



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/>

Paul Walker, "Reassessing John Andrews' Architecture: Harvard Connections" 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, p611-622.

ISBN-10: 0-9876055-0-X

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

Reassessing John Andrews' Architecture

Harvard Connections

Paul Walker

University of Melbourne

The architecture of John Andrews both in Canada and Australia has been written about in terms of national characteristics imputed to both countries: expansiveness, directness, and responsiveness to broad landscape conditions. In this regard, the main critical and historiographic responses to Andrews' work reflect the context of robust cultural development and confidence in Canada in the 1960s and in Australia in the 1970s. While acknowledging the important role of the first critics and historians to write about Andrews, the current project on his work takes different and complementary approaches. These seek to locate Andrews as an architect whose exceptional production reflects aspects of the broader architectural culture of the period of his training and the formation of his practice, in for example its adoption of particular planning strategies, exploration of building types of significance at mid-century, and for the complexity of its role in making or representing identities.

As an introduction to the reassessment of Andrews' work, this paper will consider his education at Harvard's Graduate School of Design in 1957–58. In particular, the role and influence of Josep Lluís Sert, the Dean of the GSD and Andrews' design teacher will be examined. The focus of Sert's curriculum on monumental and urban architecture connects Andrews' masters-level education to both the discourse about urbanism circulating in CIAM circles in the post-war years, and to the simultaneous debates about monumentality. Sert also reintroduced explicit discussion of architectural history to the GSD curriculum. The paper will also examine Andrews' return to Harvard to design Gund Hall for the GSD 1967–72. This coincided both with the end of Sert's deanship and with the completion by the Sert's architectural practice of a series of significant projects at Harvard and at Boston University that attempted to assertively modernise these campuses.



The architecture of John Andrews both in Canada and Australia has been written about in terms of national characteristics imputed to both countries: expansiveness, directness, and responsiveness to broad landscape conditions. When Andrews' first major independent project, Scarborough College in Toronto's outer east, was completed in 1965 commentary in the *Canadian Architect* linked it to Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, another new university complex set in a dramatic landscape, and suggested both represented a new direction in Canadian architecture.¹ Revisiting the conception of Scarborough's design in a recent analysis, Mary Lou Lobsinger and Paolo Scrivano start by noting: "It is a commonplace to assume that forms and materials of Canadian architecture are influenced by sensitivity to landscape and that this sensitivity is integral to a notion of national identity."² Jennifer Taylor's astute analysis of Australia's architecture from the boom period of the 1960s, 70s and 80s argues that

Australians seem to be primarily concerned with fundamentals, and design is tempered mostly by a direct 'grass roots' approach that accords priority to matters of practical significance or immediate importance ... Over the two centuries since European settlement, the search for consonance between country and culture has fashioned architecture.³

In the narrative that Taylor sets out to support this line, John Andrews is given a lead role, and his Cameron Offices design is described as "the first building constructed in this country to give architectural expression to the expansive essence of the land itself."⁴

In this regard, the main critical and historiographic responses to Andrews' work reflect the context of robust cultural development and confidence in Canada in the 1960s and in Australia in the 1970s. While acknowledging the important role of the first critics and historians to write about Andrews, the current project on his career and the work of his offices takes different and complementary approaches. These seek to locate Andrews as an architect whose exceptional production reflects aspects of the broader architectural culture of the period of his training and the formation of his practice, in for example its adoption of particular planning strategies, exploration of building types of particular significance at mid-century, and for the complexity of its role in making or representing identities.

1. "Scarborough College, Ontario," *Canadian Architect* 11 (May 1966): 41.

2. Paolo Scrivano and Mary Lou Lobsinger, "Experimental Architecture Progressive Pedagogy: Scarborough College," *Architecture and Ideas* 8 (2008): 6.

3. Jennifer Taylor, *Australian Architecture since 1960* (Sydney: Law Book Company, 1986), 11.

4. Taylor, *Australian Architecture since 1960*, 107.

While the first critical responses to his work foregrounded its response to landscape in relation to putative national characteristics, at the same time they acknowledged the connection of Andrews' work to the intellectual and ideological context of emerging architectural ideas of architecture in the 1960s and 1970s. Philip Drew's 1972 account of Andrews and other emerging talents in *The Third Generation* (Drew's generational conception of modern architecture comes from Giedion and the context of the demise of CIAM in the 1950s) is prefaced by three essays in which he comments on new attitudes to technology, environment, conscious and unselfconscious approaches to design, and in particular Christopher Alexander's idea of architectural "pattern languages." But his commentary on Andrews, sitting between those on Stirling and Venturi and Rauch, does not detail how these connections are warranted in the case of Andrews.⁵ Equally, Taylor makes the observation that Andrews' work relates to "structuralism," by which she means the organisation in the work of Peter and Alison Smithson and of Kenzo Tange (she names these architects specifically⁶) of elements of inhabitation as integral parts of an urban order. The term "structuralism" here can also be taken to allude to the way the term is used by Herman Hertzberger and Arnulf Lüchinger to characterise the work of a group of Dutch followers of Aldo van Eyck, which they specifically connect to the structural anthropology of Claude Lévi-Strauss.⁷ In Taylor's *John Andrews: architecture a performing art*, written with Andrews, a connection is made between Andrews' attitude to design and the approach of Hertzberger and van Eyck, and Andrews comments on "those little Hertzbergian businesses of stoops and places to stop and gather and meet."⁸ But Taylor does not identify the vector by which the architect made such links.

While the connections of Andrews' work to the emergent environmentalism of the early 1970s or of the structuralism of van Eyck's followers will be investigated further by the current research project, it also reflects an emerging sense that the intellectual landscape of architecture circa 1970–1980 did not entail as strong a break with key debates of the immediate post-war as a generational logic, or the idea of an end of modernism (or modernity) would suggest. Considering Andrews' education at Harvard's Graduate School of Design in 1957–58 throws light on this, as does his subsequent return to Harvard to design and build George Gund Hall, a new building for the Graduate School of Design, 1967 to 1972.

5. Philip Drew, *The Third Generation: The Changing Meaning of Architecture* (London: Pall Mall, 1972).

6. Taylor, *Australian Architecture since 1960*, 108, 224 n.29.

7. Arnulf Lüchinger, *Structuralism in Architecture and Urban Planning* (Stuttgart: Krämer, 1981).

8. Jennifer Taylor and John Andrews, *John Andrews: Architecture, a Performing Art* (Melbourne & Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1982), 18–19, 131.



Andrews and Harvard

Andrews had completed a BArch at the University of Sydney in 1956 and won the Ormond Prize for Design.⁹ But though he remembers his final year design teacher George Molnar in particular with affection and personal regard, he does not consider his bachelor's education to have been strong. In 1956, Pietro Belluschi, Dean of Architecture at MIT, was a visitor to Sydney in connection with the RAlA National Convention in Adelaide where he was a keynote speaker; Andrews had the opportunity to ask him about graduate study in the US. While working subsequently at Edwards, Madigan & Torzillo (where he recalls working on their entry for the Sydney Opera House competition) Andrews applied to several US MArch programmes: he chose Harvard because it offered the most generous financial support.¹⁰

Harvard was to be central to the launch of Andrews' career and in its ongoing trajectory. His entry in the design competition for the Toronto City Hall competition of 1958, done in collaboration with GSD classmates Macy Dubois, Byron Ireland, and William Morgan, was placed second, and led to his going to Canada. This competition was as significant internationally as the Sydney Opera House competition of the previous year, with which it shared the involvement of Eero Saarinen as a juror. The design by Andrews and his team beat the premiated entries in the Toronto competition of established architects including IM Pei and Perkins & Wills. Harvard connections were also to be important subsequently. The master plan for Guelph University where Andrews built the student residences that were his second major project was master planned by Canadian architect Macklin Hancock, a GSD graduate, along with his and Andrews' former Harvard professor, Josep Lluís Sert. Sert also did significant buildings there.¹¹ At Guelph, the Harvard connections were almost certainly coincidental. But in many other instances they were not. John Simpson, a key part of the Andrews Toronto and Sydney offices, undertook the GSD Master of Architecture degree in 1967–68, and immediately afterward assisted in the realisation of the Andrews design for the GSD's new building, Gund Hall. In Australia, Simpson was chiefly responsible for delivery of the firm's work in Brisbane.¹² Andrews' close friend the landscape architect Dick Strong was also a Harvard graduate. With Andrews, Strong was part of the loose collective of professionals called "Integ" that established the Colborne Street offices in Toronto where Andrews' Canadian practice was based. Strong

9. Jennifer Taylor, "Andrews, John," in *The Encyclopedia of Australian Architecture*, ed. Philip Goad and Julie Willis (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 23.

10. Taylor offers interesting information on the funding Andrews received from a Harvard scholarship. See Taylor and Andrews, *John Andrews*, 21.

11. Eric Mumford, *Defining Urban Design: CIAM Architects and the Formation of a Discipline, 1937–69*, (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2009), 171.

12. Andrew Wilson, "Simpson, John," in *The Encyclopedia of Australian Architecture*, ed. Goad and Willis, 628.

was for some time in a Toronto-based partnership with Hideo Sasaki, professor of landscape architecture at the GSD; Strong was a collaborator on several Andrews projects, including the Cameron offices. During Andrews' period as chair of the department of architecture at the University of Toronto from 1967, his close associate and lieutenant in the transformation he instigated in the curriculum was the English architect Peter Prangnell, another GSD alumnus.¹³ (Prangnell, an enthusiastic admirer of Aldo van Eyck, most probably facilitated Andrews' knowledge of the innovative Dutch work of the 1960s. Prangnell arranged visits by van Eyck and Hertzberger to the Toronto school of architecture at this period.¹⁴) The architect of record for Andrews' final realised international project, Intelsat in Washington, completed in 1988, was the Boston firm of one of his Harvard classmates, Maurice Finegold. Exactly how the Harvard network might have facilitated all these connections is unclear, but nevertheless Harvard links are an apparent pattern in the Andrews circle.

But the aspect of Andrews' Harvard experience which is the focus here is not the professional and personal networks that followed on afterward, but rather the role and influence in his graduate education of Josep Lluís Sert. Sert was Professor of Architecture, Chair of Architecture, and Dean of the Graduate School of Design, and from his appointment in 1953 when Gropius retired, the intellectual driver of the GSD. Sert was Andrews' design teacher at Harvard. Sert's influence on Andrews is openly acknowledged by the architect, and is noted by Taylor:

Forced to think, forced to communicate, and exposed to the influence of such outstanding teachers and professional men as Siegfried Giedion and Josep Lluís Sert, Andrews felt he was at last on the way to becoming an architect. Under Dean Sert the emphasis in the School had changed from the strict Bauhausian line of Walter Gropius, towards the more expressive social and technological stance of the mature le Corbusier Andrews' later work clearly demonstrates lessons well learnt at this time.¹⁵

But what were these lessons? The curriculum Andrews studied is briefly outlined in the *Official Register of Harvard University*.¹⁶ It consisted of three subjects: "Seminar on Structures," "Advanced Architectural Design," and a seminar called "The Human Scale."

For the structures seminar Andrews did a study of the Melbourne Olympic Swimming Stadium (1956) by Peter McIntyre, Kevin

13. On the reforms undertaken in architectural education at the University of Toronto under the leadership of Andrews and Prangnell, see Robert Gretton, "The Winds of Change: an examination of the new curriculum of the Toronto School of Architecture," *Canadian Architect* 14, no. 2 (February 1969): 29, and the articles following this, by George Baird & Peter Prangnell, Ray Affleck, and Hans Elte.

14. Comment by Peter Prangnell to author, Toronto, September 20, 2012.

15. Taylor and Andrews, *John Andrews*, 21.

16. *Official Register of Harvard University* LIV no. 18, The Graduate School of Design, Courses in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, City and Regional Planning. Cambridge, Massachusetts: the University (August 26, 1957). Special Collections, Frances Loeb Library, GSD, Harvard University.



Borland, and John and Phyllis Murphy. The seminar instructor was the young engineer William LeMessurier who went on to be principal in a prominent Boston structural engineering firm; Andrews was to use this firm as structural consultants on Gund Hall.¹⁷

17. Comment by John Andrews to author, April 23, 2013.

The teaching of the design subject was led by Sert himself, with the involvement of Huson Jackson, Sert's professional partner, and Alvaro Ortega, a Colombian architect who had trained at McGill in the 1940s and subsequently at Harvard, who was visiting critic at the GSD that year.¹⁸ The curriculum for this subject is described as follows:

18. "Ortega, Alvaro," card file of GSD staff members, Special Collections, Frances Loeb Library, GSD; on Ortega, see "Alvaro Ortega, Canadian Architecture Collection Accession no 35," <http://cac.mcgill.ca/home/archive.php?ID=35&letter=o>.

Advanced problems dealing with (a) complex buildings of monumental character and (b) civic design. The work is carried on in two studios The aim of the course is to develop a broad understanding of the influence of the forces encountered in modern society on the design of buildings and to investigate ways of harnessing the knowledge and techniques of this age in the creation of human environments.

Andrews' studio was under the direction of Sert himself. While the suave and cosmopolitan European Sert was a very different person to the unpolished Australian, generally Sert seems to have favoured working with the international students in the programme. He appears to have been particularly impressed by Andrews.¹⁹ The focus of Sert's GSD design curriculum on the monumental and on urban architecture connects Andrews' masters-level education to both the discourse about urbanism circulating in circles of the Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne in the post-war years, and to the debates about monumentality occurring at that time simultaneously in the US, Britain and Europe. Sert was a leading figure in both these debates. He was the author with Sigfried Giedion and Fernand Léger of the polemical 1943 text "Nine points on monumentality", which famously argued that

19. Comment by Peter Prangnell to author, Toronto, September 20, 2012.

The people want the buildings that represent their social and community life to give more than functional fulfilment. They want their aspiration for monumentality, joy, pride, and excitement to be satisfied.

The fulfilment of this demand can be accomplished with the new means of expression at hand, though it is no easy task²⁰

20. J. L. Sert, F. Léger, and S. Giedion, "Nine Points on Monumentality," in *Architecture Culture, 1943–1968: A Documentary Anthology*, ed. Joan Ockman (New York: Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture, Planning & Preservation, & Rizzoli, 1993), 29.

Sert was also central to the development of urban themes in the post-war meetings of the CIAM. In another pivotal publication from the war years, the book *Can Our Cities Survive?* published in 1942, Sert summed up the explorations of urban issues in the second wave of CIAM meetings from the fourth of these in 1933, held on board the steamship *Patris II* en route between Marseilles and Athens.²¹ In essence *Can Our Cities Survive?* is an extended exploration of the arguments put in CIAM's Charter of Athens developed during the *Patris's* passage. But while the book expostulates on the functional city, it also comments also on the city's human aspects, linking it to the ideas current in the forties that motivated the debate on monumentality. According to Sert's book, in the planned city, "Assembly halls, theaters, concert halls, museums of the arts and sciences, educational centers of different types, stadiums, administrative buildings, and open spaces for assemblies, mass demonstrations and parades will be planned so as to form an organic whole."²² These comments did not fend off Lewis Mumford's criticism of the book, that it did not sufficiently acknowledge the "cultural and civic role of cities".²³ Sert was subsequently to focus on these issues in his role as president of CIAM from 1947, culminating in theme of the 8th CIAM meeting at Hoddesdon in England in 1951, "The Heart of the City".²⁴ But while Sert's ideas about monumentality may have developed in relation to the collective institutions of the urban core, his 1957 studio focussed on medium density housing.²⁵

As well as monumentality and urbanism, the Sert curriculum had a new regard for architectural history, reintroduced after Gropius's departure. The seminar *The Human Scale*, led when it was taken by Andrews by Giedion, and Dr Eduard Sekler, an Austrian architect and architectural historian recruited by Sert to support the development of architectural and urban history content in the GSD programs,²⁶ was described in Harvard's *Official Register* as follows:

This seminar will deal with the knowledge of proportions, as well as the use of axis, symmetry, and sequence, today and in the past. The use of human scale will also be treated in case studies of urban design. The intent is to conduct discussions on a high level in order to further sensitivity in architecture. Short reports with many illustrations will be required of each student. Prerequisite: a sound background in general education and in the history of architecture.

21. J. L. Sert, *Can Our Cities Survive?: An ABC of Urban Problems, their Analysis, their Solutions* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942).

22. Sert, *Can Our Cities Survive?* 232.

23. Eric Mumford, *The CIAM Discourse on Urbanism, 1928–1960* (Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press, 2000), 142.

24. Mumford, *The CIAM Discourse on Urbanism*, 201-15.

25. Mumford, *The CIAM Discourse on Urbanism*, 135-36.

26. Eduard F. Sekler, "Sert, CIAM, and the GSD: a memoir," in *Josep Lluís Sert: The Architect of Urban Design, 1953–1969*, ed. Eric Mumford and Hashim Sarkis (New Haven & London: Yale University Press & Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Graduate School of Design, 2008), 16.



The focus on proportion, axuality, symmetry, and sequence in this seminar reinforced the aspects of the design studio concerned with the monumental in architecture and with the urban ensemble. Indeed, the seminar's title alluded to that of Sert's essay "The Human Scale in City Planning," which Eric Mumford notes specifically linked the arguments for a new monumentality with CIAM urbanism.²⁷ Coincidentally, Andrews would have taken The Human Scale seminar in the spring semester of 1958, more or less contemporaneous with the republication by Giedion of his 1944 essay "The Need for Monumentality" in the book *Architecture, You and Me*, published by Harvard University Press.²⁸ The essay presented an elaboration of the arguments made by Sert, Léger and Giedion in "Nine Points on Monumentality." Giedion and Sekler led the students in the seminar in analyses of such contemporary projects as Brasilia, Chandigarh, new towns in Britain and Sweden, and urban renewal proposals for Rotterdam by Jakob Bakema.²⁹

27. Mumford, *The CIAM Discourse on Urbanism*, 151.

28. Sigfried Giedion, "The Need for Monumentality," in *Architecture, You and Me*, ed. Sigfried Giedion (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958). This essay and Sert's "The Human Scale in City Planning" both originally appeared in *New Architecture and City Planning*, ed. Paul Zucker (New York: Philosophical Library, 1944).

29. Mumford, *Defining Urban Design*, 135.

How, then, to paraphrase Taylor's words, does Andrews' work after he completed his MArch demonstrate the lessons of the teaching he received from Sert? These lessons would link Andrews' architecture to themes in the debates of the 1950s promulgated not by the Smithsons, van Eyck, or the emergent Japanese, but rather those promoted by the older generation that the Smithsons and other members of Team 10 had so vehemently criticised at the last CIAM meetings at Aix-en-Provence, Dubrovnik, and Otterlo. My point here is not that it is mistaken to see Andrews' work in relation to the putative structuralism of Team 10, the Metabolists, or the Archigram approach that they spawned. But it is too narrow to see its historical connections as being exclusively to the neo-avant-garde of the 1950s and 1960s and to disregard the monumental aspects of the work and the particularities of its urban engagement. These relate to the new directions promoted for modern architecture in the post-war period by the older generation of modernists, especially Sert as the president of CIAM and dean of Harvard's Graduate School of Design. They were directions exemplified for Sert in the post-war trajectory of Le Corbusier's work.

Sert's take on these matters can be seen in the urban plan he worked on for Harvard, and in the three major architectural projects he did there: the Holyoke Center (1958–65; Sert, Jackson & Gourley), the student residence complex Peabody Terrace (1962–64, Sert, Jackson & Gourley), and the Under-

30. Sekler, "Sert, CIAM, and the GSD," 18.

31. Mumford, *Defining Urban Design*, 130-31.

graduate Science Center (1968–73; Sert, Jackson & Associates). His devotion to Le Corbusier is evident in the Carpenter Center, the new building for undergraduate arts education at Harvard designed by Le Corbusier and completed in 1963. Sert advocated that the university retain Le Corbusier for the project, and Sert's firm facilitated its realisation.³⁰ Sert's urban strategy for Harvard proposed increased densities; the occasional deployment of high rise blocks within the generally low matrix of Harvard's existing historic fabric of buildings and open spaces which were as much as possible maintained. His own buildings exemplified the strategy he proposed.³¹ The Holyoke Center, the Science Center and Peabody Terrace all work with building volumes of varying heights; each establishes a new urban organisation of pedestrian movement through its site (indeed, for Holyoke and the Science Center, these cut through the buildings) and small public spaces within it; within a common tectonic language of expressed frame and infill cladding within a monumental disposition of volumes of varying scales. At Peabody and the Science Center, the volumetric arrangement features the ziggurat-like stepping of storeys, a device found also in other Sert schemes, such as the projects for Boston University, across the Charles River from Harvard.

Sert's teaching that architecture has a strongly urban dimension is apparent in Andrews' work. While the design by Andrews and his colleagues for the Toronto City Hall competition has a passing formal likeness to Sert's design for the Presidential Palace in Havana (1955–58), more importantly the monumental form and the shaping of the building and the positioning of it on site to make urban space reflects Sert's teaching and his own design approach. Scarborough College is equally monumental and also establishes a kind of urban order, but its formal language shows a strong departure from Sert's aesthetic.

George Gund Hall certainly incorporated lessons learned at Scarborough and from other experiences Andrews had after Harvard. Gund's sectional arrangement of terraced trays of studio space relates to the off-set of levels in Andrews' sections from the Malton Hotel project for Toronto airport done circa 1960 while he was with the John B Parkin office, before he started independent practice. This strategy was developed further at Scarborough, and becomes a constant theme in his work thereafter. The fundamental programmatic strategy at Gund of putting disciplines together into one studio space also reflects Andrew's experiences post Harvard—the attempts to relate humanities and science



teaching at Scarborough, and the process of curriculum integration in his pedagogical reforms at the Toronto school of architecture. His promotion of more equitable relations between students and academics at Toronto is also reflected at Gund in the lack of separate lounges—or even toilets—for faculty. But if this programmatic idea is the key driver in the design of Gund, and the architectural response of the great cascade of studio terraces under a single roof is all Andrews, perhaps more than in any other Andrews project, other aspects of the scheme seem quite Sertian.

This is so in Gund Hall's drive to have some contextual urban consequence for the surrounding parts of the Harvard campus. The architect intended to open much of the ground floor to pedestrians, and this gesture survives in the provision of the high colonnaded undercroft along the building's main front on Quincy Street. The play with scale in the overall massing of Gund also suggests connection to Sert's designs of the time, for instance in the stepping down of the building on the north towards the small historic Church of New Jerusalem. Even the main formal gesture of the building—the staggered studios under the slopping steel truss and glass roof—responds to scale issues in the surroundings. The low eastern side of the building has a scale to match the two and three storey timber houses further along Cambridge Street³², while the loftiness of the Quincy Street side relates to the huge bulk of the American Romanesque Harvard Memorial Hall (Ware and von Brunt, 1866–78) across the street to the west—an acknowledgement of architectural history and the urban consequences of Harvard's architectural heritage. The stepped façade of Gund along Cambridge Street is a formal means of accommodating the building's scale shift from one side to another, but also suggests the zigurat masses incorporated in Sert's Science Center close by, Peabody Terraces, and in other projects by him of the 1960s.³³

Gund Hall also marks the first use by Andrews of free-standing 'round' concrete columns (always thereafter Andrew preferred geometry for a free-standing column), the same attenuated concrete cylinders as in Sert's work—and in Le Corbusier's Carpenter Center just a block down Quincy Street.³⁴

Conclusion

Gund was not an easy project.³⁵ Its design and construction from 1967 to 1972 coincided with the end of Sert's deanship and though

32. When Gund was built, its immediate neighbour to the south on Cambridge St was an apartment building somewhat larger in scale than this.

33. On the urban aspects of Gund Hall, see Bunting Bainbridge and Margaret Henderson Floyd, *Harvard: An Architectural History* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1985), 237–239.

34. Macy DuBois, a collaborator with Andrews on the Toronto City Hall competition, describes the Carpenter Center as “definitely an idiomatic Gund Hall ancestor.” Macy DuBois “A Protestant Work of Architecture,” *Canadian Architect* 18, no. 1 (January 1973): 40.

35. On the consequences for the project of these circumstances, see Ada Louis Huxtable, “Good Architecture – Bad Vibe,” *Canadian Architect* 18, no. 1 (January 1973): 38.

Andrews' appointment seems to have been on Sert's initiative, and Andrews the only architect Sert had appointed to a university project apart from Le Corbusier, he stepped back from much involvement in it, perhaps feeling it would be irresponsible to meddle when he would not be there when the building was complete. Political issues beset the project, reflecting no doubt the difficulties entailed in designing for a school of architecture but more significantly the turbulent situation on American university campuses in the late 1960s. But this story is not at stake here.

Eric Mumford suggests that Sert's choice of Andrews for Gund Hall "remains something of a mystery," a view that perhaps reflects Andrews' generally lower visibility in the North American scene after Gund was completed rather than the situation at the time of the commission when Scarborough had brought him international acclaim. Mumford proposes that the reason for the choice of Andrews is that the design for Scarborough College had demonstrated Team 10 influence, and that his selection for the GSD building project "seemed to recognize the growing design influence of Team 10 in the 1960s while at the same time avoiding the difficulty for Sert in commissioning actual Team 10 members such as the Smithsons, Van Eyck, or Candilis-Josic-Woods for the project."³⁶ This may well be the case, but in the design outcome of the commission we can read acknowledgement by Andrews of Sert's teaching and influence. In is certainly a much more Sert-ian building than Scarborough. We can surmise that the need to architecturally acknowledge his debt to Sert might have been particularly pressing on Andrews, consciously or unconsciously, with the prospect of building for his alma mater. It is an acknowledgment that continued through Andrews's work each time he subsequently did a column as a concrete cylinder, often with telling vertical form-work marks. Andrews may have claimed that round columns are technically better than square for structural reasons (the reinforcing has equal cover all round) or programmatic ones (a partition can be readily placed adjacent to a round column at many positions). But in each column of such form we are reminded of Sert's and Le Corbusier's similar columns. And in each one we are reminded of the monumentalisation in classical architecture of the vernacular construction of the Mediterranean.

In proposing to reconnect John Andrews' architecture to his architectural education at Harvard, this paper has aimed to complement the work by earlier architectural scholars, and in particular Philip Drew and Jennifer Taylor. The introduction to

36. Mumford, *Defining Urban Design*, 180.



Taylor's book *Australian Architecture Since 1960* posits a complex view of architectural history: it is not a single narrative that can be neatly ordered geographically or chronologically. The questions that concern us, the things that it might be possible to say or think now, are not quite those which were possible to our predecessors. Andrews certainly contributed to architectures of national identity in Canada and Australia; his work also has to be connected to the networks and modules of Team 10 and perhaps the patterns of Alexander.³⁷ But as the 50s and the 70s seem less and less essentially different now in the longer retrospect we enjoy, it is possible to see that Andrews' architecture also takes forward the monumentality and the compositional urbanism of Sert's Harvard teaching and practice.³⁸

37. Andrews suggests Sim van der Ryn is a more important connection than Alexander. Andrews comment to author April 23, 2013.

38. This research was supported under Australian Research Council's *Discovery Projects* funding scheme (project number DP120100341).