SOHC/OH 760/13

J.D. SOMERVILLE ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION, STATE LIBRARY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA: INTERVIEW NO. OH 760/13

DISK 1 OF 3

This is an interview for the University of Adelaide Architecture School History with Derrick Kendrick on the 9th July 2008, interviewer Rob Linn.

Derrick, I'm wondering if you could give me some background of what you did in England prior to, I guess the word is being head-hunted, to come to Australia to teach at the University of Adelaide. What's your story educationally, at least?

Where do I start? Back at secondary school we had a new headmaster, he comes into the classroom one day and introduces himself to us. Said, 'I've got a list of names here. Smith, you're going to Oxford; Jones, you're going to Cambridge; Robertson, you're going to the Imperial College; Levinson, you're going in your father's bank; Smith, you're going on your father's farm', went down the list, 'Kendrick and White, I don't have anything for you here. What are you going to do with your life?' 'I don't know, sir.' 'Come and see me in my office tomorrow morning.' So fear and trembling, I'm standing outside his office next day. 'Come in.' And of course you stand to attention in front of the headmaster. 'Have you made your mind up what you want to do?' 'N-n-n-n-no, sir.' 'Well, you've got to make your mind up. You're sixteen years of age, you should know what you want to do.' So I'm searching for something to say. 'My next-door neighbour's a builder, sir.' 'Oh, you're interested in that, are you? Okay, right.' So he rummages around on his desk, he produces a piece of paper, says, 'Well, you'll be interested in this'. (dejected tone) 'Oh, will I, sir? What is it?' 'It's a degree course in building at Manchester University. It's the only course in Britain that you can get deferment from the army and you don't have to be a Bevin Boy.' (bright tone) 'Oh, is it, sir?' (laughter) And that's how I made the decision about my career.

Where were you brought up, Derrick?

In Chester, in England.

In Chester, yes.

And I went to Manchester University and I got exemption from the army, and forty miles away from my home town. I have to say that I failed every subject and the

army got me in the end. So I went into national service as a clerk, statistician, draftsman, in the Royal Army Service Corps, I went in for eighteen months but that was extended because of the Berlin Air Lift, and I got involved with the Berlin Air Lift as a statistician at Buckeberg in Germany.

When I came out I knew what I wanted to do, and that was I went back to this course and I got my degree – not without some problems: I didn't care for the quality of the teachers and I used to cut their classes till in the end an Indian student friend of mind came into the YMCA[1] in Manchester, where we were living, 'He's going to fail you, you know'. 'Why?' He said, 'Well, you haven't done the work, he says'. So I said, 'Well, I'll take the work in, show him'. I'd done all the drawing work in half the time that he'd taken to explain it on the blackboard – fireplaces and whatever it was – and he was so impressed because I could draw.

Had you been taught or was it natural, Derrick?

No, it's natural, natural. And an external examiner was W.J. Smith of the Royal College of Science and Technology Glasgow, he was impressed. He called me in, he said, 'I want you to come up to Glasgow and teach'. So I said, 'Well, I've got a job as a reinforced concrete engineer'. 'Yes, but you can give that away and come up and teach.' So I said, 'How much wages are you offering?' And he offered four hundred pounds a year. I said, 'I'm getting four hundred and twenty-five pounds as an engineer'. 'Well, I'm sorry, you cannae do any more than that.' (laughter) But I decided to go and teach in Glasgow because I had some experience of teaching in the evening classes, part-time evening classes, to get some money to get through my course.

So what year would this be?

1952. And after six years in Glasgow and developing with a fellow named Edwin Morris some very early pioneering building science work for architecture students with this Scottish architecture historian professor, and every time there was a salary increase I didn't get one so I was now about five steps behind Edwin Morris, I decided I had to leave and get another job elsewhere. I got six jobs offered to me, all

[1] YMCA – Young Men's Christian Association.

with increases in salary. I could have gone to Nova Scotia as a timber engineer; I could have gone to Kumasi in what was then the Gold Coast, now Ghana, to run a school of building; and having taught the students I then had to build the University of Kumasi with the students, that was a challenge, half your new town as a head of a school of building; or inspector of schools building in West of Scotland. But I decided to come to the new School of Architecture in Adelaide.

Now, how were you approached about that, please, Derrick?

It was just an advertisement in the *Architecture* journal and I applied. When I got the offer I wrote to the South Australian Agent General in London, got hold of a fifteen-minute sound and colour film prepared by the University of Adelaide which showed in full colour how wonderful Adelaide was. I remember there was a block of flats, U-shaped blocks of flats, on Melbourne Street, which were the start of the ..... shown as this place called 'Bonny-thon' – we didn't know how to pronounce it, you see, in those days – and that was the clincher, this film.

This is A.P. Rowe's advertising.

Is it?

It is.

(laughter) Okay. It was good, it was good. So we came out for the three years and then the contract was extended for another three years, which was attractive, because at the end of the second three-year contract you had twelve months' study leave on full pay, and I thought that when I came out here we'd be able to compare life in Australia with life in England and make a decision whether we wanted to stay here or go back. But the decision was actually made by the children because we'd brought a two-year-old and a five-year-old out, and by the time we went back to England they were aged nine and eleven and we had another child. They had become Australian. What I mean by that: well, we were living in a Housing Trust house with an incorrect orientation, but the kids soon learned to play on the western side of the house in the morning and the eastern side of the house in the afternoon and it was noticeable, they were learning naturally to keep out of the heat.

When you arrived – in 1958, wasn't it?

Yes.

Mid-year?

First of September.

First of September.

Fifty years ago in a couple of months' time.

It is, too. Were you made to feel welcome here?

Oh, yes. Oh, yes. I was met by Neville Hoskings at Outer Harbor. We came out on the *Orsova*, travelling first class, which was very nice, and they decided instead of taking us through Port Adelaide they'd take us along Lady Gowrie Drive –

Oh, very nice.

– with the palm trees to Glenelg, where we were accommodated at Broadway in a house about fifty yards from the beach, and I think we arrived on the Saturday and on the Sunday I walked the kids down to the beach and it was a beautiful, seventy-degree-Fahrenheit day, and we were absolutely shocked to find the beach empty of people, whereas if it was Blackpool it would be absolutely *full* of people. We couldn't understand why people weren't on the beach on such a lovely day. That's where we learnt about some of the things that Australia had to offer. For example, how to burn the back of the hairs on your hand trying to ignite a chip heater.

They're disgusting things.

And the noise of rain on a tin roof, which was a completely new experience. We were there for three months before we moved out to accommodation at Klemzig, and we've been there ever since.

So did you purchase this house at that point?

No, no. Rental.

Rental, yes.

Every time I went along to the old Bank of Adelaide and asked for a loan to buy the house – I think initially it was three thousand dollars, then it was six thousand dollars, then it was nine thousand dollars – the bank would say to me, 'No, no, no, you're better off, you're having a subsidised rental, it doesn't make economic sense

for you to buy it. You're better off not buying it'. But eventually we did buy it and just as well we did.

Now, Derrick, in terms of what you found at the University, could you describe what the place looked like, please, when you first went there?

1958. There were these nineteenth-century buildings in the locations where the Wills Building is at the moment; an old Prince of Wales Lecture Theatre I remember once, which was a funny little place – there must be some photographs in the archives of that.

Yes, there are.

We used to go to lunch in the old Staff Club, which was on the ridge where the present security office and Architecture Building is located. Security office used to be an older bungalow, which was occupied by A.P. Rowe and subsequently, when A.P. Rowe resigned, the new Professor Jensen lived in that bungalow for a time before he built his bungalow on the hills above Glen Osmond called 'Bledloe'. The mortuary building, which was the Staff Club building, had a scissor roof and clear storey, wonderful space, and it had a Hungarian chef who used to produce marvellous food in the evenings.

I have never heard that.

Yes. And he was the first chef when they moved into the new University of Adelaide Club building – what was his name? Can't remember. But it was a quiet place. I suppose one of the things that was pleasing to me and to any people was the friendship that was generated by the university administration at the time. I don't think it was just Vic Edgeloe, the Registrar, or David McKay, the Assistant Registrar, but everybody in the top office. You got a message like, 'If anything happens to your family, the University will look after you. Don't worry'. And in fact I had occasion to put that to the test when my mother was very ill, my father had already died and I got this message that she was dying and would I go to England. And I said, 'Well, I haven't got the money'. But the University said, 'Look, we'll vouch for him to Qantas', and Qantas set me up to go to UK; but in the end I didn't go, but the University had been prepared to offer that kind of support, which is missing today, sadly, but that was the kind of quality of experience that you had.

Harry Wesley–Smith would have been Academic Registrar then?

Harry Wesley–Smith, yes, and his three sons were just learning how to play. No, Harry was wonderful. Had occasion to go to Harry one day. In my office, an Asian girl came running into my office and she was crying, second-year student. 'Why are you crying?' 'I'm going to have to go home.' 'Why?' 'Well, my father can't afford to pay anymore.' 'Why, what's happened?' 'Well, you probably read in the paper about the typhoid epidemic on the Malaysia–Thailand border. Well, it's my father's ice-cream factory and he's been put out of business.' So I said, 'I'm very sorry to hear that.' And I went up to see Harry Wesley–Smith and said, 'Harry, I've got this situation, can you do anything about it?' He said, 'Leave it with me'. About a week later, the same girl came running into my office, said, 'Mr Kendrick, Mr Kendrick'. I said, 'What?' She said, 'I've got a scholarship!' 'Have you? What – – –?' She said, 'I don't have to leave'. I said to Harry afterwards, 'Where the hell did you get the money from?' He said, 'Oh, I have ways'. There was a philanthropist. I don't know who it was but my guess was it was Mark Mitchell that he'd spoken to. So that was the kind of university that we had in those days.

So was there a sense of familyness about it, if that's the way of putting it?

Yes, yes, yes. Most new migrants didn't have any relatives out here and so we became the pseudo-aunties and uncles of each other, and that's how the friendships developed. The Hoskings family, I became their pseudo-uncle, and subsequently when I married Neville Hoskings's wife's half-sister I became a real uncle, and that is highly-valued today by the Hoskings family.

As an aside, how did he ever get the nickname 'Tex'?

Have you never seen his legs?

Yes, I have.

They were bow-legged. He died recently, by the way.

Yes.

His children spoke to me about that and they think it was the check shirts that he wore, together with the bow legs. But no, he enjoyed that.

Derrick, your teaching would have taken place in was it the top story of the Engineering Building, is that right?

Hang on, I've got to get this story right. When I arrived in 1958 in September the school had started on 17th March and Jensen and Hoskings and Miss Weiss, the secretary – Margaret Weiss – they occupied the second storey at the southern end of the Mechanical Engineering Building.

Yes.

It was a large room. To one side there was a smaller studio and at the far end there were a group of offices, and that was the School of Architecture in 1958. By 1960, the third floor of the Civil Engineering Building at the western end had been raised on jacks – which was Louis Laybourne Smith's wonderful idea, that you could expand the building upwards, and the roof was designed to be lifted – and we moved into the western end where we had two studios, one crit room, a materials museum, a photographic darkroom, an honours studio, a lecture theatre with a bio box at the back, and a building science laboratory.

So it's quite an extensive array of rooms –

Yes.

– and space set up particularly for the course.

Yes.

The course would have already been structured by the time you arrived, I suppose.

Oh, yes, yes, everything was in place. It was in the *Calendar*. Jensen's course was, I suppose, to create the Universal Man, if you can accept that word today. Four prongs – Architectural Design, taught by him; Construction, taught by Hoskings; Structural Engineering, taught by Frank Bull and the Civil Engineering staff, they weren't going to relinquish their connection; and Building Science, taught by me – over the five years of the course. But the syllabuses were all in place when I arrived and, in terms of my field, the guide for that building science prong of the course was set up by the Royal Institute of British Architects in 1943 and 1947, when the Institute of British Architects decided that the shortcoming of architects was they didn't have enough engineering, physics and chemistry in their education to make them fully-proficient architects. And committees of the Royal Institute of British

Architects looked at what needed to be done and Building Science course with building science laboratories was their recommendation in these two papers.

Professor Henry J. Cowan, known as Jack Cowan, an engineer, the first professor of architectural science in the world, was set up in Sydney University in 1955, I think, and Jensen went across to see him as well as Ashford at Sydney University, Towndrow at University of New South Wales, and Brian Lewis at University of Melbourne, who were all ex-Liverpool University graduates. Jack Cowan was a civil engineer from Leeds University, I think. So his experience of talking with them provided the basis for his design of the course.

Had you known of Jensen prior to coming here?

No. No. I did a bit of homework and I found out that he'd been the Rose Shipman[?] Scholar, which meant that he'd been able to visit Scandinavia and to study multistorey housing. I hadn't realised that at that time multistorey housing was not going to be (laughs) looked upon very favourably here in Adelaide. But he had a background of Royal Engineers during the War, town major in Malaysia and, prior to that, before the War, he was an architect in Singapore.

One of the things that I subsequently learnt about Professor Jensen was that before he came to Adelaide, when he was the chief architect and planner at Paddington in London, was that he told us that he was on the communist blacklist; but so was Sir Harold Macmillan as the Housing Minister, anyway. But Jensen was a person who built multistorey blocks of flats in Paddington and he and Abercrombie, Sir Patrick Abercrombie, who had rebuilt Plymouth after the war damage that was done there – Abercrombie was a low-density, low-rise architect and planner – these two were always clashing at RIBA meetings and Royal Institute of Town Planning meetings.

They were both firm in their views, Derrick.

Oh, yes, yes. You can read about it, it's in the RIBA journals and the Royal Town Planning Institute journals. It's an interesting opposition of views.

So, Derrick, you said you had no knowledge of Jensen when you arrived.

No.

And you've explained the course structure. What about the students? This was the next thing I was coming to. What were they like?

Can I tell you something before that?

Yes, certainly.

It's just a little story about Professor Jensen. I went to a function at Enfield and met up with several local architects, and they were up in arms about Professor Jenson. So I said, 'Why?' It turned out that he had set up in practice and they were concerned about their practices suffering because somebody with a title 'Professor' is going to, in their view, take work away from them. And on the Monday morning I thought, 'Well, I'd better tell the Professor about this', so went into his office about half-past nine on Monday morning and said to Professor I had something important to tell him, that the Department and the Faculty was being maligned by architects, and Professor Jensen said, 'Oh, yes? In what way?' So I told him. 'And who are they?' And immediately I froze and thought, 'What am I letting myself in for?' And I said, 'I'm not telling you'. And for three hours I held firm before I was released from his office. I think on that particular day [I] gained [his] respect and that may very well have been the reason why later on, much to my great surprise, in 1970 when he was going on overseas study leave he asked me to be the Dean of the Faculty. And he said the reason he wanted me to be the Dean was because he trusted me, whereas he didn't trust the other members of staff who, in my view, were more likely and more suitable to have been Dean at that time.

But you were asking about the students. I think you need to know what happened at the very beginning. In 1958, when the new School course started, the students at the Institute of Technology School of Architecture were invited to apply to enter the University's School of Architecture if they had matriculation, and that the University for its part would grant them exemption for the first two years of the University course if they wanted to come into the third year of the Architecture course or one year if they wanted to come into the second year of the Architecture course. And there were seven or eight students entered the third year, there were seven or eight into the second year, then we had about thirty new students into the first year. So we already had about fifty students when the doors opened for the School, and three years of courses to teach.

There were some pretty bright students transferred into the School of Architecture: Michael Griggs in the very first third-year cohort, he became the

President of the Architecture Students' Society and with Jensen's encouragement they got Sir Arthur Stephenson from the University of Western Australia School of Architecture to become the Patron of the Architecture Students' Association; and indeed Sir Arthur Stephenson was the first external examiner of the first set of graduates in 1961, and he came across as an external examiner to ensure and maintain the standards of the final thesis presentation, which was a pretty substantial piece of work in those days.

I can't remember all of the students in that very first third-year group, but Michael Griggs; Battersby; Jack Russell. I can't remember.

That's okay. I don't expect you to remember all of them. But you'd been used to teaching in Scotland. Was there a difference between the types of students here and there or much of a muchness?

No, no, no, no. The University of Adelaide students were the same, but I didn't understand what they had just recently been involved with, which was something called 'Bohemia', and if you walked on the University campus, down the brick staircase from the upper level to the lower level, by the Students' Union in the garden on the left there, there were some sculptures and pieces of work which were the remnants of this Bohemia activity that they had been working with or presenting or having a conference or convention about. This Bohemianism was a strange thing to me, but two or three years later the form it took was interesting. The students were instructed by Jensen to organise the Faculty dinner and they did, and when the staff turned up in evening dress and the women in long dresses they were horrified to find that the students were all dressed in sackcloth and ashes because this was Bohemia, and we didn't even know the meaning of the word Bohemia, and they were drinking wine and beer out of tin cans. It was a complete play-down of life, and Jensen was horrified, particularly as he had some guests there from the Institute of Architects – including Ken Milne, the old Ken Milne, and his wife, Hazel, who had made these wonderful donations of travelling prizes to the school – and later Jensen, having put the squeeze on the student body, then reorganised another Faculty dinner specifically for the staff and guests of the Professor. And this time in the Union the hall had been decked out in Palladian architectural style and one Sandy McLeay, architecture student, and girlfriend, turned up in a horse-drawn landau, just to set the

scene. So the students were very bright and very creative, as were the general student body of the University of Adelaide.

You've got to understand that at that time, when the students had their 'rag day', as we called it in Manchester – what do they call it out here, I forget? – Prosh Day, they always had a theme; whether it was Aborigine issues, primary school education issues, hospital issues, the students had a voice and they wanted the public to know that they had concern. That's sadly all gone from the university life of students, it's just a pity. It's completely different world.

I'm just recalling, Derrick, that the year you arrived the Union Hall would have been opened, too, the theatre.

Yes. I didn't see it as a newly-opened building, but yes. I subsequently made acoustic measurements in there to show that it was awful. There was a band of about five or six seats which didn't get any reflections from the ceiling and if you got in those seats they were the worst seats in the place. They were about eight rows back from the front, a band of about three or four rows. It's still there, the defect. (laughter)

They didn't fix it. It interested me that so many people actually involved in the University had an interest in that particular hall, the building of it and what it stood for.

Yes. Harry Medlin.

Yes.

But if we deal with the architecture students, many of the architecture students got themselves involved with the stage theatre, its lighting, the preparation of the props for whatever shows were being put on, and indeed some of them gave up the Architecture course and became involved in art as art teachers or became involved in theatre. John Dalwitz was one.

Yes, of course.

Young Schneider[?] was another one – he died early, sadly – and he left a donation of an art prize and a sculpture prize to the School. The School has never, ever awarded the sculpture prize because we never, ever had a sculpture course. But that was the way they looked upon their education: it was beyond the actual syllabus, and they made a career out of it.

Was Professor Jensen's view of how the course should function very regimented in the style that he'd come from?

I think Jensen's course was unique. I don't think he copied anybody's course. He designed this course to create the complete architect. Somewhere I've written that I thought his course was aimed to create the universal person, the 'Universal Man', as they called it; the absolute complete architect. In addition to the syllabus, the taught syllabus, the studio work, there were a whole stack of additional arrangements of talks by experts at lunchtimes on a weekly basis; there were site visits to manufacturing industries, to building sites; there wasn't an aspect of architecture that was not covered by the course. Subsequently, when the Australian Institute of Architects magazine did a survey of architectural courses in Australia and the hours spent on the courses, the timetabled hours for the Architecture course in University of Adelaide was twice the weight of any other course in Australia, and Jensen made no apology for that, said, 'The others are inadequate'. He was very proud of what he was creating. And if you talk to students today – I'm talking now 2008 – and you look around at that crop of students that attended that first eighteen years of the University of Adelaide Architecture course, and you ask them about their course, they all know that they've 'survived' – because that's the only word you can say – but they're all exceedingly grateful for the background education that he provided for them. They don't hold a candle to anybody; they are the tops, in their own view.

I don't personally hold that view. I think a lot of the later work, particularly of David Sanders and the computer work of Tony Radford, have changed the scene and there isn't time to teach students everything. What Jensen didn't do, which the new courses do do, is teach you how to learn and how to progress your own knowledge.

That is a very interesting observation, Derrick. Very, very interesting. I have not heard anyone else make the same observation, I must say.

Okay. David Sanders's course, if I may go on to that –

Yes, of course.

– there is an aspect of that which I don't think is fully-appreciated. It'll take a moment to tell the story. After Jensen it was inevitable that the University would choose a different kind of person to lead the Architecture School, and in David Sanders, an architectural historian and architect, they found that person. David

Sanders interviewed everybody and found out what their talents were and what their interests were and he proposed to design a course to accommodate everybody's interests plus what he wanted to do. When he presented the first course plan to change this five-year course which we'd all worked on for eighteen years – well, had been there since the beginning – we were absolutely shocked. He wanted to have a three-year academic course without any drawing at all, followed by a two-year professional course. No way! You can't create an architect with a course like that. And there was opposition. And I have to say that many of the staff who were silent looked upon me to lead the opposition to this proposal by this new professor. We were horrified. And I did, and I opposed it. I couldn't see how this new course could turn out a responsible, high-quality architectural graduate.

What happened then was stubborn David wouldn't move. There was a standoff for eighteen months. Following a summer break David Sanders came back and said, 'I'm going to make an alteration to the plan that I proposed before', and one of the major things he proposed at that time was to allow students from the second year of the first three-year degree to transfer directly into the professional course provided they had a credit standard; and that the second course, instead of being a two-year course, would be a three-year course. Now, when he, having been so stubborn and holding, made this move, I thought, 'Well, personally, he's made a move to accommodate our opposition. I don't think we're ever going to win any more. We're not going to go back to the old five-year course, so I will support David'. And that was probably the most wonderful decision I ever made, because David and I became very close friends and David as a friend had a shortcoming: that was he hated administration. (laughter) And the relationship that we established was that – because I liked administration, I could do that stuff standing on my head – David told me what he wanted to achieve, I wrote the rules, regulations that would achieve those objective, and that was how we worked together. And we became very, very close friends, so much so that his family invited myself and Albert Gillissen to be pallbearers at his funeral, which I still think was a wonderful measure of the closeness of that relationship that I had with David. And subsequently my second wife, Doris, formed a close relationship with Doreen Sanders, David's wife, and the family became very close to my second wife, Doris.

Derrick, might I just ask you something?

Yes.

The way I understand and you've described Professor Jensen's era is that he was *the* Professor, if you understand what I'm saying –

Yes.

– in the old mould.

The god professor.

Yes, that's what I'm getting at.

Yes, he was a god professor. Well, all the professors in the University in 1958, when I arrived, were god professors.

What I'm moving to is that it seems to me, from what I'm getting up to this point, from my own research, is that when David Saunders comes on board it is not the same type of god professor image that he wishes.

No.

He wants, as you've said, to have people involved with their strengths and abilities –

Yes.

– and it seems to me to become much more of a team effort. I'm not saying that you didn't all contribute, of course you did, under the early times; but David willingly wanted you involved, if that's the way of putting it.

Yes. I'll just make a couple of comments here. Jensen made the assumption that every staff members could teach everything, and when he was designing the teaching loads if you were given a class to teach interior design – 'But I've never taught that in my life!' – 'Well, you're going to now.' He expected you, as a competent architect, to be able to teach anything that you were given and the staff (laughs) just had to knuckle under because he was the boss. We survived. For my part, thought, with David Sanders and what *he* wanted me to do with building science, he virtually destroyed the course that I built up with the old RIBA view of the way in which building science should be integrated into an architect's education. In the first degree of David Sanders's course he wanted me to teach building science as an academic subject and I was horrified at this because I was teaching building science

as an applied subject, which is what was needed in practice. And we talked it through and he said, 'Well, I want you to spend a whole term' – and subsequently it became a semester – 'on one topic'. So he said, 'What are you going to choose?' And I thought about it and I thought, 'Well, building materials and water'. That's what I developed as a course, because building materials and water are one of the most important things in relation to building, and you can teach everything. But it had to be academically taught. What I did, because I was worried about the calibre of students' science background coming into such a course – in the second year, by the way, not the first year, in the second – was that they wouldn't have enough grounding. So I prepared some notes on preliminary learning for building science, which involved the study of water, like the old sort of Christmas party tricks of a needle floating on blotting paper in a glass putting pepper on the meniscus of water and then one drop of dishwashing liquid in the centre and the stuff moves out to the edge, and then asking the students (a) to observe and (b) to explain what was going on.

One of the most interesting things that arose in preparing for this course with the study of water was capillarity. I had always been under the impression that the finer the capillary tube the greater the amount of suction that took place and the higher up the vertical walls. It's wrong. I went back to 1880, 1890 physics books looking at capillarity in those days and I realised that what I'd been taught, what I understood, what the textbooks were saying was all wrong. In fact, it's pressure that forces the water up, not suction up. So being caused to study something academically meant you'd made a personal discovery (laughs) which you didn't know about.

How to teach building science and applied science academically was a challenge I didn't enjoy, but I thought, 'Well, what can I do?' In a second-semester course I decided to look at building science history and give the students work to do on Sabine and the history of acoustics and how reverberation time first came into play by Sabine's work for his own PhD in America. I looked at the power law of physics as distinct from the Weber–Fechner law. I looked at discomfort glare. I set one student a project to look at the lighting standards in America compared with lighting standards in Europe and Britain and to work out why the American lighting standards required ten times more light than the British and the European standards. Trying to teach an applied science academically I didn't find easy, I must say. To me I wasn't

teaching something or I wasn't encouraging students to study work that in my view was as directly applicable as before, and I don't think it was helping this business of teaching students how to learn about stuff.

May I go back to the Jensen course? One of the successes I believe I had with the Jensen course was when I went in to see him fairly early in the piece, be about 1963, saying to him, 'I don't want to set an examination in final-year Building Science'. 'Oh? Why not?' I said, 'I'd much prefer them to do a research project for me'. I said, 'If you think about these students, they've been in the University five years. Other students are in the second year of their master's degree and doing research, so – – –.' 'All right, but make sure the standards are high.' Which was reasonable – I mean, I was interested in high standards. And what I created was this: any student could put up a proposition to me that he would do research in any field that they liked, *any* field that they liked, provided it involved measurement or observation and deduction and application in an architectural or town planning context. And they could do what they liked. Okay, I met some interesting problems. Rod Lawrence, for example – who is a very bright spark these days, he runs a brilliant course in Switzerland in building construction, he's United Nations Adviser on Housing, a very bright student – he came along and he wanted to do something on, from memory, vision and what it is people *see* in architecture. And I said, 'Well, how are you going to do that?' He said, 'I'm going to write a questionnaire'. And I said, 'No, you're not'. 'What do you mean? How am I going to get the information?' And I said, 'Well, the questionnaire is not just something you're going to write; it is something you're going to design. The questionnaire is a scientific instrument you're going to use to measure what it is you're going to look at, and you can get off down to Flinders University and talk to the Visual Arts Department down there about how you would design a questionnaire; then you can come back, then you can do the project'. And this is the way in which each individual student had to be dealt with or handled.

I'll tell you another illustration. A student comes up, and a kind of emotive student. 'Well, what would you like to do?' I won't tell you his name because it could be embarrassing, but he's quite well-known (laughs) around Adelaide. 'What would you like to do?' And the arm starts playing around like a windmill: 'Ur-ur-urban design.' Oh, yes? I know immediately that I'm going to have to

squeeze, squeeze, squeeze, because you can't do a Building Science project on urban design. So after about an hour of squeezing – which wasn't easy, but every case is an individual and you have to work the project that they're going to do in terms of the student's interest but also in terms of your judgment of the student's capacity to deal with it – and I squeezed this 'urban design' fellow down to the public seat. 'Come back in a week's time and tell me what you think.' So a week's time he comes back and he's all enthusiastic. He says, 'I've been looking at people sitting at bus stops.' 'Oh, yeah? What have you found?' He said, 'They don't sit square on the seat; they sit at forty-five degrees looking at the direction where the bus comes from'. So I said, 'Well, that's observation, that's good. Now, what else?' And he didn't get much further than that so I had to make suggestions to him. I said, 'Well, look, this is your final research project in a school of architecture. You've got to enjoy it, you've got to go and look, use your eyes. Consider the public seat as a piece of sculpture, a work of art'. 'Oh, yeah, yeah!' 'Consider the public seat as a meeting place.' 'Oh, yeah, yeah! Social. Oh, yeah.' 'Consider the public seat as a bed.' 'Oh, you mean when the tramp – – –?' 'Yeah, when the tramp lies on it. Consider the public seat as a restaurant where people have a meal. The totality of your urban design project is there in that one object. That's your topic.' Very satisfied student. But each individual student had to have individual treatment to give them something they could fulfil.

Doug Alexander of Flight Path[?] –

Oh, yes, yes, I know Doug.

– he did a project on door handles, and he, if you like, pioneered the use of videotape the way in which people and the hand gripped doorknobs and lever handles and so on. He was actually achieving for me exactly what I wanted them to do: (bangs table for emphasis) learn how to look, learn how to observe, which is what science is all about and obviously a basic talent.

If I could step back, in between the two professors I was the Head of Department and Dean of Faculty, and one of the responsibilities was selecting students for honours. And this particular year I was faced with a problem as Dean because no staff member would offer to take any honours course. 'We've got enough teaching to do, we don't need to do any more.' And they had a dozen students who were

going to do honours, and in the Jensen course it was four years, the fourth year and the fifth year. So I went along to the students in the fourth year and said, 'Well, I'm very sorry, I haven't got any staff to offer honours courses to you and, as it's got to start next week, I'm going to have to take them myself, and the only course I have – because I can't prepare special courses for you – the only course I have available is Climate and Architecture. And the way in which I teach Climate and Architecture is I use Marston Fitch's *Scientific American* article about what he calls "Primitive architecture" and which I prefer to call "Preliterate architecture", and I will assign a Preliterate architecture topic to each of you and each of you will make a presentation on that Preliterate architecture. So you might have Java, you might have Japan, you might have Finland, you might have Mexico and so on'. And I said, 'That may not be what you want to do, but', I said, 'look, you do that for me this year, we'll bind it all together in a nice folder and it can go into the shelf in the book room, the Department's resources room, and next year when you come back in fifth year I'll still be your honours supervisor; I'll let you do anything you want'. We had a wonderful year in fourth year and they produced a wonderful document about Preliterate architecture of each of these different places, and I think they got a kick out of it.

They came back into fifth year, sat down with them, 'Now, what do you want to do?' And Andrew Davis said he wanted to do colour; somebody else said they wanted to do whatever they wanted to do; and I can't remember this other student's name but his father was a reader in the Institute of Technology and he was a very bright cookie student, he said, 'I want to study hypnosis and architecture'. I said, 'What?' He said, 'I want to study hypnosis and architecture'. 'Why?' He said, 'Well, I'm interested'. 'W-w-w-well, I can't supervise *that*!' 'Yeah, but you promised we could do anything we liked.' 'Yeah, I *know* I promised that, but I thought you were going to come back with a subject that I'd be able to supervise.' 'Well, I really want to do hypnosis and architecture.' 'What's the connection?' And he told me a story about a man, major in the American army, who had been damaged having been a prisoner of war by the North Koreans and he'd now come back, he was in hospital, and how as part of the treatment for his recovery the psychiatrists had hypnotised him, sat him in front of a window and said, 'Look, we know you're good at watercolour painting. There's an easel, there's your watercolours, paint the

scene outside the window; but you're under hypnosis'. And the major did this, and then under hypnosis next time they placed him in front of the window they said, 'And today we want you to paint the view through the window in the past'. And the next time they placed him in front of the window, 'We want you to paint the view through the window in the future'. And each of the paintings was different. Now, I don't know what the significance of that was to the psychiatrist, but this architecture student thought that there was benefit to him in actually studying these thought processes in terms of visualisation. Oh, gawd. 'Yeah, but you made a promise.' I said, 'Well, give me twenty-four hours to think about it.' 'Yeah, but remember you did promise.' It was brutal.

So the next day, having thought about it, I thought, 'Oh, gawd, what am I going to do? Keep my promise? Got to keep my promise'. So when we met again as a class the next day I said to him, 'I'm going to give you permission to study hypnosis and architecture'. 'You are?' 'Yep. But I won't be supervising you.' 'Well, who will?' 'The Professor of Psychiatry will be supervising you.' I'd spoken to Izzy Polovsky[?] –

Yes, Izzy.

– and he had agreed to supervise the student. And the student was dumbfounded. His bluff had been called. But at the end of that semester, when we had the presentation by this student and Izzy Polovsky was with this seminar group, it was one of the most interesting presentations we've ever had. So again, following what I said before – privately, before the meeting – you never knock back a student's idea. If you can find a way of encouraging it, you always should.

Now, Derek, following from that, you pioneered this use of projects in the fifth year in the Jensen era.

Yes.

Did that carry over to David Saunders's era and beyond?

No. It died. That was my sadness, you see. There were some wonderful things that were done. For example, Andrew Russell[?], works at the Adelaide Town Hall: for his project he decided – this is the year I was away on study leave and Brian[?] Atkinson took over, and he knew what it was all about – and Andrew Russell had put

a proposition to him he would like to design a building science game, a card game, where you did something and there was the pack of cards for how you build a multistorey office block using these cards. So Andy Russell got a lot out of [this] because he had to look up how to design a game and what games are all about, so game theory. So that was useful.

What this fellow's name? Another student, a wonderful piece of work. This was a thermal project. His father had a garage where he could get access to soldering irons and resistors and things like that, and he actually created a piece of equipment which would show the transfer of heat going through a cavity wall and you could actually measure the transfer of temperature through the cavity wall.

One of the most interesting projects which continued over a period of time with these was the urban heat island over Adelaide. I'd learnt about that during my study leave at University College London in 1965, they had done a heat island study in London. And what they had done was they had driven a car round about two or three o'clock in the morning on radial paths across London and they had an instrument on the roof of the car and they recorded the temperature on the outskirts of London, all the way in, across London and out the other side, so they did these crossed paths. And I worked it out – I had the anemometer, we built a silver tube, fastened it to the roof rack and put the instrument inside it so it was protected from the sun, and had a student driving the car and a student in the back with the instruments recording the readings, recording the temperatures, and they drove from Gepps Cross to Darlington, passing West Terrace and at West Terrace that's where the Weather Bureau used to be. And so at eleven o'clock in the morning when they passed they had a time connection with what the temperature was for there, and you could adjust the data back to this, corresponding. Then the following year we had a student who went from Henley Beach through the town to the Adelaide Hills, and we had these graphs of temperature change across the city. Now, this one proved to be very interesting because the temperature rose and then dropped as you went to the little squares – Victoria Square – rose again when you were between the buildings, dropped again in the parklands. So this showed that the heat island effect was within the built area. And subsequently students actually studied the four squares, the little squares, and the big square. I'm sure they got a hell of a lot out of it.

But students did anything they wanted. If we had the equipment, they could go out and do it. Acoustics, they wanted to do acoustics, they could do acoustics. For example, the daughter of the Professor of Mechanical Engineering at the time, she wanted to look at noise through open doors.

Is that Susan, no?

Is it Susan?

Susan Shannon?

No. No, Susan Shannon's father was at Waite Institute.

Waite, of course he was. Yes, sorry.

No, this was Mechanical Engineering. Davis, Professor Davis. His daughter. She wanted to look at doors, and she did it actually in her father's offices over the weekend when it was quiet, and she had noise in a corridor and you could have the door half an inch, an inch, two inches, three inches, and see the effect of noise. Anything they wanted to do, they could do. Don't ask me where all the stuff's gone; I think it's been destroyed, which is very sad, because I thought there was some very interesting stuff there.

END OF DISK 1: DISK 2

This is the second session of an interview with Derrick Kendrick for the University of Adelaide School of Architecture History on the 9th July 2008, interviewer Rob Linn.

Derrick, you've spoken very clearly about the Jensen era and then the switch to David Saunders and how you were all startled by moving from a five-year, very structured degree to a three-plus-two and how David backed off a bit and did it two to three, as well.

Yes. It was a three-and-three.

Three-and-three.

Yes, with a second-year, first-degree transfer, yes.

How did that work out over time, that new degree?

The further aspect of David Sanders's course that really worried the daylights out of us was, for want of a better word, the 'side entry', and that is that you didn't have to come through the first three years of the Bachelor of Architectural Studies degree to

get into the second degree of Bachelor of Architecture; you could actually come in with *any* degree and undertake a qualifying year, whereby we would look at your first-degree knowledge, design a particular set of courses that you needed to take to augment your first degree, and that would then give you a graduate diploma – this is in the days before graduate diplomas – and you could then come into the course. And we didn't like that at all. But in honesty again this was another wonderful idea of David Sanders. Can you imagine a student with a degree in dentistry becoming an architect? Can you imagine somebody with a degree in German becoming an architect? Can you imagine somebody with a degree in music becoming an architect? Those are the degrees that were presented and accepted and moved into the professional Architecture course after having done the qualifying year for their particular cases, and many of them turned out to be the most wonderful students the School has ever had. The fellow with the degree in music has subsequently shown himself to be quite outstanding, winning RAIA prizes for energy-conservative architecture. Now, these deliberate changes by these few students that came in the special side entry, they've all turned out to be rather special.

One of the things that David Sanders did was to find ten thousand dollars to pay for a psychologist to look into motivation why people should come into the Architecture course, and this psychologist – I think his name was White – carried out interviews with students and prepared reports. I think the hope was that we would come out with some kind of formula that would guide us into how we could select students for the first degree course and then later how we could select students more for the second degree course, the professional architecture course. But the research that was done didn't get us very far down the track. I think the strongest piece of evidence was the degree of motivation the student had to want to do it, that was why they succeeded. There wasn't any other academic grounding that could be found. Which I thought was an interesting finding, even though we thought it was negative for the way we wanted to go from the point of view of selecting students into the course, because at this stage we are trying to select twenty-four students for the professional degree course but we have had an intake of thirty, forty, forty-five, fifty, seventy, into the first degree and the bottleneck is getting narrower. And how do you get into the second degree? Well, it's the top twenty-four, plus your side entry of five or whatever it was, making thirty. So you had the terrible job of telling students

who had done the first degree, 'Sorry, but you're not good enough to go on to the second degree, we don't have places for you'. Then we realised that this was bad, tactically. Students from Asia, for example, wouldn't come to Adelaide unless there was a guarantee that they could continue from the first degree into the second degree to get their architecture degree, which they wanted. They were vocationally-directed; they didn't give a damn about what the course was, they didn't see the academic first degree as having merit, they just wanted to be a practising architect, they were looking for a job. And so there was pressure from that.

But then there was also pressure from the Institute of Architects. As part of the original setup of the two-degree structure, in order to make room to do more of the studio work and design work, David Sanders decided to throw out all the professional practice work and things like specification, builder quantities, whatever, office management, all the stuff which was in the existing Jensen course for professional practice, that was turfed out. 'The profession should teach it', says David Sanders. The profession took two years to decide, 'We don't have the capacity to teach it; *you*'ve got to teach it, and if you don't teach it we're going to take your recognition from you'. And so David Sanders was faced with this awful problem of having to call back students who had already graduated to do Professional Practice courses, in order to get a supplementary qualification where the University of Adelaide degree that they had obtained was going to satisfy the registration board. So that was again a mess to be sorted out, and so we now had the squeeze the professional practice into this three-year course.

Well, then the next pressure was that we are the only six-year architecture course in Australia, the University is only funded for five years, you've got to reduce your course from six years to five years. And the only way you could do that was to shift the first year of the professional course into the third year of the first degree in some way, shape or form, which destroyed the concept of the first degree.

Let me take a moment to say something about the first degree which even the University School of Architecture doesn't seem to appreciate. Certainly at the time when the two-degree structure was introduced the careers officers at secondary schools didn't really understand what we were doing and why we were doing it or what it was all about, even though we tried to get through to them. Consider the David Sanders course: in the first year of four subjects, second year of three

subjects, third year of two subjects, you had to do one of your first-year subjects outside the Faculty. That was us demanding that our students be exposed to another part of the University rather than this sort of closed shop of the School of Architecture. Secondly, you could do half your course in the first year, second year and third year outside the Faculty with the compulsory courses in the other half. And so that was what David Sanders wanted to encourage. So we had students who began to nibble towards taking this stuff. Whilst they could also take stuff in the School, like they could do the core half, they could take Architectural History in the School, they could take Art History and Appreciation in the School, they could do other things in the School like Building Science or Building Construction, we were trying to encourage them to take subjects in addition to the core subjects outside the Faculty. We had some who experimented with Architectural Studies/Japanese, Architectural Studies/Psychology, Architectural Studies/Economics, Architectural Studies/Commerce. The most interesting one, from my point of view, was a fellow who took Architectural Studies/Geology, and he took my strand of Building Science. The end of second year I had an outside lecturer who came in to lecture about graffiti and the removal of graffiti from stonework or concrete work or brickwork, and he said, 'Look, I'm looking for somebody to come and assist me during the coming vacation. We've got this new product that helps to remove stuff. Have you got anybody?' So I pushed this Architectural Studies/Geology student towards him and he worked with this company, and that company actually kept him; and even when he graduated after his first degree they had him for five years, because of his geology knowledge. And he suddenly decided to up sticks and he shifted from Adelaide to Sydney, he set up a business in Sydney and he is the number one adviser on the selection of building stones for new buildings in Sydney – which is exactly what the David Sanders course was all about.

But let's take that concept just a step further, which people don't do, even in the University: this was such a wonderful course that the individual could design their own course. *Design* their own course. The concept of the person that's going to enrol in the course, the person that's going to pay the money with international students, actually designing their own course, designing their own career, designing their own future, in a world where security of tenure of a job is no longer sure, where the only way to go is to create a special niche for yourself for your own career: this

course was so avant-garde that it's bypassed people's thought processes that they could do this. But that fellow who took the geology was an illustration of how it would work, where society would be provided with entirely new types of people. I mean if you think about it, the change which has occurred over the last thirty or forty years of mixed degrees as the only way to go forward – it's certainly happened in the science faculties and the engineering faculties – but in those days, we're going back thirty years, in those days this was outstanding forward thinking of the way in which a university – not a technical college; a university – would provide society with new kinds of talent, new kinds of people, for tomorrow's problems. Not today's problems, not yesterday's problems, but tomorrow's problems. And individuals could design their own course.

It's interesting, Derrick, to think that in a sense you were opposed to it in the first instance.

Absolutely. Absolutely. Because it was the destruction of the beliefs that I personally had with the Jensen course. It was only after David Sanders – he's only lived eight years; sad –

Yes, very.

– after David Sanders has died, and we get the appointment of Tony Radford. That's an interesting story in itself. I don't want to get too far down the track. Sometime we want to talk about students, but let's talk about the Radford thing now.

Yes.

When David Sanders died, I think everybody, so far as they were able to, had reasonably settled into this new course. We'd each been given new roles, new duties, new responsibilities, and we'd either accepted them or not. For example, Zig Kapelis had been given the opportunity of developing a course in first year called Visual Communication, and Zig had done his best in that but it hadn't really caught on academically, so to speak, and Zig much preferred to be in a studio anyway, and so that course faded out of the choices. There were other things – Building Construction was there and that faded out and got subsumed into the core subjects. Building Science faded out, that got subsumed into the core subjects. The third year of the original Bachelor of Architectural Studies course of David Sanders, the core

subject was one half of the year's work; and, as David Sanders saw it, this was the pulling together of everything in a global sense – not a house sense or an office building sense, a global sense. And the first year that David Sanders took that course, to demonstrate to himself and to others what he wanted to do, he took these Bachelor of Architectural Studies students up to Leigh Creek and he had all the experts of government that were involved in Leigh Creek giving talks and lectures to the students so that the students would have an idea of everything that was involved in the design, planning and use of a new town like that. So he was trying to do the big picture. Subsequent staff who were allocated that responsibility, they couldn't handle it. They didn't have the breadth of knowledge and understanding that David Sanders – – –. A big surprise to me, because he was an architectural historian interested in art, interested in heritage; but he was able to handle this urban planning stuff, this urban design stuff. It was rather good.

So when Radford came we had a choice of three or four different people and I was Dean at the time and I went on leave and I told Stefan Pikusa, who took over from me, 'That's the person we want, not the others', and in my view he was able to get Tony Radford. Why did I and Stefan think that he was the guy we wanted and not the other applicants, who were quite talented people, I must say? I'll tell you who they were if you're interested.

I think I know.

Judith Brine –

Yes.

– who was also up at the same time for the chair in Perth and the chair in Canberra and she eventually made the choice of the chair in Canberra; she didn't get the Adelaide one, which she wanted. Rob Cheeseman –

Yes.

– and Boris Kazansky[?].

Yes.

Very good competition. But Tony Radford was different, in my view, and I have no regrets in saying to the Council that that was the guy that I thought we wanted. Jensen all his time had wanted to get computers into Architecture, but he hadn't got

very far. David Sanders wasn't into that at all and individuals might have had Hollerith punch card technology with Wang computers, like Brian Atkinson and Deborah White, but when Tony came we actually had a fellow with a doctorate in computing science having come through the leading school of architectural science with ....., who subsequently took over from Professor Cowan when Cowan retired, as a lead in the architecture and design science field in computing. And we had a product of that school of architecture with a background in architecture and planning from Edinburgh and Newcastle, I think. And the world was moving into computers, and so David Sanders was appointed and I think (laughs) we were all rather pleased when he said, 'I'm very satisfied with the existing course; I don't want to change it. I'm going to change it bit by bit'. And I think we all breathed a sigh of relief, we didn't want to go through all this business again.

The thing about Tony Radford is that I think I should tell you that two or three years ago – no, let's go back; about 1986, when Judith Brine was Head of Department between the two professors, the Department was asked to be reviewed, and so Judith Brine apparently argued that instead of having an external review we could do our own internal review.

Yes.

And there is a document –

Yes, I know.

– that deals with that. And I thought that was a pretty good document when it was finally completed. And so we did our own review and that satisfied the University, and there hasn't been a review since, as far as I know; can't remember one, anyway.

I think so, I think there may have been. But anyway, that's all right.

I don't remember. But anyway, two or three years ago, the University decided to have an external review of the School of Architecture and they got this fellow from Queensland to chair the meeting, they got a professor of architecture from MIT[2] and they got a professor of landscape architecture, a woman from Monash University. But the professor from Queensland, Kinnegar [?] I think his name was, I'd met him

[2] MIT - ???

when he was a lecturer when I was a head of school and meeting at a heads of school thing, when we went to Brisbane for that, and he was just a wise guy. Accepted by the locals. And in the interim he'd not only become Head of Architecture in Queensland, he'd then become, would you believe, Dean of the Faculty of Architecture and Engineering. And he was not accepted by a number of the engineers: 'What do *you* know about my field of engineering?' And so apparently he had a meeting with the nano-electrical engineers to try and convince them that he knew enough to be able to act as the dean of *their* work as well as anybody else's work, and he was able to convince them that the word 'architecture' also applied to the architecture of nanotechnology, and so he got them on-side. Well, in my view he's just a bighead. And he came in for three days with these two other professors and they ransacked the school – as you can in three days – and picked up bugger all – as you can in three days – and I attended a meeting which they had called for the professions in the evening, the day before they were going to present their report. The meeting was attended mostly by landscape architects, who were concerned – and quite rightly – by the terrible Landscape Architecture course, terrible because it didn't have the staff – was too simple, no staff, it's the Town Planning story all over again – and one or two senior architects, including David Parkin, who's now the CEO for the RAIA – I should say 'AIA' now.

And this fellow Kinnegar, he lambasted Tony Radford publicly. Tony wasn't there. And I thought, 'That's terrible'. So that night I came home, I spoke to Doris, I said, 'Look, I'm going to have to ring Tony. I can't have him going into the public meeting tomorrow not being forewarned that this bastard is going to crucify him publicly for the way in which Tony Radford runs the school. He hasn't a clue'. So I rang Tony and I warned him, as best you can tell somebody that they're going to be crucified. It's not an easy thing to do, but because I have respect for somebody like David I thought it was the only honest thing to do. And he was crucified.

Why am I going on like this? Well, the thing is that Tony Radford is a completely different kind of person. He runs the School differently from other people. Yes, he has the title of Professor of Architecture, but his name is not Jensen, his name is not Sanders; his name is Radford. And he doesn't sit on the top of the pyramid and, like Jensen, send down the tablets of stone as to how you shall run the world. Tony Radford runs the Department from behind. If a staff member, like Susan Caldicott,

has an idea, he listens, he hears and he encourages and he supports, and they go for it. And what Susan Caldicott did for the staff was she got to know about something that was going on at University of Newcastle in New South Wales. University of Newcastle's School of Architecture in New South Wales had a new professor there, I forget his name, and they had decided that the medical faculty had a model of teaching which could be applied sensibly in architecture. And the model that the medical faculty in University of New South Wales had was of projects. And so the way in which the medical students learnt was through case histories, case studies. That, when applied in the Newcastle School of Architecture by a fellow named ..... and one or two others, was what Susan Caldicott latched onto. She brought that into the School; Tony encouraged that to go forward; and the whole of this old Bachelor of Architectural Studies course was now recast into a Bachelor of Design Studies using this work of case studies and projects and problem-solving, and that's what this Radford School of Architecture was now doing and pioneering fifteen, twenty years ago – fifteen years ago, anyway. Twenty years ago. And that was its contribution. It was a leader in problem-solving teaching in Architecture.

And yet two or three years ago the School gets clobbered. I made one protest comment at the meeting when we had a chance to speak. I said, 'How do you square the fact that this School of Architecture, only two years ago, was awarded a prize of twenty-five thousand dollars as being the best department in the University, as assessed by the University? That doesn't square with what you're saying'. 'Oh, that doesn't count.' Just brushed off as unimportant.

So when the report came through from this mob, these three, mainly Kinnegar, we have a situation of I think forty-three things that are wrong with the School and I, as a visiting research fellow, can attend but have chosen not to, but now I did decide, 'I'm going to sit in on the Department meetings dealing with the treatment of this report'. And the leadership of Tony Radford in dealing with this external devastation of the School that he had created – and which wasn't his problem – he worked the oracle beautifully. Nobody was prepared to take on the headship of the School of Architecture. David Jones, as the Head of School and Dean of Faculty, had collapsed under the load: you can't teach a Landscape Architecture course of his academic standard – and David Jones is very good – and do the deanship and do the Head of Department; it's a two-person job, it's not a one-person job, which I did tell

David Sanders that. He collapsed. It's a two-person job, not a one-person job. I don't know how the hell Nancy's going to survive or how long she'll survive, but it's too much in my view. But anyway, they brought in Kowalick. Wonderful choice. Wonderful man. And he held the School together until Nancy was appointed; and Nancy arrived, as you know, beginning of last year. That was step number one, getting a second chair in the Department. That was the recommendation number one.

Recommendation number two, if you read this report – you've probably got it; have you? – bring in skilled external designers. There's a bit of background here, and that is that in a university school of architecture, where the order of the day is research, research, research and teaching takes second place, that doesn't fit with a school of architecture where studio work is the dominant element of a professional architect's – graduate to become a practising architect. You can't teach it by lectures; you only teach it by the act of doing studio work, design. Academic staff cannot get promotion by being design staff; they can only get promotion by being academic staff, which is a different kind of person. We tried, for a time, to work the oracle the same way the Music Faculty does with performance staff – trumpet players, flute players, harpists, you name it. How do they satisfy the academic mould? And we tried to get design into that kind of category. Very, very difficult. You produce a set of drawings or something, but it's more than that. How can you judge music when it's written on a piece of paper? You judge music – unless you're analysing ancient scripts – it goes through the ear, it's feelings. Design's the same thing: it's feelings, it's emotion, that's what you're talking about.

So I don't think we succeeded in getting design staff recognised as designers. So they stayed on the Architectural History side, they stayed on the Islamic Architecture side, they stayed in the Engineering/Building Science side. They didn't operate in the – – –. So the School is devoid, short of highly-skilled design staff – performers, if you like. They're all competent, but they're not highly-skilled. Nancy – surprise, surprise, don't know how it happened – she bumped into Hijjas bin Kasturi, a student that I taught way back in 1958, and Kasturi stayed in the School of Architecture for four years, along with another lady, Ling Su Mae[?], who married Mr Ong, Senior, who subsequently became the President of Singapore and died, and his younger brother, also an Ong – I can't remember his name – but I think he's also died. But

Ling Su Mae stayed, but Kasturi and a group of Malaysian students, they left the school and they went to Melbourne and they graduated in Melbourne. Nancy found out about him and actually visited Malaysia and she brought him back and she got him a doctorate, she got him an appointment as a visiting professor, and this is the second of the Kinnegar recommendations: bring in talented staff.

Personally – and I don't want to denigrate Kasturi – but I don't think his architecture holds together, in *my* terms. It's artistic architecture, which is not my forte, it's not my beliefs. I mean, at the time when the Sydney Opera House succeeded in capturing the world's attention I am saying, 'It's the biggest disaster for architectural education that it could possibly have been'. Why? Because when you cut the cake the building science application is a distortion of the correct application of building science. What do I mean by that? Building science can enable an architect to build an igloo, an ice igloo, in the tropics and make it work. That's the misuse of science and engineering. Complete misuse. Just because you can do it doesn't mean it's right. It's wrong to do that. I'm not talking in terms of energy conservation and sustainability and all that stuff; I'm just talking about the basic principles that stuff should be applied properly and correctly. And the Sydney Opera House is a disaster. Wonderful imagination, wonderful piece of sculpture for that site, but that's only a part of architecture; it's the blending of all of that with the science and the acoustics and so on. It's just a hotchpotch. And I'm not saying that Kasturi's architecture's like that, but I'm just saying it doesn't move along the direction that I've always thought – I've never got anywhere with it because it's too difficult a concept for most architects to handle. Most, not all, most. So where was I?

You were at the second part of Kinnegar's recommendations.

Oh, yes. I forget what the third one was. But I think that in the Radford period you have this person who is completely different, works from behind. Nancy is more works from the top, older-fashioned. I've spoken to Tony and he is very happy with Nancy as a colleague and that's good, and I'm sure the School will benefit from having a dual head, as it were, and I think that for the time being at least we've got a few more extra staff.

When I retired fifteen years ago the student-to-staff ration was eleven to one. It's eighteen or nineteen to one now. When I retired we had sixteen or seventeen full-time staff; we have eight or nine or ten now. When I retired the School was about three hundred students; they're proposing to move to about four hundred and twenty, four hundred and fifty. I think the life of a staff member today is appalling in relation to what it should be for a university, and with the demands not just on teaching but on research performance and on professional performance, very difficult.

Now, Derrick, before I have to go would you like to talk about students, please –

Oh, yes.

– because they've come in and out of your talk the whole time, of course.

Okay, okay, okay. Students have changed over the years. Earlier when I was speaking about 'Bohemia' I got it wrong: it was 'Hobohemia'. The students of those days seemed to have more time for other activities other than their academic studies, and I think that that broadens the quality of the product that the university put out. I've heard stories about University of Cambridge from a colleague of mine, Professor Tom Bell, who was a senior lecturer in chemistry here, he became a professor at Simon Fraser University in British Columbia. When he was at Cambridge he joined the Mountaineers' Club, and before you were accepted in the Mountaineers' Club you were given a map of Cambridge and you had to climb your way from this building onto that building, down those drainpipes, up those drainpipes, across that bridge, before you were allowed into the Mountaineers' Club. That's the immediate postwar student, reminiscent of the pre-World War II students and behaviour, particularly of these number one, two universities in Britain. Now, in the University of Adelaide in the School of Architecture there was quite a bit of quality of university life that was going on underground that we staff were not supposed to know about.

I told you how we had moved, we'd started in the Mechanical Engineering Building, southern end, second floor; we moved to the second floor of the Civil Engineering, west end; we then moved as well to the east end of the Civil Engineering Building and vacated the Mechanical Engineering Building; we then moved across a bridge into the Horace Lamb Building; and we vacated the eastern

end first, which was the staff and general office, and then we vacated the western end and finally occupied the Architecture Building, in that building. When we were occupying the second floor of the Civil Engineering Building – I think everybody would be horrified to learn this – there was a test that students had to do if they wanted to be part of the club, and that was to go out of the window onto the cornice and navigate the whole of the cornice around the whole of the Civil Engineering Building down to Frome Road and back into the building. That's an activity which is reminiscent of the Mountaineering Club in the University of Cambridge. For any other reason than daredevils.

There is a story of a complaint levelled by the Professor of Chemical Engineering, who lived at the eastern end of the building on the lower floors, of Architecture students. Apparently he'd got out of his car and he was chatting with somebody before he went into the building when a Coke bottle dropped from the cornice and landed nearby, and that was reported to the University Council and Jensen was up before the Vice-Chancellor, and as a result of that the studio hours were restricted. It was difficult enough to *gain* the studio hours in the first place in the university setting – as I said earlier, they never understood the concept of studio work – but now we were told by Jensen that we had to have one night a week and weekend duties in the studio to ensure that supervised students were on the campus so they wouldn't drop Coke bottles on professors of chemical engineering.

Okay. Another story about the students of this time, the early days, that very first cohort of students that went through – and you'll get more of this from Stefan Pikusa, no doubt – was the golf course. After a time, instead of having the Jensen benches and stools, the way they were neatly arranged in rows, the students were given freedom to arrange the studio the way they wanted to arrange it as a group. And so you would actually put one table on *top* of a table and had a table on top of the tables, and so students were designing their own spaces within the studio. Well, that then led to the golf course. So in the early hours of the morning, 'Come on, it's time for golf, fellas', and the studio would then be converted into a golf course. You know down on the old Woodville Road they had one of these comic puzzle golf courses?

Yes, I do.

Well, this was a kind of three-dimensional – not a two-dimensional one; a three-dimensional golf course that you could navigate with pipes and tubes and holes and pitching up onto tabletops and so on. That to me demonstrates a student vitality, a creativity, which ought to be a part of student life today. I don't think it is. Everything's too hygienic: safety, health and welfare. Everything's too neat and too insurance-concerned and so on.

I went back to teach – well, let's put it this way: they gave me a visiting research fellowship, which is renewable every two or three years, and they have done, so fifteen years since I retired. But they found it difficult to find somebody to teach surveying – land surveying and building surveying – and because I'd taught it they rang me up and said, 'Would you mind coming back and teaching surveying?' Well, I have to say I have never qualified to teach surveying, never. What happened to me was that this external professor who visited the University of Manchester when I was graduating and saw my drawings and chose me for his school of architecture also saw my marks for surveying and I got ninety-eight per cent for surveying. Why? Because I was just methodical and meticulous. So he told me I had to teach surveying when I was up in Glasgow, and that was on my CV when I came here and Jensen said, 'You've got to teach surveying here', and so it's dogged me all my life. I might have been trained as a municipal engineer in surveying, because there's a Department of Municipal Surveying in Manchester, but the kind of surveying that I teach is not that which is in the civil engineering surveying textbooks; it's a surveying for practising architects, and when in South Australia it was decided that you had to be qualified to do land surveying, and any land surveying had to be signed off by a land surveyor, that it became more important to teach architects the needs of architects for surveying, which is to get a rough approximation of a site so that you can do a sketch design on it, get the contract to do the job, then you employ the qualified person and get a proper survey done with all the details. So it doesn't matter if they're half an inch out or even two inches out in the levels or anything like that as long as you've got a rough idea of what's happening. So it's how to do that kind of surveying; how to take photographs, what you need to photograph; what information you can take from the site back to the drawing office so you can do your designs. So they called me back to do that.

And I think, just to finish off, when I meet these students, who of course have never seen this old codger with grey hair and a rounded back who's getting on in years they don't know what to expect. And I might start off something like this: 'Yes, I know what you're expecting. You're expecting the latest computer-oriented surveying lectures, and you're not going to get them from me. I'm old, I'm decrepit, and what I know is old-fashioned stuff. Of course, you want the modern stuff. I can't teach you the modern stuff. You just stick the tripod on the ground and the instrument levels itself, it almost takes the readings for you. You don't need teaching how to use that; you need teaching the basic principles of the subject, and that's what I'm going to give you. I'm going to make a promise to you: you're actually going to be able to write it on your CV when you've finished with my course, that you can actually do a little bit of surveying. It might get you a job. And what equipment are we going to use? Very old-fashioned equipment, even decrepit equipment.' 'Oh. Why are you going to teach us that?' 'Well, when you get your first job and you're in the architect's office and the architect says to you, "Go to the surveying store and get the equipment out, we're going surveying on the site today", and you open the cupboard, you'll find it's all this old-fashioned, old, decrepit stuff. Why? Because architects are not rich people and this is second-hand stuff they picked up and it's all old stuff. But at least you'll know what surveying's about when you finish this course'. And that's my sort of introduction.

And the second thing that they find as a surprise is that I don't think they've ever been treated as roughly (laughter) by anybody as they've been treated by me. Why roughly and why like that? Not that I hate them or anything like that; I've got a job to do. I used to teach a course of twenty-seven lectures a week and twenty-seven three-hour practicals a week. I'm now squeezed into teaching landscape architects in two days so that on the third day they can go and survey two sites for their first design projects. And in the case of architects I'm given six lectures and a couple of two-hour timeslots and then they all file in a bus or two buses and they go out to a site for their design project and there's sixty of them. The only way I know of teaching them is to be a bit military. 'Right, get the instruments. Get in line. Stand around. Pay attention. Stop bloody talking. You bighead.' You know. They've never been treated like this before. But you've got to move them. It takes twenty minutes to get the equipment into their hands, it takes me ten minutes to get down to

the site. You've got two hours. You've got an hour of time because you're going to take another half an hour to get all the bloody stuff back again. So it looks like two hours on the timetable; it's only one hour in practice. And of course the weather, that doesn't help. So I gave it up when I was seventy-six, which was five years ago, because I found I couldn't walk up hill and down dale, up hill and down dale in Wellington boots in the middle of July in cold conditions, supervising students that could be anything from a hundred to a hundred and fifty metres away from you because you break up the site and each do a bit. It was all too hard, physically, so that's why I retired. But I'm still alive mentally.

Derrick, I don't think there's any doubt about that.

You can come back again another time if you want some more.

Thank you so much, Derrick, that was wonderful. Thank you very much for giving your time.

That's okay.

END OF DISK 2: DISK 3

This is a session of an interview with Derrick Kendrick on the 9th July 2008, interviewer Rob Linn. This session is specifically about the planning content, planning part of the course in the Architecture School. Thanks, Derrick.

Right. Let's set the scene. When Professor Jensen was appointed Professor of Architecture, his brief was to set up the School of Architecture and subsequently to set up a course in town planning. And so 1959, when the Faculty was created, it was called the Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning. The School of Architecture course is described elsewhere; I'll now talk about the Planning course.

Staffing of the School of Architecture and the Planning course was always going to be difficult because the University didn't understand the concept of studio work teaching, which in Architecture course is essential. Thus, when Jensen came to set up the Town Planning course, he had to consider the availability of the existing staff, because he wasn't going to get any additional staff, and their workloads. And so, whilst there was a full-time course of Master of Town Planning established, the first course to be created was the part-time course over three years, followed by a thesis. It wasn't just a dissertation; it was a thesis. Whereas other master degrees with a coursework degree and a dissertation, this was a coursework degree *followed* by a

thesis. And the thesis subsequently became the problem and the big issue. So we have Professor Jensen as Professor of Architecture, a dominant teacher, teaching Architecture in the Architecture course and is the dominant leader and teacher of Town Planning in the Planning course. But for the Planning course he gets subjects for the Planning course taught by the Faculty of Economics, Faculty of Science with Professor Boyd from Geology, the Faculty of Law and other experts around the campus and around the city. Transport Engineering was taught by Pak Poy and the like. Now, this is the part-time course.

The students in the first cohort were very eminent people in the community, and indeed one of the early graduates, John Roder, because Judge Roder and the first judge of the Planning Commission. Another product was Mr Hutchinson, who became a commissioner, and Ita Buttrose, who became a commissioner as well. So very important people in the community were being created by this course.

Stroma Buttrose.

Stroma Buttrose, not the TV.

Not the *Women's Weekly*.

That's right. Forgive me, Stroma.

In 1970 the course had been going and so on and 1970 I was Dean of Faculty and I had some interesting decisions to take. Should I accept into the Town Planning course a lady with a degree in French and English? No background even remotely associated with planning or engineering or anything to do with that. So I decided to accept this lady. I won't mention her name, but she's turned out to be a very worthwhile choice and they were very glad in retrospect that I did decide to accept her. But the most difficult one of all was when a reverend in the Methodist Church wanted to join the course and whether I would accept a degree in theology as an acceptable background for a degree in the Planning course. I did in fact accept this person. His argument was he wanted to study planning so that he could advise his church on the place to locate churches, which is a very reasonable argument, I thought. I don't think Professor Jensen was too pleased (laughter) when he got back that I'd made this decision, but it's what you do.

But that same year, 1970, when Jensen was on study leave, he was in Edinburgh and in Edinburgh he met a lecturer there by the name of Dr John Brine and

subsequently, when Jensen got back, he advertised the now-vacant position of reader – it had been vacated by Gilbert Herbert, a South African architect of some merit who had left the School to become the first ever professor of architecture in Tel Aviv in Israel – so the vacant position was advertised and Dr John Brine was appointed the Reader in Architecture and Town Planning. John Brine had a background training as an architect educating architects in Melbourne, and he also brought the benefit of his wife, Judith Brine, who joined the School as a lecturer in Architecture and subsequent senior lecturer, and then she became Head of School and Dean of Faculty before moving on to become Professor of Architecture at the Canberra School of Architecture. But when Dr John Brine arrived, for the first time Jensen had somebody who could now be responsible for running the Town Planning course, and Dr John Brine decided that the course which Jensen had accepted and which had been accepted by the British Royal Town Planning Institute as well as the Australian Planning Institute needed to be updated, and so he created an entirely new course which was given the new name, instead of Master of Town Planning it was Master of Urban and Regional Planning, and widened the scope of the title. As before, it was to be offered as a full-time course and a part-time course, but we didn't have the staff to offer it as a full-time course. And at this stage we did get one more staff member, Santiago Ortusa, a Chilean who had done his town planning qualifications at Edinburgh with John Brine, and he became a colleague of John Brine's in that area.

The first course, the Master of Town Planning course, ran its three years and students that had passed through the coursework now started their theses, and by 1967 only one student had completed the thesis component and graduated Master of Town Planning and that was Arnold Sichsner[?].

'77?

'67.

'67?

Yes. Course started '63 –

Oh, yes, sorry.

– and '67 Arnold Sichsner. The second person to graduate was David Eaver[?], who was an interesting case because we had to get passed through Senate a special new

rule in the degree regulations permitting the University to accept him. Why? Because David Eaver didn't have a prior degree. He had a diploma of a plain course from Liverpool that Jensen knew about, and Jensen knew that David Eaver's background was such that the only reason he hadn't got his degree was because way back under the rules of the University of Liverpool he hadn't done a university subject in a foreign language – French or German or Russian or what have you – and that was the only reason his qualification was a diploma and not a degree. So Jensen knew that he was fully-qualified to take the course. And David Eaver graduated with his MTP degree doing a study of the River Murray.

Now, it became something of a problem that the three years allowed for undertaking the thesis expired or was about to expire for all these senior members of the planning community who hadn't got their degree. And so the University Council, in its wisdom, decided to extend the time, and special pressure was put of these people to be assisted, because Jenson was the only supervisor and he's being pulled in all directions and he couldn't supervise them all properly. I seem to recall that Pak Poy's thesis was to be how to restrict the growth of Adelaide. I don't know whatever came of that; of course, that hasn't happened historically anywhere. But we now have John Brine taking over the Master of Town Planning course, thesis graduates, and now putting on a part-time Master of Urban and Regional Planning course with the assistance of Santiago Ortusa; and, as was the way of those days, the University saw – and we saw – postgraduate student growth as the way to go. And indeed the Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning thought that this was the way to go and, having made claims for additional staff, it assumed that the University would also see it that way and the Staff Development Committee would see it that way and that if we took on the extra students we would get the extra staff. Can you believe it that a hundred and ten students were enrolled? Only two existing staff plus Jensen, plus David Eaver who has now come on the staff as Architecture staff, available to teach and supervise this Master of Urban and Regional Planning course and to supervise all these masters' theses. It's probably inevitable that, having not got the additional staff, that by 1975 things are becoming not too good on the part of the postgraduate students.

When you put it into context, about 1972 the students' voice in the University of Adelaide mirrored the Parisian riots of students in '67, '68, and 1972 the students sat

in the Vice-Chancellor's office and they raided the Council Chamber, now known as the ..... Room, and they made their voices known. And what happens is the University agrees that there shall be students elected to the Education Committee, there shall be students elected to the Council, and in 1978 the postgraduate students in the MURP course must have made a complaint to the student representatives and the Education Committee, and under an 'any other business' item the students complained to the Education Committee about the postgraduate students in the Faculty of Architecture not being properly supervised for their work. There's plenty of documentation about that in the Faculty minutes, in the Education Committee minutes, and one would think in the Council minutes.

What happened in 1975 is that I was due to go on study leave and in February Jensen told me that he was going to resign his position due to ill health. I accepted that because I knew, I'd witnessed something which had happened a few years earlier that I knew he had high blood pressure and so on. And at that stage I didn't know, and I don't [think] anybody else knew, that the rumblings of the volcano which was about to explode was going on. Jensen left the University in July 1975 and immediately thereafter there was a crisis in the Department and a crisis in the Faculty. Although it's a one-department faculty these are two separate, identifiable roles. The crisis in the Department was that who was going to be the Head of Department now Jensen had left, so as from the 1st August there needed to be a head of department. There was a Gillissen group, there was a John Brine group and there were the neutrals in between. I was overseas, I wasn't involved. What the Department decided to do was to put forward John Hipper as the neutral candidate and the University appointed him as the Head of Department. Albert Gillissen had been appointed by Jensen as the Dean so that Jensen handed over to somebody he thought was going to be responsible, and Albert Gillissen had planning qualifications and he thought better of it. I don't think that Jensen was entirely happy with his choice of reader, and that's why he chose Gillissen.

Now, when I come back from study leave in 1976 I immediately get a call from Deputy Vice-Chancellor Barnes: 'Look, we've just come back from a trip to Malaysia to Penang, we've been to Georgetown University of Science, Malaysia, and they've got a problem with their Building Science building. You've got to go immediately.' '..... .... come back from study leave.' 'No, you've got to go,

now.' 'Yeah, but – – –.' 'No, now! And when you're over there you can buy me this musical instrument duty-free on the way back.' (laughter) Vic Barnes was interested in music and he wanted this latest box of tricks. So I went to Penang for two weeks to sort out their problem.

If I could just have an aside for a moment on this problem, the problem was that the Head of the School of Architecture was an American with a degree in surveying, knew nothing about architecture. But he'd had drawings done by himself for a building science laboratory which was a two-storey building, and the drawings had been approved and this building was to be erected. The building had gone to tender and the lowest tender that had been accepted by the treasurer was that submitted by the treasurer's brother, who was a builder. The treasurer's brother was a builder in traditional Malaysian styles – kampong building – and so what it said on the drawings was being ignored and, instead of having nice rectangular columns of timber, when I got there there were tree trunks. Honestly, round tree trunks with the bark removed. And these were in place, and that was the problem that the Professor of Architecture with a degree in surveying had spoken to Vic Barnes about, and Vic Barnes had said, 'I'll get our Building Science fellow to come and sort out the problem for you'. So when I arrived (laughs) this was what I met. But as the fortnight went on it got even worse, because as it was two storeys they had cut out notches in the tree trunks for the horizontal members and then they had fitted them and concreted them in at the bottom with welded base plates and bolts, but they'd drilled the holes the wrong way and so the notch, instead of being on the outside, was now on the inside. And so they'd extended, they'd cut out another notch, so the column had now weakened to only a quarter of the timber.

Oh, dear.

And I'm wondering, 'How on earth do I deal with this?' You could see the politics of the situation, it was going to blow up in your face. On the Saturday morning – I'd given instructions, but on the Saturday morning I got up early, because I was flying out about midday, got up and went down about eight o'clock, nine o'clock in the morning, and I found that instead of doing as I'd said they'd actually started concreting in the centre columns, which were going up more for the pointy roof. And because I was suspicious I got a stick and I started to move away the wet

concrete – and had a flaming row with the labourers – couldn't speak a word of English – 'Stop that! Stop that!' 'Bugger off! Bugger off!' 'Stop that!' – I scrape away, and I find out that underneath the concrete the base of these columns are not in fact properly fitted into the welded plates and the bolts are not going through; in fact, the bolts were not bolted. So what the hell do you do in a situation like this? And I only had about an hour and a half before I was going to leave the town and catch the plane .... back home.

So I called an emergency meeting of everybody that I could, including a little Filipino lecturer in structural engineering, and I thought, 'The only way that I've got is to try and treat it the Asian way'. What's the Asian way? Well, the Asian way is nobody must lose face. How was I going to create the situation where everybody would do what they had to do and nobody would lose face? So I started off by telling them that, 'About three or four years from now – I'm a prophet, by the way – there is a newspaper, the *Georgetown Times*, and the headline on the page of the *Georgetown Times* says, "Building Science laboratory falls down", that is what I can see in the future'. Now, the reputation of this university, particularly as it's the Building Science building that's fallen down, is damaged forever. We cannot allow such a thing to happen. Now, I'm putting this building, which is completely defective, in the hands of this structural engineer for him to guide you in what must be done (a) to pull it down and (b) to build it properly so we don't get that newspaper thing and we've saved the face of the University. We must all pull together. I'm going to catch my plane now. Goodbye'. That's how I dealt with the situation. I don't know what happened, nobody ever told me, but it was a complete disaster.

Anyway, back into Adelaide and faculty meeting in February. And because I knew I asked the Dean, Albert Gillissen, 'Well, this report about the Education Committee and this complaint by the students about the MURP course and the MTP course and so on, what has the Faculty done about it?' 'Oh, well, the Faculty prepared the report.' 'Well, what did the Faculty say it wanted to do about it?' 'Ah, well, it's been taken out of our hands.' 'By whom?' 'By the University Council. University Council has established a committee to look into the whole matter.' 'And who's on that committee?' And I can't remember who was on it other than Hugh Stretton, and I've got a lot of respect for Hugh Stretton because he's one of the most clued-up university staff members I've ever known. Wonderful man. Anyway, I

said, 'Well, what has the Faculty done about dealing with the problem?' 'Well, nothing, really.' So I said, 'Well, you *should* have done something'. 'But we can't do anything now because it's in the hands of the University Council.' So the Faculty did nothing, effectively, about handling its own problem or calling – not John Brine entirely to explain.

But what then unfolded was rather awful. John Brine, in his efficiency approach for dealing with things, had created a form to be completed by external examiners of theses and dissertations and what have you, and most of the theses, if not all of the theses, went to a Professor Ledgar in University of Melbourne, with whom John Brine had a good relationship. I think it was Ledgar, not sure, don't want to malign the man. But within a week, sometimes, of a thesis being posted off it was back, and all this form had was ticks. It was as if the thesis arrived and the form was ticked off and posted back. And I'm not sure at the moment – I think it was a dissertation, not a thesis now at this stage, because it was realised that you can't have a three-year coursework degree and a three-year thesis for one degree. And there was a suspicion that the dissertation submissions were not being rigorously academically examined, and it was that that stuck in the craw of the university committee, and they decided that the Faculty of Architecture and Planning was not fit to be responsible in running such a course. And at the end of 1976 Albert Gillissen stepped down, I became Dean of the Faculty and it was my job to dismantle the School of Architecture course in Planning, with the help of the Registrar, Gerald Stephenson, who was wonderful. And it's a job that I disliked because you're pulling something apart that was important to be built all because there weren't sufficient staff, the Department had been let down in not getting the staff then tried to work out a system of handling the pressure. Hundred and ten students, postgraduate students, for goodness' sake. Now, it was a complete disaster. And it seems that quite often during my life in University of Adelaide I have this job of Atlas, has to go around with the bucket and spade brushing up the manure.

In that time – I'm just going to diverge for a moment – in that time, that time period, I think the University spawned many wonderful babies and then killed them off because it didn't follow through with what was required for them. The one that – in addition to the Planning course which we lost, the Library, they put forward a degree for a Master of Librarianship, the first course in Australia, and I thought,

'What a wonderful idea that this university could offer a Master of Librarianship with the skills of the Barr Smith Library staff, the facilities of the Barr Smith Library: absolutely wonderful'. They gave it birth and then they didn't fund it. Another wonderful idea that was lost.

But just to go back to finish off, by the end of the 1970s the Planning course was completely removed, no students remained, but by now of course David Sanders had arrived and because we didn't have a Town Planning course we talked it through, David Sanders and I, that, whilst the Institute of Technology – SAIT – had benefitted, now everybody that wanted a planning degree would have to go to *their* course, the University of Adelaide didn't want to lose a foot in the postgraduate camp, so to speak. And so the Faculty's name was changed to the Faculty of Architecture and Urban Design, where the words 'Urban Design' was David Sanders's idea of retaining a foot in the planning camp, so to speak. And interestingly enough, we're into year 2008, late last year the University of Adelaide approved the School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture putting on a course of Master of Planning (by research) – I forget what the titles are, but we are back in the field of planning, some thirty-odd years later. So it's an interesting cycle.

It is, Derrick.

END OF INTERVIEW.