Parnell S.

**Architecture's Expanding Field: AD Magazine and the Post-Modernisation of Architecture.**
*ARQ: Architectural Research Quarterly* 2018, 22(1)

**Copyright:**

**Link to Publisher website:**

**Date deposited:**

24/05/2018

# Architecture's Expanding Field:
## *AD* Magazine and the Post-Modernisation of Architecture

*Stephen Parnell*

London, May 1979: Margaret Thatcher was voted Prime-Minister of the UK; and Haig Beck resigned as the Editor of *AD* (the magazine formerly known as *Architectural Design*), leaving Andreas Papadakis as both proprietor and Executive Editor.[1] A new era beckoned for both the UK and *AD*: as the pendulum of political consensus swung to the right, the magazine that was responsible for introducing to the world the neo-avant-garde movements of the New Brutalism and Archigram was in the incunabulum of its Post-Modern turn.

But the 1980s wasn't just about Post-Modernism as a style: it also witnessed the growth of architectural culture as an industry. In his famous essay, *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, written at the height of the Post-Modern[2] period in the mid-1980s, Fredric Jameson suggested that 'It is in the realm of architecture […] that modifications in aesthetic production are most dramatically visible' – indeed he claimed that his conception of Post-Modernism derives from architectural debates.[2] While Reinhold Martin has more recently extended Jameson's claim, arguing that 'by the mid-1980s, "postmodernism" had come to designate a discursive formation' rather than a style, he still maintained that architecture 'functioned as its avatar'.[4] As enthusiasm for Post-Modernism waned later in the decade, Jameson expanded his paper into a book of the same name and emphasised the previously implicit claim that 'in postmodern culture, "culture" has become a product in its own right'.[5] Martin, again, extended this idea by suggesting that architecture – the discipline that introduced Post-Modernism to the world and 'functioned as its avatar'[6] – can offer something more: that not only is it the 'active "unthinking" of Utopia',[7] but furthermore, that 'architecture, as a form of "immaterial production" fully materialized, stands at what we can call the crux of postmodernism, operating simultaneously along an axis of representation and an axis of production'.[8]

If Jameson's and Martin's claims are true, then *AD* must have been Post-Modernism's most vital organ, because it was the vehicle through which Charles Jencks[9] was able to launch and fight for Post-Modern architecture.[5] Papadakis's Academy Editions had already published the first two editions of Jencks's *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture* [1], having launched his ideas in two special issues of *AD* devoted to the nascent movement, guest edited by the Anglo-American writer.[10] As such it is worth re-scrutinising this 1980s title now, with the benefit of historical hindsight, to see whether it is possible to detect any clues it may offer in understanding what Post-Modernisation actually implied for the profession, practice, and culture of architecture.

On this basis, I will examine the content and wider context of *AD* in order to explain the trajectory of this erstwhile agent of Modernism to Post-Modernism. As *AD* was so central to the promotion of Post-Modern architecture, I will argue that this shift wasn't merely symptomatic of the overarching retreat from Modernist positions, and neither was it simply a question of aesthetics and taste, but more substantially that architectural Post-Modernism should be considered an underlying turn away from the production of buildings towards their representation, from material to immaterial production, and from practice towards culture. Furthermore, I will argue that *AD* was an active agent in this shift, rather than merely a witness – a director of architecture rather than just a reflector.

*AD* was unique compared to other architectural magazines in the 1980s. For example, the *RIBA Journal*, ostensibly the professional body's chief organ and mouthpiece, concentrated on the *process* of architecture rather than the *product* and much of its material concerned technical and legal issues: issues of style are barely mentioned, and articles on history/theory were rare. Its only real ideological position was to promote the practice of architecture in general, albeit only to other architects, as its circulation consisted of the Institute's membership. It was certainly a *reflector* rather than *director* of ideas and discourse. Meanwhile, *The Architectural Review* rejected Post-Modernism as a style but continued to focus on the building as the object of architecture's interest. *AD*, on the other hand, was more inclined to simultaneously embrace the style and reflect the shift to 'immaterial production' in both its content (representation) and design (production), focusing more on architectural culture than practice. The 'AD Profiles', as the issues had become known since the magazine's redesign in January 1977 [2], became increasingly devoted to cultural enterprises: exhibitions; competitions and awards; symposia and lectures; and other publications. Later in the decade, Academy supplemented its publishing activities with other cultural initiatives. Academy was already a leading publisher and seller of books on art and architecture and while this remained its main focus, Papadakis responded instinctively to the 'expanding field' of architecture by organising *AD* into part of a larger synergistic machine of architectural culture production. Importantly, he aimed these not only at architects, but also a wider public who were increasingly discovering an interest in architecture. This article examines the cultural enterprises that *AD* became progressively involved with during Academy's ownership from 1977 to 1992, an era that essentially spanned architectural Post-Modernism, in order to identify its uniqueness and agency in architectural culture during the Post-Modernisation of architecture, understood in the sense of it being more than just a style.

**Post-Modern Architectural Institutions**
The Post-Modern strain of Pluralism (or 'Radical Eclecticism' as Jencks originally called it) was ostensibly a movement away from Modernism's dogma and towards a

more democratic position of 'everything goes'. Yet Hal Foster has argued that Pluralism in fact suggests 'a cultural stalemate', and even a 'political' and 'economic screen' that is 'a condition that tends to remove art, culture and society in general from the claims of criticism and change'.[11] From the point of view of a critic like Jencks, who came from a privileged background,[12] Pluralism entrenches the values of connoisseurship of taste and reinforces the position of those who understand arguments around 'style, that old bourgeois substitute for historical thought'.[13]

Writing in the mid-1980s Foster argued, against Pluralist proponents like Jencks, that 'culture is not merely superstructural: as Adorno stressed, it is now an industry of its own. […] This is why important galleries, auction-houses, magazines, museums, as beneficiaries of such consumerism, actively promote pluralism'.[14] This explains why Papadakis was so keen to promote Pluralism: he was not trained in architecture, and was not especially interested in arguing for any particular movement himself. However, he was very good at encircling himself with those who passionately *did* want to, and needed a platform to do it. Furthermore, from a business point of view, Pluralism potentially appealed to a wider range of people from both the public and the architectural community. Papadakis acknowledged this in an interview with Geoffrey Broadbent, who wrote that 'Post Modern sells. Very well. And, says Papadakis: "I'm a Capitalist and if you're onto something good, something that sells, you don't give up because a few eccentrics don't like it."'[15]

Yet not only did the content of *AD* clearly exhibit a tendency towards Pluralism and Post-Modern architecture as a style during this era, it also increasingly focused more on architectural culture than practice. The Profiles became less concerned with the design and construction of buildings and were increasingly devoted to cultural enterprises such as exhibitions, competitions, awards, publications, lectures, and symposia – the 'immaterial' rather than 'material production' that Martin refers to.[16] Under the aegis of Pluralism, Papadakis began to supplement his publishing activities in the second half of the 1980s with other initiatives aimed at supporting the wider ecosystem of architectural culture that fed *AD*. These were perhaps in response to those of his rival Alvin Boyarsky at the Architectural Association (AA) in London between 1971 and 1990 and another of Colin Rowe's former students, Peter Eisenman, at New York's Institute of Architecture and Urban Studies (IAUS) between 1967 and 1985. These, as well as other institutions of architecture, emerged in the 1970s and '80s to form an ecosystem of architectural culture that permanently influenced how architects could make a living.

The AA quickly established itself as a leading centre of international architectural culture when Boyarsky seized the opportunity to make the school more international after its removal from student grant support in the early 1970s. Andrew Higgott, who was 'someone who was there for much of his [Boyarsky's] time as Chairman of the Architectural Association School' wrote that Boyarsky also had a 'larger obsession and long-term project of re-making architectural culture'.[17]

Besides setting up a major history and theory lecture series under the

direction of former *AD* Technical Editor Robin Middleton, Boyarsky also established a gallery.[18] But his key strategic master-stroke to reinvigorate the AA was to consider publishing as a site of architectural production in its own right: Hejduk wrote in Boyarsky's obituary that, 'the fabrication of books in a way was his first architectural love'.[19]

The AA has a long publishing tradition, starting with the *AA Sketch Book* in 1867, and its first monthly journal, *AA Notes*, appeared between 1887 and 1905.[20] On arrival in September 1971, Boyarsky inherited the AA's house journal, *AA Quarterly* (or *AAQ*), established by Dennis Sharp in 1968. *AAQ* had taken over from *Arena*, which had itself taken over from the long running *AA Journal* in 1965. Boyarsky wanted autocratic control of the AA's image and when he became chairman of not only the School, but also the Association in 1978, he set out to replace *AAQ* with his own magazine. According to Higgott, Boyarsky was also unhappy with any form of sponsorship, and 'its conjunction of academic and historical texts with advertisements for lift contractors and plasterboard manufacturers appeared to cause him physical pain'.[21] After a bitter struggle with Sharp, *AA Files* was launched in 1981 and *AAQ* shut down the following year. From this point on, the AA became a major architectural publishing house. The *Folio* series started in 1983, publishing rich works of a new breed of young future 'starchitects' such as Daniel Libeskind and Zaha Hadid, and the *Works* series consisted of monographs of key modern British practices. Then there were historical publications, the AA's *Projects Review* featuring the work of the school, and many more publications which would probably not have been viable at another publisher.[22] Quality was always paramount, thanks to the AA's own Print Studio established on Boyarsky's arrival as part of the Communications Unit headed up by Dennis Crompton, who points out that publishing is so integral to the culture of the AA because its 'constitution stipulates that the school and the association *have* to publish, so publishing is actually built into the original fabric of the organisation'.[23] According to Sharp, Boyarsky ended up spending almost £1million per year on publications – a third of the AA's annual turnover.[24]

Under Boyarsky, then, the AA emphasised its cultural program so extensively that, 'the school gradually turned into a space of exchange as opposed to production'[25] and according to Irene Sunwoo, this

> offers a historical lens that brings into focus a broader shift in architectural
> education: from a modernist system of professional training that codified the
> architect's responsibility to design and build for the needs of society, to a
> postmodernist pedagogy that positioned architecture as an intellectual and
> critical practice.[26]

Despite Jencks teaching on the General Studies programme, it was not the style of architecture produced that made the AA a postmodern institution (that simply wasn't the case), but its shift from practice to culture, of which publication formed a major part.

Just before Boyarsky started reviving the AA, Eisenman initiated another

independent architectural institution across the Atlantic. He established the IAUS in 1967 as a 'think tank for progressive inquiry into architectural history and theory and contemporary urban issues, independent of any professional or academic institution and free of the burdens of accreditation'.[27] It soon became the centre of New York architectural culture and in 1973 launched the journal, *Oppositions: A Journal for Ideas and Criticism in Architecture* with Eisenman, Frampton, Mario Gandelsonas, and later, Anthony Vidler as editors. *Oppositions* published weighty essays on architectural history and criticism until Eisenman left the Institute in 1982 after the twenty-fifth issue (although a final 'unofficial' twenty-sixth issue appeared in 1985, just before the Institute itself folded). The IAUS and its journal created something of a self-referential discursive arena for an elite architectural circle orbiting around its founder. As Belmont Freeman states in her review of Diana Agrest's recent documentary, 'Eisenman and company were obsessed with controlling the door to the clubhouse — figuratively and literally — and determining who was a member of the intellectual elite of architecture'.[28] This network of anointed architects was one of the by-products of institutions like the IAUS and the AA and there was an intersection of people between the two institutions.[29] For instance, AA graduate Rem Koolhaas went on to write *Delirious New York* while a Fellow at the IAUS, and in January 1975 Eisenman appeared in conversation with Boyarsky on AATV, the AA's own closed circuit television channel.

In his 'collective biography' of the IAUS, Kim Förster has argued that it 'promoted a postmodernism in architecture, understood not just as a juxtaposition and quick change of styles and fashions, but as a broader cultural phenomenon' calling it a 'factory of knowledge and culture'.[30] Although the Institute started out doing architectural research and design, the social and economic conditions of the early 1970s rendered this no longer viable and in order to survive, it was forced to move into the production of culture. Förster argues that the Post-Modernisation of architecture occurred at the Institute through the commodification of architectural culture in the forms of exhibitions (a gallery was opened there in 1975), the journal *Oppositions* (followed by the journals *October* and *Skyline*), public and private lecture series, and the offering of architectural education (albeit validated by other institutions).[31]

These two institutions, as well as a number of others outlined below, emerged internationally in the late 1970s and 1980s focusing on an immaterial architectural culture that coincided with, and reinforced, the rise of Post-Modern architecture, and which allowed architects to earn a living as much from the softer practices of teaching, speaking, exhibiting, and publishing, as the harder practice of designing and overseeing the construction of buildings. The Post-Modernisation of *AD* magazine should be seen more in terms of this shift from an emphasis on buildings towards representations of buildings, rather than in any promotion of a particular style.

**Exhibitions**

Besides these specifically trans-Atlantic architectural institutions, the 1970s and '80s also witnessed the emergence of a market for the architectural drawing as the primary object of interest from an architect's production – in other words, as an autonomous art object. In his Ph.D. dissertation, 'Drawing on Architecture', Jordan Kauffman has observed that 'it was as if, to rephrase Douglas Crimp, architectural drawings, though invented earlier, were really only *discovered* in the 1970s and 1980s' and notes that 'new networks of galleries, collectors and institutions arose that focused on architectural representations'.[33] The Max Protetch gallery was founded in New York in 1978 and Kauffman writes of an interview with Protetch, who says of his best shows that

> *typically retrospective in character, they gave the architects an opportunity to present their work as a critical project. As time progressed, though, Protetch found that architects began 'speaking like artists and insisting on doing a show,' by which Protetch meant that the architects began to prepare works specifically for show, thinking of their productions as gallery pieces rather than evidence of their critical practices. 'It was every one, right from Graves, through Isozaki, Zaha, and Rem.' They would formulate and curate their work while they produced it. The architects themselves were beginning to think of their productions as art.*

Kauffman argued that Post-Modernism was as much about the shift to an emphasis on drawing, as on any focus on stylistic change: 'As Postmodernism became understood as an increasingly viable critique of Modernism in architecture, drawings assumed a primary role'.[34]

The emergence of a market in architectural drawings led to architecture exhibitions and museums developing into an institution in their own right in the 1970s as Ezster Steierhoffer has pointed out.[35] These new architectural institutions learned from (and even in certain situations merged with) the art market, becoming part of the 'experience economy' of late capitalism.[36] As late as 1988, Beatriz Colomina could write:

> *While the gallery system has been a basic institution in the art world bringing together and mediating the relationship between producers and consumers, artists and audiences, the same does not hold true for architecture. The phenomenon of the museum of architecture, of architecture's exhibition in a gallery, is something so recent we have hardly managed to grasp its meaning.*
>
> *The traditional channel for the cultural diffusion of architecture has been, and will still be for a while, the professional journals, which, unlike the art magazines, have no connection with the gallery system. As architecture enters the world of the art market, of shows and sales and published criticism, those involved in its production, publicization, and diffusion must critically address its changed cultural meaning.[37]*

In 1979, the Canadian Center for Architecture in Montreal and the Deutsches Architekturmuseum (DAM) in Frankfurt were both founded, as was the

International Confederation of Architectural Museums.[38] Despite this, with the demise of Art Net that same year, there remained only two other small, nascent galleries for architectural exhibitions in London: the AA, and the emerging RIBA programme at the Heinz Gallery in Portman Square which Charles Hind remembers 'housed an extraordinary series of 135 exhibitions from 1972-99, many with catalogues'.[39]

In 1981 Papadakis extended Academy's Leinster Gardens editorial offices to accommodate small exhibitions on the ground floor, the first of which was dedicated to Quinlan Terry's drawings. This was quickly followed by simultaneous exhibitions of Robert Stern and '6 British Architects'.[40] Academy published catalogues for the Terry and Stern exhibitions, 'sponsored by *Architectural Design'*, that included additional short essays.

Although exhibitions featured in *AD* during the post-war years of Monica Pidgeon's editorship as news snippets or reviews, during the Academy era they often formed the basis of entire issues. As early as June 1977, Robert Stern guest edited 'America Now' which was 'compiled from the rich material gathered for two major exhibitions of architectural drawings in New York'.[41] Kazys Varnelis identified these exhibitions as the point at which architects realised that 'architectural drawings were art works that could be owned, bought and sold,'[42] going on to note that,

> *Stern traced the return to drawing to the Museum of Modern Art with its exhibit of the work of Cooper Union students later presented in the book Education of an Architect: A Point of View, an exhibit of 1975. The latter exhibit, Stern wrote, brought home the narcissism of modernism sealed off from everyday experience and from high culture. How the drawings by the École students or by the architects he selected for his exhibit addressed reality he didn't explain, but significantly Stern did link the economic reality of the lack of opportunity for architects in the 1970s and the production of the drawing.*[43]

Kaufmann, however, identifies Barbara Pine's purchase of a Richard Meier drawing of the Hoffman House in 1973 as the beginnings of this trend to collect architects' drawings, if not actually see them as investments.[44] He argues that this emergence of a market in architectural drawings arose not just due to the lack of work for architects at the time, but because of the specific cultural environment in the art market in New York in the early 1970s.

It was also in New York that *AD* found its first exhibition of architectural drawings – this time historical rather than contemporary – to transform into an *AD* Profile. The Architecture of the École des Beaux-Arts exhibition at the MoMA, New York,[45] which Varnelis claims catalysed the 'new appreciation of architectural drawing on its own terms,'[46] was taken to the AA in May 1978 by Robin Middleton who subsequently guest-edited *The Beaux-Arts AD* Profile comprising articles based on lectures given at a conference held during the exhibition.[47] Shortly after, the *Roma Interrotta* issue [3],[48] guest-edited by Michael Graves, assembled the twelve projects prepared for the eponymous exhibition which was held in Rome in May 1978 and

subsequently travelled internationally. Graves commissioned a series of essays to accompany the images taken from the exhibition and Quinlan Terry's lecture given to the RIBA was printed at the end of the issue.[49]

There are numerous other examples of *AD* Profiles being produced from architectural culture rather than practice.[50] When the Deutsches Architekturmuseum opened in 1985, *AD* dedicated the issue *Revision of the Modern*[51] to it, which presented work from the collection and its inaugural exhibition as well as essays about the museum and its inception. By establishing this museum, its founder Heinrich Klotz, who later wrote *The History of Postmodern Architecture*[52] as a kind of Continental competitor to Jencks' *Language of Post-Modern Architecture*, was also directly contributing to the establishment of the market for architectural culture as art.[53]

The highest profile exhibition of the period, however, was the first Venice International Architecture Biennale of 1980, entitled *The Presence of the Past*, and on whose organising committee Jencks sat. It has since become the largest and highest profile architectural exhibition in the world. The main exhibit was the Strada Novissima composed of twenty facades designed by architects invited by director Paolo Portoghesi,[54] in the space of the Corderia dell'Arsenale. Léa-Catherine Szacka explains how this street was an instrument for connecting with the wider public, not only through its representation in the media, but also for being experienced at full scale and through a language that the public could understand: not merely 'architecture for architects'.[55] This exhibition with its Post-Modern subtext initiated the Post-Modern Classicism sub-movement and Jencks guest-edited two *AD* Profiles on this theme: *Post-Modern Classicism* to coincide with the exhibition, and subsequently *Free-Style Classicism*.[56] Elizabeth Keslacy argues that this pair of issues, alongside Geoffrey Broadbent's *Neo-Classicism*[57] and Demetri Porphyrios's *Classicism is not a Style [4]*[58] from the same era, emphasise the communicative potential for architecture which was one of the key underlying motivations of the movement.[59] Papadakis visited the exhibition in Venice with David Dunster in order to network and publish what he recognised as a significant event in architectural culture. While he found it difficult to infiltrate the clique,[60] Academy managed to be the publisher of the English version of the 352-page catalogue.[61]

The tendency to publish material originally intended for other purposes became a common tactic for Papadakis throughout Academy's tenure of *AD*. Exhibitions were a particularly promising medium to publish, as they desired an extended life beyond that of the temporary exhibition, and the material exhibited was therefore itself free or inexpensive to publish. In the same way it eschewed adverts for building products, in contrast to magazines like the *AR* and the *RIBA Journal*, *AD* did not concern itself with reviews of buildings, industry chit-chat, or technical notes aimed at the practising architect. Instead, through the Profiles, *AD* became a bi-monthly book in an attempt to appeal to a wider audience. This tactic of becoming essentially *both* a magazine *and* a book, itself resonated with Post-Modern concerns to be less elitist and to communicate with the public. But it was ultimately a business – as opposed to a cultural – decision designed to sell a product: architecture

as culture.

**Competitions & Awards**

Louis Kahn is quoted as saying that a competition project is an 'offering to architecture'.[62] As a way of delivering a design for a client and finding work for an architect, competitions have been controversial for as long as they have existed, but the quote attributed to Kahn acknowledges that they are part of the 'game' of architecture.[63] Yet architects love competitions – in many ways, it's what an architectural education trains them for. Hélène Lipstadt has argued that competitions allow architects to imagine they are working in a 'pure' field of cultural production, almost autonomous from the realities of the world like literature or painting, and more like an 'art' than a 'profession'.[64] 'There are many reasons to consider competitions as analogous to carnivals,' she argues, 'the frequently proposed moment and place of symbolic inversion, the world upside down'.[65] The end result of a competition is not necessarily a building, but a series of design proposals – immaterial rather than material products. These design proposals are eminently publishable: since 1971, the German periodical *Wettbewerbe Aktuell* has even made a successful business based entirely on publishing competition entries and results.[66] Furthermore, as adverts for their creativity, the architects want and need these proposals published. While competition proposals regularly appeared in *AD* during Pidgeon's post-war editorship, they did not form the basis of an entire issue like they did in the Academy era of *AD*.[67] Papadakis even held his own architectural competitions in order to produce publications.[68]

Arguably the most controversial and highest profile competition of the period in the UK was that for the extension to the National Gallery, won by Ahrends Burton Koralek in December 1982. *AD* was the only magazine to become actively involved, hosting a debate amongst select architectural commentators[69] to criticise the process and its outcome.[55] The ensuing ten-page criticism[70] of the winning scheme was introduced in italics: [56]

> *Following the announcement by the National Gallery at a press conference in December of the proposed extension on the Hampton site by Ahrends Burton and Koralek, AD invited a number of well-known architectural historians and critics to discuss the proposals at a meeting in its editorial offices on Wednesday 4th January.*[71]

Much of the critics' discussion at that meeting was printed in the magazine and although they appeared to be talking across each other most of the time, amongst the scathing criticism the conclusion was clear: the competition had failed to produce a decent quality building for such a sensitive site and the client and architects were requested to go 'back to the drafting board'.[72]  Although a high profile competition and commission with much public interest, *AD* became involved before Prince Charles infamously called ABK's scheme a 'monstrous carbuncle on the face of a much-loved friend' on the occasion of the RIBA's presentation of the Gold Medal to Charles Correa in May 1984.[73] Kester Rattenbury has noted that the ensuing uproar

kick-started the public's emerging interest in architecture and made it worthy of discussion in the mainstream press.[74] Another competition was launched, this time won by Venturi, Rauch and Scott Brown in February 1986. The January/February 1986 issue of *AD* was dedicated to the five unsuccessful schemes for this second competition, all described by their respective architects. All the featured projects of all these competitions and awards were therefore proposals rather than built projects.

The year 1979 has already been identified as a watershed in the emergence of architectural museums and exhibitions. As well as being the year after the International Committee of Architectural Critics was established, this was also the year in which the Pritzker Prize – often referred to as the 'Nobel prize for architecture' – was first awarded 'To honor a living architect or architects whose built work demonstrates a combination of those qualities of talent, vision, and commitment, which has produced consistent and significant contributions to humanity and the built environment through the art of architecture'.[75] Since then, awards for architecture have continued to be launched by professional bodies and the press alike to the extent that today, any self-respecting architect has to be called 'award-winning'. This is perhaps due to awards themselves being able to be interpreted as a very blunt form of contemporary criticism and winning an award legitimises the project with critical acclaim by proxy, even more so than being published or exhibited.

The *AD* Project Awards were reintroduced in 1980 for the magazine's 50th anniversary, having previously appeared between 1964 and 1969 as the *AD Grand Project Awards* for projects 'still on the drawing board'.[76] These awards, however, were never considered successful in producing a high quality of architecture to publish and they were more concerned with *AD* being perceived as the definer of architecture, and 'a prime demonstration of the creation and maintenance of belief, or *illusio*, in the field of architecture of the period'.[77] Despite, or maybe even because of this – and almost certainly unaware of it – the 1982 Awards were compiled into an exhibition at the RIBA. According to Terry Farrell, Papadakis made this exhibition happen after the RIBA had wanted to hold an exhibition but had failed to coordinate the architects and funding: through sheer strength of character, and Academy's finances, Papadakis took charge of the exhibition and decided which architects would participate.[78] This exhibition, too, resulted in a large book which included the AD Project Award winners as well as unpremiated entries, along with 'projects from further practices in an attempt to present a cross-section of today's most interesting work'.[79] Amongst the various accompanying essays, Jencks wrote an obscure but knowing piece on architectural culture, identifying small elites in key cities like New York and London that effectively controlled architectural taste within the 'growth of the world architectural village – a result of inexpensive air travel and international magazines'.[80] Jencks himself, of course, was one of the major contributors to the growth of this very architectural culture he describes.

**Publications**

As *AD* magazine morphed into the Profile format, and became almost indistinguishable from Academy's other architectural exhibition catalogues and books such as *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture*, it was split into two separately paginated sections: the 'newsy' section occupying several pages of contemporary comment followed by the more substantial and themed Profile.[67] The magazine that the few thousand subscribers received included the first newsy section and the Profile, allowing the Profile to be printed (and reprinted) separately and sold as a more enduring book. According to Maggie Toy, a former *AD* Editor who worked at Academy from 1988 to 2002, the magazine had on average around 3,000 subscribers, and another 3,000 Profiles were printed in the hope that it would take off. Ingenious strategies like this enabled Papadakis to make *AD* financially viable, especially considering he would print large initial runs in order to make the cost per unit as cheap as possible, and keep the remaining publications in storage for sale later. One anonymous article in *Building Design* mentioned, 'All his titles are sold abroad and his print runs for art books are roughly double those of the average paperback. The figures for his architectural titles are astonishing in conventional terms; his usual run is between 10 000 and 20 000 copies, sometimes running up to 30 000 (compared to the average run of an architectural book of between 1 750 and 2 000 copies). Even if three-quarters of these go abroad, and he wants to hold stock for ten years, his policies are audacious'.[81]

In November 1980, after the inaugural Venice Architecture Biennale, Academy started publishing a News Supplement for all *AD* subscribers as though acknowledging that a more substantial news section was required for the magazine after all. It was a single sheet of glossy paper, approximately A1 in size, printed in black and white on both sides and folded into eight to be read as a broadsheet. The first page proclaimed that, 'A calendar covering world-wide events in architecture is planned for future supplements, and we invite our readers to send us advance news of exhibitions, competitions, lecture series, etc'.[82] The second issue, published in January 1981 concerned itself with the Venice Biennale itself *[5]*. Four more editions were published,[83] each getting gradually bulkier and more newspaper-like, and each sporting a cover price.[84] The final issue was a twenty-eight page newspaper focused on Tom Wolfe's *From Bauhaus to Our House* which was about to be published in Britain.[71] The content of the supplement overlapped with much in *AD*'s magazine section and actually enabled that section to be removed entirely by 1984, when the magazine became the same as the *AD* Profile, or essentially a bi-monthly book.

The series of *Architectural Monographs*, edited by David Dunster and launched in 1978, complemented *AD* and its design was very also similar to that of the *AD* Profile. Four *Monographs*[86] appeared in the first year. The publication was, of course, advertised in its sister publication and both magazines were available as a cheaper subscription, even though the *Monographs* were published inconsistently after the first year. Another sister magazine, *Art & Design,* first appeared in February 1985 and was advertised in *AD* with the words,

> Art & Design *covers the worlds of art and design with style, in depth, bravely, without bias, with opinion, with understanding, succinctly, with a difference, specifically, questioningly, outspokenly, overtly, with information, with consideration, challengingly, and monthly.*[73]

Subscription for both *A&D* and *AD* was also available at a special rate and this magazine was also very good at advertising the Academy back-list of books and other publications associated with *AD*. Two other new periodicals were launched in the 1980s: the *UIA Journal of Architectural Theory and Criticism* (1988), and the *Journal of Philosophy and Visual Arts* (1989). Toy remembers around fifteen to twenty people producing around forty magazines, profiles and books a year. Producing publications in the same format streamlined the process for this small team who worked across all books, catalogues and magazines, making them more commercially viable. It also inevitably made them appear similar and the distinction between the bi-monthly magazine, the less regular monograph and the one-off book or exhibition catalogue became increasingly slight.

Publications were always Academy's end product. Within this art and architecture publishing house, it is not surprising that *AD* became just one component in a larger ecosystem of architectural culture designed to be profitable as a whole. As Pidgeon discovered just a few years earlier, making a magazine financially viable in its own right was becoming increasingly difficult. *AD* on its own would likely not have survived, but when combined with Academy's other activities, such as book publishing, the book shop, and the other associated magazines, all produced by the same small team of people, the enterprise of architectural culture in its entirety became viable.

**Symposia & Lectures**

Having published others' events for several years, Papadakis soon started to initiate them himself and either host or sponsor talks, lectures and symposia. Sometimes they were published in *AD*, but not always – occasionally they were simply events that made *AD* visible and established it as a key 'player' in international architectural culture. The earliest high profile symposium was the Studies in the Theory and History of Architecture held at the Polytechnic of Central London involving a number of high profile speakers *[6]*.[87] This led onto the publication of the *On the Methodology of Architectural History* issue guest edited by Demetri Porphyrios and one of the earliest reflections on the writing of architectural history.[88]

Towards the end of his life Papadakis himself identified on his own CV that:
> *An elaborate programme of exhibitions, symposia and cultural events was developed internationally with the help of leading personalities, architects, artists and critics world-wide. The results formed the basis of the publishing of the Academy Group.*[89]

The symposia became more ambitious as the decade progressed. In June 1984, Academy hosted two symposia, one on the National Gallery extension debacle (mentioned above) and one called Architecture for Today.[90] The symposia became

increasingly high profile until they became landmarks on the international architectural culture circuit. The Academy Forum was established in 1987 and its first event – on the subject of Post-Modernism – was held that October at the Tate Gallery in London. Over the next three years, a number of Academy Forums were held at the gallery, including one on Deconstruction in March 1988. This resulted in the publication of the Deconstruction issue of *AD*,[91] importantly beating the MoMA in New York to introducing this new architectural fashion to the world and becoming a best-seller in the process, being reprinted several times.[92] These Forums[93] became so popular that *The New Modern Aesthetic* issue[94] was practically a verbatim record, complete with photographs of the speakers and audience debating the question of the day. The Academy Forum became even more part of the establishment when it moved to the Royal Academy with its inaugural Academy Architecture Lecture (by Sir Norman Foster) on New Museology.[95] While this annual lecture endures to today, Papadakis finally took his Academy to the Prince of Wales's Institute of Architecture, where he held a symposium on New Practice in Urban Design.[96]

With this progression, then, Papadakis moved quickly toward the centre of the British establishment and was instrumental in creating an elite circle of architectural commentators at the centre of which Academy Editions was situated. The photographs of the famous speakers can also be considered early manifestations of the architect as celebrity, as the media began to focus increasingly on the architect as personality rather than their work or even their words. According to Varnelis, 'This change in architectural production is based on the spread of architectural reproduction as image and to a progressive elevation of the architect as a celebrity, again an image'.[97]

### An Architectural Cultural Industry

In *Architecture, Crisis and Resuscitation*, Tahl Kaminer agrees with Martin that one of Post-Modernism's hallmarks is its 'sullen withdrawal from engagement'.[98] Kaminer carefully analyses how '"the social", including class interests and class identity, was now replaced by "the cultural". […] Unable to satisfy the new demands of society, the discipline [of architecture] lost its grounding and its confidence, withdrawing from reality into itself'.[99] He goes on to explain how, from the mid-1970s, this withdrawal from the 'real' was manifest in a turn to the 'ideal', or autonomous paper architecture, specifically drawing. I want to argue that this retreat included any form of the 'softer' architectural practice that allowed autonomy – not only drawing, but also exhibitions, education, lectures, talks, seminars, competitions, awards, and most fundamentally underlying them all, publication. This echoes sociologist Magali Sarfatti Larson's claim that Post-Modernism was symptomatic of a considerable re-grounding of how the profession positioned itself within society. In her study of architectural practice and culture during this period, she explains that 'in postmodern discourse, the model of European modernism is related as much to practical conceptions of the architect's role and to changes in the way architects must

make a living as to their formal imagination'.[100]

In other words, underpinning the usual discussion of the Post-Modernisation of architecture in terms of the superficiality of style, is the more fundamental, structural transformation regarding the emergence and commodification of an architectural culture: architects turned towards culture and away from building as they lost belief in architecture's role in constructing Utopia. A plethora of books appeared in the mid-1970s proclaiming architecture's demise, perhaps most famously Peter Blake's *Form Follows Fiasco* (1977), Brent Brolin's *The Failure of Modern Architecture* (1976), and Malcolm MacEwan's stinging *Crisis in Architecture* (1974).[101] As editor of the *RIBA Journal* from 1964 until 1971, the latter author clearly saw where the profession was heading and the recession of the early 1980s in tandem with the new Conservative government's policies to open up competition in every aspect of business hit the profession hard. Some direct or indirect consequences of these policies were architects' standard fee scale becoming merely recommended and a change in the RIBA code of conduct to allow architects to advertise as well as conduct business as a contractor or developer. But this was also the decade that Design & Build emerged to challenge traditional procurement contracts, meaning that clients could employ a contractor rather than an architect to procure a building.[102] Architects were unpopular, untrusted, and unemployed and the social, economic, and political contexts in which they practised fundamentally changed. Severely beaten and on the ropes, they were forced to find other ways to practise architecture, one of which was the softer practice of the production of architectural culture.

In addition to the emergence of the producers of this form of cultural production, consumers of it also emerged at the same time. In his 1988 study *Architectural Practice*, sociologist Robert Gutman agreed that besides the traditional 'consumers of architecture' who commission and use buildings, there is 'a much larger number of men and women who are not building owners or even heavy users of them, but who like to read about architecture, tour buildings, visit museum exhibitions, buy architectural drawings, and discuss architecture'. He called this group 'architecture buffs'.[103] Despite the economic recessions of the 1970s, people in Western society had become more educated and richer and were therefore more able to spend their money and time on cultural pursuits, enabling what Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer had famously identified as a 'culture industry'.[104] As Gutman continued, 'The significance of the consumers of architectural culture for the practice of architects is that they create an alternative market […] that offers the prospect of considerable autonomy'.[105]

The story of *AD* magazine exemplifies this narrative arguably more than any other English language publication, going from the most potent and highest profile of Modernist architectural organs under Monica Pidgeon in the 1950s and '60s to the vehicle for Charles Jencks, among others, to launch and promote Post-Modernism in the 1970s and '80s. While The Standard Catalogue Company was ultimately in the business of selling catalogues of manufacturers' products, Academy was in the

business of selling books and the fact that *AD*'s very survival was under threat as it changed hands enabled this shift to happen.[106]

Amongst the changing of the architectural avant-garde that occurred in the mid-1970s, after long periods of stable editorial direction, both the *AR* and *AD* completely replaced its editorial staff. While the *AR* maintained its owner and its Modernist stance, *AD* was more precarious. Continuing to trade on its reputation and name, changing ownership twice within two years allowed it – even forced it – to look for new markets and to embrace a Pluralist approach. The revised social and economic conditions rendered a new context in which buildings' reproduction was valorised as much as, if not more than, their production, and where a new *AD* thrived as part of a wider ecosystem of architectural culture both inside and outside of Academy. But even more than that, the magazine did more than reflect the changes in architectural style and discourse: it became an active agent in the construction of an architectural culture, embodying the values of Post-Modernism in its very essence.

**Figure Captions**
Figure 1: The first two editions of *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture* (London: Academy Editions, 1977 & 1978).
Figure 2: Cover of the redesign of *AD* – Profile no.1 – featuring Arata Isozaki, January 1977.
Figure 3: Covers of *The Beaux Arts* (AD Profile no.17, November-December, 1978) & *Roma Interrotta* (AD Profile no. 20, March-April, 1979).
Figure 4: Covers of *Neo-Classicism* (AD Profile no.23, August-September, 1979), *Post-Modern Classicism* (AD Profile no.28, May-June, 1980), *Free-Style Classicism* (AD Profile no.39, January-February, 1982), and *Classicism is not a Style* (AD Profile no.41, May-June, 1982).
Figure 5: AD News Supplement no.2, January 1981.
Figure 6: Poster for Theory & History of Architecture symposium at the Polytechnic of Central London, May-June 1981.

Notes

1. Andreas Papadakis (17 June 1938, Nicosia, Cyprus – 10 June 2008, Berkshire, England).

2. While I use the term 'Post-Modern', others such as Jameson and Martin use it without the capitals and without the hyphen. In this article, these variations of the term are used interchangeably.

3. Fredric Jameson, 'Postmodernism, or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism', *New Left Review,* 146 (August 1984), 53–92 (p. 54).

4. Reinhold Martin, *Utopia's Ghost: Architecture and Postmodernism, Again* (Minneapolis, MN and
London: University of Minnesota Press, 2010), p. xii.

5. Frederic Jameson, *Postmodernism, Or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (London: Verso, 1991), p. x.

6. Martin, *Utopia's Ghost*, p. xii.

7. Ibid., p. xiv.

8. Ibid., p. xvi.

9. Charles Jencks (b. 21 June 1939, Baltimore, US).

10. 'Post-Modernism', *AD*, 4 (April, 1977); 'Post-Modern History', *AD*, 1 (January, 1978). Jencks continued to publish many books and guest-edit many issues of *AD* during its Academy years, until it was bought by German publisher VCH in March 1991. The first six of the seven issues of *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture* were published by Academy between 1977 and 1991.

11. Hal Foster, 'Against Pluralism', in *Recodings: Art, Spectacle, Cultural Politics* (Seattle, WA: Bay Press, 1985), pp. 13–32 (pp. 23–6).

12. His ancestor Francis Jenks [*sic*] invented the safety deposit box in the 1850s: Charles Jencks, Desert Island Discs, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b01k9n81> [accessed 1 July 2012].

13. Foster, 'Against Pluralism', p. 17.

14. Ibid., p. 24.

15. Geoffrey Broadbent, notes in unsorted Andreas Papadakis papers held by his daughter Alexandra Papadakis. I am grateful to her for giving me access to Andreas's papers.

16. Martin, *Utopia's Ghost,* pp. xiv–xvi.

17. Andrew Higgott, 'Boyarsky at the AA', arq: *Architectural Research Quarterly*, 14:3 (September 2010), 189.

18. Middleton was appointed director of the General Studies programme in 1973 and Higgott
lists a stellar series of lectures until 1987. The gallery was established in November 1978.
Andrew Higgott, *Mediating Modernism: Architectural Cultures in Britain* (London: Routledge, 2007),
pp. 178–81.

19. John Hejduk, 'Alvin Boyarsky 1928–1990', *AA Files,* 20 (Autumn 1990), 3-4 (p.4).

20. Igor Marjanović, 'Lines and Words on Display: Alvin Boyarsky as a Collector, Curator and Publisher', arq: *Architectural Research Quarterly*, 14:2 (June 2010), 165–74.

21. Higgott, 'Boyarsky at the AA', 189.

22. For more on Boyarsky and publishing at the AA, see Andrew Higgott, 'Searching for the
Subject: Alvin Boyarsky and the Architectural Association School', in *Mediating Modernism:*
*Architectural Cultures in Britain* (London: Routledge, 2007), pp. 153–88; Claire Jamieson, *NATØ:*
*Narrative Architecture in Postmodern London* (London: Routledge, 2017), pp. 117–19.

23. Edward Bottoms and Dennis Crompton, 'A Riffled History', *AA Publications & Bedford Press 2014–15* (2014), p. A7.

24. Dennis Sharp, interview with author, 2 March 2009.

25. Marjanović, 'Lines and Words on Display', 168.

26. Irene Sunwoo, 'From the "Well-Laid Table" to the "Market Place": The Architectural Association Unit System', *Journal of Architectural* Education, 65 (1 March 2012), 24–41.

27. Belmont Freeman, 'The Moment for Something to Happen', *Places* (13 January 2014), http://places.designobserver.com/feature/remembering-the-institutefor-architecture-and-urbanstudies/38285/> [accessed 8 July 2014].

28. Ibid.

29. See Irene Sunwoo, 'The Static Age', *AA Files*, 61 (winter 2010), 118; and Marjanović, 'Lines and Words on Display'. The 'architectural starmaking machine', of the network that surrounded Philip Johnson and that included Eisenman is discussed in Kazys Varnelis, 'The Spectacle of the Innocent Eye: Vision, Cynical Reason, and the Discipline of Architecture in Postwar America' (unpublished PhD dissertation, Cornell University, 1994).

30. Kim Förster, 'Entertaining the Masses: IAUS's Economy of Cultural Production', in *Mediating*
*Messages*, ed. by Patteeuw and Szacka (London: Bloomsbury, 2018).

31. Ibid.

32. Jordan Kauffman, 'Drawing on Architecture: The Socioaesthetics of Architectural Drawings, 1970–1990' (unpublished PhD dissertation, MIT, 2015), p. 25.

33. Jordan Kauffman, 'Architecture in the Art Market: The Max Protetch Gallery', *Journal of Architectural Education*, 70:2 (2016), 257–68 (p. 257).

34. Kauffman, 'Drawing on Architecture', p. 31.

35. Eszter Steierhoffer, 'The Exhibitionary Complex of Architecture', *OASE*, 88 (2012), 5–11 (p. 5).

36. Hal Foster, *The Art-Architecture Complex* (London; New York: Verso, 2013), p. ix.

37. Beatriz Colomina and Joan Ockman, eds, *Architectureproduction* (New York, NY: Princeton Architectural Press, 1988), p. 17. The rise of the market for architectural drawings in the 1980s is

explained in Julia Voss, 'Heinrich Klotz, The Price, Explosion, and the Star System: A Lesson on the

Relationship between the Art Market and Museums', *ARCH+* (May 2014), 38–44.

38. Steierhoffer, 'The Exhibitionary Complex of Architecture', p.5. See *Arch+ 216: The Klotz Tapes:*

*The Making of Postmodernism*, 47 (Aachen: ARCH+ Verlag GmbH, 2014) for an excellent account of

the establishment of the DAM.

39. Charles Hind, 'Scholars and Decorators: A Personal View of the Architectural Drawings Market, Past and Present', *Icam Print* (2007), 23; David Dunster, 'Boyarsky and the Architectural Association', in *An Architect's Guide to Fame: A Collection of Essays on Why They Got Famous and You Didn't*, ed. by Paul Davies and Torsten Schmiedeknecht (London: Architectural Press, 2005), p. 43. For a more in depth look at Art Net, see Mariah Nielson, 'Form Follows Culture: Architectural Models in London,

1970–1979' (unpublished MA dissertation, RCA/V&A, 2013), pp. 63–70.

40. Featuring Post-Modernists Piers Gough, Terry Farrell, Jeremy Dixon, Ed Jones, James Gowan,

and John Outram. The Terry exhibition ran from 25 March to 2 May 1981 and the Stern and

'6 British Architects' exhibitions from 2 June to 31 July 1981.

41. The exhibitions were held at the Cooper-Hewitt Museum and at The Drawing Center from 20

September to 6 November 1977. Haig Beck, ed., *AD Profile 6*: *America Now*, 6 (1977), 375. Varnelis, 'The Spectacle of the Innocent Eye', pp. 205–7.

42. Ibid., p. 206.

43. Robert A. M. Stern, 'Drawing Towards a More Modern Architecture', *Architectural Design*, 47: 6 (June 1977), 382–2 (p. 382), cited in Varnelis, 'The Spectacle of the Innocent Eye', p. 207.

44. Jordan Kauffman, 'Architecture's History and the Art Market: Beyond the Max Protetch

Gallery' (Society of Architectural Historians 70th International Annual Conference, University

of Strathclyde, Glasgow, 8 June 2017).

45. From 29 October 1975 to 4 January 1976.

46. Varnelis, 'The Spectacle of the Innocent Eye', p. 201.

47. Robin Middleton, ed., *AD Profile 17: Beaux-Arts, AD*, 11/12 (1978).

48. Michael Graves, ed., *AD Profile* 20: *Roma Interrotta*, *AD*, 3/4 (1979).

49. Quinlan Terry, 'A Question of Style', *Architectural Design*, 49: 3/4 (March 1979), 107–16. The lecture was delivered on 21 November 1978.

50. For example, the *Engineering and Architecture* issue (*AD*, 11/12 (1978)) was published to coincide with *The Great Engineers* exhibition, commemorating the 150th anniversary of the founding of the Royal College of Art; and the *Cairo International*

*Exhibition* issue (*AD Profile 56: Cairo International Exhibition, AD*, 11/12 (1984)), guest-edited by Jorge Glusberg was published to coincide with the UIA's XVth World Congress in Cairo in January 1985.

51. *AD Profile 58*: *Revision of the Modern*, *AD*, 3/4 (1985).

52. Heinrich Klotz, *The History of Postmodern Architecture* (Cambridge, MA and London: MIT

Press, 1988).

53. See Voss, 'Heinrich Klotz, The Price, Explosion, and the Star System'.

54. Portoghesi, Klotz, and Jencks present a kind of Italian, German, and Anglo-American triumvirate of Post-Modern protagonists. Their respective books represent slightly different takes on a common

desire to break with modernity: Paolo Portoghesi, *Postmodern: The Architecture of the Post-*

*Industrial Society*, trans. by Ellen Shapiro (New York: Rizzoli, 1983); Klotz, *The History of*

*Postmodern Architecture*; Charles Jencks, *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture*, 1st edn, An

Architectural Design Monograph (London: Academy Editions, 1977).

55. Léa-Catherine Szacka, 'The 1980 Architecture Biennale: The Street as a Spatial and Representational Curating Device', *OASE*, 88 (2012), 14–25 (p. 18).

56. Charles Jencks, ed., *AD Profile* 28: Post-Modern Classicism, *AD*, 5/6 (1980); Charles Jencks, ed., AD Profile 39: Free Style Classicism, *AD*, 1/2 (1982).

57. Geoffrey Broadbent, ed., *AD Profile* 23: Neo-Classicism, *AD*, 8/9 (1979).

58. Demetri Porphyrios, ed., *AD Profile* 41: Classicism is not a Style, *AD*, 5/6 (1982).

59. Elizabeth Keslacy, 'Style's Second Coming: Postmodernist Recursions to Classicism in Architectural Design Magazine 1980–1982', in *Mediating Messages: On the Role of Exhibitions and*

*Periodicals in Critically Shaping Postmodern Architecture*, ed. by Véronique Patteeuw and

Léa-Catherine Szacka (London: Bloomsbury, 2018).

60. David Dunster, interview by Steve Parnell, 21 January 2013.

61. Charles Jencks, 'Towards Radical Eclecticism', in *The Presence of the Past: First International Exhibition of Architecture – Venice Biennale 80*, ed. by Gabriella Borsano (London:

Academy Editions, 1980), pp. 30–7.

62. Cited in Hélène Lipstadt, *The Experimental Tradition: Essays on Competitions in Architecture* (New York, NY: Princeton Architectural Press, 1989), p. 10.

63. Ibid., p. 17.

64. Hélène Lipstadt, 'Can "Art Professions" Be Bourdieuean Fields of Cultural Production? The Case of the Architecture Competition', Cultural Studies, 17:3/4 (May 2003), 290–418; Hélène Lipstadt,

'Are Competitions Populist? A Bourdieusian Alternative Perspective', in *What People Want*, ed. by Michael Shamiyeh and DOM Research Laboratory (Birkhäuser Basel, 2005), pp. 133–49.

65. Lipstadt, *The Experimental Tradition*, p. 17.

66. Torsten Schmiedeknecht, 'Germany – (Un)edited Architecture; Wettbewerbe Aktuall', in *An Architect's Guide to Fame*, ed. by Davies and Schmiedeknecht, pp. 121–43.

67. For example, IBA Berlin, an ongoing international competition for re-planning Berlin held between 1979 and 1987, formed the January 1983 issue.

68. For example, the Dolls' House issue of March 1983 was based on an *AD*-sponsored competition to design a doll's house for Andreas's daughter, Alexandra, and the entries were sold at Sotheby's for charity: *AD Profile* 46: Dolls' Houses, *AD*, 3/4 (1983). There was also a competition sponsored by
Barrett Developments PLC called 'A House For Today', which resulted in the November 1986
issue: *AD Profile 64: A House for Today*, *AD*, 10/11 (1986).

69. The invited participants were: Colin Amery (Chairman), Alan Colquhoun, Charles Jencks, Léon
Krier, and Demetri Porphyrios. Audience members included Alvin Boyarsky, Stuart Durrant,
Terry Farrell, James Gowan, and Ron Herron.

70. The piece was published in the magazine section, before the 'profile': *AD*, 11/12 (1983), 130–9.

71. 'National Gallery Extension', *AD*, 53: 11/12 (December 1983), 130–9 (p. 131).

72. Charles Jencks in ibid., p. 137.

73. 'A Speech by HRH The Prince of Wales at the 150th Anniversary of the Royal Institute of British
Architects (RIBA), Royal Gala Evening at Hampton Court Palace' (30 May 1984), <http://
www.princeofwales.gov.uk/media/speeches/speech-hrhthe-prince-of-wales-the-150thanniversary-
of-the-royal-instituteof> [accessed 21 June 2016].

74. Kester Rattenbury, 'Architecture in the Mass Media' (unpublished PhD dissertation, Oxford Brookes, 1990), p. 235.

75. 'History | The Pritzker Architecture Prize', online:
<http://www.pritzkerprize.com/about/history> [accessed 21 June 2016].

76. Steve Parnell, 'Architectural Design, 1954–1972: The Contribution of the Architectural
Magazine to the Writing of Architectural History' (PhD dissertation, University of Sheffield, 2012), p. 179.

77. Ibid., p. 183.

78. Personal communication, January 2016.

79. Andreas Papadakis, ed., *British Architecture* (London: Academy Editions, 1982), p. 4. In a similar
vein, the March 1984 issue of AD was devoted entirely to the 1983 and 1984 AD Project Awards.

80. Charles Jencks, 'Notes on an Architectural Culture', in *British Architecture*, ed. by Papadakis, p. 12.

81. 'Beyond the Bookshelves', *Building Design*, 342 (15 April 1977), 22–3 (p. 22).

82. Ian Latham, 'AD News Supplement', *AD News Supplement* (November 1980).

83. March, June, and July 1981, and January 1982.

84. From 50p to £1.50.

85. Tom Wolfe, *From Bauhaus to Our House* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1982).

86. The subjects of the first four were: Venturi and Rauch (interestingly Scott Brown is missing from the title!); Hector Guimard; James Gowan; Alvar Aalto.

87. The symposium lasted from 18 May to 4 June 1981. The speakers included Giorgio Ciucci, Robert
Maxwell, Dalibor Vesely, Georges Teyssot, Joseph Rykwert, Tomas Llorens, Robin Middleton,
Manfredo Tafuri, Kenneth Frampton, and Alan Colquhoun.

88. Demitri Porphyrios, ed., *AD Profile 35: On the Methodology of Architectural History*, *AD*, 6/7 (1981).

89. Andreas Papadakis, 'Curriculum Vitae' (CV, n.d.), personal archive (emphasis added).

90. On 4 June and 23 June 1984, respectively. The second event does not seem to have resulted in
any specific publication.

91. Charles Jencks, *AD Profile 72: Deconstruction*, *AD*, 3/4 (1988).

92. This led directly to the Deconstruction Omnibus volume which Geoffrey Broadbent suggested sold some 30,000 copies: Geoffrey Broadbent, 'Pioneers of Po-Mo', *Building Design*, 1061 (13 December 1991), 14–5 (p. 15).

93. The Forum concentrated on New Classicism in July (Published as *AD Profile 71: The New Classicism*, *AD*, 1/2 (1988)) and then Denise Scott Brown spoke on The Rise and Fall of Community
Architecture in September 1988, published as Denise Scott Brown, ed., *AD Profile 83: Urban Concepts*, *AD*, 1/2 (1990). In November 1988 the Forum debated Prince Charles's Visions of Britain
television programme, which was written up sympathetically in Geoffrey Broadbent, 'The Academy Architecture Forum', *Architectural Design*, 58@ 11/12 (November 1988), 13–5.

94. *AD Profile 86: The New Modern Aesthetic*, *AD*, 7/8 (1990).

95. On 15 June 1991, published as *Art & Design Profile 22: New Museology*, *A&D*, 7/8 (1990).
Further Forums were on: Pop Architecture (16 November 1991); Architecture in Arcadia

(21 March 1992) published in *AD Profile 103: Architecture in Arcadia*, *AD*, 5/6 (1993);
Theory and

Experimentation (13 June 1992) published in *AD Profile 100: Theory and Experimentation*, *AD*, 11/12

(1992).

96. On 1 December 1992, published as *AD Profile 105: New Practice in Urban Design*, *AD*, 9/10 (1993). The issue came out after Papadakis's release from his position with VCH who had bought Academy Editions in March 1991.

97. Varnelis, 'The Spectacle of the Innocent Eye', p. 13.

98. Martin, *Utopian Ghosts*, p. xiv.

99. Tahl Kaminer, *Architecture, Crisis and Resuscitation: The Reproduction of Post-Fordism in Late-Twentieth-Century Architecture* (London: Routledge, 2011), p. 4.

100. Magali Sarfatti Larson, *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis* (Berkeley; London:

University of California Press, 1977), p. 6.

101. Peter Blake, *Form Follows Fiasco: Why Modern Architecture Hasn't Worked* (Boston, MA: Little Brown & Co., 1977); Brent Brolin, *The Failure of Modern Architecture* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1976); Malcolm MacEwan, *Crisis in Architecture* (London: RIBA Enterprises, 1974).

102. The JCT Standard Form of Contract with Contractor's Design appeared in 1981.

103. Robert Gutman, *Architectural Practice: A Critical View* (London: Princeton Architectural Press,

1988), p. 91.

104. Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer, 'The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception', in *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, trans. by John Cumming (London: Verso, 1979),

pp. 120–67.

105. Gutman, *Architectural Practice*, p. 92.

106. See my article on the behind-the-scenes story of *AD* between the Standard Catalogue Company and Academy in Stephen Parnell, 'Acroshaw: Forgotten, but Not Forgiven', *Architecture & Culture*, 6:1 (March 2018), 37–59.