

# On the Uses of History, Theory and Criticism for Architecture

JOSEPH BEDFORD

Virginia Tech

**Keywords:** architecture, history, theory, criticism, design

**It has been nearly two decades since Sarah Whiting, Bob Somol, Michael Speaks and Stan Allen, declared that architectural design practice should break from what they described as a design culture bogged down with theory, and restrained by what they called the “critical project.” This paper returns to the twin problematic of posttheory and postcritique. Yet it approaches the topic from a more institutional perspective, developing a new diagnosis based on the fate of institutional arrangements within schools of architecture involving the creation of “history, theory, and criticism” in the mid-1960s and its relation to design practice. It returns to papers delivered by Peter Collins, Bruno Zevi, Sibyl Moholy-Nagy, and Stephen Jacobs at the 1964, ACSA-AIA Cranbrook Teachers Seminar in order to revisit a number of arguments about why schools of architecture should develop a particular relationship to history within their own institutional context, different from art history and uniquely tied to theory and criticism; and how this development would enable studio design practices to be critical. Despite this institutional settlement, which gave birth to a new form of history inside schools of architecture that promised to transform practice into a new critical mode, larger processes of academic growth during the 1980s and 1990s have led to a severance of this relationship and a return to something close to what Collins, Zevi, Moholy-Nagy and Jacobs criticized when they challenged architectural education’s derivation of its history from the independent field of art history, which they deemed too disengaged from creative practice. The paper argues that our posttheoretical and post-critical situation within the culture of architectural design has more to do with the changing institutional configuration within education: namely the professionalization and thus polarization of history and design, and the erasure of the mediating field of theory and criticism.**

## THE END OF THEORY

In 2000, the simultaneous closure of the journals *Assemblage* and *ANY* seemed to constitute a symptomatic end to a phase of architectural culture dominated by “theory.”<sup>1</sup> When *Assemblage* and *ANY* ceased publication, two new journals appeared that year: *Grey Room* and *Log*. *Grey Room* was more historical,

scholarly and peer reviewed, more closely allied with the histories of science and the history of art. It has become the principal venue in which recent doctoral researchers aspire to publish their work. *Log*, by contrast, is engaged, as its tag line indicates, with contemporary observations and has become the principal venue in which young architects with a foot in academia aspire to publish short casual and polemical texts. Where *Assemblage* represented an orientation both to scholarship and design simultaneously, now, *Grey Room* and *Log* represent the separation of those orientations.

Here, I will argue that what came to be viewed as the “end of theory” might usefully be understood as a reflection of a larger institutional process taking place within architectural academia in the latter half of the twentieth century that, having brought together scholarship and design, saw them subsequently separate again. My claim in what follows is that the creation of what we call “History, Theory, and Criticism” as a new expanded conception of what previously would have gone by the name of “History” in schools of architecture, and the early years of growth in the curricula field of “HTC” (as it is more commonly abbreviated to) from the 1960s onwards was an expression of that coming together of scholarship and design. By rehearsing the institutional story of the creation of that curricular field in the 1960s and 1970s, we can observe precisely that intent to link scholarship and design, as well as a number of reasons for doing so; including the idea that history would influence designers and improve design, and that both historical scholarship and practice could reinforce each other’s critical orientation.

## THE CRANBROOK SEMINAR AND ITS INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTS

The founding event of what many academic programs still refer to as “history, theory, and criticism” was the AIA-ACSA teachers seminar organized at the Cranbrook Academy of Art in 1964. This event, organized by Henry Millon, was linked to MIT where, in the subsequent years,<sup>2</sup> Millon and his colleague Stanford Anderson developed “history, theory and criticism” as an academic field, first as an undergraduate program major in 1966 and then as a doctoral program in 1974. MIT’s program was not the first or only place in which architecture schools hosted doctoral studies in the history of architecture, but it was the program that first



Figure 1. Reyner Banham and Steven Jacobs at the Cranbrook Seminar. Image courtesy of Taylor and Francis.

described that study as rooted in the combination of history with theory and criticism and is one that has been influential upon the formation of other programs.<sup>3</sup> Given the linkage between the Cranbrook event and the institutional transformations at MIT, one can take the debates during the Cranbrook event as indicative of the horizon of ideas behind such institutional changes and their impacts on other programs and schools.

In several of the papers presented at Cranbrook, including those of Stanford Anderson, Bruno Zevi, Peter Collins and Stephen Jacobs, one repeatedly observes the claim that architectural design should be guided in some way by historical understanding, and in the context of architectural education by the curricula space of architectural history teaching and architectural historians. Steven Jacobs (Figure 1) of Cornell University put the point most clearly in advocating for the creation of a new figure that he called the “hybrid historian-architect,” someone who would have, in his words, “sympathy for architecture’s creative, intellectual, and technical problems, as well as the usual understanding of its meanings, forms and social character.”<sup>4</sup> In order to foster the training of such hybrid historian-architects, Jacobs advocated also for the development of graduate-level education that would “make available to the professional schools qualified, creative, and productive architectural historians able to make a contribution of high scholarly caliber to the local educational scene.”<sup>5</sup>

It was Sibyl Moholy-Nagy (Figure 2) who addressed most clearly why such a development was desirable. As she explained, it was a means for educators to respond to the recent failures of practice to “provide identification for the client, *or* answer to the need for historical consciousness in cityscapes.”<sup>6</sup> The built environment, she argued, needed to be informed by historical consciousness

and recent failures in this department were the direct result of the decline in history teaching in schools of architecture in the preceding decades.

Architectural history had indeed declined in schools of architecture during the previous decade as modernist pedagogies supplanted or augmented Beaux-Arts pedagogical models both in terms of the proportion of time it occupied in the curriculum and in terms of its ability to connect to the orientation of architectural designers.<sup>7</sup> A number of educators at the time thought the kind of history taught in schools also to be inadequate on account of the fact that in many instances it was provided by art historians who, it was frequently claimed, knew less than they should about the practices and purposes of architecture. As Steven Jacobs put it at Cranbrook, art historians tended to “be consumer rather than producer oriented, to emphasize the what at the expense of the how, and perhaps to misunderstand the why.”<sup>8</sup> As Joseph Rykwert put it caustically again in 1981, the art historian in a school of architecture was like “a eunuch in a brothel.” They “know who does it with whom, how many times, which way, and in which room; but what he can’t understand is why they want to do it in the first place.”<sup>9</sup> As he went on, “the history of architecture done by architects is important ... because we as architects know how we proceed when we are on the drawing board, and how we make decisions, that we can understand certain decisions of past architects.”<sup>10</sup> In 1988, Marvin Trachtenberg, argued that, ultimately, the difference between architectural history as written by art historians and architectural history as written by architects, hinged on the concern of the latter group “to alter, to shape, to affect somehow the course of current architectural development with their writing.”<sup>11</sup> Speaking instead of the stance of art historians, Trachtenberg



Figure 2. Sibyl Moholy-Nagy at the Cranbrook Seminar. Image courtesy of Taylor and Francis.

argued that “we like to believe that we are untarnished by the sin of critical judgment in our work, especially when it concerns a distant past free from the necessity of our advocacy of one work over another.”<sup>12</sup> Such “divergences of interest” between art historians and architectural historians, as Alina Payne put it in 1999, was also a matter of their different preferences about what to attend to. Where “issues of style and iconography ... loomed large in art historical studies”<sup>13</sup> professional architects tended to focus on such topics as “typology, the columnar orders, mass culture, tectonics, materials, the vernacular, urban issues, and professional tools and processes.”<sup>14</sup>

For all these above reasons, architects began in the 1960s to articulate the need for a new kind of architectural history that they argued would be appropriately fostered within the professional school. It would be a history focused on what architects do in designing buildings, how and why, and it would be a history that is willing to admit critical judgement and to shape and affect architectural developments.

There had, of course, been a long lineage of architectural history as taught by architects in schools of architecture in earlier centuries, including a long sequence of architects who lectured on architectural history at the *École des Beaux-Arts* in Paris.<sup>15</sup> Yet during the 1930s through the 1950s with the spread of Bauhaus influenced pedagogies through schools of architecture, architects came to view history as “academicist” and as retarding the imagination and direct engagement with the problems of the day. The figures that more frequently appeared lecturing in history in schools of architecture in these years as a result were more likely to be art historians, especially students of the émigré German art historians such as Rudolf Wittkower, Fritz Saxl, Richard Krautheimer, and Erwin Panofsky, who had made their way from Germany during and after WWII to the UK and US. They had brought within them a more independent and scholarly approach to architectural history indebted to the traditions of *Geistesgeschichte* (intellectual history) and *Kulturgeschichte* (cultural history) in Germany, and they played a central role in fostering the development of architectural history within departments of art history at such institutions as the Warburg Institute and Columbia University and Princeton University. It was their doctoral students, such as Henri Millon, John Coolidge and Edward Seckler who could be more commonly found delivering history lectures within professional schools of architecture such as MIT and Harvard in the late 1950s and 1960s. But from the late 1960s onwards, schools of architecture would make substantial changes to their own curricula, programs, and recruitment in order to change this situation ensuring that in the two decades that followed architectural history and architectural practice would come into much closer institutional alignment and that as a consequence art history would play a much smaller role in contributing to the education of architects.<sup>16</sup>

The reasons for this change, as we have observed already, was a critical assessment of architectural education as responsible

for having fostered the sensitivities and approaches of a whole generation of architects that built an urban environment widely criticized. A more institutional reason, however, can be seen in many responses of educators to the very dominance of science-based research in the postwar university and the concern that such dominance had reduced architecture to little more than engineering and treated it as too much of a science and not sufficiently an art, or at least as a cultural activity.

Indeed, as Lawrence Anderson, who would go on to become the head of the architecture department at MIT in 1963, put it in 1959, articulating his own critique of architecture’s absorption into science and engineering “Architecture, even in a ‘university polarized about science’ must stand apart as having the program and the temperament of a high art, and cannot masquerade as an aberrant kind of engineering.”<sup>17</sup> Lawrence Anderson would go on to make proposals to double the proportion of architectural history teaching in the curriculum at MIT in 1961. He would chair the steering committee for the Cranbrook conference in 1964. And he would make the crucial hire of the art historian Wayne V. Andersen in 1964 to support the development of the undergraduate major in the “History, Theory and Criticism of Art and Architecture.”<sup>18</sup>

A parallel voice of dissent against architecture’s late 1950s techno-scientific orientation who also played a role in architectural educational change was that of Joseph Rykwert. In reaction to his experience teaching at Ulm in 1958, Rykwert penned a text “Meaning in Building” in 1960 that criticized the rationalist “attitude of the technocrats” in architecture and their failure to address the “qualities” “values” “memory” and “poetry” of architecture.<sup>19</sup> Rykwert went on in that text to advocate a “study of environment” that would address semantics and “referential content in architecture.”<sup>20</sup>

Six years later, Rykwert would make it a condition of his appointment as the chair of the new department of art at Essex University that he be able to found a new graduate-level program in the “History and Theory of Architecture,” the first of its kind anywhere in the world. Anticipating his later published remarks championing a new “history of architecture done by architects” in contrast to the history of architecture done by art historians, he advertised his new master’s program as being specifically for architects: as he put it, “for those who have acquaintance with current practice. ... [It] may be taken either as an intercalated year from an architectural school or on completion of either an architecture, design or engineering course.”<sup>21</sup>

The growth of programs such as at MIT and Essex in the mid-1960s, therefore, had a clear critical edge. It was part of an effort among educators to shape the development of architecture. There was a clear belief or hope that what architectural historians did could play a role in shaping what architects did. This, of course, after the critiques of modernist pedagogues, would no longer take the form of instruction in historical styles. Instead,

it would take the form of changing the wider social, cultural, and historical understanding of architects asking them to think more critically about the ideas they operate by in practice and to hesitate or reflect on ways that professional practice tends to operate under economic, social, political and cultural logics that lead it towards the creation of less-than-ideal environments. This is arguably what was at stake in the expansion of the single word “history” into the three new conjoined terms of “history, theory and criticism.”

Such sentiments regarding this new conjunction of history with theory and criticism can be found throughout the Cranbrook seminars and in the documents and writings of its organizers and participants such as Millon and Anderson who went on to develop new programs at MIT.

In regards to theory, Jacobs argued that while the historian was not necessarily the ideal agent for teaching theory, this task had nonetheless “fallen by default to history” within the context of the professional school, and that the historian could suitably teach theory also because theory was best, so Jacobs argued, presented as a dialectical sequence of ideas that circulated around architecture and among architects.<sup>22</sup> Peter Collins, likely still proofing the manuscript for his *Changing Ideals in Modern Architecture* at this time—a work of intellectual history that accounts precisely for the theories (or “ideals”) that informed architectural practice between 1750 and 1950—similarly agreed that even if history differed from theory in its vocational habits, the two were complimentary in that history could “provide the basis of speculation about architectural theory.”<sup>23</sup> One finds littered throughout the published papers and reports on the conference, similar remarks as architectural historians worked out what conception of history conjoined to theory might look like, and how the historian could teach history alongside theoretical issues or use history to prompt theoretical consciousness. Anderson would go on in his MIT proposal to insist on theory as a component of the new graduate program at MIT writing that students on the program were to be encouraged to “focus on an examination of the scientific basis for theoretical positions,” develop studies of “current views about the sources and growth of knowledge in the field” and analyze “current and earlier conceptual thought” about the environment.<sup>24</sup>

The matter of “criticism” was less one of new fields of knowledge but of a certain attitude and while “criticism” is the word used in the triad of HTC, participants of the Cranbrook seminar more often use the word “critical.” Peter Collins (Figure 3) and Bruno Zevi (Figure 4), made the clearest statements at Cranbrook that advanced the case for architectural history in schools of architecture to assume a critical role. Collin’s, for example, argued that the historian in the school of architecture had a duty to demonstrate critical judgement and by doing so conveying to the student that “every architect is morally bound to criticize (and design critically)...”<sup>25</sup> Bruno Zevi, advocated for “a fusion between history courses and design courses”<sup>26</sup> such that design

would “use the instruments of history and criticism more and more”<sup>27</sup> And as Zevi had said in 1957 this would create “a critical consciousness”<sup>28</sup> among architects that “can be checked at the drawing table better than in the library.”<sup>29</sup> Similarly, Joseph Rykwert made clear in 1974 that a critical attitude to history meant advocating for something and, following the example of Gottfried Semper, offered a vision that ran “counter to the practice of his day.”<sup>30</sup>

The published papers from the Cranbrook seminar thus indicate the views of a number of architectural historians in the mid 1960s that the rationale for the existence of architectural historians inside professional schools and the rationale for the growth in graduate study within those schools to create architectural historians rooted in professional schools rather than architectural historians borrowed from art history departments was that such developments could engage the creative orientation of design practice, and operate in a critical mode that designers could adopt, thus influencing their work and influencing the design of the built environment.

As Millon and Anderson put it in their proposal in 1971 for the new doctoral program at MIT, advancing precisely these claims, historians already teaching in the architecture school at MIT were “committed to a close association between their efforts



Figure 3. Peter Collins (Left), Steven Jacobs (Middle) and Reyner Banham (Right) at the Cranbrook Seminar. Image courtesy of Taylor and Francis.





Figure 4. Bruno Zevi at the Cranbrook Seminar. Image courtesy of Taylor and Francis.

and the school as a whole” and that “a critical and theoretical grasp of history shares a natural and mutual growth with the criticism which is the core of the design studio.”<sup>31</sup> Reflecting back many years later, Anderson also made clear that the development of history and theory was intended to influence design. As he put it, the “intention” of the new program, was “to remain in contact with, and to influence ... [the] design, and production of our cultural realm and our environment.”<sup>32</sup>

### HALF A CENTURY LATER

Hopefully, the foregoing remarks have made the case that the growth of history, theory, and criticism in architecture, was driven by a desire to bring the scholarly orientation of architectural history into alignment with the speculative orientation of architectural design. While I have not had enough space here to continue to trace the detailed transformations of architectural history during the 1980s and 1990s, I hope that it will be sufficient to conclude with a brief contrast with a number of sentiments among architectural historians today.

Reinhold Martin, the founder of *Grey Room*, that more scholarly of the two journals that followed in the wake of *Assemblage* and *ANY*, has given voice to what I take to be a more widespread an increasing distance emerging between contemporary architectural historians teaching in professional schools of architecture and the architectural profession. As Martin has put it in the opening of his most recent book: “Despite its institutional location in schools of architecture and in departments of art history, the history of architecture—or “architectural” history—is, as I conceive it, of a piece with historical scholarship in general.”<sup>33</sup> Rather than *history for architects*, Martin writes of doing “*history with architecture*.”<sup>34</sup> While, in his own writing many of his readers might view him as something of a critical theorist as much

as a historian, in his own stated positions upon the relationship between architectural history and the architectural profession, Martin appears to advocate for the autonomy of history from the profession. As he has put it: “Rather than confine architectural history (and theory) to the humdrum task of servicing a sclerotic profession ... we might consider reversing the order.”<sup>35</sup> That is, Martin proposes placing the profession in the service of history.

Martin has since passed on the editorship of *Grey Room* to a number of young architectural historians who earlier in their career had been founding members of a group called *Aggregate*. Generationally, this group has played a significant role in advancing the scholarly standards of architectural history in the last decade, particularly in the direction of attention paid to new kinds of evidence, archives, and forms of documentation. At the same time, they have also understood their work as part of a movement of architectural history away from its relationship to design practices in schools of architecture, writing: “Over the past two decades, scholarship in architectural history has transformed, moving away from design studio pedagogy... ”<sup>36</sup> In a recent text, one member of the *Aggregate* group, Timothy Hyde, suggested that for architectural history to “mature,”<sup>37</sup> it should move on from its recent attention upon architects as creative agents, the aesthetic effects of buildings, or contextual narratives, and add new areas of attention focused on “data sets,” “visualizations of molecular change,” and “contracts, specification, legislation and other instrumental texts of legal reasoning.”<sup>38</sup> If I can take these remarks as indicative of the methodological innovations advocated by the *Aggregate* group, which Martin has supported, I would read them as a call to improve the standards of architectural history around the most rigorous and pioneering historical methods, exemplified by the history of science and media histories. In this, current architectural history aspires to break new ground *as history* and to address a larger scholarly community in the university, but it risks doing so at the expense of withdrawing from critical attention paid towards how architects work today, the theories by which they operate.

If I can interpolate from Martin and Hyde’s statements a little, one can view the current generations of architectural historians located inside professional architecture schools as aspiring, despite that location, to be part of a continuous scholarly dialogue with art history and increasingly the history of science, and to be read by a broader community of scholars on campus. Even though many have entered the field from prior degrees in architectural design. It is not clear whether they would agree that in their work as historians they view themselves as being “committed to a close association between their efforts and the school as a whole;” or “influencing design” as Jacobs, Millon and Anderson put it in the 1960s and 1970s.

Maintaining such “close association” is understandably difficult given the time commitments in such high-quality architectural research, and given the pressure from promotion and tenure structures in the university to excel primarily in research. *Grey*

*Room* constitutes a venue for that more rigorous research but the sharp contrast between it and *Log* constitutes a symbol of the increasing difficulty of holding together the advanced historical scholarship and design practice. A further symptom of this is that rarely would one find architectural historian in the studio teaching design where a generation ago, figures from Kenneth Frampton, Anthony Vidler, Colin Rowe, Dalibor Vesely to Sarah Whiting all taught both history lectures and seminars as well as studio.

I will end with anecdotal evidence from a few young architects today noting the absence of any engagement with their work by figures in the academy who write more than practice. As one put it, “there’s not enough people ... who are trying to help designers ... build conceptual clarity around their work.”<sup>39</sup> Or as another put it, “we have realized that we don’t have our own generation of theorists.”<sup>40</sup> Or as another put it, “I don’t find many of those relationships [between theorists and practitioners] right now. I would love someone to theorize our generations work. If there was someone ... it could have a profoundly positive effect on the work that we produce.”<sup>41</sup>

Indeed, very few recent educators with PhDs in architectural history seem as engaged by the task of working with contemporary designers to develop a more theoretical understanding of their work, certainly not as many as might have been found in schools of architecture from the 1970s through to the 1990s. Again, I would point to figures ranging from Colin Rowe, Charles Jencks, Joseph Rykwert, and Peter Eisenman, through to Sylvia Lavin, Bob Somol, Mark Wigley, Catherine Ingraham and Michael Speaks.

The theory moment of these years, therefore, might be understood less in terms of the particular set of ideas that circulated in architecture and the manner in which they were applied to architectural design, and more in terms of larger institutional and curricular relationships within schools of architecture. The “End of Theory,” was perhaps a product of the larger forces at play in the growth and maturation of architectural history within schools of architecture and its eventual separation from architectural design. “Theory,” in this understanding was a kind of mediating space between history and design. Without this mutual dialogue between history and design, architectural history as it further professionalizes as a scholarly arena within the university risks moving back into a position once occupied by art history, and architectural design risks moving back to into the position in which practice will remain widely criticized for its failures; failures that architectural education might still be partially responsible for.

## ENDNOTES

1. On the end of theory see the entirety of *Assemblage* 41 (Apr., 2000).
2. Buford Pickens was Millon's former teacher. Serge Chermayeff taught briefly at MIT. Marcus Whiffen, who edited the Cranbrook seminar proceedings, taught the history survey course at MIT in 1953 and remained associated with the school into the 1980s. Stanford Anderson was, as Millon had, undertaking doctoral study under Rudolf Wittkower in the history of art department at Columbia (completed in 1968) and had been appointed alongside Millon at MIT the previous year. Bruno Zevi was likely invited because Millon had encountered his work on a stay in Italy and taken his position on the relation between history and design very seriously, responding to it critically in print. And similarly, Reynier Banham was likely invited because Anderson had encountered his work on a stay in London and had also responded to his work critically in a lecture at the Architectural Association.
3. A cursory internet search returns at least twenty-four schools spread across the United States, Europe, Asia and Australia that use the formulation of HTC in their course catalogues and syllabi today. A brief list of schools of architecture using this convention of “history, theory, and criticism” today in their course and program descriptions, include: MIT, Princeton University, Yale University, Arizona State, IIT, New York Institute of Technology, Georgia Tech, KU Leuven, Université catholique de Louvain, Edinburgh University, University of Wisconsin, University of Houston, University College London, University of Cincinnati, The University of Queensland, Monash University, Massachusetts College of Art and Design, Florida International University, The Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna, Kyoto University, University of Sydney, Sepuluh Nopember Institute of Technology, Amherst College, and Bilkent University. One recently-founded course at the Accademia di Architettura in Mendrisio explicitly states that it was modelled on the HTC program at MIT. As its website put it the new program “has a profile inspired by similar famous and long-established institutions, such as the History Theory and Criticism of Architecture and Art (HTC) of the MIT”. <https://www.isa.arc.usi.ch/en/istituto>. Accessed on Sept 5th 2021.
4. Stephen W. Jacobs, “History: an Orientation for the Architect,” in Marcus Whiffen ed., *The History Theory and Criticism of Architecture* (Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press, 1965), 60.
5. AJacob, “History: an Orientation,” 60. By “local educational scene,” I take Jacobs as meaning something like the scene of the professional school, with a culture of studio-based design training at its heart.
6. Sibyl Moholy-Nagy, “The Canon of Architectural History” in Whiffen ed., *The History Theory and Criticism of Architecture*, 40.
7. J.A. Chewing has estimated that time spent teaching architectural history in the United States declined from 10.8 percent in 1920 to 8.8 percent in 1960. J. A. Chewing, “The Teaching of Architectural History during the Advent of Modernism, 1920s–1950s,” *Studies in the History of Art* 35 (1990): 101–10.
8. Jacobs, “History: an Orientation,” 59.
9. Joseph Rykwert, “A Healthy Mind in a Healthy Body,” ed. John E. Hancock, *History in, of, and for Architecture: Papers from a Symposium* (Cincinnati: School of Architecture and Interior Design, University of Cincinnati, 1981), 45.
10. Rykwert, “A Healthy Mind,” 45.
11. Marvin Trachtenberg, “Some Observations on Recent Architectural History,” *The Art Bulletin* 70, no. 2 (Jun., 1988): 241.
12. Trachtenberg, “Some Observations,” 241.
13. Payne, “Architectural History and the History of Art: A Suspended Dialogue” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 58, No.3, (Sept., 1999): 294.
14. Payne, “Architectural History and the History of Art,” 294.
15. For a list of architects teaching architectural history at the Ecoles des beaux-arts including Jean-Nicolas Huyot (1819 and 1840), Louis-Hippolyte Lebas (1840 and 1863), Eugène Viollet-le-Duc (1863 – 1864), Albert Lenoir (1870 - 1891), Lucien Magne (1891 – 1916), see Richard Spofford Chafee, *The teaching of architecture at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts and its influence in Britain and America* (PhD Dissertation at the University of London, 1983), p117. The situation was not limited to the Beaux-Arts, however. As one other example of a school that consciously rejected the Beaux-Arts model, one might think of, William Lethaby and his teaching of architectural history at the Central School of Arts and Crafts. See William Lethaby, *Architecture: An Introduction to the History and Theory of the Art* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1912).
16. In larger history of the institutional separation between art history and architectural history see Payne, “Architectural History and the History of Art: A Suspended Dialogue.”
17. Lawrence B. Anderson to Pietro Belluschi, 22 July 1959, cited in John Harwood, “How Useful? The Stakes of Architectural History, Theory and Criticism at MIT, 1945-1976,” Arindam Dutta ed, *A Second Modernism: MIT, Architecture, and the ‘Techno-Social’ Moment* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2013), p115.
18. Harwood, “How Useful?,” 114.
19. Joseph Rykwert, “Meaning and Building” *Zodiac* 6 (1958): 195.
20. Rykwert, “Meaning and Building,” 193.
21. Essex Course Prospectus. “Graduate Scheme of study in the History and Theory of Architecture leading to the degree of Master,” The University of Essex: School of Comparative Studies, Department of Art (1970-71) Special Collection University of Essex Archives.

22. Steven Jacobs, "History: an Orientation," 51.
23. Peter Collins, "The Interrelated Roles of History, Theory and Criticism in the Process of Architecture" Whiffen ed. *History, Theory, and Criticism of Architecture*, 5.
24. Stanford Anderson, "HTC at MIT: Architectural History in Schools of Architecture." Werner Oechslin et. al. eds. *Architektur Weiterdenken: Werner Oechslin Zum 60 Geburtstag* (Zürich: gta, 2004): pp330-339.
25. Collins, "The Interrelated Roles," 8.
26. Bruno Zevi, "History as a Method of Teaching Architecture," Whiffen ed. *History, Theory, and Criticism of Architecture*, 17-18.
27. Zevi, "History as a Method," 17-18.
28. Zevi, "La Storia Dell'Architettura per gli architetti moderni," translated by Millon in "History of Architecture: How Useful?" and cited in Harwood, "How Useful?," 122.
29. Zevi, "La Storia Dell'Architettura," cited in Harwood, "How Useful?," 122.
30. Joseph Rykwert, "Art as Things Seen," *The Times Literary Supplement* 3768 (Friday May 24, 1974): 547.
31. Extracts from the MIT proposal cited in Harwood, "How Useful?," 139.
32. Anderson, "HTC at MIT," 333.
33. Reinhold Martin, *Knowledge Worlds: Media, Materiality and the Making of the Modern University* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2021), ppx-xi.
34. Martin, *Knowledge Worlds*, ppxi.
35. Reinhold Martin, "On the Uses and Disadvantages of Architecture for History" *History/Theory e-flux Architecture*.
36. This quotation is taken from the advertising copy of the book, *Writing Architectural History: Evidence and Narrative in the Twenty-First Century* (University of Pittsburgh Press, 2021).
37. Timothy Hyde, "Is Architectural History Getting Any Bigger?" *Architectural Research Quarterly* 21, no.4 (2017): 347.
38. Hyde, "Is Architectural History Getting Any Bigger?," 347.
39. Kyle Miller, Interview with the Author (Oct 18, 2021).
40. Kelly Bair, Interview with the author (Dec 10, 2021)
41. Jaffer Kolb, Interview with the author (Dec 04, 2021)