2.
Architecture School

In October 1975, with the start of the 1975–76 academic year, architecture critic Paul Goldberger published an article in the *New York Times* entitled "Midtown Architecture Institute Flowering as a Student Mecca." In this positive and lively portrait of the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, Goldberger attempted to make sense of the recent restructuring, as the Institute had totally changed within the period of a year.[245] Since being chartered as an education institution in 1967, the Institute spent most of its early years doing commissioned work for public agencies, with its labor pool comprising a handful of students operating without any proper curriculum. Thus far, the Institute's distinguishing feature as a place of learning had been providing students of various years and cohorts the opportunity to obtain practical working experience outside academia and outside the context of a conventional office job. 1973 marked a turning point in the Institute's history in many respects. Now, after many twists and turns, the Institute was increasingly presenting itself as a "true" educational institution, with a comprehensive range of offers targeting diverse groups that would qualify students for further study.[246] Although these transformations had already been implemented a year

245 Paul Goldberger, "Midtown Architecture Institute Flowering as a Student Mecca," *The New York Times* (October 30, 1975), 41 & 77.

246 Eisenman, 2007. In this conversation with Boyarsky, then director of the AA in London in its television studio, the contradiction between pedagogical aspiration and didactic reality became particularly evident when Eisenman said that the Institute "has never had a curriculum; it has never had a philosophy." This kind of rhetorical gesture was typical of Eisenman. In his characteristic ambivalence, which constantly oscillated between irony, exaggeration, provocation, and cynicism, Eisenman on the one hand negated any pedagogical task and social function of the Institute as an architecture school, but in this negation relativized his own

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

before the *New York Times* article, Goldberger's piece represents one of the first portraits of the Institute as architecture school. Goldberger, then a young journalist, was something of a postmodern apologist who had previously voiced criticism of the Institute, while bringing public attention to the architects who were part of its organization or worked there. In this extensive two-page article, supplemented with photographs of the students at work, Goldberger described how, over the past year, the Institute had developed into a serious "teaching organization"—a positive verdict overall. *New York Times* readers were offered a detailed description of the Institute's various education offerings which, as products designed to be purchased, were set up as self-contained modules. Prior to this, the Institute had primarily made a name for itself in the planning community as an innovative project space that dealt with public research and design commissions, and in the profession and general public thanks to a MoMA exhibition on public housing it organized in the summer of 1973. Since the fall of 1973, the Institute had garnered national and even international attention through the publication of three pilot editions of its ambitious journal *Oppositions*. Goldberger, however, made a distinct point of emphasizing how the Institute had now begun defining itself as an alternative to established schools of architecture, and how it was addressing a broader target group than it had before. The Institute was, in his words, "the only center of architectural education anywhere where the student body ranges from ninth grade to postdoctoral scholars." The article contains a quote by Peter Eisenman, the founding Institute director, that is downright baffling in light of the Institute's history: "It's true that we've become more of a service organization, and that's not what was originally intended." This confession to now viewing education in a commercial light was somewhat surprising considering that, since its early days, the Institute had presented itself as a mediator between politics and society and had primarily served public agencies. In the context of the knowledge-based society, which was changing the entire economy, it was equally surprising that Eisenman, who had been teaching at Cooper Union since 1968, was openly and in front of the broadest possible audience, describing the Institute as his place of work—even though, in professional circles, he had repeatedly emphasized that his autonomous design practice derived from his independence from universities and the architectural profession. This is especially noteworthy considering that *House VI*, the culmination of Eisenman's house designs at the time, was completed in 1975 and that Eisenman portrayed himself as a theorist and polemicist in his exhibitions, lectures, and publications. Even so, in an era of structural change—at the time, New York's financial and fiscal crisis was reaching its peak, with far-reaching negative consequences for commissions and construction activity—economic concerns ultimately trumped

teaching interests and thus created the greatest possible flexibility for the Institute in terms of curriculum design. See Kim Förster, "A Postmodern School of Architecture. Education at the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies," in *Histories of Architecture Education in the United States*, ed. Peter L. Laurence (New York and London: Routledge, 2023), 98–117.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

pedagogical arguments for Eisenman. Indeed, Goldberger's article ends with a final Eisenman quote and the observation: "Even in economically difficult times, people still want education."[247]

Educational Offerings

Reinventing the Institute as an architecture school had become unavoidable. After 1973, it was clear to the Institute's leadership that it needed to acquire new markets since it was no longer possible to acquire well-paid public sector commissions for large-scale research studies or construction projects. Neither architectural production (such as the development of a prototype for low-rise housing commissioned by the New York State Urban Development Corporation) nor theoretical production (such as the Program in Generative Design funded by a start-up grant awarded by the National Institute for Mental Health) had proven economically viable. The Institute's early recognition and capitalization of the economic value of undergraduate education in architecture is related to America's far-reaching political, social, and cultural transformations in the years after 1973. The architecture world faced a significant rupture after the conservative turn under President Richard M. Nixon and the departure from welfare state policies in the fields of housing and urban planning. No less significantly, the architecture world was also impacted by the collapse of the American building sector in the wake of the global energy and economic crisis, as well as by the unraveling of the real estate market for office buildings after the completion of the World Trade Center and the ensuing financial and fiscal crises that gripped the city and state of New York. In the Institute's early years, it had offered a small coterie of students—first, select graduate students, then postgraduate students as Research Associates, and later on larger groups of undergraduates and interns—the opportunity to collaborate on actual research and design projects, and in doing so to gather practical experience at the intersection between college and professional work (with the positive side effect of forming contacts with important architecture circles in New York). After 1974, not without a certain amount of entrepreneurial calculation, the Institute's leadership discovered how to actually *earn* money from architecture education. By introducing a one-year "Undergraduate Program" for students hailing from a network of liberal arts colleges across the Eastern Seaboard that lacked architecture programs, and by initiating an "Evening Program" of daily lectures promoted as adult education, the Institute was expanding on and developing two education initiatives that had already been in existence since 1971: first, a student internship program run in collaboration with the Great Lakes College Association (GLCA), an association of twelve northeastern colleges, and second, the IAUS Spring Lectures Series, the first public events series hosted at the Institute's premises on 8 West 40th Street. Unlike these two older programs, however, the new programs would be supported by nonprofit organizations

247 Goldberger, 1975, 77.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

and sponsors, and consciously developed as education offerings with commercial promise. As a consequence, the Institute—whose small cadre of eight Fellows had previously been criticized for being overly hermetic and elitist (for example, in 1973, reviews in the professional press were critical of the MoMA exhibition on low-rise housing and again, at least indirectly, in 1974, when a feature on Italian architecture historian and critic Manfredo Tafuri cited his criticism of *Oppositions*)—was soon compelled to open up to a much more heterogeneous student body and a far broader public within an extremely short period of time.

In economic terms, the Institute's repositioning as an educational institution and brand was absolutely necessary, as it wouldn't have survived the 1974–75 fiscal year otherwise.[248] In an era of deindustrialization and deregulation, this also represented something of an "avant-garde" maneuver on the Institute's part; after all, by focusing on "education" and "culture," the Institute discovered for itself two key realms of communication and information that over the coming years would serve as core driving forces and sources of revenue—while in greater New York, the higher education landscape was in the process of expanding, cultural life was being actively promoted, and the notion of urban marketing as a neoliberal concept for reviving urban economies was being introduced.[249] Opening up the Institute along these lines served to reposition and restructure it; from this point on, the Institute would support itself primarily from the revenues from tuition fees, public and private subsidies, and donations. This multi-pronged business model succeeded in stabilizing the Institute's balance sheet while shaping its program policy and institutional, nonprofit business over the coming years. It is also important to consider the Institute's new conception of its education offerings or "educational products" against the backdrop of broader social developments in the USA: above all, the transition to a postindustrial society or service economy,[250] postwar expansion in the education field, and the post-1968 education reforms which had lingering effects on architectural pedagogy.[251] Arguably, the reason this strategic

248 Eisenman and Ellis presented the Institute's architecture education at the 1974 ACSA conference.

249 Sociologist John McHale characterized the new functions of "education" and "culture" as two central areas of the information and service society in the 1970s, see John McHale, "Education and Culture," in *The Changing Information Environment* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1976), 43–58.

250 Manuel Castells, "The Service Economy and Postindustrial Society: A Sociological Critique," *International Journal of Health Services* 6, no. 4 (1976), 595–607.

251 Aside from the transfigurations that accompanied enrollment in a specific teaching tradition, architecture education at American universities in the postwar period was characteristically determined by individuals, first of all European émigrés, e.g., Walter Gropius or Josep Lluis Sert as dean at Harvard University's Graduate School of Design in Cambridge (1938–52 and 1952–69), Ludwig Mies van der Rohe at the Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago (1939–58), like Jean Labatut as director of graduate studies at Princeton University (1928–67), before American architects became formative, e.g., Paul Rudolph as dean at Yale University in New Haven (1958–65) or Louis Kahn at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia (1957–74), see Frampton and Latour, 1980. In the

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

reorientation was so successful was because Institute director Eisenman managed to mobilize all the social and cultural capital the Institute had already accumulated, while simultaneously marshaling the Institute's Fellows (most of whom ran their own practices or taught at one of the other architecture schools in the metropolitan area—Princeton, Cooper Union, Columbia University, or the City University of New York—at the same time) and Visiting Fellows (many of whom had been persuaded to move to New York by Eisenman) to work together as teachers and cultural producers toward a shared goal of revalorizing architecture as an art form. In the early postwar years, architecture education in the USA had been defined by increasing specialization and compartmentalization of the disciplines, while in the 1960s the focus had been on urban studies and interdisciplinarity. Yet within a relatively short timeframe, in tandem with the emergence of postmodern service, entertainment, and attention economies, the Institute's position, role, and function underwent a dramatic transformation. What emerged from a formerly mostly self-proclaimed, yet also quite accomplished office for research and design projects, was an educational and increasingly also cultural institution that portrayed itself as "alternative" while, in the final analysis, obtaining a considerable degree of power—an organization that successfully managed to establish itself as a bridge between the college system and the universities. Marketing the new education offerings as a service, a commodity even, on an entirely separate basis from the conceptual, hitherto critical perspectives of the Institute's Fellows, was not only unusual for the time, it would also prove symptomatic of the accelerating transformation and economization of the education system occurring throughout the USA in the 1970s, as private colleges began to proliferate, and universities increasingly came to resemble factories for knowledge.[252]

1970s, there was little change in this close connection between institutions and individuals in relation to the formulation of a pedagogy. Teaching at Cornell University in Ithaca, under Colin Rowe as head of the Urban Design Studio (from 1962) and at Cooper Union in New York under John Hejduk (from 1964 as professor and from 1975 as head) proceeded from a conceptual understanding of architecture, which in the architecture debate of the time was traced back to the heroic phase of the "Texas Rangers" between 1951 and 1958 at the University of Texas School of Architecture in Austin; see Alexander Caragonne, *The Texas Rangers: Notes from the Architectural Underground* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995). In contrast, at Columbia University in New York, where in the 1970s several design studios for housing were offered in parallel, influenced by a modernist approach developed at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in Troy while all following different approaches and scales, "a certain revisionism of CIAM" could be discerned as the origin of the basic theoretical assumptions of a continuation of architectural practice in socio-political terms; see Richard Plunz, "The Four Typologies. The 'Master of Architecture' Program at Columbia University," *Lotus International*, no. 27 (1980), 106–126.

252 The academic and pedagogical context of architecture education at the Institute was the transformation of higher education in the United States, as analyzed by sociologist Alain Touraine and historian John Thelin; see Alain Touraine, *The Academic System in American Society* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974); see also John Thelin, "Coming of Age in America. Higher Education as a Troubled Giant, 1970 to 2000," in *A History of American Higher Education* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), 306–326. Thelin argues that as higher education became economized—moving from "grants" to "student loans," from "gyms" to "health and fitness centers," and from "dormitories" to "apartment suites"—problems increased and all

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

The year 1974–75, with its diversification and commercialization of education, represented in many respects a rupture and turning point in the history of the Institute that reverberated for a long time to come—on programmatic, technical, economic, and political levels. Concurrently, this rupture shaped American schools of architecture and higher education in a broader sense. For the Institute's Fellows, the change meant that their combined teaching duties would become a central field of activity, synergistically linked to other programs in adult education and cultural production (in addition to some of their work on *Oppositions*), redefining their relationships to work and training. Their new educational programs addressed both undergraduate students and college graduates looking to complete a course of study or internship that would qualify them for a degree in architecture.[253] Yet architecture teaching at the Institute was far from a "radical" pedagogy, i.e., one that is critical and utopian, in its efforts to overturn socially constructed distinctions and destabilize norms and values that underlie designs and allow for differentiation at the intersection of race, class, and gender.[254] Indeed, the education offerings were in fact institutionalized by established colleges and developed as add-ons, extending their existing curricula. They were not necessarily critical in nature, nor did they fundamentally question or change the existing institutions. Instead, what the Institute supported, if not explicitly encouraged, was the redisciplining of architecture study, in something of a backlash or reaction to the activist-led research and teaching paradigms that had taken root after 1968—exemplified by advocacy planning and community design centers[255]—and the accompanying reorganization of university curricula vis-à-vis the contents, methods, and goals of teaching and learning. The Fellows of the pedagogically oriented Institute (in addition to Peter Eisenman these were Kenneth Frampton, Mario Gandelsonas, and Diana Agrest at the time, as well as Peter Wolf, and later Anthony Vidler) were committed to a renewed focus on history and theory, partly in a leading

institutions of higher education in the United States, despite society's countervailing perception of them as a growth industry, underwent a profound crisis in the 1970s as grant money diminished. For a critique of the transformation of universities into factories of knowledge in the course of capitalist valorization, see Gerald Raunig, *Fabriken des Wissens: Streifen und Glätten 1* (Zurich: diaphanes, 2012).

253 Reinhold Martin makes a fundamental distinction regarding education and discourse; see Martin, 2010, 66. This differentiation, however, lacks a historical dimension, as it does not take into account the legacy of the Institute's research and design projects, and, above all, does not consider the cultural and educational importance of the media and mechanisms of the Evening Program and the Exhibition Program from 1974 onward.

254 Colomina, et al., 2022. Architecture historian Beatriz Colomina conducted a research project with PhD students at Princeton University titled "Radical Pedagogies" on trends in architecture education worldwide in the second half of the 20th century; see Colomina et al., 2012; see also: Colomina et al., 2015. Yet, politically speaking, education at many institutions was anything but radical. For my earlier accounts of architecture education at the Institute, see Kim Förster, "Alternative Educational Programs in Architecture: The Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies" in Reto Geiser, ed., *Explorations in Architecture. Teaching, Design, Research* (Basel: Birkhäuser, 2008), 26–27.

255 The first and possibly most successful community design center was the Pratt Institute Center for Community and Environmental Development in Brooklyn, inaugurated in 1963.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

role and partly in an advisory capacity. By developing and introducing a wide variety of education offerings in a short time, the Institute was able to establish itself in a competitive educational market with a differentiated and, above all, flexible or modular approach to architecture education—and it did so in economically challenging times, as the state of New York was undergoing a severe financial and fiscal crisis in the mid-1970s with serious consequences for the national and international economy and society. Through its educational practice, in addition to the publication of *Oppositions*, the Institute took an active role in hastening the paradigm shift to postmodernism on the East Coast of the USA and beyond, with both aesthetic and epistemological consequences.

Due to its incommensurability with the teachings of the previous years, the Institute's pedagogy now focused on imparting historical and theoretical knowledge, as well as knowledge about construction and planning, as a foundation for abstract formal exercises that, in principle, revolved around a humanistic approach and yet were informed by a formal, linguistic, and semiotic understanding of architecture, which was legitimized by recourse to architectural modernism and (post)structuralist theory. For the Institute's longstanding Fellows, this presented an opportunity to test new research and insights and bring these into circulation at a remove from their usual academic obligations, while making a name for themselves as pedagogues and intellectuals—some of them with a view to qualifying for professorships. The tuition fee-based education offerings, which students could sign up for à la carte, enabled the Institute to not only address entirely new target groups and acquire new markets, but also to redefine how architecture knowledge was produced, disseminated, and received (and habitus was created)—not just beyond the usual confines of colleges and universities, exhibitions, and periodicals, but also of the office world and construction projects.[256] At the same time, the Institute's leadership expected the new, distinctive educational focus of the Institute to first and foremost stabilize its budget.[257] Beginning in the 1974–75 academic year, after which an average of forty-five students attended the Institute per academic year, the organization and program of architecture education at the Institute went through a series of successive phases that followed an economic logic: first the introduction of new education offerings, followed by growth, consolidation, and maturation, all the way to saturation. The individual phases were fundamentally different with regard to the didactics and pedagogy of the various education offerings, the composition and expertise of the faculty, and the general relationship between teachers and students, as well as the conception and function of an architecture education that was never

256 Dana Cuff, "The Making of an Architect," In *Architecture. The Story of Practice* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991), 109–154.

257 Peter Eisenman, "Director's Report," June 19, 1974. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-2.; Peter Wolf, quoted in: Richard Meier, minutes of the annual meeting of the Board of Trustees, December 10, 1974. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-2.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - [cc] BY-NC-ND

fully institutionalized as the cornerstone of the Institute's complex financial apparatus. As the backbone of the Institute, the one that paid the bills and thus financed all the other activities, this apparatus retained its essential features until 1985, when after ten years as an architecture school, the Institute finally ceased its operations. In total, the Institute taught more than five hundred students, not all of whom were to become architects, and shaped their architectural approach, thinking, and practice with a distinctly postmodern habitus or social behavior.

In assessing the institutional significance of architecture education at the Institute, its social, economic, and cultural impact within the framework of an institutional history, two key aspects stand out: First, after the Institute was formally recognized as an educational institution by the Board of Regents of the State University of New York in early 1973, it no longer operated on an autonomous basis. From this point on, its authority to designate itself an architecture school was granted from the outside, i.e., it could only portray itself as an "alternative" teaching and learning institution *in relation to* established colleges and universities, even if it did come to influence these.[258] Second, the Institute managed to contribute to the liberal arts and practical education of ambitious young architecture students, some of whom would one day become part of the architectural and academic elite even though, unlike other established schools of architecture in the USA—and this is truly astonishing—the Institute *never* offered accredited degrees in architecture. This is especially striking when one considers the non-linear process of academic and professional socialization and acculturation in architecture that the Institute's students went through, i.e., the process of growing up in and assimilating into an increasingly differentiated and globally networked architecture culture.[259] In the years that followed, it would become noticeable that the Institute, with its multi-pronged, continuous teaching and learning opportunities, was indeed pursuing what was then understood as a humanistic ideal of education—yet at the same time, that this ideal turned upon a bourgeois principle of measurable output, ultimately contributing to the marketization and privatization of education in the broader architectural field.

258 Architecture historian Mary McLeod published an essay on the evolution of architecture studies from 1968 to 1990 in a comprehensive survey of the history of architectural education in the United States, see McLeod, 2012. McLeod attributes the pervasiveness of postmodernism, which she sees as "part of a larger epistemological shift" and equally as a "new stage of consumer capitalism," to the work of architecture schools as a "leading force" where she identifies a shift in "values and forms." However, she does not write about the Institute to which she herself belonged, only about accredited schools.

259 Architecture sociologist Dana Cuff refers to the architecture school and the architecture office as the two most important sites of socialization and acculturation in the education of aspiring architects, see Dana Cuff, "The Making of an Architect," in Cuff, 1991, 109–154. For an early essay arguing that the Institute, as a new educational and cultural institution outside the system of higher education in the United States in the 1970s, took on precisely these functions, see Kim Förster, "*Arch+* features 19. Die Netzwerke des Peter Eisenman," supplement to *Arch+*, no. 210 (2013).

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

2.1 Operating as a Teaching Facility

Launched in the fall semester of 1974, the Institute's new "Undergraduate Program in Architecture" proved to be a truly innovative and comprehensive education offering—nothing of its kind had ever existed before in the USA. Personally directed by Eisenman, the program was targeted toward undergraduates enrolled at liberal arts colleges in the Northeast that did not offer a major in architecture. The program's educational objective, as articulated by the Institute, was to teach architecture as one of the humanities—on par with art history, literature, and music—rather than as a purely artistic or technical subject. Architecture was to be embedded in a European modernist, humanist cultural ideal.[260] The undergraduates, hailing from a variety of majors at their home colleges, were offered the opportunity to spend their junior years—the semesters typically chosen for study abroad—at the Institute in New York rather than at a renowned university in Europe. At the Institute, they specialized in architecture, regardless of whether they ultimately planned to become architects or not. The Institute made a point of differentiating this one-year introduction to historical, theoretical, and aesthetic approaches to architecture, available for an initial tuition fee of US$3,000 (the fees increased successively over the years), from the undergraduate studies being offered by architecture schools whose primary focus was vocational training.[261] The Institute's offering, in other words, skillfully targeted an entirely new market, if not outright creating it. After a year, the Institute's students returned to their original colleges, without a degree accrediting them to work in the architecture field, to finish off their final year of studies. By repositioning itself within the American education landscape in this way, the Institute profiting off education reforms and an education boom taking place across the USA—a phenomenon that John Thelin, a professor of higher education and public policy, describes in his *History of American Higher Education* as "a proliferation of new degree programs and fields of study."[262]

Unlike previous years at the Institute, architecture was now taught as an integrated discipline within the didactically organized course offering. Designed as an ambitious introductory course, the Undergraduate Program comprised

260 The American educational ideal of liberal arts education favors broad fundamental knowledge over subject specialization, see Henry Crimmel, *The Liberal Arts College and the Ideal of Liberal Arts Education* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1993), here "The Principle of Liberal Education" 115ff.

261 In New York, an undergraduate major in architecture was first established at Columbia University at Columbia College under Robert Stern beginning in the 1973–74 academic year, at the same time as the establishment of the master's program at the Graduate School of Architecture and Planning (GSAP, now GSAPP, the second "p" added for preservation, a program that ran since 1964). Stern initially continued to teach the course "Elements of Architectural Design" in the "Culture: Theory" track at the Graduate School during the 1972–73 academic year and was then the architecture faculty representative at Columbia College beginning in 1974–75.

262 Thelin, 2004, 319.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

five learning clusters that roughly corresponded to a liberal arts curriculum. At the center stood courses on the history and theory of architecture, planned and taught by Frampton ("The History of 20th Century Architecture") and Gandelsonas ("Elements for an Architectural Theory"). Other courses covered "Urban Development: History and Theory" (taught by Wolf) and "Structures" (Robert Silman). The curriculum was rounded off by the "Design Tutorial" taught by Fellows, Visiting Fellows, and New York-based architects, ensuring a more pluralistic approach rather than a focus on problem-solving. In the first year, in addition to Eisenman, the tutorials were taught by William Ellis, Mario Gandelsonas, Rem Koolhaas,[263] and Giovanni Pasanella.[264] As is only natural, the overall curriculum of the Undergraduate Program was conceived to match the knowledge and interests of the Fellows. The theory-laden lectures and intense discussions of texts meant that students were primarily brought into contact with the "heady world" of architectural ideas and criticism, and less with the practice and methods of building and construction. The faculty's expertise and experience, however, were paired with the didactic and methodological principles of a liberal arts education—such that Frampton's history course, for instance, focused on modernism as a case study for a temporally delineated and stylistically defined period of architectural history, while Gandelsonas's theory course was founded on close analyses of classical architecture texts. Each course was conducted as a morning lecture or seminar, followed by an afternoon design studio. First semester design studios focused on abstract tasks and went on to tackle concrete projects in the second semester. Students were assigned to a single architect in groups of five, enabling the Institute to ensure intensive supervision (and a student-to-teacher ratio of three to one). Ultimately, the Institute sought to confront the students with all the rites and rhetoric of an architecture education: the design studio as an action-oriented (and yet exploitative) form of instruction, long periods of intensive day-and-night work preparing presentations, and arguments and counterarguments as the fundamental communicative form for feedback and final reviews. And with its focus on history and theory, the Undergraduate Program also reflected the reorganization and redisciplining of architecture education that was taking place in a broader sense in the wake of 1968—as demonstrated elsewhere, for example, in the Columbia University curriculum reform, or in

263 Rem Koolhaas was at the Institute from 1973 to 1976, working on his monograph *Delirious New York*, which he researched at the Public Library at Bryant Park with the help of Institute students and interns. In the fall semester of 1974, while still assigned as a tutor in the Undergraduate Program, he was simultaneously employed as a lecturer at Columbia University, where he taught a course on "New York: An Architectural Appreciation," for which students could receive credit in the "History/Theory/Criticism" track. It was not until 1975–76 that Koolhaas was granted Visiting Fellow status at the Institute.

264 Giovanni Passanella had taught design at Columbia University since the mid-1970s, practiced independently as an architect since 1964, and was the last to be involved in the Twin Parks UDC project with three projects. Of all the Institute's design tutors, he was by far the most experienced.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

the rise of new doctoral programs.[265] After the various teaching experiments of the 1960s, socio-political approaches such as "neighborhood-based advocacy planning" and "school-based community design" were quickly being rolled back across the country in favor of expanding degree programs and focusing on approaches that were centered around the arts and humanities.[266] The multidisciplinary, even "polytechnic" approach of the Institute's Undergraduate Program should therefore not obscure the fact that the curriculum was no longer centered around urban studies as a collaboration between sociologists, artists, planners, historians, etc. From 1974 onward, the architectural theory taught by the Fellows was more about a broad-strokes "Architecture" with a capital "A."

In addition to the Undergraduate Program that began in the fall semester of 1974, the Institute also launched a comprehensive series of evening lectures titled "Architecture," inspired by the course offerings of the New School for Social Research.[267] To help organize and implement the events for the "Evening Program," conceived and advertised as a continuing education offering for adults, the Institute secured funding from public art foundations—from the New York State Council on the Arts (NYSCA) in 1974, and subsequently from

265 After his transfer to Columbia University with the 1972–73 academic year under Dean James S. Polshek, Frampton was instrumental in designing the curriculum of the new master's program at GSAP and also taught there, first as an associate professor and from 1974 with tenure. He taught the theory course "Critical Comparative Analysis" and the history course "Thresholds in Modern Architecture" in the "Cultural Matrix" track for a long period of time. With the 1975–76 academic year, Frampton was involved, albeit sporadically at first, in the new housing studio led by Richard Plunz, which included a field trip to the Institute's low-rise housing development in Brownsville, Brooklyn, while it was still under construction. After returning from England in 1977, Frampton taught both history and theory courses and one of the housing design studios. The assignment he gave to his students was a refinement of the low-rise housing prototype as a perimeter block development in Manhattan.

266 Anthony Schuman, "The Pedagogy of Engagement: Some Historical Notes," *An Architektur*, no. 19–21, 2006: "Community Design: Involvement and Architecture in the US since 1963." Curricular reforms made after 1968 in the wake of student unrest in American higher education, especially due to the large role of architecture students in the political protests at schools of architecture, brought about an abolition of the Beaux Arts system and led to a focus on social and political issues such as "low-cost housing, urban revitalization, community development, social needs" and an enforcement of non-hierarchical teaching and learning methods; see McLeod, 2012. But by the end of 1973 in the United States, the broad politicization of the student body that had endured since 1970 had largely faded; see Thelin, 2004, 327.

267 The New School for Social Research (now The New School) was founded in 1919 by a group of progressive thinkers who openly criticized U.S. policies and resigned from their positions at Columbia University after an act of censorship. Modeled on the Volkshochschulen in Germany, it created a model of continuing education for adults and, beginning in 1933 as the University in Exile, provided a home for intellectuals who had been stripped of their teaching positions by fascists in Italy or were forced to flee the Nazis. With its curriculum, the New School had a significant influence on the social sciences and philosophy in the United States. In addition to pioneering courses in "African-American History and Culture" (1948, W.E.B. DuBois) and "Women's History" (1962, Gerda Lerner), the New School was also known for courses in "Creative Arts," such as courses on film history, photography, and jazz. Frank Lloyd Wright taught architecture at the New School.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). Eisenman brought the young architect and Columbia graduate Andrew MacNair into the Institute's fold to coordinate the "Architecture" series; MacNair was subsequently in charge of all the Institute's public events. From 1974 to 1977, "Architecture" encompassed multiple lecture series running in parallel, offering a lecture every evening of the week throughout the semester—an unbelievable feat, involving an immense amount of work—for paying audiences and the cohort of students and interns. The Institute's "continuous education" offering was geared towards a broad audience, from young architects, and architecture students, to anyone from New York with an interest in architecture (the core target groups included artists from the East Village and SoHo and wealthy clients from the Upper East Side). Even though this form of education, like the Undergraduate Program, blurred the line between cultural product and commercial bid, "Architecture" nevertheless set itself apart as being an unusual extracurricular public education offering that was partly academic, partly popular, with a focus on the history and theory of architecture. Topics ranged from hot-button urban planning issues in New York to presentations by sought-after architects and designers. The individual lecture series, this time geared towards socializing and acculturating professionals and laypersons, i.e., potential clients, were hosted by the Institute's Fellows (including Frampton, Gandelsonas, Agrest, Vidler, and—most frequently—MacNair), Visiting Fellows, such as Rem Koolhaas, and collaborators like Colin Rowe and—most frequently—Robert Stern, all of whom brought their own individual interests to bear on the events.[268] What distinguished the Institute's adult education from existing offerings at New York art institutions, such as those by the Museum of Modern Art or the Metropolitan Museum of Art, was that the "Architecture" series focused solely on topics related to architecture and planning and—with ticket prices of US$60 per series—was slightly cheaper than its competitors. By the end of the 1974–75 academic year, thanks to the Undergraduate Program and the Evening Program (which was registered as a major public success, drawing over 400 participants for the six series offered in the first year), the Institute had managed to establish itself as a new purveyor of architectural knowledge through its innovative pedagogy, topical architectural debates, and broad-impact PR campaigns. Ultimately, this move towards education and culture spoke to the Institute's new openness, but it also testified to the postmodern sensibilities of the 1970s: the meeting of highbrow and popular

268 Stern belonged to the Mayor's Task Force on Urban Design as a young architect, encouraged by Philip Johnson, and from 1969 ran a practice with John Hagman. At the age of thirty, he published the survey volume *New Directions in American Architecture* (1969). From 1970–71 he taught at Columbia University and briefly at Yale University in 1972–73. In 1973 he positioned himself for the first time as an opponent to Eisenman, leading the "Grays" in their polemic against the "Whites." From 1973 Stern was president of The Architectural League in New York and from 1975 director of the Society of Architectural Historians. He was active at the Institute from 1974–75 and took a decisive role, although he did not hold an official position for a long time.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

culture within the framework of "Architecture" as well as the fact that the Institute could cater to the alternative scene alongside a bourgeois public (for a more extensive discussion of the Institute as a cultural space, see chapter three).

Liberal Arts Education

The Institute's performance as an alternative architecture school for very different cohorts of students was only possible thanks to its institutional acceptance by established higher education institutions—the colleges that conferred a certain authority on the Institute as an educational facility in the first place, and that additionally lent it their administrative, financial, conceptual, and intellectual support. One of the most important collaborative partners in developing and running the Undergraduate Program, in both institutional and pedagogical respects, was Sarah Lawrence College in Bronxville, New York. Located north of Manhattan, a thirty-minute drive from the Institute, Sarah Lawrence was one of America's leading liberal arts colleges in the 1970s. When Eisenman first presented the idea of a one-year study program in early 1974, both institutions initially hesitated to engage more seriously with the proposition, until students launched an initiative expressing their interest. As was the case earlier in the Institute's history, personal contacts then proved decisive for institutional developments. Under the leadership of its then-president, Charles DeCarlo, Sarah Lawrence contributed significantly to the details and design of the Institute's new education program, ultimately playing a key role in facilitating its creation.[269] The preparations involved intensive consultations between representatives of the Institute and Sarah Lawrence administrators (in addition to DeCarlo, the chairman of the Curriculum Committee, Robert Wagner, was heavily involved), as the principals hashed out the fundamental principles of a humanities education and the concrete didactic content of the courses.[270] The conditions for the Institute were favorable; there had already been isolated attempts among Sarah Lawrence students and faculty to offer design courses at the college. As a result, the Sarah Lawrence directorship saw enormous opportunities in collaborating with the Institute—not only did the Institute have superlative architects and academics as teaching staff, but its upper-floor studios also afforded plenty of space for

269 In the archives of Sarah Lawrence College in Bronxville, New York, more than in any other archives, there are a number of folders of original and copied documents relating to the Institute's educational programs, from which the conceptual and administrative history of the Undergraduate Program emerges, including the *Progress Bulletin*, which reported on the current status and latest developments of the educational programs on a quarterly basis, thus providing a good understanding of the organization and program of teaching at the Institute, or, as an equivalent medium, the *Student Bulletin*, which communicated all the important information for the students participating in the Institute's educational program.

270 The formulation of the courses in history and theory as part of the Undergraduate Program at the Institute was initially rejected by some members of Sarah Lawrence's faculty as being too remote and too exemplary from a didactic point of view, while the school administration agreed in principle to cooperate, and the Curriculum Committee supported the concept.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

teaching design. Beginning in May 1974, interested students could apply for a spot in the coming fall semester. It was not until then that the dean of studies at Sarah Lawrence came together with Dean Robert Wagner to formulate concrete requirements for the Institute. At the same time, DeCarlo shared his concerns and recommendations in a personal letter to Eisenman: Sarah Lawrence was to have a significant hand in shaping the Undergraduate Program's pedagogical approach. This was the starting point for the Institute to begin offering its new educational program at other liberal arts colleges in the eastern Coast United States. Financial support for the first three years of this unusual educational initiative was provided by the John Edward Noble Foundation, a private nonprofit chaired by June Larkin that specialized in working with educational programs and had previously collaborated with MoMA to support its educational offerings. In June 1974, before the Institute's leadership had even officially submitted a grant application, the Noble Foundation donated US$15,000 in seed capital.[271] This was put toward establishing administrative structures and a concrete lesson plan, making the Noble Foundation the third key institutional actor involved in the establishment and implementation of the Undergraduate Program.[272] Following this, a bulletin was drafted as the main medium of communication, which framed the offering as a humanistic education in architecture, portraying it as an alternative to existing offerings, and articulating the goals of the Institute and Sarah Lawrence with regard to the program.[273] According to the bulletin, seventeen students had already shown interest in the first year. If one examines how the Institute envisioned its new definition and role, it is telling that the document describes the Institute as an "arbiter" of various pedagogical offerings, as opposed to an "advocate" of any one political organization. In actual fact, the Institute, despite its early years as a "non-profit educational, research and development center" from 1967 to 1969, had scarcely any pedagogical experience to speak of, let alone a

271 The Institute's leadership submitted an initial, comprehensive concept paper for the Undergraduate Program in Architecture to the Noble Foundation in late June 1974, which included a precise analysis of architecture education for undergraduate students, the general objectives of the educational program, the specific structure of the courses, a budget plan for the next three years, and information about the faculty and the Institute; see IAUS, "Proposal for an Undergraduate Architectural Major," n.d., Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: AR2018.0112.001; see also Peter Eisenman, "Director's Report," June 19, 1974. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-2. A "[t]hree year grant for a new undergraduate major in architecture among five colleges and universities, and the Institute" was approved; see "The Next Thirty Years 1970–2000" in *The Edward John Noble Foundation 1940–2000. A Report at Sixty Years* (New York: The Edward John Noble Foundation, 2000), 51.

272 In the 1970s, the Noble Foundation sponsored art education programs at major cultural institutions in Manhattan, including, since 1972, those at MoMA. Initially, grants totaling US$ 1 million were provided by the private foundation to revitalize the Educational Department there, see The Edward John Noble Foundation, 2000, 21. Mrs. June Larkin, née Noble, had once studied at Sarah Lawrence College herself, where she had graduated with a bachelor's degree in 1944. She then served as a trustee at Sarah Lawrence College from 1964 to 1973, and even chaired the Board of Trustees there during the last two years of her tenure.

273 IAUS, "Bulletin no. 1. Program in Undergraduate Architectural Education," June 24, 1974. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: AR2018.0112.001

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

fleshed-out curriculum. Yet the Institute intended to profit off the intellectual and academic capital it had accumulated; here and in all its grant applications, it made a point of invoking the activities and expertise of its Fellows, who all taught at renowned schools of architecture. In doing so, it drew on an expansive definition of education, encompassing "university exhibitions, lecture series, [and] special issues of magazines." Further qualifications noted by the Institute in its application to the Noble Foundation included the housing project it was realizing in Brooklyn, as well as *Oppositions* journal, launched the year before. Over the course of the summer, Eisenman was busy promoting the Undergraduate Program, and by the fall of 1974, the Noble Foundation had upped its support to an annual sum of US$60,000. The private foundation's only condition was one of an institutional nature—namely, that any funding was contingent on the Institute being recognized by all cooperating colleges as a valid site of external studies.

The new teaching duties at the Institute in the academic year 1974–75 led to an increased professionalization of its administrative structure. Although it had not been conclusively determined at the outset whether the Undergraduate Program would function as a form of occupational training, the first academic year already saw students coming to the Institute not only from Sarah Lawrence but also from a handful of other liberal arts colleges. The Institute offered them an opportunity to specialize early, undertaking a kind of "pre-professional study" that qualified them for a future degree in architecture—a phenomenon that has been described as a "new vocationalism."[274] The Institute's immediate popularity as an architecture school can perhaps be attributed to its prior reputation, the renown of some individual Fellows, or simply the gravitational pull of New York. However, it was also bound up with the more encompassing changes that the American academic system was undergoing at the time. The greatest achievement of the Institute—and in particular of expert networker Eisenman—was that, in cooperation with Sarah Lawrence, it managed to construct an entirely new education network for the Undergraduate Program in a remarkably short time. The two initiators soon joined forces with other colleges such as Amherst, Oberlin, Smith, and Wesleyan to form a consortium that had not existed in this format before, and which was quickly expanded to include more colleges.[275] In his triple role as Institute director, director of the Undergraduate Program, and teacher, Eisenman invested much of his subsequent time in expanding his relationships with various liberal arts colleges. Once per year, Eisenman would take a "road trip" with Regina Wickham (an administrator in the Undergraduate Program), going from college to

274 Thelin, 2004, 327.

275 By the end of 1974, the Institute was already negotiating with Brown and Hampshire Colleges, as well as Stanford University. Furthermore, Bennington, Mount Holyoke, and Swathmore College were under consideration as potential partner colleges of the Institute in the Undergraduate Program; Peter Eisenman, "Director's Report," December 10, 1974. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-2.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - [cc] BY-NC-ND

college as a kind of traveling architecture salesman, making contacts with potential partner schools, promoting the Institute's education offerings, and recruiting interested students (while also distributing the latest issue of *Oppositions*). Mutual agreements between the Institute and the cooperating colleges ensured that interested students would be allowed to spend two semesters at the Institute and be awarded credits for their coursework. Oberlin College acted as an interface for all the GLCA colleges that were not officially part of the consortium. Arrangements were also made for the tuition fees paid to the colleges to be forwarded directly to IAUS Central. The humanities focus of the Institute's five-part curriculum ensured that students were awarded course credits for completing a one-year course of study, even though the faculty's standards for evaluation weren't always made transparent or consistently applied. Ultimately, the Undergraduate Program enabled the Institute to tap into an important revenue stream that, over the following years, would cover the majority of its operating budget while giving its Fellows the opportunity to secure a steady income or top up their university salaries.

To further validate and implement the Undergraduate Program, the Institute set up an Advisory Committee to provide oversight and expertise. This advisory body, which met at least once per year to discuss and regulate administrative and academic issues, included Institute faculty and representatives from the cooperating colleges, as well as the president of the Noble Foundation, June Larkin, and the deans of two leading architecture schools, James Polshek of Columbia University and William Porter of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). Institute students could also elect delegates to represent their interests and contribute their experiences. The agenda covered topics ranging from admission procedures, the centralized handling of tuition fees, the awarding of credits by individual colleges, and the teaching of individual courses, to the function of the design tutorials. More than anyone else, Polshek proved to be a passionate supporter of the Institute's education offerings, predicting early on that they would have a significant and lasting impact on architecture education in the USA. In fact, the conception and implementation of the Institute's Undergraduate Program, with its focus on history and theory, was strongly influenced by the standards at Columbia University, where an undergraduate major in architecture had been introduced under the leadership of Robert Stern in 1973–74, while in its early years, the Institute had been more strongly influenced by the instruction offered at Cornell University and Cooper Union. In early 1975, in collaboration with Stern, the Institute organized a conference on "Undergraduate Non-Professional Architectural Education" to demonstrate its newfound role. While the opening of the conference was celebrated at the Institute on January 10, 1975, the conference itself was held at Columbia's Avery Hall on January 11.[276] Organized in

276 Suzanne Stephens, "Architecture for Undergraduates," *Progressive Architecture* (March 1975), 23.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

partnership with Columbia (Stern, who had proven instrumental in launching the Evening Program, had once again become an important partner for the Institute) and the Architectural League of New York, the conference was dedicated to the structures, methods, and goals of existing undergraduate programs. “The various components of such curricula,” the statement of intent proclaimed, “will be discussed, including the study of history, design, technology, social sciences and the broader understanding of the relationship between architecture and culture.”[277] The Institute presented its offerings as appealing to universities that ran a graduate school of architecture, but no corresponding undergraduate program as well as liberal arts colleges with no architecture major. Merely dedicating a one-day conference to the topic, with over seventy registered guests, meant that the Institute could justifiably claim to occupy a leading role in the emerging field of undergraduate architecture education, even though the conference proceedings were never published, and no survey of existing curricula was conducted. The Institute’s transformation into an educational institution was completed in the summer, when Charles DeCarlo and June Larkin were named as trustees, along with the Canadian-born but California-based architect Frank Gehry. With the appointment of DeCarlo and Larkin, the Institute’s new pedagogical interests would now be represented and embedded within the organizational structure; they were not only expected to contribute their pedagogical experience and institutional capital but also to serve as the Institute’s envoys to the outside world.

Institutional Growth

Restructuring meant that, beginning in the fiscal year 1974–75, the Institute would finance its operations primarily via income from architecture education, with additional support coming from public grants and private donors. Most of the Fellows, Visiting Fellows, and faculty were awarded teaching salaries. The Undergraduate Program and the “Architecture” series represented a conscious decision by the Institute to open up to the outside world. In epistemological and sociological terms, the Institute’s leadership and Fellows, who portrayed themselves not just as educators, but as the new elite in the architectural world, had come to realize that the Institute was a small, esoteric circle that depended on a larger, exoteric circle if it was to have any chance of survival as an educational and increasingly cultural institution. It was only thanks to this larger circle that projects like the costly and time-intensive journal *Oppositions*, as well as educational programs and public events were able to flourish. The same went for the Institute’s incipient “Exhibition Program” and the labor-intensive publications that were soon to follow. All of these were of pedagogical value, in terms of content and design, but they couldn’t sustain themselves or be launched independently. At the same time, the collective of architects and academics at the

277 IAUS, “Conference on Undergraduate Architectural Education. Statement of Purpose and Organization,” Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: AR2018.0112.001

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

Institute was, thanks to its publications and combined pedagogical and cultural efforts, accruing a wide range of networks and public audiences. Whether they considered themselves to be a group, an organization, or an institution, they were presiding over a generational change—one simultaneously bound to tradition *and* sworn to destroy it, dedicated to producing, reproducing, and disseminating new historical and theoretical knowledge and creating new power structures. By investing in architectural education and developing or expanding complex networks, such as the establishment of the "Fellows" as a new form of work and organization, the Institute had managed, now that its survival was ensured, to create a context for intervention on the one hand, and on the other, to educate the next generation of architects while socializing them as future producers and consumers of the Institute's cultural products.

The Institute's success as an architecture school was initially due to the fact that Eisenman, in his capacity as Institute director, was able to incorporate nearly the entire circle of Fellows, especially Frampton, Gandelsonas, and later Vidler, into the Undergraduate Program as teachers. In return, these Fellows were given the opportunity not only to teach and publish there but also to hold and chair lectures within the framework of "Architecture," or participate in group exhibitions as part of the "Exhibition Program" launched in 1975 (also organized by MacNair). In other words, they were given the opportunity to distinguish themselves as culture producers. In this sense, architecture teaching at the Institute didn't stop at conveying basic skills and knowledge: the Fellows, Visiting Fellows, and faculty at the Institute were initiating students into a new way of thinking, as well as appearance, needs, preferences, and habits. It must have been during the academic year 1975–76 that their teaching, the lectures and exhibitions, and the Institute's publications brought about a fundamental paradigm shift for the profession and the discipline, grounded in a historically and theoretically informed reflection on architecture itself and legitimization of architecture as a self-aware practice.[278] Moreover, this was taking place at a time when "heroic modernism," after the deaths of master architects like Le Corbusier and Ludwig Mies van der Rohe in the late 1960s, was yet to be historicized (although the International Style had already sold out in service of corporate architecture). Beyond the dissemination of a specific kind of self-reflexive and self-legitimizing architectural knowledge—conceived, it is important to note, outside of the requirements of technical, social, and economic reality—the Institute's program extended to the teaching of cultural competencies

278 Both Ludwik Fleck (1935) and Thomas S. Kuhn (1962), with their epistemological approaches to the theory and history of knowledge, also posited a sociology of knowledge production and dissemination; on Fleck's theory of thought styles and thought collectives, see Ludwik Fleck, "Introduction to Thought Collectives" & "Further Observations Concerning Thought Collectives," in Fleck, [1935] 1979, 38–51 & 98–111; on Kuhn's theory of paradigm shifts, see Thomas S. Kuhn "Introduction: A Role for History" & "The Nature and Necessity of Scientific Revolutions," In Kuhn, 1962, 1–9 & 92–110.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

for decoding an architectural vocabulary, and in structural and linguistic terms, the internalization of formal and semantic codes to help students comprehend architecture in all its complexity and, on that basis, formulate a new language.

In this period, Eisenman, who may not have been an equal among equals, continued to be the most vibrant and enigmatic personality at the Institute: as Institute director, he was responsible for hiring new faculty, and as director of the Undergraduate Program, he was responsible for the programming and curation with regard to pedagogical models and political strategies. In 1974–75, he ran his own one-off design studio and, even when he wasn't teaching, regularly attended the final reviews and supervised interns. Interns came to the Institute expressly to work for him, and Eisenman, whose office operated from the Institute, used them as a workforce for his own projects. What is more, not only did Eisenman share faculty and students with Cooper Union, where he had taught design since 1968, but the institutional relationship extended to a special agreement to recognize internships and waive tuition fees. When it came to personnel decisions and curriculum development, the Institute was further influenced by the teaching programs of other East Coast schools of architecture, among them Columbia University under Dean Polshek and Princeton University under Dean Geddes. Cooper Union, Columbia University, and Princeton: these were the architecture schools where some of the Fellows taught theory, history, and design, subscribing to a formal and aesthetic approach that sought to reinstate architecture as an independent practice, if not an art form, and to attach more importance to architecture—which they saw as having been lost. Eisenman and the other Fellows subscribed to and taught a critical line of thinking, one that sought to foster a better understanding of the major historical, social, and cultural contexts (less so political and economic) that had influenced architecture since the modern age.

2.2 Expanding Educational Offerings

Now that the Institute had succeeded, within the span of only a year, in establishing itself as an architecture school, positioning itself in the academic landscape with its undergraduate training and in the metropolitan culture of New York with its adult education program, after 1975, it increasingly began to target the broader American education market and expanded its offerings as an educational service provider. Next to the Undergraduate Program in Architecture and the "Architecture" series, the Institute's leadership sought out niche products to diversify its education offerings, and thus address new target groups and tap into new sources of revenue. It was certainly aided by the fact that the concept of "lifelong learning" was gaining traction in American society. The spectrum of education offerings was expanded to include the following programs launched in rapid succession in the 1975–76 academic year,

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

most of which were rather short-lived: an integrated "Undergraduate Program in Planning" for undergraduates, slated to run in parallel to the Undergraduate Program in Architecture, the practically oriented "Work/Study Program in Preservation and Adaptive Re-Use" for undergraduate and graduate students, which did not exist in this form at any other school of architecture, and even a "High School Program" to support young talent, in a similar form, albeit different motivation, as one that had already existed at Cooper Union for some time. As a result of this expansion, the Institute was now offering educational programs for every age group (as recommended by the *Princeton Report*, a 1967 guide published by Robert Geddes and Bernhard Spring on the study of environmental design, which included architectural education).[279] Once again, the individual educational programs were institutionalized via collaborations with partner colleges. In its proposals shared with other educational institutions, in info brochures for students, and at the annual meetings of the Board of Trustees, the Institute repeated, mantra-like, that these education offerings posed no threat to established schools of architecture. Instead, they were portrayed as complementary offerings.

By 1975–76, the Undergraduate Program in Architecture was already an authority: in its second year, twenty-four students, hailing from nine different colleges, signed up for classes. Moreover, the Institute had already implemented a first reorganization of the program: having taken over Frampton's history course, Vidler now taught "Architecture in the Age of Revolutions," which now accompanied Gandelsonas's theory course.[280] Another major change was that Eisenman put Diana Agrest in charge of all the design tutorials and coordinating the tutors. The Institute hired William Ellis, Colin Glennie, Andrew MacNair, Stephen Potters, Myles Weintraub, Todd Williams, and Stuart Wrede to lead design courses alongside her. Agrest formulated the required tasks for the first semester: students would initially design a building and define its spatial program without making stylistic specifications, the second stage then encompassed the design of a residential building and the creation of a public square. Design tutorials took a postmodern approach, especially in the second semester; the large variety of individual approaches led to a prevailing air of polyphony and polysemy. Agrest's own approach, grounded in French theory, was characterized by a multi-faceted reading of public space. Her teaching shows that she conceptualized the city as an urban fabric of different structures

279 Geddes and Bernard, 1967.

280 Frampton was in London from 1975, initially on a Guggenheim Foundation fellowship, where he researched and taught on Le Corbusier for two years at the Royal College of Art. He returned briefly to the Institute in the spring semester of 1976 to offer a six-session survey lecture on Le Corbusier's work as part of the Undergraduate Program, in addition to Anthony Vidler's course. Although this series of lectures expanded the course offerings, creating elective options for the first time, Frampton's presence was viewed rather negatively on the grounds that the course distracted from the other offerings.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

or as a sequence of individual objects and took this as the starting point for teaching design. Ultimately, the Institute's collective pedagogy was heavily influenced by postmodernism, understood not only discursively or aesthetically, but more generally as a cultural phenomenon and pedagogical concept.

Market Diversification

The Undergraduate Program in Planning was headed by Wolf. It was developed as an equivalent to the Undergraduate Program in Architecture but differed primarily in that it was designed to be somewhat more pragmatic, even though it similarly aimed at combining theory and practice into an integrated "work/study" program.[281] Because it was necessary for the educational program to be recognized by multiple departments at every college, administrative issues delayed the launch and institutionalization of the program by a year. Unlike other colleges, which predominantly emphasized formal aspects of urban planning, the Institute stressed a multidisciplinary approach, enabling undergraduates to better prepare themselves for graduate studies by obtaining a more practical grounding. To this end, the first module of the Undergraduate Program in Planning comprised two courses: one on the history and theory of urban planning (taught by Wolf), which explored the subject in its socio-cultural, technological, and economic aspects, and one on the social and psychological aspects of urban planning (Robert Gutman), which focused on planning public spaces and public housing. This was followed by a second module featuring case studies on twentieth-century urban planning (Craig Whitaker) and a research seminar with weekly excursions to urban infrastructures (Whitaker and Myles Weintraub). In the third module, students enrolled in an "urban design studio" (Weintraub) where they worked on independent projects or in small groups and where they were taught technical and analytical skills such as drawing, mapping, and model making.

Unlike the two undergraduate programs, the Work/Study Program in Preservation and Adaptive Re-Use, headed by Ellis and Stuart Wrede, was aimed at students from established architecture schools that did not offer this kind of program in their curricula.[282] The educational program was project-based, and the students' assignment was to spend a year preparing an inventory of buildings with landmark status. The Institute received an initial grant of US$5,000 from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation to develop and organize the program. After the study was commissioned by the New York Landmarks Conservancy, the

281 Peter Wolf, "Program in Undergraduate Planning Education," n.d. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: AR2018.0112.001

282 William Ellis, "Program in Adaptive Re-Use of Old Buildings," n.d. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-2. Ellis had built a consortium of twelve architecture schools for the "Program in Preservation and Adaptive Re-Use:" Cornell University, University of Kentucky, Kent State University, Montana State University, State University of New York, Buffalo, Notre Dame University, The Pratt Institute, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Rice University, University of Southern California, Syracuse University, Tulane University.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

Sloan Foundation donated another US$15,000. The Institute was deemed to be qualified for the project thanks to a 1974 adaptive reuse and preservation project led by Ellis on the conversion of a mill site in Cohoes, New York, which the Institute had successfully carried out and publicized.[283] The original vision for the curriculum was quite innovative and was to include courses on history and theoretical issues, legal and financial topics, technology and landmark protection, and a design tutorial. Ultimately, however, no separate course was offered due to low enrollment—only three students and three interns signed up for the 1975–76 academic year. Instead, the program was spontaneously integrated into the Evening Program, for which Wrede chaired two lecture series on the topics "The Future of the Past: Issues in Historical Preservation" and "The New Architecture of Old Buildings: Additions, Insertions, Deletions." Although the series were primarily aimed at the general public, they also fulfilled the requirements for awarding credit to student attendees.[284]

These new additions were supplemented by the High School Program, which was introduced in the fall semester of 1975, also at Eisenman's initiative. The program was aimed at Manhattan's private school students; MacNair was initially appointed to lead it.[285] Unlike Cooper Union's "Saturday Program," which combined early training in architecture with a strategy of critical emancipation, the Institute's High School Program was conceived as an ambitious introductory course on topics relating to architecture and design—comparable to the specialized courses in art, literature, and music offered as youth summer programs by New York colleges at the time. Initially, fifteen high school juniors and seniors would meet at the Institute one afternoon per week to be taught by co-instructors Eisenman and MacNair. These students were recruited via New York Interschool, a consortium of private schools in New York.[286] But by 1976, MacNair, with the aid of a grant from the Noble Foundation, had already developed an ambitious new six-week summer course called "Manhattan: Capital of the Seventies," organized as a kind of mini-Institute for aspiring young architects. The program featured a design studio, lectures by architects and planners,

283 Stephens, 1975.

284 Wrede, who had already spent a year at the Institute in the late 1960s working on "New Urban Settlements" project and was tasked by Eisenman to design his own journal, was again a Visiting Fellow there in 1975–76 and taught design in the Undergraduate Program. Wrede left the Institute in the fall of 1976.

285 One model for the Institute's High School Program was the Saturday Program at Cooper Union, where, since 1968, students from the East Village, i.e., the adjacent neighborhood of a socially disadvantaged population, were taught architecture and the arts to give them access to private art colleges and thus open up educational opportunities; see Kim Förster, "Teaching Architecture, or, 'How to Create Spaces for Teenagers?'," in *Arts for Living*, eds. common room and Kim Förster (New York: common books, 2013), 63–108.

286 The Institute's private partner high schools in New York were Spence, Chapin, Collegiate, St. Bernards, Nightingale-Bamford, Brearly und Trinity.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

and excursions, afternoon lectures, and film screenings.[287] Although the High School Program, unlike the other education offerings, did not make a significant financial contribution to the Institute's budget (or, if it did, one that was more indirect than direct), there were both institutional and personal motivations for its creation. Not only did it draw the attention of academic advisors from high schools and colleges to the Institute's new pedagogical concepts, it also served as a broader PR campaign in the local press to help brand the Institute as a serious educational institution.

Beyond diversifying its education offerings after 1975, another strategically clever move in pedagogical, more so in entrepreneurial respects on the part of the Institute's leadership was the decision to professionalize, and even commercialize the Internship Program, the Institute's longest-running educational program. Until 1974–75, internships were still integrated into the Undergraduate Program. Starting in the summer of 1975, however, they would be offered to any college graduate looking to gather first working experiences at the Institute before applying for a degree program in architecture. For a fee of initially US$1,000 (soon raised to US$1,500), Institute interns could either work directly for one of the practicing Fellows or Visiting Fellows on concrete design projects, or they could be engaged in other work at the Institute.[288] Surprisingly, the not-insignificant internship fee did not work as a deterrent. Quite to the contrary, in fact: six interns worked at the Institute in the first summer, and fourteen applied for internships in the 1975–76 academic year. This can be attributed, on the one hand, to the Institute's power of attraction, its reputation and prestige that it had built up and consolidated over the course of time; on the other hand, it can also be attributed to the fact that American society in the 1970s generally accepted that "good education" had its price, as "internships, field experiences, study abroad and numerous other innovations gradually came to be accepted components of the bachelor's degree experience" in architecture education as well.[289] A one-year stay "abroad" at the Institute promised interns an in-depth engagement with, initiation into, and development of a specific habitus and thought styles they sought to learn from Eisenman and other Fellows. At the Institute, interns were confronted with the most important theoretical and historiographical debates of the day while coming into direct contact with an Institute Fellow (possibly one of their personal heroes)—even if their education was more about conceptual skills and abilities than practical experience. In exchange for the interns' collaboration on individual or collective projects, the Institute offered intensive supervision in the

287 IAUS, "High School Program" leaflet, 1976. Source: Walker Arts Center

288 The following Fellows offered internships: Diana Agrest, William Ellis and Stuart Wrede, Mario Gandelsonas, Andrew MacNair, Stephen Potters and Todd Williams, Myles Weintraub, and Peter Wolf.

289 Thelin, 2004, 330.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

preparation of a portfolio—which was crucially important for students applying for a coveted spot in a master's program in architecture. The student bulletin expressly stated that the Institute would assist them in the selection of the right architecture school: "It is the intention of this program to work closely with the graduate school to develop a mutually beneficial and interlocking relationship."[290] Crucially, the Institute operated in close collaboration with college staffers responsible for handling applications and acceptances, and Fellows provided sought-after letters of recommendation to students at the end of their one-year studies. By advising interns on their choice of university, the Institute played a key role in their education, if not their career. What the Institute had effectively introduced, in other words, was a market in recommendation letters.

School Routine

Within a very short time, the Institute, formerly more interested in its own research and design projects than in mentoring students, had managed to fundamentally transform itself, as described by Goldberger. With its education offerings and public events, it had morphed into a new educational center of basic and further training for future architects and planners, an unusual site for communitization and communication not only between Fellows, Visiting Fellows, staff, students, and interns but also the New York public in general. During the day, the Institute was enlivened by its busy educational programs, while crowds flocked to the evening lectures every night of the week during the semester. Starting in 1975, exhibitions were on constant rotation in the two-storied main hall. The creativity and vitality displayed at the Institute at this point, as evidenced by brochures and posters, had an enormous appeal. In the 1975–76 academic year, just one year after its reinvention, the Institute boasted nearly forty students, the consortium had been expanded to include ten colleges, and the faculty had grown to seventeen members.[291] A total of four hundred people attended the evening lectures in the "Architecture" series. In the context of the Institute's history, it is crucial to note that the focus on education, increased public interest, support from public and private foundations, and networking with academia ensured that the Institute, which in the years before had repeatedly faced insolvency, was finally on solid financial footing. And it wasn't just the Institute that profited from this transformation; students and interns also benefited from the intellectual debates and passionate exchange of ideas taking place there, even if they weren't obtaining a vocational degree. Many of the college graduates who came to work at the Institute came specifically to work for Eisenman, whose *Houses* had been widely published and seen as demonstrating

290 IAUS, "Student Bulletin Two. Program in Undergraduate Architectural Education," February 1975. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: AR2018.0112.001

291 In the 1975–76 academic year, most students came from Brown, Hampshire, Oberlin, and Sarah Lawrence Colleges.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - cc BY-NC-ND

a radical attitude toward design. His interns finished a small series of models or drawings for him, which he then displayed in museums and galleries or sold to collectors and archives; only a few interns gained any actual experience in building.[292] Other interns worked for the other Fellows, who were themselves practicing architects, such as Diana Agrest and Mario Gandelsonas, who entered local and international competitions in the mid-1970s from the Institute and planned building projects in Argentina.[293] In addition, interns worked for Visiting Fellows like Rem Koolhaas and helped him research a number of topics for his upcoming monograph *Delirious New York*, which was developed at the Institute and had already been announced in its publications, lectures, and exhibitions. Interns also helped finish drawings for Koolhaas's Manhattan Projects and, after the establishment of his Office for Metropolitan Architecture in early 1975, contributed to his submission to the Roosevelt Island Housing Competition organized by the Urban Development Corporation.[294] Those interns who didn't work directly under one of the Fellows or Visiting Fellows were assigned to one of the Institute's more general productions, such as *Oppositions*, managed by

292 Interns who have worked for Eisenman include Sam Anderson, David Buege, Read Ferguson, Randall Korman, John Leeper, Jay Measley, and Caroline Sidnam. For *House VI*, which Eisenman designed from the fall of 1972, commissioned by Richard and Suzanne Frank, and which eventually was built, he had hired Randall Korman as executive architect. In 1975, when *House VI* was just completed, Eisenman had interns retrospectively make series of drawings of the transformations in the design process based on his sketches, in addition to Randall Korman, Read Ferguso, and Caroline Sidnam. The drawings of transformations of *House VI* were shown at MoMA in the spring of 1975 as part of the exhibition "Architectural Studies and Projects"; they were also scheduled for a May 1975 exhibition in Naples, which was ultimately cancelled. Sidnam, who was one of Eisenman's interns in 1974–75, produced drawings for *House III* and *House IV*. A model of *House II* produced by interns was exhibited at the Institute in November 1976 in the exhibition "Idea as Model". Joan Ockman referred to Eisenman's habit of only theorizing his designs after the fact as "ex post facto diagrams of the design process of his own houses;" see Ockman, 1995, 59. However, she failed to point out that the authorship of the drawings and models was shared, since the interns were involved in the theorizing, and that they were produced to become art objects on the art market. In his monograph *Houses of Cards*, Eisenman mentioned the interns by name, but reduced their contribution to making the drawings or building the models; see Peter Eisenman, *Houses of Cards* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), VI. Some names were missing here though, for example David Buege, who built the model of *House II*.

293 Interns who have worked for Diana Agrest and Mario Gandlesonas include Stan Allen, Andrew Anker, Peggy Deamer, Livio Dimitriu, Christian Hubert, Joan Ockman, Miguel Oks, and Pat Sapinsley. They worked on projects for Roosevelt Island, New York (1975), the French Ministry of Housing (1975), La Villette, Paris (1976), and Nicollet Island, Minneapolis (1976). Miguel Oks, who was an Agrest/Gandelsonas intern from 1975 to 1977, prepared drawings for three apartment tower blocks (1977) in Buenos Aires, which were subsequently built.

294 On one of the last pages of *Delirious New York*, Rem Koolhaas states: "Between 1972 and 1976 much of the work on the Manhattan Projects was produced at the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies in New York, with the assistance of its interns and students." Rem Koolhaas, *Delirious New York. A Retroactive Manifesto for Manhattan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 255. The students and interns who worked on the Manhattan Projects were: German Martinez, Richard Perlmutter, and Derrick Snare. For OMA's entry to UDC's housing competition for Roosevelt Island, the Institute seconded Livio Dimitriu, German Martinez, and Richard Perlmutter.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

Julia Bloomfield, or the library that Suzanne Frank had stepped in to run, both providing access to content and knowledge as an educational resource and educational facility.[295]

Soon the Undergraduate Program teaching staff was recruited from outside the Institute's circle of Fellows and New York architects. Eisenman had always used his frequent visits to Europe to persuade young and ambitious architects and academics to move from Europe to New York—something that added to the allure of the education offered at the Institute.[296] The Institute promised them a creative working environment, plus the opportunity to exhibit, lecture as part of "Architecture," and publish in *Oppositions*. Eisenman even managed to hire some of them to teach at the Institute as Visiting Fellows. In early 1975, Archigram came from England to give a workshop. In early 1976, Bernard Tschumi and Grahame Shane—like Koolhaas previously, who had now left New York and thus the Institute to finish *Delirious New York* in London—both came from the Architectural Association to the Institute, where they taught in the Undergraduate Program as design tutors on temporary contracts. But neither Tschumi nor Shane remained in their intended roles for long, only lasting one semester. Tschumi, however, continued to use the Institute to write for *Oppositions*, to work on his own projects, and to organize the exhibition "A Space: A Thousand Words," while Shane immediately turned his back on the Institute. For both, the Institute proved to be a springboard (as it had for Koolhaas) to establishing a footing in New York and launch their international careers.[297] Despite the constantly changing workforce, the Institute's ever-widening social, educational, cultural, and financial networks were an

295 One of the Institute's interns at the time was Ockman, who, after initially being assigned to Diana Agrest, worked for the *Oppositions* editorial staff as an editorial consultant on the basis of her bachelor's degree in Comparative Literature, where she was paid for her copywork, contrary to standard practice, before going on to study architecture at Cooper Union. Following the internship, Ockman was active at the Institute for a long time: first, from 1976 to 1980, working alongside her studies for the *Oppositions* editorial staff, where she rose to associate editor, and in the early 1980s, after graduation, also as executive editor of Oppositions Books and as editorial consultant to several exhibition catalogues. Finally, in 1981, Ockman was made a Fellow, published in *Oppositions*, and was involved in the Young Architects' Circle.

296 Eisenman made several trips to Europe in 1975 and 1976 for different purposes: a contribution to the "Conceptual Architecture" exhibition (January 1975) at Peter Cook's Art Net with an accompanying conference at the AA, in the context of which he was interviewed by Alvin Boyarsky in the TV studio of the AA; a meeting of *Arquitecturas Bis*, *Lotus International* and *Oppositions* editors in Cadaqués near Barcelona (November 1975); and the curation of and participation in the American contribution to the architecture section of the Venice Art Biennale (July 1976).

297 Bernard Tschumi, who as an architect was interested in a performative approach, quickly turned away from the Institute, as he did not feel at home there, although he positioned himself in relation to the New York architectural scene. His diverse projects, some of which he worked on at the Institute, the Architectural Manifestos, the Manhattan Transcripts, and the various Follies, and which he also published in *Skyline* at the time, were not exhibited at the Institute, but at Artists' Space (1978), the Architecture Room at P.S.1 (1979), Max Protetch Gallery (1981), and Leo Castelli Gallery (1983).

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

enormous benefit to students. For example, in the summer of 1976, students in the Undergraduate Program had the opportunity (as an addition to their regular curriculum) to work on a design and exhibition project headed by Colin Rowe and Judith DiMaio to redesign Nicollet Island, a now derelict former industrial zone in inner-city Minneapolis.[298] As part of the Bicentennial exhibition "The River: Images of the Mississippi," highlighting the significance of the river for the city, the Institute was commissioned by the Walker Art Center to conduct a design study to be exhibited in the fall of 1976 (October 2, 1976 to January 9, 1977); which was immediately turned into a research and design project, and subsequently an exhibition project, with a US$10,000 endowment.[299] Working on the project—further evidence of how architecture education at the Institute had evolved from the urban studies projects of the early years (in which Rowe had also been involved before leaving in protest)—nevertheless gave students the opportunity to gather experience in planning and staging exhibitions and more generally engaging in cultural production. For the urban design project, students produced architectural drawings and an urban model under the supervision of DiMaio and Rowe. Their proposal called for low-rise buildings on the island's shore, postmodern urban forms (terraces, labyrinths, gardens), and water features (pools, fountains). For the urban districts just north and south of Nicolette Island, the students also designed low-rise residential buildings, plazas, and a shopping district, as well as skyscraper towers and apartment blocks.

The Institute generally saw many of its students and interns spend a formative phase of socialization and acculturation in architecture, thanks in particular to the Undergraduate Program and the Internship Program, where their understanding of the profession and discipline was strongly influenced by the (predominantly male, with a few exceptions) faculty and mentors assembled there. One pedagogical effect of studying at the Institute was to not only shape and define the aspiring

298 Colin Rowe, "Nicollet Island, Minneapolis" in *As I was Saying, Volume 3: Urbanistics* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996), 121–126. At the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis, the archives contain some documents on the exhibition and also on the Institute.

299 *Design Quarterly*, no. 101/102 (October 1976): "The River: Images of the Mississippi" [Exhib. Cat.]; see also Martin Friedman, "The River: Images of the Mississippi, Walker Art Center, Minneapolis, United States of America," *Museum International* 32, no. 1/2 (1980), 15–21. The exhibition "The River" included commissioned artworks as well as 19th-century classics, boat tours, film screenings, tours, and seminars, and three architectural projects in the form of design studies: next to the Institute, The Hodne-Stageberg Partners from Minneapolis and Craig Hodgetts were also invited, along with Charles Moore from Los Angeles. Source: Walker Arts Center. In preparation for the Institute's contribution, consisting of a model and several drawings, the Undergraduate Program students took time off from the Design Tutorial and instead worked exclusively on the project for a month to ensure that the exhibits were ready in time for the exhibition opening. They then started their regular classes slightly behind schedule. The original plan was for the three architectural projects to also be displayed at the Minneapolis City Planning Office following the exhibit, but this did not happen. Thus, the design study ultimately had no political effect.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

young architecture students' approach to design but also to formulate a new habitus and thought style specific to architecture for them. Grounded in theoretical concepts and historical knowledge, this approach led students to adopt a more reflected way of writing and speaking about architecture and the city, and about their own creative practice and cultural values in general. At the Institute, the students acquired cultural skills related to postmodern practice—drawing and model making, exhibiting and lecturing, writing and editing—that would prove essential to their future careers. There is growing evidence that outside of their everyday studies and work, students and interns also participated in the social and cultural life of the Institute. After setting up seating and helping with ticket sales for the "Architecture" series, for example, they were able to sit in on the evening lectures from the gallery. Beginning in 1976, they also increasingly had the opportunity to witness a variety of exhibitions at the Institute of architectural drawings and contemporary projects by rising European architects who were largely unknown in the United States at the time, e.g., Aldo Rossi and Massimo Scolari, who not only exhibited their works in connection with the lecture series "A New Wave of European Architecture" in 1976 but also held seminars for the Institute's students and interns.[300] In this golden era of the Institute, the list of architects and academics holding lectures and exhibiting their work was both immense and illustrious. For example, students had the opportunity to listen to Manfredo Tafuri on one of his rare trips to the United States. While the Evening Program increasingly came to feature designers and artists, humanities scholars, progressive thinkers, and important figures from public life, the "Exhibition Program" quickly grew to include not only historical exhibitions, but also work by sought-after architects from Europe, the US, Japan, Austria, and South America. Some students and interns were involved in installing the exhibitions or helped with the poster design and merchandizing. They were also involved in the preparations for the group exhibition, first "Good-bye Five" (1975), an exhibition of architectural drawings by young architects, including Fellows and Visiting Fellows, most of them from New York and the United States, and then "Idea as Model" (1976), an exhibition in which long-term Fellows, friends of the Institute, and a few envoys from the New York Five presented architectural models as conceptual works, and even works of art.[301] Generally speaking, the Undergraduate Program

300 Following the "European New Wave," Rossi spent a few days after holding his lecture at the Institute, where he was to exhibit his drawings for the first time. Apparently, rather than spend his spare time at the Institute, Rossi preferred to go on excursions across New York with a group of students and interns. Theses daily excursions were an experience for everyone involved and took them to Coney Island and Central Park, among other places.

301 A few students and interns who helped with the installation on the night before the opening of "Idea as Model" even witnessed (and thereby became the exclusive audience for) Gordon Matta-Clark's notorious "Window Blow-Out," see Philip Ursprung, "Blinde Flecken der 1970er Jahre: Gordon Matta-Clarks 'Window Blow-out'," in *Reibungspunkte, Ordnung und Umbruch in Architektur und Kunst. Festschrift für Hubertus Günther*, eds. Hanns Hubach, Barbara von Orelli-Messerli, Tadej Tassini (Petersberg: Michael Imhof Verlag, 2008), 293–300. Legend has it that Matta-Clark was originally invited to carry out one of his famous cuttings on a seminar

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

and the Internship Program in particular helped assimilate these students into the organization, gender roles, and culture of a competitive, and ultimately precarious architectural practice. Moreover, the Institute was initiating not only its students and interns, but also its Fellows, Visiting Fellows, and faculty into a series of educational, cultural, publishing, and ultimately professional practices that were typical of the New York architecture scene at the time. The Institute exposed them to all the ambivalences, contradictions, and complexities inherent to the New York architectural community—confronting them, in other words, with the very micro-politics and micro-economies that, in this early phase of postmodernism, were paving the way for new forms of research and education and new architectural jobs.

School Profile

In the mid-1970s, a period of transition, both for architecture culture in general and the Institute in particular, between symptom and cause, the Institute's leadership attached central importance to education in institutional, financial, social, and cultural respects. From 1974 to 1977, the Institute's education offerings were not only its most reliable source of income, but they also exerted a multi-pronged multiplier effect, magnifying the resonance of the Institute's production and reproduction as well as the dissemination of new theoretical and historiographical knowledge. In "economically difficult times," as Eisenman had put it, the Institute's continued visibility was more important than ever and was achieved through its teaching activities, outreach to colleges and universities, as well as through its own public relations efforts to promote its education offerings, lecture series, and exhibitions, and through coverage in the press. For this reason, Goldberger's laudatory article in the *New York Times* on the revival of the Institute as an architecture school, published on October 30, 1975, came at exactly the right moment. Of all people, it was Goldberger—one of Eisenman's harshest critics and a champion of Robert Stern's "Grays"—who gave the Institute exactly the kind of non-polemical publicity that it (its occasional penchant for polemics notwithstanding) so desperately needed to recruit an even larger number of new students and attract new paying audiences. This was repeated when, in the summer of 1976, Goldberger again provided the Institute with media exposure with another feature article in the *New York Times* in which he wrote exclusively about the new High School Program.[302] The network of the Institute as an educational institution, however, also encompassed professional organizations such as the American Institute of Architects,

room at the Institute, which in this context would have referred less to the buildings shaped by suburbanization, deindustrialization, and real estate speculation, as their departure from valorization, but rather to the specific power structures that underlay architecture education at the Institute.

302 Paul Goldberger, "Young Summer Class Students Learn Architecture by 'Building'," *The New York Times* (July 27, 1976), 33.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

i.e., the national association of practicing architects in the United States, which in 1976, at the suggestion of James Rossant of AIA's New York chapter, awarded the Institute a Gold Medal.[303] Praised as an "unusual and innovative educational institution," the Institute was recognized for becoming "a controversial center of discussion and debate on architecture and planning. Through dedication to excellence in education, research, and publication, it has extended its sphere of influence beyond its New York home."[304] Although this was only an institutionalized honor, it brought further attention to the Institute, and the Institute's leadership capitalized on this in its subsequent publicity and advertising campaigns. In the following years, the Institute came to increasingly rely on professional public relations and outreach for student recruitment and fundraising and hired Frederieke Taylor as the first director of development. In 1976, the Institute published another prospectus designed by its own Massimo Vignelli to promote its range of education programs.[305] Next to listing the two Undergraduate Programs and the High School Program, the printed brochure, in accordance with the graphic identity of the Institute, announced that, in the following academic year, the program "Design and Study Options" would be expanded beyond the six existing courses of study. In doing so, the Institute hoped to place a greater emphasis on design and recruit more students from schools of architecture. Parallel to this, it pursued a strategy of enlisting other colleges to help institutionalize the education offerings—for example, by offering the "Architecture" series as an on-site complement to the course catalogues of other colleges, such as the Parsons School of Design (today The New School of Design), the Pratt Institute, or the New Jersey Institute of Technology. In addition to undergraduates and graduates, the Institute was now reaching out to a new target group of "non-traditional students," a group that had in recent years "worked its way into admission offices and student affairs centers."[306] During the Institute's period of prosperity as an architecture school, students from private universities and art and design schools in the surrounding region were able to take advantage of its adult education offerings, with their flexible

303 IAUS, portfolio for an application to the 1976 AIA medal, n.d. Source: AIA Archives. The Institute had applied for an award from the American Institute of Architects (AIA). The Institute's application folder, which includes documentation of the 1975–76 educational and cultural programs, the two Undergraduate Programs in Architecture and in Planning, the Program in Preservation and Adaptive Re-Use, announcements of public programs, exhibitions, lecture series, and closed events, a public relations overview, and a compilation of letters of recommendation, is documented in the AIA archives.

304 American Institute of Architects, letter of December 23, 1975. Source: AIA Archives.

305 IAUS, prospectus, 1976. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-7. Taylor had come to the Institute in the spring of 1976 to fill the new post of director of development, established for two years at the initiative of Armand Bartos, chairman of the Board of Trustees, with a grant from the Gottesman Foundation. Her primary tasks were to prepare financial reports for the Institute for the first time, apply for grants, and improve public relations.

306 Thelin, 2004, 326–327.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

modular structure, so characteristic of goods and services in the information and knowledge society, to learn about architectural history and theory, urban planning, and contemporary debates in architecture, design, and the arts—all in a central location in Midtown Manhattan, in a space embedded in the local architecture and design scene. The Institute had turned into a kind of night school of architecture, allowing students to further specialize while obtaining the credits necessary for their studies.

Apart from critical size, and even business continuity, there was one more major difference between the Institute and the leading international schools of architecture to which it compared itself, through collaboration or competition, especially the AA in London, Cooper Union in New York, and the Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia (IUAV). This was the fact that it never held the status of an officially accredited university. There were both structural and strategic reasons for this. The 1976 edition of *Peterson's Guide to Architecture Schools in North America* noted that the Institute required no entrance exam, but also that students could not attain any kind of recognized degree.[307] Yet this circumstance did not diminish the economic success or cultural influence of the Institute as an architecture school. The lack of admission requirements was attractive to students, even though, as an architecture school, the Institute was not as anarchic, creative, or critical as its role models. For some time, however, the Institute did discuss collaborating with Sarah Lawrence College to develop a professional master's degree based on its Undergraduate Program that would have qualified graduates to practice architecture. On Charles DeCarlo's initiative, a concept paper was even drawn up, outlining a joint degree program with a focus on the public role of architecture and urban planning.[308] Arthur Drexler, then still on the Board of Trustees, supported the push, arguing that the Institute needed to take a leadership role vis-à-vis other institutions of higher education. In the past few years, he argued, the consortium of colleges had shown an interest in cooperating with the Institute: "because the universities believe[d] the Institute ha[d] a clear idea where architecture [wa]s heading."[309] A committee was set up that, besides DeCarlo and Drexler, included Richard Meier, Peter Wolf, and Peter Eisenman. The strategy they formulated for architectural education at the Institute was based on the Internship Program and the Evening Program and was called a "Terminal Master Program." According to this concept paper, the Institute's master's program would have been aimed primarily at

307 Karen Collier Hegener and David Clarke, eds., *Architecture Schools in North America* (Princeton: Peterson's Guides, 1976).

308 The establishment of a master's degree program was on the agenda of the 1976 annual meeting of the Board of Trustees, see Peter Eisenman, "Director's Report," June 10, 1976. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-2.

309 Ibid.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

graduates from liberal arts colleges and at professionals looking for further qualifications, as well as at young mothers planning an entry into professional life. It was assumed that, after their completing degrees, master's students would be seeking positions in management, education, industry, or governance—i.e., not in architectural practice per se. For this reason, the courses on offer were to cover the public sector, public administration, construction supervision, taxation, development planning, urban development planning, land use planning, urban history, and so forth, all of which problematized the various ways influence could be exerted upon the built environment. But in the end, the Institute never did establish a master's program. It was Eisenman who opposed the establishment of a fully-fledged degree program from the very beginning, and for good reason. The Institute lacked the necessary financial and human resources, space for teaching, and other facilities, such as a fully equipped library, to make such a step towards professionalizing its education program possible. Moreover, the fact that the Institute, with its education offerings and especially its Undergraduate Program, had only assumed duties from its partner colleges that it had the capacity to fulfill, also proved to be a strategic advantage. Ultimately, when it came to formulating course content and requirements, the Institute was accountable to nobody. The flexibility that lay at the heart of the Institute's education offerings with their modular design made it possible for the Institute's leadership to redefine the program each successive year, depending on the budget and staff available, and modify it as needed. This made it possible to build up surpluses and maximize profits. From a pedagogical point of view, the spectrum of education programs on offer each academic year was ultimately determined by supply and demand, rather than the need to meet educational objectives or humanistic ideals. After all, one of the fundamental prerequisites for creating and maintaining an educational program at the Institute was that it would pay for itself. When, after a one-year test phase, an education offering failed to demonstrate financial viability or couldn't garner a minimum number of students, it was unceremoniously canceled or, at best, replaced by a new offering.

Teaching and Learning Success

In terms of the relevance of the architecture education offered at the Institute, the Undergraduate Program and the Internship Program would ultimately, at least indirectly, influence the next generation of architecture students, while the Fellows played a role in shaping the broader architectural curricula. The innovations relevant in this context were that the Undergraduate Program functioned as a kind of preliminary education opportunity for ambitious liberal arts students and that the Internship Program operated as a pre-sorting mechanism for people looking to apply for one of the coveted spots at an Ivy League university. What is more, the programs enabled the Institute and its Fellows to expand their academic and intellectual capital by forming ties to all the major institutions on the East Coast. In doing so, they did not explicitly position themselves in competition with

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

the established schools of architecture (predominantly those of the Ivy League on the East Coast, as well as those in California), but instead operated as an interface between colleges and universities. The Institute thus came to occupy a unique position within the academic and higher education landscape in America, especially by the second half of the 1970s. After three years of being supported by the Noble Foundation, the Institute's leadership had come to measure its success as an architecture school not so much qualitatively, in terms of having achieved certain teaching and learning goals, but rather quantitatively vis-à-vis the institutional network, in terms of the admission rates of former students to graduate schools. The university acceptance details were published in the annual *Progress Bulletin*.[310] The significance attached to architecture education when it came to the education not only of prospective architects but also of responsible citizens and future developers, is evident in a memo Eisenman once wrote characterizing the Institute's basic educational strategy as that of a "trojan horse" within the architectural field.[311] Eisenman was also alluding to the new position of power occupied by the Institute, in its role as a major but non-institutionalized architecture school. The Institute's power expanded with each new academic year, as students and interns educated at the Institute infiltrated the universities and the professional world, disseminating, in settings both educational and practical, the postmodern paradigm, thinking, and practice they had learned at the Institute.

Ultimately, the Institute's success was also due to the fact that its restructuring as an educational institution, and its strategy of flexible adaptation to the market, was profitable in a variety of ways. In its first two or three years as an architecture school, as student enrollment rose to thirty-eight, the Institute immediately began earning significantly more income from architectural education. In the 1975–76 academic year, the Institute already began running out of space; a new seminar room and a provisional library were hastily erected on the mezzanine floor. Suzanne Frank, whose work at the Institute was initially confined to copying texts for Undergraduate Program students for free, now worked in an honorary capacity as Institute librarian.[312] What made the expansion of the Institute's education offerings in 1975–76 even more surprising was the fact that, in the same academic year, nationwide college attendance had declined for the first time since the 1944 G.I. Bill of Rights, and public and nonprofit institutions in general were undergoing a period of crisis.[313] In this context, one possible determinant for the Institute's success was the fact that, in 1970s America, people were newly

310 As schools of architecture, Princeton, Columbia University, Cooper Union, and MIT were particularly popular, followed by Yale University, Berkley University, and UCLA.

311 "Progress Bulletin no. 3," January 27, 1975. Source: Sarah Lawrence College Archives.

312 Frank, 2010, 6. The installation of a library as the basis for teaching architecture had been an unresolved problem at the Institute for years at that time and was to remain an issue.

313 Thelin, 2004, 321 & 323. The GI Bill of Rights aimed to promote the reintegration of U.S. soldiers into the workforce and thus into American society.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

conscious of the need for lifelong learning, and students, in general, were adopting an "academic consumerism"—a development that took hold across the field of architecture in a broader sense and was expedited by the Institute. Actual professionalization of the Institute's architecture education was finally achieved in the 1976–77 academic year, when, with the appointment of Carla Skodinski as the new Undergraduate Program coordinator, the Institute began to actively set about improving its administration. In concrete terms, this meant that in the period from 1974 to 1977, the Institute was largely able to finance its operations and pay the rent for its representative penthouse premises through its work as an architecture school. Although the tuition figures declined slightly in the 1976–77 academic year (after optimistic predictions of thirty students and ten interns), the offerings were nevertheless profitable, primarily due to the increase in tuition fees and further economization, i.e., the decision to charge more for internships. In the 1976–77 fiscal year, the Institute earned nearly US$150,000 from the Undergraduate Program alone, having attracted "only" nineteen students from twelve colleges, plus fourteen interns.[314] Despite the various issues facing the administration and public relations team, the Institute's consortium now comprised seven colleges: Amherst, Brown, Franklin & Marshall, Hampshire, Hobart and William Smith, Oberlin, and Sarah Lawrence. Advertising for the Undergraduate Program, however, was subpar on both sides. Not only did some of the colleges neglect to list the classes in their course catalog, but the Institute failed to print a poster advertising the education offerings for three years running. Nevertheless, the Institute's income continued to rise (even as the expenses for teachers and tutors increased): after years of debt management, the Institute now, for the first time in its history, was operating on a balanced budget.[315]

In the mid-1970s, at a time when there were scarcely any jobs available for New York architects due to financial and fiscal crises, the Institute under Institute director Eisenman was transformed into a new kind of workplace, one that allowed Eisenman, the other Fellows, and external instructors to support

314 IAUS, "Summary Report: Budget Summary 1974–1977," n.d. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-3.

315 Lucia Allais describes the years 1974 to 1977 at the Institute as "stable educational years," see Allais, 2010, 35. She does not however differentiate between the individual programs and their respective funding sources to support this statement. To confer a financial, and therefore institutional dimension on architecture education at the Institute, revenues from tuition must be considered separately from other revenues and always in relation to total revenues. Grant funds were used specifically to help set up an educational program and therefore must also be attributed to this institutional role of the Institute. For example, in 1975–76, the Undergraduate Program in Architecture was the most financially successful, with revenues of US$ 140,000, compared to the other newly launched educational programs. The Undergraduate Program in Planning had tuition revenues of just over US$ 12,000. The Program in Preservation and Adaptive Re-Use brought in an additional US$ 20,000. Nevertheless, the Undergraduate Program in Architecture incurred debts in its first two years. In terms of the 40 percent overhead, the Institute's income from all educational programs in 1975–76 still contributed just under US$ 65,000 to a total budget of just over US$ 108,000. Architecture education revenues were slightly less than the projected total.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

themselves by teaching while still raising their profile by participating in the "Architecture" series, exhibiting at the Institute, and writing for *Oppositions*. After visits by Koolhaas, Tschumi, and Shane, the Institute's relationship with the AA cooled off slightly. Eisenman maintained his networks, e.g., by inviting Spanish architect Rafael Moneo, a professor of architectural theory at the Escola Tècnica Superior d'Arquitectura in Barcelona, to the Institute for the 1976–77 academic year. He had met Moneo in 1967 at the Aspen Design Conference along with Oriol Bohigas, Frederico Correa, Ignasi de Solà-Morales, and Nuno Portas, and again in 1975 at a meeting of the editorial staffs of *Arquitecturas Bis*, *Lotus*, and *Oppositions* in Cadaquès, Spain. While Moneo, who remained in New York for one-and-a-half years, was teaching at the Institute, he was also conducting his own research at Cooper Union, which he published in *Oppositions*. Curating and taking part in the American contribution to the Venice Art Biennale in the summer of 1976, and editing and publishing *Oppositions* 5, the so-called "Italian Issue," in October 1976, Eisenman expanded the Institute's relationship to the IUAV, in particular through his intensified intellectual and artistic dialogue with Manfredo Tafuri and Aldo Rossi, who had both been guests of the Institute before, in order to develop collaborative education programs, and later research and publishing projects. Even if these discursive and institutional encounters did not result in a program or project, they helped Eisenman establish what later became called the "New York–Venice axis," which, proceeding from Tafuri's neo-Marxist critique of contemporary postmodern architectural practice, was intended to enliven architectural debate in North America in the second half of the 1970s.[316] By offering Fellows, Visiting Fellows, and external scholars the opportunity to teach, publish, lecture, and exhibit at the Institute—that is to say, in a broader sense, to work as cultural producers in both material and immaterial respects—the Institute was able to activate its collective social, cultural, and symbolic capital and—through education *and* culture—transform it into economic capital. In the process, work at the Institute took on the shape of a collective learning experience, with fluid boundaries between teachers and students. In 1976–77, after various attempts to establish an in-house reference library had failed in the face of financial and organizational limitations, Frank was now officially entrusted with the task of reviving the library project at the Institute as a Visiting Fellow.[317] She estimated a budget of US$14,500 for a core collection of two hundred books, emphasizing that the Institute's book collection and archive would play a vital role in the students' educational experience. As cities in general

316 On the intellectual and institutional exchange between Eisenman and Tafuri and the relationship between the IUAV and the IAUS, see Ockman, 1995; On Tafuri's reception in the United States, see Diane Ghirardo, "Manfredo Tafuri and the Architectural Theory in the U.S., 1970–2000," *Perspecta*, no. 33 (2002): "Mining Autonomy," 38–47; on Tafuri's biography, see Leach, 2005.

317 Suzanne Frank, "A Proposal for Reviving the Library," n.d. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: ARCH401150.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

and architecture, in particular, became culturalized, the Institute was subsequently designed and managed to ensure that both the educational *and* cultural programs contributed to the production, reproduction, and dissemination of a wide variety of architectural knowledge.[318] In the final analysis, the interaction between various fields of activities served to evoke a multiplicity of internal synergies and external networking effects. This had repercussions in the pedagogical and discursive spheres, but also on an economic and political level. For many Fellows, however, leisure time and working time were barely distinguishable.

Alternative Education

The opportunities and challenges of the Institute's work as an architecture school—which resulted from the fact that the modular education offerings could be designed flexibly and altered at short notice as needed, thanks to rapid decision-making processes and an administration geared around Eisenman—became apparent when, in the 1976–77 academic year, contrary to what had been advertised in the brochure, the Institute was unable to maintain its full catalogue of education programs. In its third year as an architecture school, after a phase of growth and differentiation, the Institute was entering its first consolidation phase. The Undergraduate Program in Planning was discontinued after only one year, as Wolf hadn't been able to obtain the necessary funding. On top of this, the Institute also faced bureaucratic problems in obtaining recognition from the relevant departments of the individual colleges for the work performed by students in the program. Nevertheless, the Urban Design Tutorial (one of the modules in the Undergraduate Program in Planning) was retained under the leadership of Weintraub in order to remain true to the humanistic ideal of a "broad education." The internship in urban planning at the Institute was also retained. Meanwhile, the Work/Study Program in Preservation and Adaptive Re-Use under Ellis's direction was extended for another year thanks to the renewed sponsorship of the J. M. Kaplan Fund, although it continued to feature no course offerings. Another program created under Ellis's direction was the "Design and Study Options," offered in 1976–77 following a short preparation period. Unlike the Undergraduate Program, these options would primarily be aimed at architecture students who, as was common at the time, were completing a five- or six-year bachelor's program at one of America's schools of architecture and would typically spend one year of their degree studying in Europe.[319] This education offering was tantamount to a public proclamation: the Institute was now going to increasingly focus on obtaining new market

318 Andreas Reckwitz, "Creative Cities: Die Kulturalisierung der Stadt," in *Die Erfindung der Kreativität. Zum Prozess gesellschaftlicher Ästhetisierung* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2012), 269–312.

319 In 1976–77 the Institute attracted a total of six schools of architecture as partners for the Design and Study Options: University of Notre Dame, University of Illinois, University of Miami (Ohio), Syracuse University, University of Virginia, University of Cincinnati.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - cc BY-NC-ND

segments and student groups and aggressively solicit students at established schools of architecture by focusing on “integrated design” as a pedagogical selling point. To set itself apart from its European competitors, the Institute planned to simply fly in European faculty and hire internationally renowned architects from New York’s architectural scene as tutors. During the conceptual phase, the following names came up as dream candidates: from England, James Stirling, Peter Smithson, Leon Krier, Rem Koolhaas, and Elia Zenghelis (from the AA in London), from Italy, Aldo Rossi, Massimo Scolari, and Manfredo Tafuri (from the IUAV in Venice), from Germany, O. M. Ungers (Cornell, UCLA), from Spain, Rafael Moneo (Universidad Politèchnica de Catalunya de Barcelona), and from the USA, John Hejduk, Richard Meier, and Giovanni Pasanella. Meanwhile, the Design and Study Options would appeal to American architecture students because, unlike a one-year study abroad in Europe, it was easy to have their coursework recognized, thanks to prior agreements with their home universities. In addition to this, prospective students could take advantage of the courses already on offer in the Undergraduate Program, which now held a central position in communicating the Institute’s perspectives, topics, and approaches.[320] At this point, it had become clear that the Institute’s significance as an architecture school, despite its international aspirations, lay primarily in the USA. Over time, it had managed to build up a solid national reputation.

At the end of its three years of funded activities, the Institute’s reinvention as an architecture school was deemed a success. The final report to the Noble Foundation in January 1977 made a particular point of highlighting the progress that had been made, especially with the Undergraduate Program and the Internship Program (although the report did discuss the administrative and academic issues involved in expanding the consortium and tackling bureaucratic obstacles at the individual colleges).[321] After taking stock, the Institute’s leadership concluded that its best strategy lay in supplementing the liberal arts education offered at colleges, and thereby offering an “alternative” to undergraduate studies at schools of architecture. Once again, the admissions figures at graduate schools were cited as an indicator of the Institute’s success. For instance, eighty percent of Undergraduate Program students who applied for architecture degrees were accepted to their university of preference. At the same time, the Institute’s leadership admitted that they hadn’t managed to integrate theory and history courses into the Undergraduate Program’s design studio as successfully

320 Interest in the Design Study Options was limited. The Institute was unable to expand the consortium to the targeted number of twenty colleges even in the following year. In 1977–78, only five students were enrolled. Only five schools of architecture cooperated with the Institute: University of Cincinnati, Syracuse University, University of Miami (Ohio), University of Illinois, Kentucky State University.

321 IAUS, “Final Report to the Noble Foundation,” n.d. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-3.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - cc BY-NC-ND

as they had hoped. The Internship Program, meanwhile, was chalked up as another success; it had offered college graduates a variety of ways to prepare themselves for an architecture degree beyond a conventional internship at an architecture firm. The report specifically noted that feedback from former Institute students was largely positive. These students attributed their academic success to the fact that they had more experience in translating ideas into forms than other students in their cohorts. In the end, the Institute's final report to the Noble Foundation, more self-referential than self-reflective, stated that the end result of its three-year education initiative was precisely the goal that had been formulated three years earlier, amounting to something of a self-fulfilling prophecy: "As we have stated from the beginning our intention is to educate a unique cadre of people with the notion of architecture as a fundamental cultural resource as a mirror and a repository of man's [sic] hopes and aspirations."[322] The project undertaken by the Institute (as an architecture school), Peter Eisenman (in his triple function as Institute director, director of the Undergraduate Program, and intern mentor), and the teaching Fellows (as a new architectural and academic elite) was to "nurture youth" in two senses. On the one hand, they were nurturing youth in general, by promoting a new generation of producers and consumers in the field of architecture who would put their trust in the Institute and have faith in its cultural production. On the other hand, in a much more concrete sense, the Institute was grooming its own academic progeny, insofar as many students and interns either remained attached to the Institute—distinguishing themselves by working as teaching faculty or editorial staff, or in certain cases even rising into the hierarchy of Fellows—or else followed careers later in life as academics attached to American schools of architecture, where various Fellows also worked as professors of history, theory, and design.

Given that, in early 1977, not only the future of the Undergraduate Program was at stake but also that of the Institute, the final report to the Noble Foundation can be read as both a programmatic document and an instrumental one. This explains why Eisenman outlined that, over the following three years, the Institute planned to continue expanding its education offerings—to implement architectural education more consistently through tighter integration of theory and history courses and closer coordination among the course directors. Pedagogical approaches would be differentiated, in didactic terms, by introducing "team teaching," course offerings would be diversified by focusing more on art (explicitly film), painting, and sculpture as well as the sociology of the built environment, to meet the requirements of the educational ideal of a "liberal arts education" in terms of both content and methods. Of course, the Institute's leadership hoped that the Noble Foundation's patronage would continue but did not express satisfaction with the scope or influence of the Institute as an architecture school. Therefore,

322 Ibid.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

the Institute made a systematic effort to minimize its dependence on funding from the foundation by continually expanding its consortium and thus educating more students in total. In the end, despite its initial promises to the contrary, the Noble Foundation did not maintain its support. On top of this, the close cooperation between the Institute and Sarah Lawrence also came to an end after three successful years. In the 1977–78 academic year, Sarah Lawrence did not send a single student to the Institute, and the numbers were limited in the following year as well. From 1977 to 1980, the number of students enrolled at the Institute certainly increased, but enrollment ultimately remained far below the optimistic predictions of fifty students in the Undergraduate Program and thirty interns per year. Without further funding, the Institute's expected income of US$350,000 from architecture education alone remained unrealistic. From this point on, the Institute could only depend on revenues from tuition fees, even as the significance of the pedagogy practiced at the Institute clearly began to recede behind its cultural activities.

2.3 Entering into a Phase of Consolidation

In 1977, after three years of growth and experimentation following its relaunch as an educational institution, the Institute began to reconfigure its work in all areas, including architectural education. However, as the Institute celebrated its tenth anniversary in the autumn of 1977, Institute director Eisenman began to prioritize other programs over education, by formalizing and professionalizing public programs even more and expanding publication programs. This was because, in January of 1977, anticipating its upcoming anniversary, Eisenman made a proposal that the Institute undertake another strategic reorientation. In his "Director's Memo" to the trustees, which he titled "Definition of the Institute: The Next 10 Years," and which sought to reposition the Institute again, he wrote extensively about the Institute's past programs and the challenges it had faced in recent years.[323] In his characteristically polemical tone, Eisenman argued that, for the first ten years of its existence, the Institute had lacked a proper objective, being more of an "ad hoc collection of programs based on fund raising." Not only did he dismiss the successes already achieved by the Institute, both working on real-life research and design projects in its original capacity as a link between office and academia and later as an architecture school, but he also dismissed its original ambitions. In the context of the history of the Institute, it was crucial that the lack of a purpose, according to Eisenman, could only be changed by increasingly viewing it as a "cultural resource," while linking it more intensively to international architectural debates (see chapter three). Eisenman made no secret of the fact that he

323 Peter Eisenman, "Director's Memo: Definition of the Institute: The Next 10 Years," January 11, 1977, Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-3 / ARCH401031.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

was chiefly interested in the Institute's two journals: primarily *Oppositions*, which since 1976 had been published by MIT Press and was already a staple of university curricula and library collections, but also the art criticism journal *October*, launched in the same year (see chapter four). At the same time, however, he firmly defended the idea of architectural education as a business model. To focus human resources when it came to teaching activities, he recommended a politics of consolidation—suggesting, for example, that, in the future, the Institute should prioritize its most successful education offerings: "the Undergraduate Program in Architecture with both its Undergraduate and Internship components; the Evening Program of Continuing Education; and the Summer High School Program."[324] However, he argued in favor of canceling the less successful ones, for example, the Work/Study Program in Preservation and Adaptive Re-Use, claiming that it was impossible to maintain a sufficiently high standard of quality. Ultimately, Eisenman's memorandum, bridging the past, present, and future of the Institute, argued for continuity. But soon after, it became apparent that the Institute's leadership intended to apply for larger grants, while maintaining the education offerings, in order to expand the "Architecture" series and to professionalize it as a center for adult education. The Institute's work over the coming years, in addition to its various grant applications, testify to the extent that American architecture education and culture as a complex were increasingly being permeated by an economic approach, an attention economy, and a desire for power. Over the years, the Institute's continued existence as an institution was ultimately contingent on personal and professional networks, even as it sought to compete with other institutions, universities—especially the Ivy League schools of architecture—and museums. In the end, these networks were political in nature, not only in terms of Institute policy but educational policy as well. With the launch of new services in the educational and cultural sphere, the social dimension of these networks—the contacts and connections—became even more economically important.

Learning Institute

Only shortly thereafter, as the Noble Foundation and NEA grants expired, architectural education was given a new role when the Institute's leadership capitalized on the opportunity that arose and applied for a large grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) under their "Cultural Institution Program."[325] The comprehensive proposal, complied by Taylor, that the Institute submitted to the NEH in April 1977 was preceded by about a

324 One personal motivation for keeping the High School Program might have been that Eisenman brought his children to the Institute on weekends, where they attended sessions of the High School Program.

325 IAUS, application to the NEH for a "cultural institution grant" (EH-28433-77-547). Source: NEH Archives.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

year of discussions with the National Council on the Humanities. In this proposal, departing somewhat from the management rhetoric that Eisenman had established in his "Director's Memo," the Institute portrayed itself as serving a dual function as both a humanistic educational institution and an international research center for architecture. Originally, this fundraising initiative was part of a larger plan, referred to here as the "NEH Learning Institute Program," which was conceived as an ambitious two-semester adult education program that would complement existing educational offerings at the Institute. The proposal, co-authored by Kenneth Frampton, Mario Gandelsonas, and Anthony Vidler, followed a didactic concept, and identified three subject areas that were to form the core of the curriculum in teaching architecture as one of the humanities, and which now addressed the public: "the American city and the development of cities, the nature and problems of contemporary artistic culture, and the development of modern architecture from the turn of the century." The concept built on the Institute Fellows' expertise, encompassing three core courses on the themes of "The City," "Architecture," and "Culture," which were to be supplemented by Institute Seminars.[326] With this methodological approach, the Institute proposed to promote interdisciplinarity and to provide insights on a variety of themes. The "NEH Learning Institute Program," which, had it been realized as planned, would have included workshops, lectures, reviews, and discussions, was to run concurrently with a continuation of the Evening Program and was to be supplemented by a fourth course. This fourth course, which was to be taught by MacNair, would have focused on "Visual Literacy" in the first semester and "Design" in the second. However, with this complex educational structure and the renewed blending of education and culture in the same vein as "Architecture," the Institute's main objective was not so much the humanities as such but continued to be to popularize architecture and bring both the discipline and the profession to the attention of New York metropolitan society.

The Institute's proposal presented the "NEH Learning Institute Program" as a key component of a wider restructuring of the Institute, according to which the Fellows would focus primarily on two areas of activities, teaching, and research, involving cultural production and publishing, over the next five years. Accordingly, the Institute would have consisted of a two-part structure: a Center for Public Education, with the existing educational programs and the yet-to-be-established "NEH Learning Institute Program" assigned to it, and an International Study Center, which would have encompassed in particular the Fellows' individual research projects, the library project, and various publication formats. Three years of experience in the field of adult education and the

326 In its NEH application, the Institute repeatedly emphasized, as a statement of intent, that the long-term Fellows were to serve as facilitators. Attached to the application were course plans by Vidler ("The City"), Frampton ("Architecture"), Krauss ("Arts"), plus a fourth on "Visual Literacy" (by MacNair). There was a slight mismatch between arts and culture.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

Fellows' affiliations with various universities were cited to support the expansion of the Institute into a public educational facility, while the Institute's international institutional network was advertised in support of its expansion into a research center, explicitly including a future cooperation with the IUAV and international guests as Visiting Fellows. Given the flirtation with the humanities, it became clear that the Institute's understanding of research had changed considerably since the early years, a fact that the Fellows repeatedly noted with regret. For the NEH proposal no longer cited projects for the City Planning Commission, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, or the Urban Development Corporation of New York State as qualifications, but instead listed the Institute's publications, including new formats that were planned but not yet realized, e.g., the publication of historical documents or a book series, all of which were interwoven in the proposal.[327] Other documentation on research and publication plans mentioned a major study on New York that was to be produced in cooperation with IUAV professors and a conference on formalism in architecture.

The NEH proposal was far more professionally devised, more comprehensively framed, and more thoughtfully formulated than any of the Institute's previous proposals. Strikingly, the Institute's application for a Cultural Institution Grant was nothing less than a claim to leadership in architecture education directed at the public at large. The proposal text proclaimed that the Institute intended to produce additional teaching and learning materials as part of its adult education, which ambitiously included the production of course notes and course books, a new book series of selected lectures, and the publication and sale of slide series and audio recordings of each lecture series. With its rhetoric of a humanistic architecture education for the general public, its promise of an interdisciplinary study of architecture, and the expert opinions enlisted from well-known architects and university professors of the humanities, the proposal finally convinced the National Council on the Humanities to such an extent that, in June 1977, the Institute was granted the requested funding amount in full. Apparently, the federal agency in Washington, D.C. expected the Institute to make a significant contribution to the study of architecture as one of the humanities in the United States.

Continuous Education

When the Institute received the US$357,000 NEH grant in the summer of 1977, the largest project to date in financial terms, the NEH Learning Institute was not implemented, for whatever reason, and many of the ideas advertised were also not to be realized. But the Institute's leadership, now presiding over an enormous budget and the associated planning security for the next three

327 In this context, the grant application also mentioned for the first time an English translation of Aldo Rossi's seminal monograph *L'Architettura della Citta* planned with MIT Press.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

years, launched "Open Plan," a continuation of its adult education offerings. The program included both lecture courses and more in-depth seminars that could be booked for US$60 and an additional US$45 and, like "Architecture," addressed a metropolitan audience. For the price of US$200, you could also become a "friend" of "Open Plan" and lend your financial support. A limited number of scholarships were also available. The promotional material made sure to mention that tuition fees were tax deductible. As with the Evening Program before, the ultimate effect of the new education offering was to forge an even closer tie between social, cultural, and symbolic capital, architectural debate, and an economy of attention. One effect of "Open Plan" on the Institute was that, by acquiring such a large source of funding and raising its budget by over one hundred percent, the lecture and event series necessitated further professionalization, even bureaucratization of the Institute's operations, a development that was not untypical for the educational landscape of the 1970s.[328] The shift in emphasis from education toward culture and the resulting organizational and programmatic developments already anticipated by Eisenman in his "Director's Memo"—especially the choice to refocus on public events, exhibitions, and publications—would prove to have a major impact on the pedagogy of the Institute's other architectural education offerings (especially the Undergraduate Program, more so than the Internship Program), since the development of the curriculum and the composition of the faculty were no longer the chief priority and were instead contingent on the availability of various Fellows and Visiting Fellows. Again, the profound changes happening at the Institute were also reflected in the composition of the Board of Trustees: in the summer of 1977, Charles DeCarlo and June Larkin, who were both instrumental in the introduction of the Undergraduate Program and the Institute's performance as an architectural school, resigned from their posts as trustees. While the Board of Trustees was now to more closely reflect the public interests of the Institute as a cultural institution, including representatives of the architecture world and New York patronage, the interests of architecture education were to be safeguarded by the inclusion of William Porter (dean of the MIT School of Architecture) and Colin Campbell (president of Ohio Wesleyan University).

In 1977, the year in which the Institute celebrated its tenth-year anniversary, it was at the peak of its activity and vitality, due to the complexity of its programs, the range of offerings and products, and the skillful leveraging of the opportunities presented. A popular architecture school and a trendy cultural space, with a publishing imprint that was soon to expand, it was now competing for public funds, audience, and attention with New York's largest institutions—with the city's museums, theaters, libraries, and universities. *Oppositions* was not only shaping debates in the field of architecture but also influencing the history and

328 Thelin, 2004.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

theory education being offered at schools of architecture. In 1976–77, alongside prefaces and articles from its four editors (Eisenman, Frampton, Gandelsonas, and recent addition Vidler), it also featured writings by external authors such as Rem Koolhaas on Ivan Leonidov and Coney Island, Rafael Moneo on Aldo Rossi, James Stirling on typologies, and Manfredo Tafuri on a transatlantic comparison of postmodern approaches, the historical context behind the Five Architects, and the work of Giuseppe Terragni, etc. Meanwhile, with "Open Plan," featuring "the most prominent practitioners and thinkers in the field," the Institute was helping to embed contemporary architectural thinking in New York society, at a time when the construction industry was booming again, and raise public awareness. In the fall, "Open Plan 77" covered such topics as "Style and Meaning in American Architecture," "The Anglo-American Suburb," "Cities within Cities," "The Modernist Vision," "The Metropolitan Vision of New York and Paris," "The Languages of Design," and "The Interior Landscape." As Fellows like Frampton and Vidler entered the ranks of New York intellectuals by hosting lecture and event series and publishing their own work, the Institute as a group, organization, and institution became, functionally speaking, the new architectural elite. As the design of the public program made clear, this was happening in both discursive and institutional respects: by assuming the power of interpretation, by defining who belonged and who didn't, the Institute was drifting further and further into the establishment. This development also manifested itself in the architecture education offered at the Institute as a cultural and educational center. Like the knowledge and cultural economy, education at the Institute underwent a phase of consolidation and maturation from 1977 to 1980.

Simultaneously, the Institute's directors were planning, designing, and launching new formats for communicating contemporary examples of architectural practice, often drawings or models, followed by all kinds of cultural production in the guise of education offerings. As work at the Institute became increasingly attuned to the higher education market, this became more of a focus. This also meant that, from 1977–78, the Institute was able to continue expanding its most successful education offerings: the Undergraduate Program, the Internship Program, and initially also the Design and Study Options. This process was aided by the fact that the necessary structures already existed. The enormous significance that was still attached to architecture education at the Institute was demonstrated when Carla Skodinski, coordinator of the Undergraduate Program, was appointed a Fellow in 1977, while Eisenman was officially still directing it. Yet by offering architecture education outside of the Institute, and by opening itself up to the arts and the humanities, the Institute was increasingly becoming an institutional authority, itself tasked with consecrating and legitimizing those who taught, lectured, exhibited, or published there, and ultimately with authorizing the dissemination of postmodern architectural styles and architectural thought. In the winter of 1977, the Institute's exhibition "Princeton's Beaux-Arts and Its New Academicism: From

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

Labatut to the Program of Geddes" featured student works by former Princeton University students under the last two deans, the most prominent of whom were perhaps Robert Venturi and Charles Moore (but Mary McLeod's thesis, who had just graduated, was also shown, five years before she became involved in architecture education). Eisenman, in a letter to Robert Geddes, emphasized the great influence of Donald Drew Egbert, the architectural historian who had once taught there.[329] The full spectrum of architecture education continued to be a strategic cornerstone of the Institute's work, yet, in terms of the economic, legal, and ideal interests of the Institute, individual Fellows, staff, and students, foundations and sponsors, such work was no longer accorded the significance it had been before. After a brief decline in enrollment in the 1977–78 academic year, the Institute once again quickly reached its full capacity as an architecture school. In 1978–79, the consortium for the Undergraduate Program was expanded to include thirteen liberal arts colleges; the number of registered students had risen to fifty-two.[330] Although the Noble Foundation's support was gone, revenue from education programs rose to approximately US$260,000 after a slump in the 1977–78 fiscal year.[331] This meant that, notwithstanding considerable funding from the NEH, the share of revenue from tuition fees still amounted to nearly forty percent of the total budget of US$660,000.

Institutionalizing postmodernism through education and culture also meant that the Institute was able to grow and expand its fields of activities and diversify its range of products which, in addition to cultural value, also had an educational value. The public programs—be they lecture series, exhibitions, or a variety of new publication formats—not only served a discursive function within the field of architecture but also proved to have institutional dimensions. In 1978, at the same time as the establishment of "Open Plan," the "Exhibition Program" was professionalized with the aid of funding from the NEA. The exhibitions, be they historiographic or contemporary, thematic or monographic, would prove to influence debates such as the historiography of modernism or the full range of postmodern positions. Meanwhile, in addition to *Oppositions* and *October*, which were changing the way people discussed architecture and art, the Institute was simultaneously developing new publications and formats. These included: *Skyline* (launched in 1978), an architecture newspaper that featured reviews and interviews alongside announcements for the Institute's own

329 Stanford Anderson, "Architectural History in Schools of Architecture," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 58, no. 3 (September 1999), 282–290.

330 The consortium of the Undergraduate Program included thirteen colleges: Amherst, Brown, Colgate, Connecticut, Franklin and Marshall, Hobart and William Smith, Middlebury, Oberlin, Sarah Lawrence, Skidmore, Smith, Swarthmore, Wesleyan. The bulk of the Design and Study Option students came from Syracuse University.

331 Berlin and Kolin, "Accountant Report," 1977–78, June 30, 1978; "Accountant Report," 1978–79 & "Accountant Report," 1979–80, May 30, 1980. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-10.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

events and education offerings, IAUS Exhibition Catalogues (1978) that included not only plans, sections, and drawings, but also critical essays, and Oppositions Books (1981), which aimed at changing the architectural canon by publishing famous authors (eventually including two books by Aldo Rossi, and one each by Alan Colquhoun, Adolf Loos, and Moisei Ginzburg). In 1978, the "National Architecture Exchange" was also promoted as a new platform for communicating architecture. Using the "National Tour," as this key mechanism of architecture education came to be called, institutions across North America—universities and museums—could book traveling exhibitions and lecture series conceived at the Institute and order exhibition catalogues and slide series as teaching materials—much more diverse, albeit less professionalized than Monica Pidgeon's audio-visual series which she started a year later at the RIBA in the UK. In addition, the "New Wave" series, which showcased architectural scenes in different countries (first after Europe came Japan, then Austria), was redesigned as a lecture tour by architects, which included a traveling exhibition featuring their projects. Over the course of this phase, the Institute evolved into a postmodern salon for all kinds of people—not only practicing architects, critics, and historians, but also academics from other disciplines, authors, artists, curators, publishers, and gallery owners from New York and all across the USA, even from Europe, Japan, and Latin America. In addition to Rafael Moneo, Aldo Rossi, and Arata Isozaki, people like Gerrit Oorthuys (TU Delft), Giorgio Ciucci, and Massimo Scolari (both from the IUAV) came to the Institute as visiting faculty in the late 1970s. As the decade came to a close, the Institute's leadership sought out an institutional collaboration with the IUAV, having formed personal relationships with individual professors—with Manfredo Tafuri in particular.[332] The relationship with what in the Anglophone world became referred to as the "Venice School," however, seemed somewhat unusual, as the two institutions differed in their interpretations not only of history and theory but also of their pedagogical project in general, despite a shared interest in the classical modernist avant-garde and the postmodernist neo-avant-garde. However, they agreed to organize a joint workshop in Venice scheduled for the summer of 1979—and the Institute even advertised it. In the end, it was canceled, like so many other things before. Other pedagogical projects planned by Institute leadership in

332 The Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia (IUAV), founded in 1926 as an independent school of architecture and officially recognized as a university, had succeeded in repositioning itself in the early 1970s with its historical research projects on the American, Soviet, and European city that resulted, among other things, in the publication *The American City* (1979), edited by Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co, Mario Manieri-Elia and Manfredo Tafuri. In the mid-1970s, under the direction of Manfredo Tafuri, the "Venice School" broke new ground. A preoccupation with Michel Foucault and a transference of discourse analysis to architecture took place in 1978, when the French philosopher, at Tafuri's invitation, participated in a series of discussions in Venice with the professors teaching there. These were published in the volume *Il Dispositivo Foucault* (1977); On the positions of the "Venice School," see Hilde Heynen, *Architecture and Modernity: A Critique* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999), 128–147; see also Leach, 2014.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

this period failed to get beyond the conception phase. For example, the idea of preparing teaching materials to accompany "Open Plan" events proved to be far too time-consuming for the course instructors and program leadership.

Core Curriculum

By the end of the 1970s, a decade in which the higher education system in the USA—architecture in particular—had undergone major reforms, and education in general was becoming increasingly marketized, the Institute was no longer pursuing the humanistic ideal it had originally set for itself for its pedagogical project as consistently as before. In 1978, as part of its fundraising and development efforts, the Institute mailed out a promotional brochure introducing its organization and program, its history, and its mission, with architecture education playing only a secondary role.[333] Overall, the brochure highlighted the extent to which the Institute's education offerings were no longer as committed to a humanistic ideal of education—the notion of educating a human holistically in the arts and sciences, in keeping with the standards imposed by the ideal of a general education—as well as the extent to which architecture was no longer taught as an integrative approach to problem-solving, but rather as an intellectual and artistic practice. Instead, the brochure emphasized historical references and the idea of creative activity from a humanistic tradition—i.e., on the basis of cultural if not religious heritage. This backdrop served to demonstratively frame the discussion of contemporary structuralist and post-structuralist approaches. The Institute's increased focus on history and theory was accompanied by an increased pedagogical push to address specific architectural problems and principles via recourse to formalism and modernism. In the teaching of design, for example, a conceptual approach was encouraged, and this had impacted how architecture was conceived and discussed at American schools of architecture. At a later meeting of the Fellows, some complained that architecture education at the Institute stopped being sufficiently practical after the "Undergraduate Program in Planning" and the "Program in Preservation and Adaptive Re-Use" were discontinued.[334] Ultimately, the interdisciplinary methods inherent in the teaching of urban studies, a subject that had once given the Institute half its name (instantiated at the Institute through the concrete research and design projects carried out under Peter Wolf and William Ellis until the mid-1970s), were increasingly replaced by drawing boards and textbooks. In the end, "urban studies" only appeared on the Institute's curriculum in the context of "Open Plan," with lecture series like "Forum on New York: The Place of Urban Design" (fall 1978) and "Housing Versus the City" (fall 1979). In the meantime, the Undergraduate Program had evolved in such a way that the primary aim in

333 IAUS brochure, 1978. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: C.3-2 / C.3-3

334 Marguerite McGoldrick, official minutes of Fellows meeting, October 8, 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-9; Marguerite McGoldrick, unofficial minutes of Fellows meeting, October 8, 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-9.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

developing the curriculum and selecting faculty members was to juxtapose different postmodern philosophical and architectural approaches, even though the five-unit requirements remained essentially the same: courses in history, theory, urban planning, structure, and a design tutorial. This is unsurprising when you consider that the Institute's contribution to the marketization of basic architectural education, training, and continuing education represented a postmodern phenomenon par excellence. The Institute's history and theory courses remained set in stone and continued to be taught by Eisenman, Frampton, Gandelsonas, and Vidler, who here, similar to *Oppositions*, also laid claim to what might be termed "interpretive sovereignty." However, in the years between 1977 and 1980, course offerings repeatedly had to be rearranged to accommodate the individual obligations and interests of the teaching Fellows—not least because they were now in higher demand as teachers or else involved in expanding other programs at the Institute. Frampton, after returning from London in 1977, went back to the Graduate School of Architecture and Planning at Columbia University, where he taught history, theory, and design, and prepared his first monograph, *Modern Architecture: A Critical History*. Vidler, who had always remained attached to Princeton, worked there as chairman of the dissertation committee and headed the "Program in European Cultural Studies" together with cultural historian Carl Schorske. Therefore Eisenman, in his role as director of the Undergraduate Program, took over the history course, which was usually taught by Frampton and Vidler, for the 1978–79 academic year. He put a creative spin on the curriculum, inspired by Colin Rowe's humanistic approach, which he had experienced firsthand.[335] In the first semester, he problematized the relationship between history and theory by examining the sixteenth-century Italian Renaissance, particularly the architecture of Andrea Palladio and Vincenzo Scamozzi. In his lectures and seminars, he focused on imparting a visual understanding of architecture as a historical text. In doing so, he was interested in the structural qualities of individual buildings rather than their textual qualities—in syntax rather than semantics. He treated historical examples as a theoretical tool for thinking analytically and architecturally, i.e., for focusing on formal and structural issues. Students were tasked with drafting plans and axonometric drawings, constructing models, and presenting their analyses of individual structures in the form of diagrams. For Eisenman, it was not about "historical accuracy or thoroughness" but about conceptual precision. While this understanding of architecture and history was somewhat one-dimensional, it allowed him to conclude the course with

335 Eisenman was once a traveling companion of Colin Rowe on his Grand Tours of Italy. For the course description and reading list, see Peter Eisenman, "History," Undergraduate Program in Architecture. Course Outlines and Reading Lists, Fall 1978. Source: private archive of Patrick Pinnell. Unlike Frampton and Vidler, Eisenman was also primarily interested in teaching formal and structural analysis as a basis for design. Both socio-economic and political issues, as well as the urban scale were deliberately left out, as were the technological or practical problems that govern architectural practice. It should be noted that Eisenman did not design the course alone, but together with Giorgio Ciucci.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

an analysis of Giuseppe Terragni's *Casa del Fascio* (1932–36). In the second semester, as a follow-up, Eisenman offered a course on "Architectural Analysis: Image and Text." This was essentially a theory course centered around a formal analysis of canonical buildings, similar to what he had taught at Cooper Union since 1968. The case studies were selected buildings by Terragni and Le Corbusier.[336] The list of required reading covered the established historiography of architectural modernism: Sigfried Giedion's *Space Time and Architecture* (1941) and *Mechanization Takes Command* (1948), Rudolf Wittkower's *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism* (1949), and Françoise Choay's *The Modern City: Planning in the 19th Century City* (1969). But beyond reading these classics, students at the Institute were given no further instruction in the historiographical method, as would have been required in a liberal arts college.

The 1978–79 theory courses, on the other hand, were divided between Gandelsonas and Vidler. While the fundamental approach of Gandelsonas's fall semester course ("Elements for an Architectural Theory") was pragmatic, exploring how architectural knowledge is produced and how contemporary practice can use it as an instrument for critique and transformation, Vidler's spring semester course ("Ledoux, or the Formation of Modernism") focused solely on the biography of a single architect, hoping to use Claude-Nicolas Ledoux as a case study to reveal the contradictions of modern architecture.[337] Another time, Gandelsonas, whose thinking was informed by post-Marxist and post-structuralist approaches, semiotics, and linguistics, organized his theory course as a reading course of Leon Battista Alberti's *Ten Books of Architecture* and Le Corbusier's *Towards a New Architecture* to teach the differences between normative and interpretive theories and discuss their structure and function in terms of practice. He taught interpretive theories in relation to specific themes: the role of architectural history, the merits and limitations of formal and typological analysis, and history as a prediction of the future or memory of the past. In epistemological terms, he was concerned with the fundamental possibility of establishing an objective theory. The reading list included essays by Agrest and Gandelsonas well as Louis Althusser and Claude Levi-Strauss, John Lyons, and John Searle. Vidler, on the other hand, worked biographically and followed the exemplary principle in his theory course, conceptualizing it around the contradictory figure of Ledoux, whose life and work exemplified for him the transition from the classical to the modern era. Based on a reading of Ledoux's texts, he discussed various textual formats in relation to the question "What are the Limits of the Text?" and the education of new architects in relation to the question "What is Architectural Education?" but also addressed issues of utopia and politics. For Vidler, the intensive discussion

336 Peter Eisenman, "Architectural Analysis: Image and Text," Undergraduate Program in Architecture. Course Outlines and Reading Lists, Fall 1978. Source: private archive of Patrick Pinnell.

337 Mario Gandelsonas, "Elements for an Architectural Theory" & Anthony Vidler, "Ledoux, or the Formation of Modernism," Undergraduate Program in Architecture. Course Outlines and Reading Lists, Fall 1978. Source: private archive of Patrick Pinnell.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

of Ledoux as one of the main representatives of revolutionary architecture, whom he positioned between Palladio and Le Corbusier, was about questions of modernism and postmodernism in a genealogical sense.

For both Gandelsonas and Vidler, the introduction of "French theory" to the United States offered a means of underpinning formal analysis and formal design as well as historiography and theory production, regardless of whether the space being referenced was conceived at an architectural or a more urban scale.[338] The one constant in the Undergraduate Program, and in architecture education at the Institute in a broader sense, however, was the "Structures" course taught by Robert Silman, which he had offered since the beginning in 1974. This course borrowed heavily from Henry Cowan and the teaching approach of Mario Salvadori, an engineer at Columbia University. The course in "Urban Development" had to be scrapped, since Wolf had taken a temporary break from teaching at the Institute. But Eisenman as director of the Undergraduate Program managed once again to attract international guests to the Institute to teach this unit instead. In the fall semester of 1978, Italian architectural historian Giorgio Ciucci, who was also teaching at the Rhode Island Institute of Design (RISD), taught a course entitled "Representation of Space, Space of Representation," which he had prepared at the IUAV, and now only had to recycle it. Ciucci also supervised interns at the Institute. In the spring semester of 1979, the French architectural historian Antoine Grumbach, who was also teaching at Princeton University, held a course entitled "Urban History: Paris as an Urban Form; The City as Collage." Another constant was the design tutorial led by Diana Agrest; the team of tutors was reassembled from scratch every year, however, leading to a rather eclectic design pedagogy.[339] The development of the Institute's curriculum and faculty over the years clearly showed that different perspectives could be juxtaposed and brought into contact with each other, even if its publications and public events, in addition to the required learning materials for students of the Undergraduate Program, at least hinted at a postmodern understanding of history and theory, which would have highlighted metafiction and deconstruction, rather than objectivity and facts, based on a critical, academic understanding of research.[340] Naturally, this stemmed from the fact that the staff imported their own stylistic preferences and methodological approaches to their teaching.

338 However, contemporary French philosophy, both structuralist and post-structuralist approaches, while referenced in *Oppositions*, and published in *October* and *Skyline*, were rarely taught at the Institute.

339 Stephen Harris and Stephen Potters were tutors in the fall 1978 semester, as well as Italian architect Massimo Scolari, who was also a guest at the Institute along with Giorgio Ciucci; in the spring 1979 semester, Harris and Potters were joined by Patrick Pinnell and Myles Weintraub.

340 However, it has been pointed out there is no clear definition of the term postmodernism. French philosophers who are generally considered postmodern, such as Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida, but also the American historian Hayden White, strictly refuse to be identified with postmodernism, see White, 1973.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

As an unconventional architecture school, the Institute enabled its Fellows to build careers as academics and architects, including by showcasing their skills as pedagogues, historians, and theorists, or otherwise financing their work. The best illustrations of this are Agrest and Gandelsonas, both of whom were unknown before coming to the USA in 1971 and joining the Institute. The Institute provided a framework in which they could make a name for themselves, whether with articles in *Oppositions*, lectures within the context of the "Architecture" or "Open Plan" series, or contributions to the "Exhibition Program." As the decade progressed, Agrest would become an assistant professor at Princeton University in 1972 and a professor at Cooper Union in 1976; Gandelsonas worked various teaching jobs, first at Sarah Lawrence and then at Columbia University.[341] Towards the end of the 1970s, they were the primary shapers of architectural education at the Institute, where they had both risen to leading positions on the faculty. In addition to heading the theory course, Gandelsonas also became the coordinator of the entire Internship Program when intern numbers began to rise.[342] In the meantime, it had become mandatory for all interns to spend two semesters at the Institute. During the first semester, they were required to complete one of the Undergraduate Program's design tutorials, and in the second semester, they worked on personal projects with individual Fellows. They also had to participate in two "Open Plan" courses per semester. Another consequence of the Internship Program's administrative reorganization was the rule that interns were recognized for all of their work and shared in the profits, at least in cases where Fellows made money off their projects. Eisenman, for example, compensated his interns with drawings and models that they had produced according to his specifications. As assets, these objects were likely to appreciate on the art market, or in museum archives. To maintain its credibility as an educational institution, the Institute limited letters of recommendation to two per person.[343] Although the interns could list two preferred architecture schools each, it was ultimately the Fellows who decided among themselves how to allocate the letters, thus exerting a key influence on the interns' choice of the most suitable architecture school. The Institute predominantly sent graduates of its Internship Program and Undergraduate Program to Columbia University or Yale, but a few also ended up at Princeton, Harvard's Graduate School of Design, or MIT. The function and purpose of the internships were a controversial issue at the Institute. The Fellows all agreed that the Internship Program

341 Agrest became a professor at Princeton University as early as 1981, Gandelsonas not until 1991.

342 Mario Gandelsonas & Giorgio Ciucci, "Internship Design Tutorial," Undergraduate Program in Architecture. Course Outlines and Reading Lists, Fall 1978. Source: private archive of Patrick Pinnell.

343 The new "Graduate School Admission Policy" was on the agenda at the beginning of 1979; Advisory Committee, meeting minutes, February 8, 1979. Source: Sarah Lawrence College Archives.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - [CC BY-NC-ND]

explicitly functioned as a form of career guidance. The decision to formalize the internships was justified by the fact that interns were now working exclusively for one of the Fellows; this meant that the goals were different from before, when interns worked alongside the Fellows on urban research and design projects. As director of the Internship Program, Gandelsonas argued it should also be the individual Fellows' responsibility to train interns in basic skills and abilities—after all, they were being used for their labor at the Institute. He argued this because, unlike students in the Undergraduate Program, interns often came to the Institute with no previous training. But the idea of an eight-week crash course was never implemented. The role of interns at the Institute and their relationship to the Fellows was neatly summarized by Agrest, who described their status as that of "apprentices," suggesting a master–apprentice relationship. What the internships amounted to was a pre-modern, artisanal approach to teaching and learning, based on modeling and imitation, rather than a modern scientific or even postmodern problem-oriented approach.

Compared to its other offerings, the Institute's High School Program was exceptional, something of a luxury, in that it displayed quite a high degree of continuity over the years. The reasons why the Institute maintained the program after 1977, once it had repositioned itself as a high culture educational institution, were both institutional and personal. While contributing little to the funding of the Institute's operations, it was extremely important as a public relations tool. Perhaps the main reason the Institute preserved the program was its interest in maintaining the self-image it had cultivated, as a site that offered a "continuous education" encompassing all age groups.[344] In the summer of 1977, after Eisenman and MacNair had successfully launched the program, two junior New York architects, Lawrence Kutnicki and Deborah Berke, were appointed co-directors, MacNair having been assigned to other tasks. Eisenman entrusted the two to lead the program, even though they were both only recent graduates and had scarcely any teaching experience.[345] By the fall of 1977, Kutnicki and Berke had transformed the High School Program into a

344 Compared to offerings at other New York institutions, a pedagogical history and didactic analysis shows that the Institute's High School Program was committed to teaching architecture as art according to a humanities ideal; see Förster, 2013. Each semester, the Institute produced its own poster, designed in-house on the basis of its graphic identity. Source: private archive of Lawrence Kutnicki. In addition, the High School Program found a major supporter in Guy Trebay, a journalist with *The Village Voice*. To target students, Kutnicki and Berke wrote to private schools in the metropolitan region, where they worked with art teachers, but also to some public high schools. In November 1978, they presented the program at the National Institute of Architectural Education's (now the Van Alen Institute) Career Day, which was graced by no other than Philip Johnson.

345 Kutnicki's qualifications included a bachelor's degree in architecture from Cooper Union and a master's in urban planning from City College; Berke had a bachelor's degree in architecture and art from the Rhode Island School of Design.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

comprehensive, carefully thought-out education offering, operating on a shoestring budget with relative independence from the Institute's usual activities. They quickly assumed full autonomy, teaching Saturday courses during the fall and spring semesters, although the core of the program was still the multi-week course offered during the summer holidays. With Eisenman's support, they were able to use all the Institute's facilities and resources to develop a sophisticated program for talented architectural youth. Since the High School Program, unlike the Undergraduate Program, wasn't tied to any institutional requirements or learning outcomes, Berke and Kutnicki had a free hand in taking an experimental approach to designing the courses, both in terms of content and methodology. From 1977 to 1980, every course (which they redesigned each semester) was dedicated to an overarching theme, alternating between architecture and urban planning. In "Architecture and the Arts," they delved into architecture's position in relation to the other arts like poetry, drawing, painting, sculpture, photography, film, dance, music, and literature. In "Five Architects," they focused on specific heroes of architectural modernism (Frank Lloyd Wright, Le Corbusier, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Alvar Aalto, Louis Kahn) and projects from contemporary architects. In "Mapping Manhattan," they focused on the architecture of New York and the development of specific urban structures and building typologies. Initially, Eisenman and some of the Fellows participated in the High School Program, but over time the program directors increasingly sought to hire artists from their circle of acquaintances and friends, sometimes even former students, as faculty. The fundamentals of architecture were conveyed to the students from a theoretical and historical perspective, and course topics ranged from architectural principles to historical figures, from construction to symbolism. The quality of the courses was extremely high, as evidenced by the intellectually demanding texts that were on the required reading lists. The High School Program design studio, meanwhile, followed an approach that was both formal and artistic, comparable with the education offered by Cooper Union. In this case, however, John Hejduk's design principles were adapted to the language and life experience of teenagers. In addition to this, the directors organized regular excursions to contemporary exhibitions or selected buildings, during which students were asked to make on-site drawings. Because Kutnicki and Berke invested a great deal in mentoring students, they achieved their declared goal of introducing them to abstract concepts and spatial thinking.[346] Ultimately, the High School Program was meant to convey an impression of what it meant to work as an architect, critic, and historian. Even though

346 Kutnicki and Berke demonstrated their work as educators each year with books of students' works compiled by them, which next to copied records of drawings, models, and collages included written reflections and course evaluations by the students. Source: private archives of Lawrence Kutnicki and Suzanne Frank. Based on these books, students can be said to have achieved not only cognitive goals, but instrumental ones of learning to see and draw, and affective ones of developing a critical awareness of architecture and the built environment.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - cc BY-NC-ND

it was a relatively small program, featuring ten to fifteen students per course, both formats, "Summer Architecture" and "Saturday Architecture," were very popular, and some students returned in the following years. There is evidence of students who went on to study architecture.

Design Education

Ultimately, by offering the Undergraduate Program, the Internship Program, and the High School Program, the Institute performed a pedagogical function that hadn't existed in this form in the American education system, an initiating function as much as a gatekeeping one—despite constant changes in curriculum development, certain major personnel changes in the faculty, and the renunciation of responsibility for a traditional degree qualification. But the educational programs always had an institutional function as well, for while the Institute had built a philanthropic network of architects and builders through its offerings in adult education and had increasingly come to serve the architectural establishment and building industry, the architecture education it provided contributed to the formation of a new architectural elite in the United States. Near the end of the decade, the Institute launched another (very expensive) teaching format: the "IAUS Advanced Design Workshop in Architecture and Urban Form." Offered for the first time in the 1979–80 academic year, the program was led by Diana Agrest and represented an exclusive environment for conveying a postmodern attitude towards design. The course, conceived as an experimental design studio, was a one-year program predominantly aimed at advanced architecture students. Applicants were required to have already finished a four-year bachelor's degree or be enrolled in a five- or six-year bachelor's degree program. In this regard, the Advanced Design Workshop was a successor to the Design and Study Options, which served Agrest as a cornerstone in both administrative and institutional respects.[347] Once again, the Institute teamed up with a consortium made up of state schools primarily aimed at vocational training (meaning, in this case, technical colleges), in addition to Cooper Union and the schools of architecture at Cornell University and Yale.[348] By using the qualifier "advanced" in the title, the Institute purposefully set the program apart from conventional architectural programs, no longer placing itself in a supplementary role, but for the first time positioning itself as a site of further education. Equipped with a state education grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and

347 Agrest for her part was not only able to take over the institutional network of Design and Study Options that Ellis had built, but also use the remaining credit; see Frank, 2010, 135. The administration was initially held by Jill Silverman, and in the second year it was taken over by Berke.

348 The ADW consortium included: Cooper Union, Cornell University, University of Cincinnati, University of Houston, Illinois University, University of Maryland, Miami University (Ohio), Syracuse University, Yale University. Students came in large part from Syracuse University and Tulane University.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

Welfare (HEW-FIPSE), Agrest was able to aim higher with the new education offering than with the former Design and Study Options. She managed to hire acclaimed architects as teachers for the program, most of whom held professorships at renowned universities. In the first year, guest professors included Charles Gwathmey, Cesar Pelli (dean of the Yale School of Architecture), and Aldo Rossi (IUAV)—big names who were tied to Eisenman and the Institute in various ways. Their likenesses were also used on the posters specially designed by Vignelli to advertise the Advanced Design Workshop in a nationwide campaign. One element that set it apart from other schools of architecture was the high tuition fees: when the program first began, the cost was US$4,500 per year or US$2,500 per semester; in the following academic year, these figures rose to US$5,500 and US$3,500. In addition to the Undergraduate Program and the Internship Program, the Advanced Design Workshop was a commercial offering with which the Institute sought to position itself in the new decade as the "Center for the Study of Architecture and Urban Design," as it called itself in a new funding application to the NEH.[349] However, in institutional, pedagogical, financial, intellectual, didactic, and personnel respects, the Institute remained dependent on the Ivy League schools of architecture.

While the Institute positioned the Undergraduate Program as a foundational course and the Internship Program as an in-depth training program within the changing discipline of architecture, it made no claim towards the Advanced Design Workshop, a form of expanded college study, amounting to a vocational training program.[350] In addition to its claim to professionalism and exclusivity, the Advanced Design Workshop's distinguishing feature was that it reached a balance between theory and practice—that is to say, by integrating history and theory into design. To achieve this, Agrest stressed that all design projects must have a relationship to the urban context. On the posters advertising the program, interested students read the following dual objective: "to find new ways to make architectural education more effective and relevant to the urban situation and to find new ways for architectural students to apply theoretical concepts to existing urban problems; to serve a limited number of special students and provide an intensive and exceptional year of work and study articulating the theory and practice of design in a work situation." For potential participants, the poster presents New York (even though it speaks in general terms) as an urban setting with a dual function: as a learning environment and a case study. Didactically, the course was split into a workshop component and a theory and history component. The program was too small, however, for there to be a course offering in history and theory led by Agrest. Instead, Advanced Design Workshop students were invited to the "Open Plan" lectures, which in the fall semester of 1979 were

349 Frederike Taylor, "NEH Proposal," n.d. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-10.

350 Ibid.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

quite eclectic, with courses on "Piranesi/Le Corbusier" (led by Gandelsonas and Vidler), "The American Monument" (Patrick Pinnell), "Housing Versus the City" (Frampton), and "Architecture in the 1980s" (MacNair). Additionally, Advanced Design Workshop students were referred to the Undergraduate Program's curriculum, specifically the courses taught by Eisenman, Frampton, Gandelsonas, and Vidler. Beyond its institutional synergies, the modularity of architecture education at the Institute now had a pedagogical component, as leadership anticipated that the older, ambitious graduate students would exert a positive influence on the undergraduates and interns at the Institute.

In terms of service orientation, when it came to hiring a teaching staff, the Institute continued to profit from its networks, friendships, cooperations, and affiliations that had been carefully curated and designed by Eisenman. For those involved, one asset was that the Institute was finally able to secure Rossi as a design tutor for the Advanced Design Workshop course in the 1979–80 academic year. Affiliated with the IUAV, Rossi had been a regular guest at the Institute since 1976 and frequently taught at Cooper Union;[351] he was to teach at the Institute for two years, even after rising to international stardom with his appearance at the first Architecture Biennale in Venice in 1980. At the time, the Institute was involved in translating his *L'architettura della città* and preparing the first edition of *A Scientific Autobiography*, both of which were to take Rossi's reception in the Anglophone world to a new level. There were some students who came to New York and attended the Advanced Design Workshop exclusively because of Rossi and his famous postmodern, contemplative, and melancholy approach to design (some of this fame was no doubt attributable to his essays in *Oppositions* and exhibitions at the Institute).[352] Rossi's approach—visible in his writing, photography, drawings, and projects—was characterized on the one hand by the historical and geographical contextualization of urban architecture, and on the other, by the typological, artistic, and pictorial approach of analogous architecture. The innovation and transformative power of the Advanced Design Workshop, however, cannot be ascribed solely to the personality of Rossi, some credit is due to the format itself. Broadly speaking, the distinguished and diverse faculty stood out from the faculties of other universities in the metropolitan area. The composition of the faculty demonstrated the extent to which Eisenman had over the years deliberately assembled a variety of perspectives in teaching at the Institute. But it also reflected a postmodern tipping point in American architecture education.

351 Eisenman had charmed Rossi and promoted him to the utmost, the Institute granting him a solo exhibition twice after the spring of 1976 and once again in the fall of 1979 (only Scolari had the opportunity to do this).

352 One student was Kyong Park, who had come to New York especially to study with Rossi, but soon turned his back on the Institute in disappointment, only to start the Storefront for Art and Architecture in 1982; see Joseph Grima, José Esparza, Chong Cuy, Charles Sneath, Suzannah Bohlke, Cesar Cotta, Pernilla Ohrstedt, and Danny Wills, eds., *Storefront Newsprints 1982–2009* (New York: Storefront for Art and Architecture, 2009).

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - [CC BY-NC-ND]

Prominent design tutors like Rossi stood for postmodern fashions, dispositions, thinking styles, and behaviors, employing self-referential, sometimes even self-satisfied language and diction. This kind of habitus was echoed in figures like Agrest, Eisenman, Gandelsonas, and Vidler, all of whom maintained friendly or otherwise close relationships. The fact that, in the 1980–81 academic year, Cesar Pelli was replaced by Robert Stern and O. M. Ungers, two architects who had once stood for quite different approaches to design, was emblematic of how postmodernism was institutionalized at the Institute. In the early 1980s, when the Institute sought to capitalize on the emerging "star system" in architecture that it had helped to create, architecture education played a significant part. Ultimately, the Advanced Design Workshop, as a new type of education offering with which the Institute competed with other educational institutions in the academic landscape, was only effective for a short period of time, namely the length of time it had a sufficiently large budget to be able to afford experienced, well-regarded teachers. When funding from HEW-FIPSE ended after two years, and the Institute, as a result, curtailed its public relations campaigns for the 1981–82 and 1982–83 academic years, the composition and performance of the Advanced Design Workshop faculty fell considerably short of its high expectations, with enrollment dropping from twenty-one to nine. The shelf life of Agrest's unique education offering was brief. Even expanding the target group to include master's students was of no avail, and the program was ultimately canceled.

Nevertheless, the Advanced Design Workshop is symptomatic of the changes in American architecture education after the revolts and reforms of 1968 and the general tendency toward redisciplining—that is, the return to a more intellectual and artistic understanding of architecture. As the Institute became more institutionalized as an architecture school over the years, it contributed to this process with its various education offerings, as well as its conferences, exhibitions, events, and publications—beginning with the conference it organized at MoMA in 1971, "Architecture Education U.S.A.: Issues, Ideas and People," as well as the "Universitas Project" conceived by Emilio Ambasz in 1972.[353] Eisenman regularly sought to position the Institute in the tradition of the Bauhaus, the modernist school par excellence, which exerted its influence on the American architecture education system via personal continuity, even though the opportunities of 1970s New York were entirely different. In his polemics, he also compared the Institute to other contemporary architecture schools like the AA, Cooper Union, or even the IUAV. Yet the Institute never (or only to a limited extent) engaged in a critical, historical, or even theoretical

353 On the 1970s shift of architecture education and the triumph of formalism, see McLeod, 2012. McLeod, and more generally the *Architecture School* anthology edited by Ockman, only address the role and function of the Institute and the Fellows in the American higher education system sporadically, for whatever reason.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

reflection of the role and function of architectural education in a time of social change. The sole exception was Kenneth Frampton, who published an article entitled "Apropos Ulm: Curriculum and Critical Theory" in *Oppositions* 3 about the Ulm School of Design, founded in the aftermath of World War II, which was known for its modern conception of design and its efforts to spearhead a democratic reorganization of living conditions in postwar Germany.[354] Frampton also contributed to a 1980 issue of *Lotus International* dedicated to "Architecture in the American University," with selected examples of contemporary architecture education (in addition to his various editorial tasks at the Institute, he was part of the Executive Council of the Italian journal, which he had joined in the fall of 1976 with issue 12).[355] The issue compared the doctrines of three American schools of architecture, Cornell, Cooper Union, and Columbia, and thus had to be selective in its approach. It opened with an introductory essay co-authored by Frampton with Alessandra Latour, outlining the historic development of architecture education in the United States throughout the twentieth century. It then went on to profile, in extensive detail, Cornell University, and Colin Rowe's Urban Design Studio in particular (written by David Middleton), Cooper Union (written by Rafael Moneo and Robert Slutzky, who taught design there), and Columbia University (written by Richard Plunz, who was chairman of the Architecture Division there). Rowe himself contributed a text revisiting a talk on the utility of education he had given in 1971 at the conference "Architecture Education USA," which was organized by the Institute but never published and has now been erroneously reduced to Rowe and his case for style.[356] The editorial expressed the hope that an analysis of the structure of teaching at the different colleges would provide insights into the self-perception of American architecture. Accordingly, Cornell University (a collaborator with the Institute in its early days) stood for the attempt "to reconcile the Beaux Arts tradition with the modern movement," Cooper Union under John Hejduk (who had hired Eisenman and maintained close relations to the Institute) stood for "the entrance of the artistic avant-grade into university teaching in the wake of the Bauhaus," and Columbia University (where Frampton himself taught) stood for "a pragmatic tradition that has found its field of application in the impact with the social problems of the metropolitan city."[357]

Yet the enormous changes that took place in higher education and the architectural world of 1970s America were barely the subject of historical comment,

354 Kenneth Frampton, "Apropos Ulm: Curriculum and Critical Theory," *Oppositions* 3 (May 1974), 17–36.

355 *Lotus International*, no. 27 (1980): "Architecture in the American University."

356 Colin Rowe "Architectural Education in the USA: Issues, Ideas, and People. A Conference to Explore Current Alternatives," *Lotus International*, no. 27 (1980), 42–46.

357 Frampton and Latour, 1980.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

critical reflection, or public debate. The *Lotus International* editors paid no attention to some of the East Coast's most important architecture schools—not just the University of Pennsylvania, Yale, and Princeton, but also Harvard and MIT, to say nothing of the schools of note on the West Coast, including Berkeley, UCLA, or the recently founded Southern California Institute of Architecture SciArc in Los Angeles. However, even though such an approach yielded only a rough sketch of architectural debate and education in the USA, the juxtaposition of teaching approaches at Cornell, Cooper Union, and Columbia revealed the shadowy outlines of the Institute as an architecture school in this renegotiated space of transatlantic, modernist approaches to architecture. The Institute was always in evidence here, even if only implicitly, as a negative foil. Peter Eisenman was even discussed in the *Lotus* editorial, albeit as an architect, not as the Institute director. He was mentioned in the same breath as American architectural historian Vincent Scully, in order to illustrate two opposing positions held by American architecture vis-à-vis Europe. Standing on one side was Scully, an avowed advocate of "genuine" American architecture, with Eisenman, a militant interpreter of Europe's architectural modernism, on the other. Eisenman's characteristic rhetorical gestures were described here as "a complex play of transatlantic influences and exchanges," which the editors claimed was in turn exerting an influence, in a truncated form, on European architecture. Ultimately, in the perception of the *Lotus* editors, it was the traditional schools of architecture, some of which were backed by over a hundred years of tradition, rather than the Institute, that continued to set the standard for architecture education. The Institute did, however, exert an influence on education, whether directly or indirectly, with its Fellows' teaching, its cultural activities, and the teaching material it provided. For it was through its relational, complex, and differentiated work—through the interplay of its educational, cultural, and publishing practices—that it came to alter the architecture culture, in the USA and internationally, in critical and decisive ways. Arguably, the Institute was the most postmodern of all America's architecture schools. What was exemplified at the Institute was a deeply engaged, highly ambitious pedagogy that aimed beyond merely keeping the Institute alive. Despite the faculty's commitment and skills, academic display, and professional advancement eventually came to trump the needs of a quality architecture education. Such an approach, if sustained, would not only have prepared students of architecture for diverse living and working environments by imparting core competencies in architectural, ecological, organizational, methodological, and socio-economic fields but would also have fostered social responsibility in the profession and discipline.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

2.4 Commercially Exploiting Learning

At the end of the 1979–80 academic year, when the NEH grant for Open Plan expired and was not renewed, the chapter of adult education at the Institute was closed once and for all. Yet as America stood at the brink of a major conservative turn, affecting the federal endowments, the Institute's leadership had no choice but to undertake yet another reinvention in tandem with a restructuring of its finances for the 1980–81 fiscal year. Despite the recent shift in emphasis toward a much larger portfolio of publications and exhibitions as main fields of activities, architecture education continued as a successful business model, even though at this point the Undergraduate Program, the Internship Program, and the Advanced Design Workshop made up only a fourth of the total budget, which had risen to nearly US$877,000. While teaching was still a central focus, the figures for the Institute's education offerings had actually even begun to dip into the red: a total deficit of US$45,000 was anticipated for the 1980–81 fiscal year, and only part of the debts were paid off in the following year.[358] The complexity, however, is reflected in the fact that the Institute reached peak enrollment in the 1980–81 academic year, with a total of seventy students enrolled in the three commercially successful education offerings, not least because it had conducted a successful marketing campaign with new posters and brochures.[359] As an educational institution, and especially in terms of personnel, the Institute had once again reached its limits. The neoliberalization of Institute operations, now financed by a challenge grant from the NEH, which had to be matched by private donations at a 2:1 ratio, therefore manifested itself in the restructuring of the Board of Trustees. This began in the 1980–81 fiscal year. In addition to Philip Johnson, more architects, developers, and businessmen were added to the board, and in the future, they would decide the Institute's fate. New management positions were being created to be filled by people from the business world. For example, Hamid-Reza Nouri, an auditor, was nominated associate director, and Lynn Holstein became director of development after the departure of Frederieke Taylor, both of them being tasked with making individual programs profitable.

In "Education Programs," one of the four pillars of the new decade, next to "Publication Programs," "Public Programs," and "Development Programs," however, the biggest challenge was the composition of the faculty, as veteran Fellows took on new projects and new people had to be brought to the Institute. In fact, the biggest change in architecture education at the Institute revolved around Peter Eisenman who relinquished his position as director of the Undergraduate

358 IAUS, "Undergraduate Program/Internship Program," 1980–81, May 23, 1980, Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2- 10; IAUS, funding requirements of each program, 1980–81, Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2- 11.

359 IAUS, "Student lists," 1980–81. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-4.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - [cc] BY-NC-ND

Program, which he had occupied for six years, for the fall semester of 1980, after having founded the firm Eisenman/Robertson with Jaquelin Robertson on January 1, 1980.[360] In 1980, Diana Agrest and Mario Gandelsonas did the same, founding Agrest and Gandelsonas Architects, headquartered in New York.[361] Although Eisenman encouraged young faculty members, the Fellows' primary complaint was that his successor wasn't satisfactorily vetted. Initially, Lars Lerup from the University of California, Berkeley, who did not make an appearance at the Institute beforehand, took on the administration of both the Undergraduate Program and the Internship Program, as a Visiting Fellow. He was assisted by Deborah Berke as administrator, while Lawrence Kutnicki and the painter Robert Slutzky, returning to the Institute after many years, supervised the interns. The Undergraduate Program's history and theory courses continued to be taught by the long-tenured Fellows—Frampton, Gandelsonas, and Vidler, as well as Robert Silman—at least ensuring their continuity and quality. Replacing Agrest, who was concentrating on the Advanced Design Workshop, Gandelsonas took over the administration of the design tutorial, which he taught in collaboration with Deborah Berke and Christian Hubert as tutors. Ignasi de Solà-Morales, the second Visiting Fellow at the Institute in 1980–81, was also brought back to teach and headed a course on "Urban History." Another major issue was that, beginning in 1980–81, the Institute was on the constant lookout for new premises, as already announced by Eisenman in 1977, both because it lacked space and because the stepped rent for the 8 West 40th Street penthouse had become a problem. The Institute's leadership visited a variety of properties that met the requirements for an architecture school, but in 1981 the Institute was able to expand its spaces once again, renting additional studio rooms one floor below, on the building's twentieth floor, since the former design studios on the upper mezzanine floor had in the meantime all been converted to offices for the editorial staff of the various publications. At the outset of the 1981–82 academic year, addressing a meeting of the Board of Trustees, Eisenman appeared happy with these developments: "[E]ducation programs were doing well, for the first time we have adequate quarters."[362] Under the new political auspices—after 1981, with President Ronald Reagan taking office, America was becoming a "nation of the rich" and occupying a central place in the rise of global neoliberalism—the Institute had transformed into what was primarily a training ground for architects of the post-industrial knowledge and information society since education now represented an investment in the future.

360 To mark the founding of the office, Eisenman published early projects; see *Architecture + Urbanism*, no. 112, (January 1980): "Peter Eisenman."

361 Agrest and Gandelsonas followed; see *Architecture + Urbanism*, no. 114 (March 1980): "Diana Agrest, Mario Gandelsonas."

362 IAUS, minutes of the meeting of the Board of Trustees, October 6, 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-5.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

Throughout 1981, the Fellows held a series of meetings to develop plans for the future and draw up new scenarios that would allow the Institute to continue to fulfill its function as an architecture school, especially with junior teachers as faculty. The proposals submitted in these meetings made it clear that architecture education had an economic dimension that was just as important as the pedagogical one.[363] First of all, for the first time since 1976, the agenda included the idea of establishing a degree-granting program. The Fellows discussed the details of adding a graduate program to their education offerings and, eventually, offering students the opportunity to obtain an accredited degree at the Institute. One prerequisite the Institute would have to meet before becoming an officially recognized school of architecture was that such an education offering would need to be approved by the U.S. Department of Education. However, establishing a fully-fledged degree program would require an estimated start-up capital of US$500,000, which the Institute could not raise. Another option would have been for the Institute to partner with another educational institution that already had state recognition, as was discussed with Sarah Lawrence College in 1976. But this was only possible if the arrangement offered something to both parties. In any case, no degree program was possible without the existence of a research library, which would need to be constructed around the existing inventory of Eisenman's library, but doing so would cost an estimated US$1.5 million. The discussions clearly revealed that the Fellows were divided over whether the Institute had the time, energy, and money to invest in developing such a program. The Fellows had quite differing ideas about the Institute's direction. Frampton, for instance—following up on a suggestion by Lerup, who envisioned the Institute as a research center—even suggested incorporating a doctoral program in art history, since art historians were underrepresented when it came to teaching history and theory at schools of architecture.[364] As Frampton saw it, such a move would place the Institute in an ideal position to enter a consortium with NYU, Harvard, and Columbia University to offer postgraduate academic architecture education in place of a master's degree. Eisenman, on the other hand, was toying with the idea of founding a new institution along the lines of the Canadian Centre for Architecture in Montréal, founded in 1979 by Phyllis Lambert, yet without the corresponding spaces.[365] The Institute pursued this idea seriously in the 1981–82 fiscal year, briefly drafting plans for what was called "The Philip Johnson Center for Architecture."[366] In its existing form, the Institute

363 Silvia Kolbowski, minutes of Fellows meeting, March 10, 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-9. / ARCH401178

364 Doctoral programs were now offered at Princeton, MIT, and Berkeley; see McLeod, 2012.

365 Kolbowski, 1981.

366 IAUS, project description for "The Philip Johnson Center for Architecture," 1981, Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.1-13 / ARCH263662.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

would have been continued, albeit merged into this new institution, creating something unprecedented in New York: part archive, part museum, part research library, and part study center. The plans extended to founding a new school of architecture that would finally have offered fully fledged, accredited architecture degrees, but the project ultimately fell through due to a lack of funds.

The Institute's success from 1974–75 derived from the fact that, on the basis of architecture education, with government funding and in the course of its professionalization and bureaucratization, it had become a powerful institution that knit two areas of society, education and culture, tightly together while also functioning as a publishing imprint (or, in certain cases, as a co-publisher).[367] Nevertheless, its financial future remained uncertain. The Institute hoped to find a programmatic solution to this uncertainty when, over a few days in the fall of 1981, it called a series of meetings of the Fellows to "departmentalize" itself. The idea was to reorganize the Fellows' activities into four different working areas with separate responsibilities while drafting a strategy for development and priority-setting over the next five years. The result was a five-year plan that divided the Fellows' work into the following categories: "Publication Programs," "Education Programs," "Public Programs," and "Development Programs."[368] By then at the latest, development—i.e., fundraising and public relations, as well as grant applications and income-generating project planning—was the Institute's driving force, to which education offerings, public events, and publications all catered to. The unofficial minutes of these meetings recorded the course of the discussions between the Fellows present (unlike the official minutes, which had been revised and only summarized the content of the discussions), highlighting the problems facing the individual education offerings.[369] As testimonies, they reveal that certain Fellows had come to see the Institute's architecture education project as fundamentally doomed to failure. They did acknowledge that the Institute had achieved a certain measure of renown as an alternative architecture school, attracting students from liberal arts colleges and schools of architecture not only throughout the USA but now from around the world. Students of the Advanced Design Workshop, for example, came from places as diverse as the AA in London, Ireland, and South Africa. Yet enrollment figures were already declining to the extent that the Institute's leadership felt it had no choice but to increase tuition fees. In the 1981–82 academic year, fees for the Advanced Design Workshop were raised from US$5,500 to US$7,500, while fees for the

367 Ockman, 1988.

368 CCA's IAUS fonds contains a folder of unofficial and official minutes of Fellows meetings from the fall of 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-9.

369 Marguerite McGoldrick, official minutes of Fellows meeting," October 8, 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-9 / ARCH401164; Marguerite McGoldrick, unofficial minutes of Fellows meeting, October 8, 1981. Source: CCA Montréal, IAUS fonds: A.2-9 / ARCH401167.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

Undergraduate Program were raised from US$5,700 to US$6,000, and then to US$7,800 in 1982–83. The Institute's leadership defended this drastic increase in the fees paid by undergraduates—by nearly a third within only two years—by claiming that the Institute's tuition fees needed to match those of competing liberal arts colleges for it to survive on the education market. Some of the Fellows had already expressed grave concerns about this development, even though its main intention was to ensure that architecture education didn't turn into a loss-making venture.[370] Deborah Berke argued that education offerings were no longer worthwhile, pointing out that tuition fees of US$7,000 were effectively "outpricing the market." The Fellows also discussed the fact that higher tuition fees would present certain "social issues" affecting the composition of the student body, as students from less well-off families would be effectively excluded. Such debates over tuition fees, target groups, pedagogy, and market viability testified to broader trends in American higher education. Since at least the 1974–75 academic year, if not since its foundation, the Institute had found itself in the middle of an overall trend towards an academicization of architecture education, reflected in the widespread growth of new master's programs, undergraduate degrees, and doctoral programs in architecture. The diversification, intellectualization, internationalization, and even commercialization of the architecture education landscape was a steamrolling trend—one to which the Institute had ultimately contributed but with which it eventually fell in line.

In the end, the Institute's education offerings influenced a rather small, but select contingent of students over the years, even if the Institute only contributed to one stage of their induction and incorporation into the New York architectural community. Some nonetheless went on to pursue careers as architects and even academics. The Institute's influence was even greater, perhaps, when it came to the production of teaching materials. Even though they weren't explicitly conceived as such, many of the publications edited and published at the Institute—ranging from *Oppositions*, Oppositions Books, to the IAUS Exhibition Catalogues—were quickly incorporated into architectural curricula. Yet even if only temporary, the decline in the Institute's enrollment figures, especially in the Advanced Design Workshop, presented a major financial problem that endangered the health of the Institute. Some of the Fellows blamed this on insufficient recruitment and lack of leadership.[371] In any case, by the 1981–82 academic year, the Institute was no longer at full enrollment. One obvious explanation was that Eisenman was no longer recruiting students as actively as he had in years past. Additionally, some of the Institute's contracts with cooperating universities expired without anyone doing anything to renew them. The diminished interest in the Advanced Design Workshop was

370 Kolbowski, 1981.

371 McGoldrick, 1981.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - cc BY-NC-ND

blamed on controversial hirings, lack of funds to print posters, and poor word-of-mouth advertising. Once again, events demonstrated that good public relations and outreach work had a major influence on the success of architecture education at the Institute. Only the Internship Program continued to see unabated popularity, largely thanks to the reputation of practicing Fellows. There were so many applicants for internships, in fact, that the Institute began selecting interns according to their past academic achievements. Meanwhile, the Fellows discussed whether the Internship Program had now grown disproportionately large in relation to the Institute's activities and whether interns were still getting sufficient insight into the profession. Cooperating with architecture firms was ruled out, however, for practical reasons. Instead, the Fellows decided to continue educating the interns at the Institute, in certain cases under individual Fellows, so that in their second semester, they could focus on producing a portfolio that included model making. What this demonstrates is that, regardless of which educational program is under consideration, the student-teacher relationship at the Institute had clearly changed: students no longer pursued their own education on an equal footing with the teachers, as advocated in the progressive pedagogical debates of the 1970s. At the Institute, the relationship was conceived quite traditionally, and students and interns were subordinated to the Fellows. In extreme cases, this could manifest in a certain kind of paternalism. Still, in a time of institutional upheaval, Eisenman tried to precipitate a generational change by transforming the Fellowship, bringing in a new culture and pedagogical approach. At the dawn of the 1980s, the Institute promoted junior faculty. As the old guard, consisting of Eisenman, Frampton, Gandelsonas, and Vidler, as well as Agrest, who had shaped architecture education in history, theory, and design at the Institute since 1974–75, were busy with other things, increasingly pursuing careers as architects by founding firms and taking leading academic positions, the Institute appointed Deborah Berke (1980), Larry Kutnicki, and eventually Robert Silman (both in 1981) as Fellows. For example, in the 1981–82 academic year, the urban planning course taught by Vidler was turned into an "Urban History" course taught in conjunction with David Mohney, who had studied under Vidler at Princeton, as a teaching assistant. The new course called "Architecture and the City," which contrasted utopian urban designs with ones that had actually been realized, played a fundamental role in reintroducing a humanities orientation to the liberal arts curriculum at the Institute.[372] In 1982–83, architecture education at the Institute was widely advertised as an alternative, mainly with posters in the by now typical Vignelli design, which was also used for all cultural events. The High School Program was communicated separately. The Undergraduate Program's history and theory courses, taught by Frampton and Gandelsonas, experimented with forms

372 Anthony Vidler, "Architecture and the City," Undergraduate Program in Architecture. Course Outline, fall semester 1981. Source: private archives of Patrick Pinnell.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

of "team teaching," and tutors in the design studio were now composed primarily of Princeton graduates. While the veteran Fellows continued to monitor the quality of education, these late arrivals brought new approaches to methodology and content—thinking less dogmatically and operating more openly. Yet ultimately, Eisenman's resignation as Institute director—in the summer of 1982, after fifteen years, he withdrew from his post, while still remaining at the Institute in some capacity as a trustee—represented an enormous rupture in the Institute's history, with far-reaching consequences for the Institute and the fellowships, and above all the leading role of education from this time on. Despite Eisenman's departure, architectural education thrived, although students were unaware of the changes at the Institute and complained that they were not being taught by him.[373] To maintain day-to-day operations, Frampton had taken on the role of director of programs in June 1982, at least in the short term, but he too would resign from all his posts before the end of the year—for good reasons. While the Institute, having moved to its new premises on Union Square in 1983, tried to maintain operations, balancing organization and programming, architecture education was placed at the fore and Gandelsonas, appointed the new director of education, took on temporary leadership of the education offerings. In the 1982–83 academic year, the Institute was to embark on a new beginning.

373 Although he was no longer Institute director, nor a Fellow at the Institute, Eisenman again supervised interns in the academic year 1982–83.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - [cc] BY-NC-ND

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839465189-005 https://www.inlibra.com/de/agb - Open Access - CC BY-NC-ND