



*Proceedings of the Society
of Architectural Historians,
Australia and New Zealand
30, Open*

Papers presented to the 30th Annual Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand held on the Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia, July 2-5, 2013.

<http://www.griffith.edu.au/conference/sahanz-2013/>

Peter Scriver, “Andrews at Expo: Placing Africa in an Architecture of the Late Twentieth Century” in *Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand: 30, Open*, edited by Alexandra Brown and Andrew Leach (Gold Coast, Qld: SAHANZ, 2013), vol. 2, p623-635.

ISBN-10: 0-9876055-0-X

ISBN-13: 978-0-9876055-0-4

Andrews at Expo

Placing Africa in an Architecture of the Late Twentieth Century

Peter Scriver

University of Adelaide

Montreal's Expo 67 was a production of unprecedented scale and conceptual and technical ambition. Held in Canada's centennial year, the World's Fair was conceived not only to have a transformative impact on the host city, but to affirm a vision of an open, technophile world of late-modern humanism and cosmopolitanism of which bilingual Montreal, and the multi-cultural Canada of Marshall McLuhan, were both aspiring microcosms.

Whilst lay observers were generally wowed by the built outcomes, expert critics were more discerning. Few of the architectural ideas and technologies on show were truly novel, but for the first time the radical propositions inherent in projects such as Safdie's Habitat and Otto's mega tent structure had finally been rendered full scale, in tangible and therefore testable form. Real progress was imminent. Still, the experience was of a "middle-world of hesitation," as the editor of Progressive Architecture expressed it, one that hovered between monumental and intimate, hi-tech and no-tech, and the increasing allure of artificially mediated perception versus the atavistic surety of actual physical mass, volume and space.

This paper examines John Andrews' "African Place" as a case in point—a technically earnest exercise in passive energy design that fairgoers mistook for a seemingly obligatory 'village-like' pastiche of noble savagery against which surrounding technological marvels could be measured. Quite apart from representational concerns, however, the distinctive cluster was a solution to the primary question of how to design inclusively and affordably for contingency with an open and indeterminate program. Lumped together with other talented "locals" whose unselfconsciously innovative work on the thematic infrastructure of the fair had triumphed, in Reyner Banham's judgement, over the symbolic pomposities of the individual national pavilions and their more celebrated designers, the office of the expatriate Canada-based Andrews



was part of a vanguard that was seen to be pointing beyond structure and technology to human agency itself as the central concern of architecture in the next era.

Introduction: Openness and Internationalism in Canada in the 1960s¹

For young Australian architects on their constitutional “OE” (Overseas Experience), Canada in the early 1960s held a great attraction. In a word, it was “open.” As in Australia, the post-war baby boom and parallel migration programs were stimulating major building programs in both the private and the public sectors. But Canada’s US-linked economy was positively surging by comparison.² Beyond the opportunities arising from economic demand alone, however, “it was the openness of Canada . . . which gave me a break . . .,” recalls John Andrews, the eminent Australian architect whose early career in Canada attracted considerable international attention as the harbinger—somewhat ironically--of a nascent modern “Canadian architecture.” Having initially been attracted to the USA by a scholarship to undertake a masters degree at Harvard’s GSD, Andrews had arrived in Toronto in 1958 on the coat-tails of his runner-up submission (with a team of fellow Harvard classmates) to the Toronto City Hall international design competition, working initially as the project architect for the local Toronto firm that was engaged to document and construct the winning design by Finnish architect, Viljo Revell. For Evan Walker, a fellow Australian abroad and member of the interdisciplinary collective of architects, artists and associated professionals that gathered around the young independent practice that Andrews was subsequently to establish at 47 Colborne Street in Toronto, “[Canada] was ready for pretty much all the things you wanted to do . . . There was never the sense which we always had here [i.e. in Australia] about it wasn’t your turn, or you didn’t go to the right school.”³

It was precisely this openness to new and untested talent and ideas that had given Andrews the extraordinary opportunity to design and build in little more than two short years (1963-65) the remarkable Scarborough College, the University of Toronto’s trend-setting contribution to the explosion of new university construction across the developed world in this period, and the building that was briefly to catapult both Andrews and contemporary Canadian architecture onto the centre stage

1. The research for this paper, including travel to relevant archives and built projects in Canada, is supported by a 2012-2014 Australia Research Council Discovery Grant entitled “John Andrews: Making Architectural Identity.”

2. Canada’s historic demographic and economic expansion continued through the 1960s, achieving a billion dollar merchandise trade surplus for a population of 20 million by 1968. “City Within a City,” *Architect and Building News* (June 5 1969): 30-34.

3. John Andrews in interview with Evan Walker, Cape Liptrap, April 1 2003.

4. Completed by early 1965, international coverage of Scarborough College was extensive and almost universally positive, from both popular and critical quarters. In-depth documentation and critical analysis in the May 1966 issue of *Architectural Forum*, along with a shorter article in the same year in *Time* magazine regarding the integrated architectural and pedagogical innovations of the new college, did much to create Andrews' emerging international profile, whilst Reyner Banham's later re-appraisal of Scarborough's pioneering, if almost "primitive," realisation of many of the most significant features of the widely theorised notion of the early 1960s of a "megastructural" new architecture and urbanism was to simultaneously emphasise its particular success as a response to the peculiar 'Canadian accountancy' of design & construction in an extreme climate. Oscar Newman, "The New Campus," *Architectural Forum* 124, no. 4 (May 1966): 30-55; "Colleges: A Satellite Built for TV," *Time* 69, no. 2 (January 13, 1967): 46-48; Reyner Banham, *Megastructure: Urban Futures of the Recent Past* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1976), 133-139.

5. Established informally in 1962 as a one-man office, the core practice of John Andrews Architects had grown into an innovative co-operative of 12 equal partners by the time that Andrews himself had relocated back to Australia, in 1969. Key members of the informal collective of allied professionals and frequent collaborators known as "Integ" who were co-owners and occupants with the Andrews office of the same historic sandstone premises on Colborne Street in the shadows of Toronto's central financial district, were the engineer, Norbert Seethaler, landscape architect Dick Strong, and lawyer, George Miller. Evan Walker, and the independent practice of Ron Thom, one of most critically acclaimed Canadian architects of the day, were some of the other tenants who made Colborne Street a financially viable address. "John Andrews architects, Colborne Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada" (Toronto: John Andrews Architects, no date [ca. 1970]); John Andrews in interview with Evan Walker, Cape Liptrap, April 1 2003.

6. Andrews in interview with Walker.

7. Carol Moore Ede, *Canadian Architecture 1960/70* (Toronto: Burns and Mac Eachern 1971); Banham, *Megastructure*, 133-59; Philip Drew, *Third Generation: The Changing Meaning of Architecture* (London: Pall Mall Press, 1972); Jennifer Taylor and John Andrews, *John Andrews: Architecture a Performing Art* (Melbourne and Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1982). The possibility of a substantially different reading of the work's "Canadian-ness," from a pedagogical and political perspective, is offered in Paolo Scrivano and Mary Lou Lobsinger, "Experimental Architecture Progressive Pedagogy: Scarborough College," *Architecture and Ideas* 8 (2008): 1-19.

of international architectural discourse in the mid-sixties.⁴ Scarborough was also the project that would enable Andrews' Colborne Street office to find its feet as an established commercial practice.⁵ While the new office was to continue to attract a string of prestigious institutional commissions and ever larger ventures into urban design in and around Toronto over the next few years, it was also one of the relatively few non-Montreal based Canadian practices that was to secure a piece of the architectural design action leading up to Montreal's world's fair of 1967—arguably, one of the most significant and internationally-watched architectural "happenings" in Canada of that particularly eventful decade. Again, this was an instance of the exceptional opportunity that the Canadian scene in that moment had opened for him and those of his contemporaries who were poised to cease it: "What an incredible time that was," Andrews later recalled. "They actually decided to give the work to younger architects."⁶

Interpretations of such iconic works as Scarborough College, with its monumental sense of rootedness in the landscape from which it erupts, or comparably grounded buildings from Andrews' later Australian career such as the Belconnen Offices in the ACT, and Andrews' own family farmhouse at Eugowra NSW, have tended to read his architecture in either or both of the possible national/regionalist frames in which he and his transnational career between Canada and Australia would appear to fit.⁷ But this paper focuses, alternatively, on Andrews' self-conscious notion of his "international" status and agency as a late-modern architect formed in the middle decades of the twentieth century whose practice ultimately operated under the banner of "John Andrews International," designing and realising a corpus of significant works on two different continents including the project to be examined more closely here which, ostensibly, represented a third continent. Andrews' work for Expo 67 lends insight into the particular ideal of internationalism in which his early work and that of his architectural contemporaries in Canada in the mid-1960s were invested. But it also demonstrates how the internationalist ideologies and assumptions of his generation were already failing to appreciate the cultural dimensions and complexity of the post-industrial and post-colonial worlds that accelerating progress toward global modernity was beginning to bring into collision in the burgeoning cities of Canada, as they would some years later in Australia as well.



Expo 67

The Montreal Universal and International Exhibition of 1967 was the official successor to the Brussels World's Fair of 1958 which, with Montreal and the succeeding Osaka fair of 1970, were class "A" fairs according to the criteria of the Paris-based Bureau des Expositions International. But planners of "Expo 67" had aimed from the outset to make it the most extraordinary of such events since the tradition was established with the great European international exhibitions of the mid-nineteenth century. Relative, certainly, to the most recent class "B" world's fairs that had been held in Seattle (1962) and New York City (1964), Montreal's "Expo" was an architectural and urban production of an altogether different scale and ambition, conceptually as well as technically. Whilst the Brussels fair had privileged the technological power and potential of the ideologically polarized world of the Cold War era centred still on Europe as the frontline, the Montreal Expo was to be a celebration of a more consciously global world in which technology was the servant of "Man". Borrowing its theme and subtitle—"Man and his World" / "Terre des Hommes"—from the French author and aviator, Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, best known for his cosmic modern children's fable, *The Little Prince*, the fair sought to articulate the neo-humanist ideal privileged by the perspective of the modern airborne traveller in which human-kind, in all its superficial diversity, is reduced to the essential universality of the human subject as creator and steward of the respective environments in which it dwells, and the shared world which these comprise.⁸

8. Rhona Richman Kenneally and Johanne Sloan (eds), *Expo 67: Not Just a Souvenir* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 5-9.

To translate this vision into the physical form and space of the exhibition a series of theme pavilions were projected in which the various dimensions and modes of "Man's" engagement with his world—"Man the Explorer," "Man the Creator," "Man the Producer," "Man the Provider," "Man in the Community"—would be investigated. The overarching theme was further represented and explored through additional structures such as Moshe Safdie's iconic experimental housing cluster, Habitat 67, erected immediately adjacent to "Man in the Community", and the extensive transport and media saturated matrix of the exhibition grounds themselves, which were literally "man-made" on a pair of artificial islands created in the Saint Lawrence River opposite Montreal's old port.

Exceptional as this conception was, however, the exhibition organizers had declined to realise one of the most radical

propositions entertained in the early planning stages (ca. 1962-63), in which participating countries were to have collaborated in designing and installing a more extensive and holistic array of integrated thematic infrastructure, but with no individual national pavilions as such. Of particular relevance to John Andrews' approach to the fair (to which we will return presently), this decidedly unconventional conception of a "post-national" world's fair had been championed by two members. In particular of the initial master-planning team, Blanche Lemco van Ginkel—a former student and later a tutor in urban design at Harvard GSD, possibly during Andrews' time at that school—and her husband H. P. Daniel (Sandy) van Ginkel, an expat member of the original Dutch core group of Team Ten who had also served as Moshe Safdie's advisor for his final thesis project at Montreal's McGill—the original hypothetical project from which Habitat 67 was to arise.⁹

9. Kenneally and Sloan (eds), *Expo 67*, 9.

In the end, in addition to the theme pavilions and a range of corporate and institutionally sponsored pavilions, a record number of 71 countries also exhibited at the fair, the large majority building separate pavilions of their own design, including the host nation along with several of its own provinces, not least the host province of Quebec.¹⁰ Indeed it was relatively inconceivable that the official fair organizers—The Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition (CCWE)—could have foregone this opportunity for national celebration in what was to be Canada's centennial year of confederation as a self-governing dominion of the former British Empire. In the paradoxical context of the growing nationalist-secessionist movement within predominantly French-speaking Quebec, however, the Fair was also conceived strategically to have a catalytic effect on the further dynamic development of the host city—which was still Canada's undisputed premier metropolis at the time—affirming a vision of an open, technophile world of late-modern humanism and cosmopolitanism of which bilingual Montreal—the second largest French-speaking city in the world (after Paris)—was an aspiring microcosm, integrated simultaneously as it was in the new-media-savvy Canada of Marshall McLuhan and the broader transnational economy and techno-sphere of modern production and consumption in North-America as a whole.

10. "Expo 67," *Design* 11, no. 7 (July 1967): 79-91.



African Place

How, then, did the Andrews office get involved in Expo? With the Scarborough project only just built and yet to be published, Andrews was still relatively unknown. So there were no invitations forthcoming from “the upper levels of power,” according to Andrews.¹¹ This included the Australian Government whose rather unremarkable metal and glass box of a pavilion (at least from the exterior), designed by John McCormick of the Commonwealth Department of Works, Canberra, was to be built (somewhat ironically) by Andrews’ former employer, John B. Parkin Associates, as the affiliated Canadian firm.¹² As an aspiring but not yet fully established Toronto-based practice, the source of potential Expo work for the Andrews office proved to be a lower-level acquaintance they had within the organizing authority itself, the CCWE. As Andrews recalled, “we new a fellow working there who was in a position to know what projects could possibly happen, and he literally manufactured a thing called African Place.”¹³

African Place was the largest of three (and a possible fourth) such facilities for which the Andrews practice was eventually engaged, by early 1965, to develop preliminary designs, two of which would finally be built. The other realised scheme was a complex of smaller food-services and support buildings referred to as “Activity Area ‘F’” which comprised part of the secondary yet nonetheless architecturally distinctive urban infrastructure of the fair.¹⁴ “Commonwealth Place” had been intended for an adjacent site to African Place and had a similar brief, but did not proceed beyond the sketch design phase when insufficient commitment could be secured on the part of the intended exhibitors, whilst an analogous commission for a “Joint Arab Pavilion” was evidently awarded to another Canadian architect (the Quebec City based firm of C. R. Anderson) before any substantive ideas were developed for it by the Andrews office.¹⁵

None of these facilities were conceived as independent “pavilions” in the conventional sense and, significantly, Andrews and his team were to have no direct relationship with the intended user/occupants or their exhibit designers. Rather, the client in each case was the CCWE itself which had realised, once the pavilion commissioning process had begun, that many of the poorer developing nations in post-colonial Africa, the Middle-East and Asia could not afford to build full-fledged pavilions of the minimum 3,000 square-foot area that the planners had prescribed

11. Taylor and Andrews, *Architecture a Performing Art*, 73.

12. I. Kalin, *Expo '67: Survey of building materials, systems and techniques used at the Universal International Exhibition of 1967*, Montreal, Canada (Ottawa: Materials Branch, Dept. of Industry, Trade and Commerce, Queen's Printer, 1969), 134. The interior was designed by Robin Boyd.

13. Taylor and Andrews, *Architecture a Performing Art*, 73.

14. Area F was designed in collaboration with A. J. (Jack) Diamond, another expatriate architect working in Toronto—in Diamond's case from South Africa—with whom the Andrews office was then exploring a potential association. Roger Du Toit in interview with Evan Walker, July 1, 2004.

15. All four of these prospective projects are listed in the accessions list of drawings and records related to Expo, in the relevant Andrews collection preserved in the Canadian Architecture Archive at the University of Calgary (CAA). However, no actual drawings or documents pertaining to the “Joint Arab Pavilion” could be found during the author's April 2013 visit to the CAA. The pavilion for the “Arab Countries” ultimately built to C. R. Anderson's design on a site immediately adjacent to African Place was relatively undistinguished conventional ‘Orientalist’ response to the brief, by contrast to Andrews work, harking back to the colonial and Empire exhibitions of the previous century. Kalin, *Expo '67*, 132.

to attain the critical mass and urban qualities envisioned for the fair, let alone the cost of demolishing them again after the fair was over. Smaller units of more affordable rental space within pavilion-sized complexes would be the key to a more universal and equitable inclusivity which might also help ensure that the record number of international participants that the organisers were aiming for was in reach.¹⁶

16. Taylor and Andrews, *Architecture a Performing Art*, 73.

Among more than twenty different African nations that had been courted, no less than fifteen were to mount exhibits in African Place in the end, but some of which were only to formally confirm their commitment within a few months of the official opening of the exhibition in April 1967, and well after the architecture was already substantially constructed.¹⁷ “The problem,” as Andrews defined the design challenge, was not, therefore, a matter of representation. Indeed with the anticipated multi-cultural mix of content, from both French and English-speaking African nations, and the sheer indeterminacy of the final range and number of participants, the primary facet of what was an inherently open-ended, multi-factorial design problem was the need for optimal flexibility in the spatial layout of a generic exhibition facility that would also be as affordable to construct and operate as possible.

17. The exhibiting countries were Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Togo, Chad, Gabon, Niger, Nigeria, Ivory Coast, Rwanda, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Ghana, Madagascar, and Senegal. *General report on the 1967 World Exhibition presented by the Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition, Montreal, Canada*, vol. 1 (Ottawa: Queen’s Printer for Canada, 1969), 391-407.

“The solution” that Andrews and his team arrived at was described in tellingly generic and abstract terms in an official retrospective government report on the building materials, systems and techniques employed at Expo: “One of the largest pavilions of the geometrical cellular variety at Expo, Africa Place [sic.] was basically realised in terms of the original concept.” And: “Design was based on a natural flow pattern which resulted in a series of interrelated and interdependent spaces arranged within a modular system. A natural ventilation system was devised based upon consistent prevailing winds on this section of the St. Lawrence River.”¹⁸

18. Kalin, *Expo '67*, 131, 129.

The openness of the formal solution—a series of white, upturned egg-crate-like ply-wood roofs floating nimbus-like over a dark landscape-like base of canted terracotta tiles (individual clusters of which bore an uncanny family resemblance in both compositional principle and aesthetic effect to Utzon’s yet to be constructed design for the Sydney Opera House, when viewed across the adjacent canal)—was thus not only to enable flexibility in the planning of the exhibits, but to ensure the free-flow of air necessary for the proper performance of the passive ventilation



system. Large and distinctive vertical square openings in the roof sections were adaptations of the technical principle of traditional wind-scoops employed in various desert building cultures of northern Africa and western Asia, but had been wind-tunnel-tested by Andrews and his consulting engineer, Norbert Seethaler, at the University of Toronto to act together with the anticipated evaporative cooling effect of the nearby river and the shallow canals that bounded the site on three sides.¹⁹ What many fairgoers mistook for a “village-like” pastiche on the African theme was thus, in fact, an early prototype for a more environmentally and energy-conscious approach to architectural form-making that would also be relatively cheap to build.

19. “Beyond the Individual Building,” *Architectural Record* (September 1966); “Reaping the Wind: Africa Place, Isle Notre-Dame,” *Progressive Architecture* (June 1967): 147.

This criterion of constructability was perhaps the least obvious, but one of the most significant factors that dictated the final resolution of the design. Indeed, after their recent whirlwind experience in designing and constructing Scarborough College in just two years, the Andrews office was familiar and relatively comfortable—by contrast to many other consulting architects and designers—with the “critical path” methodology that was employed with draconian rigour by the CCWE to manage the myriad major and minor architectural and engineering works that had to be coordinated and delivered in parallel to build and complete the exhibition in time.. The personal face of the CCWE in this regard was Colonel Edward Churchill, the Director of the Department of installations. Churchill was a retired Canadian military officer and logistics expert of the WWII generation who was personally responsible for building the entire fair beginning with the very islands on which the exhibition was to be erected, and for whom Andrews developed a healthy respect as the effective client and commanding decision-maker in what could potentially have been an opaque morass of bureaucratic entanglement.²⁰ Prompted by the iron constraints and logic of Churchill’s critical path, Andrews’ designs for both African Place and Activity Area “F” were among a number of other projects at Expo that aspired to make innovative new use of basic domestic grade plywood as the principal material. In the context of a super-heated local construction market where all the major contractors and materials suppliers were already committed to the larger and more sophisticated Expo projects, this humble material was relatively inexpensive, widely available off the shelf and, moreover, could be largely worked offsite into prefabricated components by the only contractors still available to bid on the job who tended to be smaller less experienced builders familiar

20. Taylor and Andrews, *Architecture a Performing Art*, 73-75.

21. John Andrews, interview with the author and research team, Orange NSW, July 2-3, 2012.

22. Taylor and Andrews, *Architecture a Performing Art*, 75.

23. African Place Exhibit Design Co-ordination Report, prepared by John Andrews Architects, 47 Colborne Street, Toronto, Ontario (dated: September 21, 1966). Soft-bound typescript report, in Box 43-24 (text files), John Andrews Collection, Canadian Architectural Archives, University of Calgary.

24. Kalin, *Expo '67*, 131; Andrews in interview with the research team.

25. *General report on the 1967 World Exhibition*, vol. 1, 392.

26. Banque National de Paris, *Montreal Expo 67* (Banque National de Paris, 1967), 50.

only with conventional residential grade construction materials and methods.²¹ Andrews relished this challenge and claims to have been one of only a very select few—including Buckminster Fuller with his colossal geodesic dome for the US Pavilion—to have fully met Churchill’s regime, and delivered the results on-time and in-budget.²²

For all the open flexibility that Andrews had aimed to embody in his design as its guiding principle, however, neither he nor the intrinsic order of his design were successful in guiding the independent Parisian exhibition designers who were ultimately engaged to fit-out the interior spaces for the African exhibitors. Although the Andrews office took pains to prepare a brief report outlining the principles of the design as a guideline to the exhibitors and their designers, this was evidently ignored.²³ Consequently the complex was not used or experienced to its full potential as the free-flowing spatial pattern was partitioned and compartmentalised, simultaneously obstructing air-flows along with sightlines and thereby the passive ventilation and cooling capacity of the structures.²⁴

In the final official description of Africa Place offered in the summative report of the exhibition prepared in the afterglow of the fair, however, such niggling technical pitfalls were tactfully overlooked in favour of the visual and sensory impressions that the architects and designers combined had imparted, together with the diverse cultural content of the pavilion itself: “[I]n the scope of a distinctive pavilion . . . Africa Place offers a panorama of modern Africa . . . which will linger in the minds of visitors—together with the haunting beating of the drums welcoming them there.”²⁵

Demi-official and Popular impressions were similarly benign but patronizing. In a commemorative volume published by a key corporate sponsor, in which the designs for the various pavilions and facilities of the fair were previewed, it was explained, quite incorrectly, in the relevant caption to an image of the presentation model for the African cluster that “[s]everal African nations arranged to pool their individual pavilions in such a way as to give a realistic impression of an African village.”²⁶ Aimed at French visitors to the Fair, and preceded by a potted-historical account of the impact and evolution of previous universal exhibitions since the era of the French colonial Empire, the description still anticipated (somewhat remarkably, for the swinging 60s!) the seemingly obligatory representation of noble



savagery as a trope of the world's fair tradition against which the technological and cultural advances of other exhibiting nations could be measured.

Possibly because of this misapprehension of its formal allusions, direct commentary on Andrews' design from qualified architectural critics was largely mute. A minor technical note on the environmental and structural systems of the complex in a special issue of *Progressive Architecture* offered Ian Motion, a member of Andrews' architectural team, an opportunity to record the architects' dismay with the unanticipated sentimentality and misunderstanding with which their design was being received: "It is interesting that the layman finds it necessary to identify with the so-called 'unusual.' The roof and cellular plan has been identified symbolically by news media with African villages. One wonders what the lay description would be if the project were to house a cooperative market in a North American city?"²⁷

27. "Reaping the Wind," 147.

Expert assessment of the architecture of the fair in general was more equivocal than that of the uninformed beholder. Whilst lay observers in the popular press were generally wowed by the built outcomes (a measure of considerable success for the Exhibition organisers), correspondents and editors covering this "Architects' Expo" for the professional journals were more discerning. Few of the architectural ideas and technologies on show were truly novel, but for the first time the radical propositions inherent in projects such as Safdie's Habitat 67 experiment with "pre-fab" housing, and Frei Otto's tensile mega-structure for the West German Pavilion had finally been rendered full scale, in tangible and therefore testable form. Real progress was imminent. Still, the experience was of a "middle-world of hesitation," as John C. Rowan, editor of *Progressive Architecture*, expressed it, one that hovered between the intimate and the monumental, hi-tech and no-tech, and the increasing allure of artificially mediated perception versus the atavistic surety of actual physical mass, volume and space.²⁸

28. John C. Rowan, editorial to special issue on Expo '67, *Progressive Architecture* (June 1967).

Sir Basil Spence's British Pavilion epitomised the latter, an expressionistic ode to the monumental, aggressively angular in form and brutalistically rendered, literally, in a sprayed-on pastiche of rough-cast concrete, but at a relatively diminutive scale that, unintentionally, had the almost Disney-like effect of a sentimental caricature. Indeed, with its staggered profile and eroded tower element, it was more than a little reminiscent of some of the more iconic features of Andrews' Scarborough

College (first published while Spence's pavilion was still on the drawing board); a further curiously contextual echo of the brutalist aesthetics of the moment and competing claims in the international context of a world's fair to their particular cultural pedigree and symbolic value.

If anything, Andrews' collective facilities for the African exhibitors, and Activity Area "F" were encompassed under Reyner Banham's praise for the un-sung "locals" who, in his opinion, had out-classed the more self-conscious and frequently pompous efforts of the better-known and established American and European architects, such as Sir Basil (and even Buckminster Fuller), in their designs for conventional nation-specific pavilions.²⁹ Andrew's primary aim in these projects—to address the need for an open system that could contend with indeterminate needs and contingencies—resonated, at least in principle, with the same potential that Banham ascribed. to the nearby theme pavilion, "Man the Producer," designed by a local Montreal-based architectural partnership³⁰ which, in Banham's view, had enabled the Expo public to experience a certain ludic situationism in their spatial ramblings within that they were denied in their linear cue-bound experiences of other pavilions.³¹

Here Andrews was aiming, at a smaller scale, for a non-heroic architecture as a supporting "meta" (if not a "mega")-structure in which circulation and connectivity were the driving forces. This, of course, had already become a dominant guiding idea in Andrews' work. The concepts of the internal public "street" and "meeting place," had already been explored at Scarborough College, and (as Philip Goad and Anthony Moulis have shown in their respective papers for this session) were to continue to be fundamental design ideas that would recur in Andrews' designs for educational buildings and institutions, including student residences, over the next couple of decades.³²

These design aims also reflected the currency of such ideas for other North American-trained architect/planners of Andrews' generation. But, as Paul Walker has observed, Andrews' masters course at Harvard, with the particular dual focus of Jose Luis Sert's GSD curriculum on monumental and urban architecture, had connected him to both the increasingly contested discourse about modernist urbanism circulating in CIAM circles in the post-war years, and to the debates for and against a new monumentality in modern architecture occurring simultaneously in the US and Britain.³³

29. Reyner Banham, "Arts in Society: L'Homme a l'Expo," *New Society* (June 1967): 811-13.

30. Affleck, Desbarats, Dimakopoulos, Lebensold, Sise, later incorporated as ARCOP: Architects in Co-Partnership

31. Banham, "Arts in Society," 813.

32. Philip Goad, "Open field, open street, open choice: John Andrews and the South Residences, University of Guelph (1965-8)" and Antony Moulis, "Searching for Open Form: The Pinwheel Plan in the Work of John Andrews," in *Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand* 30, "Open," ed. Alexandra Brown and Andrew Leach (Gold Coast, Qld.: SAHANZ, 2013), 639-50 and 651-60, resp.

33. Paul Walker, "Reassessing John Andrews' Architecture: Harvard Connections," in *Proceedings* 30, ed. Brown and Leach, 611-22.



Despite his putative membership in a “Third Generation” of international modernists—who, as Philip Drew attempted to define them, were better attuned to the humanistic dimensions and open-ended flux of social space, and the ecological imperatives of environmental design than their forbearers in the more narrowly mechanistic understanding of functionalism that had been upheld by CIAM³⁴—Andrews remained an exponent of an architecture which was still intent, true to the modernism of his first and second generation mentors, on providing “the solution,” as he put it, to a given design problem. The solution to the problem of designing freer, less-oppressive buildings was to re-conceive them alternatively as integrated structures of an urban nature and scale in which circulation and communication were the essential issues on which the lion’s share of design thought and innovation was to be focused.

34. Drew, *Third Generation*.

Whilst the first significant projects, designed in the early ’60s, such as Scarborough and the Expo pavilions were serendipitously still sufficiently open, loose, and unresolved for sheer lack of experience at such an early stage of Andrews’ and his collaborators’ careers, the brazen confidence, even arrogance, and forthrightness of the next phase of work characterised by major urban-scale developments such as Toronto’s massive Metro-Center scheme and the Belconnen Office complex that was to lead Andrews back to Australia indicated a new certainty that the “critical path” of architecture in the future lay in solving, once and for all, the problem of movement.³⁵ But this seemingly reductive and increasingly rigid conception of architecture as a form of connective social infrastructure was increasingly detached, ironically, from the actual content of contemporary society and culture itself.

35. Arrived at somewhat prematurely, perhaps, due to the unusual degree of fame and praise Andrews’ work had earned him at an early stage of his career.

Conclusion

As this snapshot of Andrews at Expo and its immediate aftermath has helped make clearer, his meteoric early career was a phenomenon of an era that was already passing in which the modernist ideal of “internationalism”—so present in Andrews’ US graduate education and his subsequent perception and experience of Canada in the early ’60s—had opened doors to a young Australian and his international team of other expats with the gumption to realise bold and untested ideas that were then only “in the air.” A key factor in his early success and accomplishments

had been his personal capacity to deal directly and decisively with decision-makers who were still accustomed to exercising “top-down” technocratic authority. But he and his operative ideas were ultimately less-suited to the realities of a multi-cultural post-industrial society that were already beginning to manifest themselves in the rapidly-changing national and civic politics of Canada that followed its’ cosmopolitan “coming-out” exercise at Expo 67, and which would follow him back to the changing Australia to which he was soon to return.

In the heady moment of Expo, then, Andrews had not really sought to make a place for the African nations to show and express themselves on their own terms, but rather to place Africa in an architecture of the later Twentieth Century that was suitably versatile for the functional requirements and logistical constraints of the actual client—the Exhibition organising authority. To the extent that the pavilion even acknowledged its specific “cultural” content, it was not as a source to draw formal character or conceptual inspiration from so much as a further “problem” to bring into order through the architectural “solution.”

Unpublished Sources:

John Andrews in interview with Evan Walker, Cape Liptrap, April 1, 2003.

Dick Strong and John Andrews in interview with Evan Walker, Cape Liptrap, March 12, 2004.

Roger Du Toit in interview with Evan Walker, July 1, 2004.

John Andrews in interview with Peter Scriver, Paul Walker, Philip Goad and Antony Moulis, Orange, NSW, July 2-3, 2012.

John Andrews Collection, Canadian Architecture Archives, University of Calgary.

Affleck, Desbarats, Dimakopoulos, Lebensold, Sise fonds, Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montreal.

Luc Durand fonds, Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montreal.

