demand the keys, failing which he must sue for them, and for any damages caused by the contractor withholding same. There is nothing mysterious in this word "lien," and it is quite time architects, contractors and employers were familiar with the actual facts.

TENDERS.

The position of the contractor in submitting his tender is not thoroughly understood. From judgments given it is quite evident that, whether stated in the advertisement or elsewhere, or not, the fact remains that the lowest or any other tender need not necessarily be accepted. On the other hand, immediately the tender is accepted, the contractor cannot escape his responsibilities of carrying out the contract.

The tenderer has the right to revoke his tender up to the time of its acceptance, but immediately his tender is accepted he cannot withdraw same, even though the contract may not be ready for him to sign for some time afterwards.

It therefore behoves every architect, immediately he is instructed by his employer to accept a particular tender, to do so forthwith, unless he wants to make himself responsible for any damages to his employer by the tenderer withdrawing his tender before it is accepted.

Some architects will tell you that, on receiving instructions to accept a tender they send for the contractor's priced bill, to see if everything is in order. This is distinctly wrong, and is no excuse for not carrying out your employer's instructions forthwith. If, after having accepted the tender and then obtaining the priced bills of quantities, you were to find something inconsistent and not in order, then on those grounds alone, if you wished, you could legally cancel your acceptance. So no harm can occur by carrying out your employer's instructions immediately, while a great deal of harm leading to damages might result by neglecting to immediately carry out his instructions.

ARBITRATION.

" Arbitration " seems quite an innocent word, and if left alone can be used in quite a simple manner. However, unless provision is made for the terms and conditions under which the arbitration should be held, then you have to fall back on the Arbitration Ordinance of the particular Province in which you arbitrate.

If, however, you have made all the necessary provisions for arbitration, then it is another case of contracting out of common law, and it matters not what the Arbitration Ordinance says: provided you have contracted for all the provisions necessary, then you can put the Arbitration Ordinance aside and abide by the interpretation of your own contract.

The most interesting aspect of arbitration is when you compare it with law. That is the comparison between settling a building dispute by the Courts, in which legal men are predominant, and by arbitration, in which the lay or technical men are predominant.

Anyone who has attended a Court in which a building dispute is being heard is quite accustomed to hear a Judge say: " What do you mean by stanchions? " or " What do you mean by footings? " and so on, and so on. Hours and days are spent in enlightening the Judge, barristers and solicitors of the meaning of technical terms, and still more time in working out any complicated calculations. It is quite evident, therefore, that the Judge has, in the end, to rely on technical evidence from experts whose opinion he must accept without being able to follow how that opinion is arrived at.

Now in an arbitration, with a qualified technical expert arbitrator, all this is saved. In the first place, all technical terms are understood, most calculations can be followed, and no technical evidence is necessary. In an ordinary civil case no Judge would allow a barrister to be put into a witness box to teach him the law, and therefore no arbitrator should permit any

witness to teach him technical matters of which he is supposed to be an expert; evidence of fact in connection with the particular case, yes; but not opinions of technical men. The arbitrator is the technical man and should no more require opinions of technical points than a Judge requires same from barristers on law.

BUILDING RESTRICTIONS.

The payment of local and other fees by the contractor throws a certain responsibility on the architect, to ascertain all the conditions connected with any particular contract.

It is the architect's duty to ascertain from the employer's title deeds any servitudes, townships restrictions, municipal and other requirements before he completes his scheme. It is recognised as part of the architect's duty, and ignorance of the contents of the employer's conditions of sale of his property is no excuse. An employer may be ignorant or negligent in the matter, but in the fact of employing an architect he throws all such responsibilities on to the architect's shoulders.

MAINTENANCE.

The maintenance or defect clause is one frequently misunderstood. Almost every contractor reckons that immediately the three months' retention has expired, and particularly if he has not heard from the architect, that his responsibility ceases. This is not so. The clause distinctly states that " any defects that may appear within three months from completion shall within a reasonable time be made good." It is quite conceivable, therefore, that the contractor's obligation in this respect may and can run on for months after the expiration of the three months' retention.

LUMP SUM AND QUANTITY CONTRACTS.

The two contracts with which we are mostly concerned (though there are others) are the lump sum contract and the quantity basis contract.

Any undergraduate learns, before he is far on in his studies, the principles embodied in each of these contracts, and it is almost inconceivable that any practising architect can be ignorant of the principles underlying them.

The fact that a total sum is mentioned in a quantity basis contract is argued by some quantity surveyors that it also becomes a lump sum contract. If the work of all quantity surveyors was immaculate, then there would be no need for the clause providing for errors, or omission of items, in their quantities, and the total sum referred to would become a lump sum, but immediately one single error or omission is discovered in the quantities, then the lump sum goes and the total sum is amended accordingly. So

the total sum is a lump sum on one condition, and that is that the quantities are so immaculately accurate that there can be no error of any kind whatsoever.

ISSUING ORDERS TO MERCHANTS.

An architect is asked to do some strange things in his career, and his training should stand him in good stead as to the advisability or otherwise of his actions.

The question of issuing orders to merchants is one which should be avoided, but if found necessary it needs very careful handling, and it must always be borne in mind that if the contractor goes insolvent before the order is paid, the employer may have to pay the amount of that order, not only to the merchant, but to the contractor's creditors also.

CERTIFICATES.

In the issuing of certificates the architect is in a very different position in this contract, in comparison with all previous contracts where he was a quasi-arbitrator. In the latter, in the absence of fraud, his certificate was accepted as having come from an arbitrator and could not be questioned; but in the present contract he has no such protection, and if the certificate be incorrectly made up he is distinctly liable for negligence and any damages or costs incurred through his negligence.

ISSUING SUPERVISING CERTIFICATES.

Another practice architects indulge in is to issue certificates for work for which they may have drawn the plans but are not supervising. This is definitely wrong, and conveys to anyone outside that they are supervising the work. It is not wrong, however, to issue a statement—though not the supervising architects—that they have nevertheless examined the work, and are satisfied that the amount of work done represents so much in pounds, shillings and pence.

GENERAL.

The foregoing statements may appear to some architects and quantity surveyors quite revolutionary, but each and every statement is based on authorities which are unquestionable and indisputable. It is hoped, therefore, that anyone with different opinions may come forward with same, with a view of discussing the matter and ventilating the subject to such an extent that there may be no misunderstanding in the future regarding the interpretation of our contract.



Lake photo W.D.H.

ARCHITECTURAL PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA

By C. P. WALGATE, A.R.I.B.A.

In an address read to the Cape Provincial Institute at the close of my year in the chair, I expressed the fear that one result of the reticence imposed upon us by professional etiquette was that the public tended to forget about us and that the profession was at a disadvantage in competition with those outside it who advertised themselves as performing the work which should rightly be ours.

The President-in-Chief has courteously invited me to set down my views on what can be done to prevent such an eclipse. Lest I should seem to stand alone, may I first recount the views and actions of the R.I.B.A. in the matter?

At its Fifteenth Annual Conference, held in June at Southampton, the President, Mr. Percy Thomas, in his inaugural address, referred to a " blind spot " in the public mind in relation to building. In a lawsuit they will employ the best solicitors or

barristers they can afford. If they are ill they will call in the physician or surgeon. If they have the toothache they will go to the dentist. If their drainage is defective they call in a sanitary engineer. If they want a portrait painted they look for a skilled artist. But in the matter of architecture they are as likely as not to entrust themselves to people who have not a shadow of qualification for the work. The President suggested two reasons: firstly, that the public is surrounded by so much bad design that it takes it for granted, and, secondly, that it does not realise the high degree of skill required to produce something better. In conclusion, he urged the architects present to take advantage of the awakening public interest in such matters, to carry on a campaign for a greater use of the architect, knowing that they would be providing opportunities for the architects of the future and bringing greater beauty, comfort and efficiency into the national life.

Some years ago the R.I.B.A. was pressed from certain quarters to take up collective advertising in the Press on behalf of its members, but it decided against such a course, as being a lapse from professional dignity. In view of its ideal and policy of public service, it concluded that the only publicity the Institute could seek was through a scheme of public education in architectural matters intended to improve the standard of appreciation and consequently of achievement, and thus to raise the status of the profession in the eyes of the public.

A Public Relations Committee was set up to carry out the idea. This Public Relations Committee has functioned for several years and, judging by annual reports, has not been idle. During its first two years of activity it came to certain conclusions, upon which its subsequent policy has been based. The general principles may be summarised as follows:

(1) Public interest in architecture is almost entirely concerned with such building problems as arise out of our social needs, such as slum clearance, recreation, amenities and education, hardly at all with abstract theories.

(2) The profession's only effective appeal lies through social service, such as educating the public, providing better living and working conditions for the community and being of service to the Press.

(3) The prevalent idea of the architect as the person who adds the pretty bits must be destroyed and replaced by the idea of the architect as the universal planner, director of building, arbiter of design and potential saviour of a jerry-built and slum ridden country.

After several years of activity, the Public Relations Committee has found itself obliged to devolve upon the Allied Societies in England certain functions which could not be carried out effectively by a central body. These are:

(1) Arranging local exhibitions and showing loan and travelling exhibitions.

(2) Giving lectures to clubs, societies and schools.

(3) Supplying the local Press with information on architectural matters of public interest.

(4) Making the most of important buildings.

In regard to the latter it was noted that when a public building is opened everyone will receive mention except the architect and that the published description of the building will be inaccurate.

To carry out these delegated functions Allied Societies are requested either to set up Public Relations Committees for their local areas, or to appoint Public Relations Officers.

In 1935 the R.I.B.A. adopted a new scheme of exhibitions to meet the increasing public demand for education in architecture. A separate department was set up under the Exhibitions Sub-Committee of the Public Relations Committee, with a permanent full-time secretary. This department set about forming a collection of more than 6,000 photographic enlargements, supplemented by drawings, diagrams and lettering. This collection is fully indexed in such a way that a great number of different exhibitions can be compiled quickly and easily. A group of voluntary selectors keeps the collection up-to-date. An offer of this collection to the B.B.C. for television has been welcomed.

In connection with exhibitions of photographs, lectures assume a particular importance. A panel of lecturers has been formed so that the promoters of an exhibition can find out who is available to speak on any particular subject. There is also a catalogue of lantern slides and films available.

Gaumont British have produced as part of a "G.B. Magazine," and under the auspices of the Film Sub-Committee of the R.I.B.A. Public Relations Committee a film of the R.I.B.A. new building. It opens with a glimpse of the President seated in the studio, about to start a commentary on the pictures. At the same performance are shown pictures of a series of models illustrating the development of English house-building. A number of other "G.B. Magazine" films are under consideration by the Film Sub-Committee.

Now let us look at some of the R.I.B.A.'s more practical efforts. According to the Ministry of Trade Returns for 1930, 72 million pounds were spent on buildings in England. Of this sum 49½ millions were spent through the speculative builder, and 22 millions by local authorities. With two-thirds of the total in the hands of speculative builders, it is not surprising that the R.I.B.A. has made a special effort to encourage them to employ architects and have drawn up a special tariff for such services. Recent numbers of the Journal show how successful the outcome has been. In a review of the work of Staverton Builders, Ltd., under Mr. Louis de Soissons, the Journal says: "The choice of

an architect is important. The employment of a staff junior—a tame architect—is considered to be bad policy, whereas the appointment of a consulting architect of acknowleded reputation in house design not only gives the best results, but is also a guarantee of quality in the houses and therefore a good selling point."

In 1933 the Architectural Association, in conjunction with Messrs. John Laing and Son, held a competition for designs for houses for " direct sale." Houses were built from the winning designs at Sunnyfields Estate, Mill Hill. Reviewing the position, Mr. Laing this year stated that 75 per cent. of the public chose by preference the usual standard type and that only an educated minority chose the more individual architect's house, but it may be supposed that after some practice at this class of work architects would be able to do better.

In May this year a deputation from the R.I.B.A. called on the Minister of Health, requesting his influence to bear on local authorities to ensure that work undertaken by them should be designed and supervised by qualified architects. It was made clear to the Minister that the ultimate aim of the Royal Institute was to secure for the profession the same legal status as is accorded to other registered professions, such as the legal and medical. The Minister replied that he fully recognised the desirability of employing architects over as wide a field as possible, that his Department had in various ways endeavoured to promote the objects which the deputation had at heart, and promised further action.

Before leaving my review of English matters, I should like to refer to the boundary line between legitimate publicity and undignified advertising. Our Executive Committee has recently made a pronouncement which does nothing to clarify this important matter, being what the lawyers term " vague and embarrassing." The Royal Institute appears to have been more explicit. At the time of writing these notes I have not seen its amended Code of Professional Practice, but Mr. G. C. Wilson, the Honorary Secretary of the Practice Standing Committee, made some comments on it in the Journal of September 5th. " An Architect," he says, " like any other properly qualified practitioner, may not advertise nor offer his services by means of circulars, nor may he make paid announcements in the Press. . . . . Illustrations and descriptions of buildings are matters of public interest, and of necessity appear from time to time in both the professional and lay Press under the name of the responsible architect, none of which is contrary to professional ethics, provided monetary consideration is not given for such insertions and there is no attempt to distribute the publications to potential clients."

It may be of interest to note some of the steps taken by the Cape Provincial Institute to bring before public bodies the claims of its members. Both the City Council and the Divisional Council have new building regulations under consideration, and a deputation awaited on these bodies requesting that recognition be given in the new regulations to the status of registered architects. The following arguments, but with slight variation, were used in both cases:

(1) It is maintained as a reasonable proposition that the recognition given by the State to the architectural profession should be reflected in any new local building regulations, and that only persons who are registered under the Architects' Act No. 18 of 1927 should be permitted to submit plans for approval.

(2) Regulations generally stipulate that work of plumbers, drainlayers and electricians may only be performed by registered artisans, and it is claimed in the case of architectural service, embracing as it does, every detail of a structure, that similar restrictions are necessary and should be imposed.

(3) The acceptance of plans prepared by non-registered practitioners (who at present are able to evade the spirit and intention of the Act by describing themselves as draughtsmen, designers, owners, etc.) is encouraging the construction of a class of building that is an offence to the practical and aesthetic requirements of modern conditions.

(4) The Architects' Registration Act has been in operation since 1927. Every person who had at that time a reasonable claim was given the opportunity of inaugural registration, and since then only qualified persons have been admitted to the profession. The Universities, which under the Act are nominated as the examining authorities, are now supplying well-trained recruits to the profession, and the Institute of Architects believes that the body of qualified practitioners so built up is entitled to protection against the competition of unqualified persons.

(5) The elimination of unqualified practitioners would benefit building owners and the community generally, greatly simplifying and lessening the work of the Council's technical staff to whom the approval of building plans is entrusted

Quite recently a letter was sent to fifteen Building Societies in the following terms:

" The attention of local Building Societies is respectfully directed to the advantages that will accrue to them and to their clients by the employment of registered architects to undertake the preparation of plans and the supervision of building schemes or units which they may desire to promote or are asked to finance.

" It is an unfortunate fact that many potential home-makers are misled into the belief that their properties can be built equally well and at a lower cost by eliminating the architect and handing

over the whole of the work to a building contractor; but it is an everyday experience that this method generally leads to disappointment and not infrequently to disaster. The service of a qualified architect to prepare the plans, specify the proper materials to be used, obtain competitive tenders from reliable builders, and to supervise the work whilst in progress, is of primary importance if disappointment and loss are to be avoided.

" A house built under such direction will be a safe investment both for the Building Society and its client, because of its aesthetic design, its well-planned arrangements and its permanent construction.

" I am sending to you with this circular letter several copies of an interesting book entitled ' The Adventure of Building.' It sets forth in greater detail than I have attempted to do the pitfalls attendant upon building without the help of an architect."

A well printed memorandum has also been sent to all the municipalities and many other public bodies in the Cape Province, pointing out the advantages that are to be gained by the employment of registered practising architects for new building works involving the expenditure of public funds.

On the other hand, lack of a progressive policy on the part of the Institute has resulted in the neglect of valuable opportunities. May I quote one example? In 1934 a wealthy progressive land development company invited half a dozen Capetown Architects to lend designs to be exhibited in their estate office, with a view to encouraging purchasers of land to erect properly designed houses. The company did not wish to assume any obligation and proposed merely to give the name of the architect to any inquirer. Several of the invited architects asked the Local Committee for advice. The committee felt that the principle involved was practically that of a panel of recommended architects and that no objection could be raised if professional advertising were avoided, so a memorandum was drafted for the guidance of the development company. This memorandum represented a great deal of work and appeared to open up considerable opportunities. It expressed, however, too clearly the nervousness of the profession in the face of the unknown, and offered little constructive suggestion. A copy of it was sent to the development company, who thanked the committee for their courteous consideration of their suggestion, and asked that the matter be allowed to drop. At the next Central Council meeting the whole business was brought up on account of its professional interest. There was a good deal of discussion, and it was finally decided that the Institute could help in two ways: firstly, by organising an exhibition of domestic architecture, which could

be exhibited centrally and afterwards loaned to the company under the Institute's control; and, secondly, by organising a competition for designs for houses. Nothing further was done. Either of these suggestions would cost a considerable sum of money, which neither the company nor the Institute would wish to pay. A splendid opportunity was lost and more work has drifted away from the profession.

I have beaten about the bush longer than I intended and must now make a few practical suggestions.

Firstly: We require a booklet more interesting than the official reprint of the Scale of Fees, that we can give to all who want to build.

The Architectural Press of London published in 1932 such a booklet, called " The Adventure of Building." It contains general advice to those about to build, is pleasingly illustrated by pictures of small houses, and must have had a great vogue as it has run through many editions. It constitutes a powerful plea for the employing of practising architects, pointing out the value of skilled and disinterested advice in both practical and aesthetic problems, explaining the method of calling for competitive tenders on an equitable basis, and giving useful information about building loans. Something of the sort applicable to our local conditions could easily be produced.

There is a paragraph in " The Adventure of Building " headed " How to find your architect," and one method suggested is looking out examples of executed work illustrated in the architectural periodicals, and that leads me to the second field—the Technical Press. The proprietors of our monthlies complain that the profession does not back them up by supplying information about their work. It is certain that a periodical publication showing a wide selection of buildings and giving information for the guidance of prospective builders would have a great value as publicity. Whether it would have much value as a professional journal is a matter upon which I am unable to express an opinion.

If the two purposes are in conflict we may find that there is room for two publications—one intended primarily as publicity and public education in architectural matters, and the other as a record of more technical information and a forum for our recurring disputations on matters of importance and interest only to the profession. The former should be made as attractive as possible, sold cheaply and given away where it might be widely seen. At first it might be annual or quarterly. There is already an annual—" Architecture in South Africa "—which, however, lacks professional direction.

Thirdly: The lay Press welcomes pictures and notes about buildings, advice on all sorts of problems, and expressions of views on aesthetic matters, as well as more serious reviews of civic, social and economic aspects of building. In a busy office Press representatives are generally regarded as a nuisance, and often the information and news published lack the reliability and usefulness they might have if there was a better link between the Press and the profession.

Fourthly: We now have broadcasting on a national basis, and there is no doubt that talks on architectural matters, if given by responsible persons and dealing with affairs of current interest, would be welcomed. A little while ago I broadcast from Capetown an address on the Cape's contribution to architecture. I was surprised to find how many people I knew listened and were interested. Talks on architectural problems of to-day should be very popular.

Fifthly: The newly-formed National Film Board hopes to raise the standard of our cinema shows and to arrange for films of educational value to be made in the Union.

Recently the Board had a meeting of all the bodies likely to be interested and willing to co-operate. " What about architects? " I enquired afterwards. " Oh," I was told, " we never thought of the architects." Quite so. Nobody does.

Sixthly: We should have a good collection of lantern slides and films for lending, and a panel of members who can be called upon to give lectures on various subjects. The Town Planning Association in the Cape has done this with some success.

Seventhly: The Provincial Institutes should make the most of the architectural sections of established exhibitions of art, and supplement these with specialised exhibitions whenever possible, so as to keep design of good standard before the public until it becomes recognisable.

I think that broadly covers the present field for publicity, but a great deal by way of propaganda can be effected on behalf of the profession by direct representation to persons or bodies who control large sums spent on building. Public authorities, building societies, land agencies and speculative builders have been mentioned, but a new field of great promise lies in the sphere of housing subsidised by the Government.

Considerable sums of public money have already been spent through public utility societies, which have apparently failed to avail themselves of the wide experience of the profession in the



Eastern Province Pavilion
Louw and Louw, Architects

photo S.A.R.

solution of their very special problems. It seems certain that in the near future the expenditure in this direction will be enormously increased, and for the honour of the profession, as well as for the welfare of the community, steps should be taken to ensure the employment on any large undertaking of a panel of the most experienced architects available, so that the housing problem may be solved with efficiency and economy, order, and maybe even beauty.

I have been able to deal with my subject only in brief outline, but I hope that my confreres will regard it as being of sufficient importance and urgency to justify the appointment of Public Relations Committees or officers in the several provinces. If these notes serve as a starting point for their activities I shall be richly rewarded.

PROFESSIONAL CO-OPERATION

By NORMAN EATON, A.R.I.B.A.

I wish to take the opportunity afforded by the present Congress to enter a strong profession-wide plea that members should, under the auspices of the Institute, set afoot a scheme which will make it possible for them to establish and occupy in every main city in the Union an Architectural Centre in the form of a purpose-designed block of offices with common ancillary amenities.

Financially such a proposal should offer no greater difficulty than it does to the ordinary investor, and there are obvious economic advantages in collective ownership.

The desirability and convenience of having dignified and appropriate premises which can be publicly recognised in each city as the main source of architectural services is clear.

Provision for such necessary common conveniences as meeting rooms, a library, catalogue room, materials bureau, general enquiries office with telephone exchange and so on, as well as for sharing services such as typing, plan-printing and general office supplies would greatly reduce the excessive wastage of time, energy and money, which is the inevitable concomitant of independent practice.

As a place for social meetings, public lectures and functions of all sorts, in which the public is brought into close contact with the profession as a body, such a centre must become a strong influence in the guidance of " taste," with exceptional opportunities for giving it its proper direction.

The forcefulness, furthermore, of corporate action on these lines, must lead to proper recognition of the profession by public bodies, and give an ever widening scope to its activities.

A scattered profession is of no public moment.

Apart from obvious practical advantages, there are those of " bringing together " people having similar technical interests, which would afford opportunities for the pooling of knowledge, particularly knowledge relating to mistakes. This would result in a sort of co-operation without the drawbacks of actual collaboration.

This " bringing together," moreover, with its interchange of opinion, criticism and gossip, would induce a spirit of camaraderie and a sense of common objective eliminating the narrower competitive outlook.

An accessibility of authoritative ideas based on genuine interested contacts must increase the efficiency of individual work, expedite it and build up those high standards which are the foundations of economic soundness of any profession.

The mutual independence upon one another, or architects, for general information and experience in technique, is no bar to original work, but, on the contrary, sets free the creative talent of each for individual expression.

Plagiarism, as such, need not be feared from this mutual contact, as is clear from the experience of the medical profession and, perhaps more applicably, the Bar, where it is found that through free exchange of opinion a broader and better view of the problem is gained and, subsequently, an easier and more expeditious solution to the difficulties.

Shakespeare culled his ideas from all and sundry, and not an original theme runs through his work, yet his powers flourished rather than fell upon the very ordinary material with which he pieced together works of beautiful design and great vitality.

The significance of Shakespeare's work lies in its complete understanding of humanity.

Architecture is a social function in the broadest sense. The demerits of " individual " work when it is " solitary " work lie in its inability to fully exploit common knowledge regarding the needs of society as a whole.

Awareness of the common need would tend towards harmony in the underlying principles of " design," and order would grow out of the architectural chaos which at present characterises our towns.

It may be seen in an unspoiled town such as Nürnberg, belonging to a single architectural period, that variety and uniformity—or, in other words, individualism and common technique—may and do exist together harmoniously. Individualism, here, affords constant pleasure and surprise, but it is the unifying force of the common technique, running through it like a musical theme, which gives the town its architectural vitality and completeness.

Architecturally, a town sums up the collective worth of its numerous contributors. If this summary is to be a worthy one, architects must see to it that the common needs of society are truthfully and impartially reflected in their work. Only by some form of co-operation on all matters touching these basic social needs can architects ensure that their knowledge is comprehensive enough to achieve the best results.

My opening plea for the establishment of an architectural centre in each city has been made with this primary object, which is to rally the whole architectural force of this country to co-ordinated effort in the common good.

Opposite
North Transept • ST. GEORGE'S CATHEDRAL, CAPETOWN
F. K. Kendall, Architect
Sir Herbert Baker, Consulting Architect





Chapel & Tower, St. Andrew's College, Grahamstown Baker, Kendall & Morris

FRANKLIN KAYE KENDALL

The first honorary degree of Master of Arts in Architecture was conferred on Mr. F. K. Kendall by the University of Capetown at its graduation ceremony on December 10th, 1936.

To those of us who know Mr. Kendall intimately, this is a well-merited award for a life-long service to the profession of architecture.

Mr. Kendall was born in Australia and was educated at Blackheath School, London.

After spending two years with a building contractor, under whom he gained valuable office and workshop experience, he was articled to Professor T. Roger Smith, and was subsequently employed as an assistant in his office. During this period he attended courses in special subjects at University College, London, and at the South Kensington School of Art. He passed the examinations for the Associateship of the Royal Institute of British Architects in 1894, and was elected a Fellow in 1912. Mr. Kendall was associated with Sir William Emerson for two years, and came to South Africa in 1896 to join Herbert Baker, and soon afterwards entered into partnership with him and the late Francis Masey.

Much important work was carried out by the firm in Capetown during this period, such as work for Cecil Rhodes, the City Club, Guardian Building, D. Isaacs and Co.'s premises, Geo. Findlay and Co.'s premises, the Rhodes Building, Marks Building (original portion), the National Mutual Assurance Association of Australasia (original portion), the choir of St. George's Cathedral, the Rhodes Memorial, extensions to the Houses of Parliament, buildings for the South African College, including the Hiddingh Hall, and several churches and houses. Soon after Herbert Baker settled in Johannesburg, Francis Masey went to Rhodesia, and much of the subsequent work of the Capetown firm was carried out by Mr. Kendall, in collaboration with Mr. James Morris and Mr. Brian Mansergh.

Grahamstown became an active centre for Mr. Kendall's work some twenty-five years ago. Here he carried out work for St. Peter's Home, Rhodes University College, St. Andrew's College and the Diocesan School for Girls.

Other important works of his include the Humewood Hotel, Port Elizabeth; the Technical College, Capetown (which were won simultaneously in competition); extensions to the Mount Nelson Hotel, Lourensford, Somerset West; London and Lancashire House; St. Cyprian's New School, Capetown; the North Transept of St. George's Cathedral, just completed, and the Filter House on Kloof Nek for the Corporation of Capetown, now under construction, etc.

Sharing with Sir Robert Baker a keen interest in the early Cape architecture, it is little wonder that, after the disastrous fire of 1925, which destroyed Groot Constantia, the work of reconstruction was placed in his hands. Many interesting discoveries were made by him during the restoration.

In his book, " The Restoration of Groot Constantia," Mr. Kendall has contributed a most interesting and valuable historical work on old Cape architecture.

Mr. Kendall, like Sir Herbert Baker, has done much to create a wider public interest in architecture in South Africa and to improve the standard of architectural design, which was at a very low ebb at the end of the nineteenth century. He has carried out some interesting restoration work in several of the historic homes at the Cape for the Rhodes Fruit Farms, Ltd. As a member of the profession, he has devoted a good deal of his time to the activities of the Cape Institute of Architects, of which he was president from 1913 to 1916.

He has served as president of the Fine Art Association and as a trustee of the National Gallery, Capetown, and has rendered the University valuable assistance in the development of its School of Architecture.

G.E.P.



"Luncarty" Kirstenbosch F. K. Kendall, Architect

Journal of the SA Architectural Institute

PUBLISHER:

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

LEGAL NOTICE:

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.