

indeed many students would cheerfully continue at the University for far longer than is good for them. This is a matter of the greatest importance. The architectural course is today becoming standardized at five years, and it may be questioned whether this is not already too long. Most people lose their youthful elasticity of mind at some time between twenty and thirty, after thirty few can learn anything new. They have learned, they can increase and improve their learning and their ability, but their ideas are fixed.

Now it is very important that the young man should go out into life whilst his mind is still flexible and his ideas still capable of change. This means that his period of formal tuition must be finished in time to allow of a further period of self-education. The tendency to lengthen the period of University tuition is, of course, very strong; courses are always being improved and lengthened; desirable subjects are always being added. To this tendency one answer must always be given. The University course is not, and cannot be, a complete training for the profession. It is a training in certain fundamental subjects, its objects are not immediately practical and it cannot include everything.

The need of early contact with the living profession may to some degree be satisfied by requiring office experience during the long vacations of the academic course, indeed this experience is necessary if the student is to make full use of his academic opportunities. It is a common saying that the young architect learns more during his first year out of the school than he did during the whole of his course; he learns in fact the relation of his previous training to the practice of his profession; he learns, we hope, how much more he has to learn.

Opinions will always vary as to what subjects are the most important and as to how they should be taught. Courses will always vary with the teacher and there can be no such thing as a standardized best course. The very idea is objectionable. Variety exists amongst the schools of architecture today; this variety is good and it must be allowed to continue for there can be no cut and dried formula in a subject so large and so human as architecture.

Some very important subjects are quite unsuited to academic instruction and can only be learned by doing them. We cannot give lectures on how to manage a building committee or how to take lunch with a client. Generally speaking, the subjects of academic instruction are those which can be treated fundamentally, that is, from the point of view of why as well as of how. A technical school teaches its students what to do, a university in addition teaches why we do it so. Our universities today are very apt to be turned into technical schools, and this tendency must be guarded against. Yet, even

allowing for differences in the technical training, the schools of architecture today differ in fundamentals. This, too, is good and should be preserved.

The ideal course which I shall outline will be of such length that the student can complete it in his early twenties. School should continue up to seventeen, after this may come a year devoted to travel, to the acquisition of a foreign language or to cultural work at a university; in any case a year free from the bonds of the schoolboy. Entering the architectural school at eighteen, the student may hope to graduate at twenty-three; graduation may be followed by a year of travel and study, and at twenty-four our young architect will begin work as a draughtsman. If he has already done some office work during his vacations, he may hope by this time to be a young architect, inexperienced, but with a realization of what his profession means to himself. There must be no post graduate course to tempt him to further academic lectures and classes; practice is his only real post graduate work.

The first year of the course must be preparatory, devoted to drawing and construction, including the mathematics necessary for the advanced branches of construction. But the importance of drawing need not be exaggerated.

The making of very elaborate and highly-finished drawings is rather a waste of time; neat and accurate drawings are all that are necessary. In any case those students who have a natural talent for draughtsmanship can be trusted to develop it with a little encouragement. It is a mistake to think that a building can be very deeply studied in detail on paper. Such study is much more likely to result in a paper architecture and the best way to study detail is by measuring old buildings.

From the very beginning construction must be a principal subject. Until the student knows how a thing is made he cannot draw it, until he knows why it is made in any particular way he cannot design it. Architecture is a structural art, founded on structure and dependent on structure for its development. An architect who cannot construct is worse than a bad practical man; he is, of necessity, a bad designer.

But the architect is not an engineer, he should know his structure, how it is made and why it is so made, he should feel his structure in his design, but he need not be able to design a complete steel frame or a ferro concrete bridge. In practice he would be very unwise to attempt the actual calculation, but he cannot design the building unless he knows very well where his steel framing will be placed, how big it will be, what spans he can properly use and how it must be protected. He must design with a sense of structure, whether in steel or brick or wood. So his structural work will begin with simple carpentry or mason work and advance