Epistemology, or who is the Architect? A Fable

Paper for conference on Epistemology in Architecture, Monte Verità, 23 March 1997

John McKean

---

1. Introduction

In his Socratic dialogue *Eupalinos, or the Architect*, the poet Paul Valéry has the following passage, as Phaedrus talks to Socrates of a conversation with his friend Eupalinos, an architect:

> PHAEDRUS:
> "Phaedrus", he was saying to me, "the more I meditate on my art, the more I practice it; the more I think and act, the more I suffer and rejoice as an architect; and the more I feel my own being with an ever surer delight and clarity."
> "I go astray in my long spells of waiting; I find myself again by the surprises I give myself; by means of these successive degrees of my silence, I advance in my own edification; and I draw near to such an exact correspondence between my aims and my powers, that I seem to myself to have made of the existence that was given me a sort of human handiwork."
> "By dint of constructing," he put it with a smile, "I truly believe that I have constructed myself."
> SOCRATES:
> To construct oneself, to know oneself - are these two, distinct acts or not?
> PHAEDRUS:
> ... and he [Eupalinos] added: "I have sought accuracy in my thoughts, so that being engendered by the consideration of things they might be changed as though of their own accord into the acts of my art I have apportioned my attentions; I have arranged the problems in another order; I begin where I finished off formerly, so as to go a little further... I am niggardly of musings, I conceive as though I were executing. What I think is feasible, and what I do is related to the intelligible. ... And then... listen, Phaedrus," he went on to say, "this little temple which I built for Hermes, a few steps from here, if you could know what it meant to me! There where the passer-by sees but an elegant chapel - 'tis but a trifle: four columns, a very simple style - there I have enshrined the memory of a bright day in my life."

This paper offers a few thoughts on the unusually consistent personal theory of the method of knowledge of architecture[1], of one man who that quotation brings to mind: Walter Segal (1907-85), who spent his formative years (1914-18) here, around Monte Verità[2], then returned as an architect to build his first little building (1932) just halfway down this hill.

---

[1] OED definition of epistemology: the theory or science of the method or grounds of knowledge.

[2] see *Monte Verità*, exhibition catalogue documented by Harald Szeemann, edited by him with Gabriella Borsano, Claire Halperin, Ingeborg Lüscher (Armanda Dado, Electra Editrice, Italian and German editions, 1978).
Among visitors mentioned by the Segals were Isadora Duncan, Rudolf van Laban (choreographer) and Mary Wigman his pupil; Johannes Nohl and Otto Gross psychoanalysits; Herman Hesse, James Joyce and D.H. Lawrence; Kropotkin and the anarchist poet Mühsam; Lenin and Silvio Gesell (a monetary

As is well known, the place of craftsmanship in ancient Greece became downgraded as that of abstract thought was raised; the eclipse of thinking-by-making was a reversal of values, which reached its classic formulation in Plato and Aristotle. Early in this 20th Century, thinkers were stitching the connections again; *Eupalinos* was published in English exactly at the moment Segal was building his 'casa piccola' here in Ascona. At the same period, Martin Heidegger began explicitly arguing that it is in the act of making that humanity discovers more about its own existence.

Before looking at what is made, and then how, first we must ask: why make what it is we make? The ground of Segal's architecture was a social goal appropriate to our time: the theme of equivalence and balance. His was the essentially democratic 20th-century, post-Freudian goal, first, of working towards an equality without sameness, a world in which each individual's experience is honoured; and, second, of working towards a less hierarchical world in which each individual's development is encouraged. The material of Segal's expression was the production of dwellings; engaging with their planning, construction and inhabitation.

2. Equipotential - and not just visual - space

The idea of equipotential space, of an openness and a loose but precise relation of parts held in equilibrium, is something which was a deep theme through Segal's life. Perhaps he is closest to his father, the painter Arthur Segal[3], in the goal of an order where loose parts are held in dynamic equilibrium and not subservient to the whole. While in Ascona (1914-18), Arthur Segal developed a theory of "equi-valent value" which he applied to the composition of his paintings as to his politics. His son, later, aimed for an equilibrium of architectural parts, each with its identity and strength, but which, without hierarchic relationships and by touching gently, built into casually formed wholes. Such an aim applies to construction techniques, to house planning, or to laying out cities, as to the social world.[4]

If Walter Segal's visual goal was a certain balanced calm, fundamentally he attacked the prevalent cultural fixation on the visual. All his life he kept an essay Bruno Taut had written in Japan[5]. Taut first contrasted the famous, small imperial palace at Katsura with another, built at the same time under the highly decorative Chinese influence, at Nikko:

---

reformer); Annie Besant, Krishnamurti and Rudolph Steiner. (Perhaps Kropotkin's and probably Lenin's were mythical visits.)
Family friends who came to stay chez Segal included Lou-Lou Albert-Lazard, Hans (Jean) Arp, Tristram Tzara, Hans Richter Hugo Ball, Emmy Hennings (the founders of Dada), Raoul Hausmann and the writers Leonhard Franck and Eli Ludwig. Ascona neighbours included Henri Oedenkoven, Viking Eggeling, Heinrich Goesch, Otto van Rees and Alexi von Jawlensky.

3 On Arthur Segal; see "Arthur Segal in Ascona", in *Arthur Segal 1875-1944*, (exhibition catalogue) herausgegeben von Wolf Herzogenrath und Paven Liska, Argon Verlag, Berlin, 1987.

4 The sense of Segal = Se-egal = c'est égal was alive in Arthur Segal's circle

5 Bruno Taut, "Das Architectonische Weltwinder Japans", *Nippon 11*, 1935, p2. Taut, Walter Segal's friend and mentor in 1920s Berlin, invited him to teach with him in the 1930s. Taut's mystic expressionism (*Alpine Architektur*, 1919) seemed to hold a Monte Verità-like longing; while Monte Verità itself had been home to Paul Goesch ("Tancred" in Taut's famous Glass Chain correspondence). Perhaps Segal had a fellow feeling with the journey Taut had made by the mid-1920s.

> "What happens to a visitor to Nikko, and what happens to a visitor to Katsura? In Nikko the eye has to see and see until it is tired. If in Katsura it only sees, it sees very little. (...) In Nikko you cannot think, as you are preoccupied with seeing. In Katsura, however, there is nothing to see without thinking. Here the eye of the master turns the eye into the transformer of thoughts; so in quiet observation the eye could be said to think."

Of course Segal understood that ordinary domestic architecture is not a palace built without budget limitation, and comparison with his houses would be absurd. But they too encourage quiet observation, they encourage the thinking eye.

> Segal: "I never use my clients and their resources as a means of self-expression. Solutions should be optimal and typical, not individual. A result thus obtained is rarely startling. The better a design performs, the less pronounced will it appear, the less assertive."

Praising new Swiss houses in the 1950s, he said:

> "Superficially these dwellings are modest and simple, but their detailing is superb. Real appreciation of simple architecture depends on a good and well-trained eye."

Taut (on Katsura):

> "Modern man here encounters a particular difficulty: we are accustomed to regard architecture as image, and for the sake of the image effect. Is it not indeed something very simple and therefore beautiful, when the entrance, the house and the spaces, garden and everything don't present themselves as soldiers, in regimented formation to left and right of the centre, but instead, each individual piece is placed precisely according to its purpose and its good sense, like a living being? A proper society of free individuals. A true miracle in our world, this arrangement of house and garden is nothing else than a tight representation of relationships...

Segal was fascinated by even patterning and never tired of playing with such forms - from the scale of town planning, housing neighbourhood layouts, building facades, and even tile patterns and tile design. He wrote about ancient town forms:

> There is no false romanticism in these [Classical Greek] towns which had to be laid out as economically as possible. There is no indulging in soft curves for interest's sake... It achieves a balance between the requirements of the individual and the community. The hippodamic town is a proof of the thesis that order is not rigidity; that is the lesson of Ancient Greece. Flexible regularity offers a balance which we strive to achieve... the free application of geometry.

The theme of even, undifferentiated forms is quiet; it has to be listened for with care. Segal was modest:

> "I tried to find my own way, easily accepting my limitations and the fact that I was not going to leave a fantastic mark on a visually-oriented people. (...)
> "Acceptance by the mind is essential for a building to be convincing... We must study aspects that transcend the realm of practical purpose and mere visual appeal... The form giver today is still no nearer a deep understanding of the intellectual processes that are needed to make his shape concept possible... Practical ability does not necessarily produce good buildings; visual inventiveness is fleeting and fickle... To convince, a shape needs more than proportions and texture or colour."

3. Researching the house plan

From the late 1930s to the late '40s Walter Segal worked on housing "research (...) and the study of design problems without the limitations imposed by the requirements of a client." The first major result of these laboratory exercises, *Home and Environment*[6], was a fascinating book of layout gambits. Seen together, this was a virtuoso exercise of humane and common sense reasoning brought to bear on house planning, studied in laboratory conditions. The central tool used throughout was the plan[7]. "For it is the plan which in the simplest way defines the conception." The central theme was a radical thinking through towards solutions. Segal was impatient with housing researchers whose goal was not the search for optimal performance, "optimal performance standards exist and should have been pursued with vigour."

As a quietly revolutionary document, *Home and Environment* is magnificent, and utterly down-to-earth; literally. For it demonstrated conclusively, and in marked contrast to almost all its contemporaries, that humane low-rise and high-density residential areas are sensible and achievable goals. Segal played variations on this theme all his life. This book, which with cool dryness first stated his case, was the clearest essay in the study of house planning ideas until Chermayeff and Alexander's seminal *Community and Privacy* in the 1960s. Segal's thorough taxonomy of dwelling form and layout centres on the three-bedroom, L-shaped patio house, for which he offers many subtly differing plan variations. The careful sequence of privacies inside is echoed in the sequence of external spaces, up to the perimeter site planning, colonising the whole land in a humane, defensible and inherently economical layout[8].

He designed mats of linked patio houses; and then, with his lightweight house-building from the 1960s, he developed radically new 'carpet' layouts. Two-storeyed square houses, in a plot with private garden of similar size, were grouped to give common open spaces and garages, at 22 dwellings to the acre. "In most situations in the British Isles you will not have to exceed such densities. Therefore, I think that the detached house in a layout such as this can replace the terrace with its lower quality of amenity."

4. The design process

A 'theory of loose parts' like Segal's implies a transparency of construction and refurbishment; each element in an architectural work is seen for itself, yet all are together becoming building. Such a sensibility of spatial ordering implies working without a preconception of an overall image, and leads into a design process which he described in a rather parallel way:

---

6 Segal, W., *Home and Environment*, London: Leonard Hill, 1948; 2nd revised edition, 1953

7 Segal talks throughout of 'planning' as the skill in question, rather than 'design' as we might instinctively say today. The term 'planner' (and the even more neutral 'technician' used throughout *Homes for the People*, which he co-wrote at the same period) is used for the agent, rather than 'architect'. As if even the terms 'design' and 'architect' stray too far from objectivity, too far from the study of housing centred on how it permits or inhibits our action.

8 as was argued conclusively over two decades later by Leslie Martin's researchers in Cambridge.

> "Planning on so limited a scale as in housing is an operation comparable, perhaps, to the playing of a game of chess. In the game, one move determines and restricts the next. Likewise in small house planning..."

And he later expanded:

> "I go step by step, and see how little decisions affect bigger ones; changing the position of a table alters the convenient position of a door, which affects the entrance space, whose alteration means the stair must move, and so it goes on..."

The game of chess, with its equally spaced, equal value board is a good image. The game offers a range from directly simple to quite complex moves, whose choice offers an immense freedom of action and range of computable ramifications, but within the utterly precise rules. It is a method of design, then which follows rules but not a pattern; a sense of visual order which allows space and not rigidity; and also an openness, a looseness in this spatial equilibrium.

Perhaps few images show this better than the perspective he used as his first illustration for the study of Deya in Mallorca (July 1934), one of the very few 'pictures' made by Segal in his life. It encapsulates the goal of ordinary conviviality in equipotential space. It has a way of linking buildings loosely together, bound in a topographic context, which is so clearly seen again in his last buildings, 'Lewisham 2' (1985).

5. Construction and common-sense

This way of thinking about design leads to similar thinking about construction. As Segal later said about the way of timber building:

> "The scope increases if you work within a method. In fact I've far more possibilities now than ever before. I don't know of any other type of building which has this degree of flexibility... It's quite an astonishing freedom."

The same sensibility centred on equi-valence and balance, with its transparency of construction, its 'chessboard' problem-solving logic, also leads to a constructional "common-sense". Segal's architectural project in this sense is based on a logical step-by-step common-sense more like that of Paxton and Fox at Crystal Palace (1850)[9] or even closer to I. K. Brunel's, when he designed the timber-frame Crimean War hospital (1855)[10], shipped out to Renkioi and erected extraordinarily fast – a project where Brunel's thoroughness even extended, just as did Segal's, to designing details of the processes of generating the components, transporting and unloading them, and then their assembly by a few chosen carpenters.

The Segal method of building is based on precision technology: total calculation, and optimisation of resources, the point is not "hi-tech", of course. The point is that it offers a system which becomes humanised into 'appropriate technology.' It is informed by Segal's intuitive concern for personal freedoms and responsibility, it produces an architecture totally under control, quick and pleasant to erect (being dry and with a shell up in a few days), economic in material and labour; enjoyable to design, build and pay for. Common-sense building uses hand power tools as an

---

[9] see my *Crystal Palace*, London: Phaidon Press, 1994

[10] see David Toppin, "The British Hospital at Renkioi", *The Arup Journal*, Vol 16., No.2., July 1981

appropriate technology, to release the creativity of the individual. Calculation allows the freedom to make other common sense decisions.

Pace Buckminster Fuller's famous question, Segal did know how heavy his houses were. If Segal's common-sense logic shows the advantages of buildings sitting on their foundations without having to be tied down, of roofs sitting on the tops of buildings free to contract and expand without being tied down, then to know their weight is precisely essential. Only the calculated approach to design makes this common-sense architecture possible.

And he needed to know how heavy each bit was, not just to show calculations of loading and deflection, and to design foundations to hold them. But so that the bits could be conveniently moved, lifted and fixed in place by real, ordinary people - his clients. His important point is that by the architect working with calculation and reason and as much precision as possible, the maximum freedom is allowed both (a) to material possibilities and (b) to the human choice, of the client or contractor - which may or may not be the same.

Segal's constructional understanding grew from a remarkable innate feel for structure and instinct for building. As Florian Beigel said of Segal, "He related building to his bodily experiences. He understood the basic structural mechanisms which members pull, bend and push in an almost physical way."[11]

This common-sense based on bodily experience is exemplified by his discussion of insulation and condensation. "It is perfectly obvious," Segal would say,

> "that if you join materials of different densities together where they cannot 'breathe', you get condensation. If you go outside, you wear a waterproof to keep the rain off; you have something to keep you warm; and then something to stop that scratching you, like a shirt. If you stick all these parts together in one single garment you will sweat immensely; meanwhile the condensation on the inside of the raincoat, as it cannot get out, will make your pullover damp and soak you further...."

The Segal method, then, is an attitude of mind; but one which quickly moved from common-sense construction to the possibility of a uniquely client-responsive housing. And his developed system (from the 1960s to the 1990s) shows this sophisticated intermeshing of sensible ideas. The design method is easily understood; it allows great flexibility in planning and in location. The lightweight construction is easily understood. It is economic, dry, pleasant to build and easily altered. It opens the method to use by all, regardless of strength, sex and age.

6 Self build - building selves

Here we touch on the archetypal activity of building one's own house; on the deep dream of this action which can give structure to our being. Building an edifice is an armature for building a person; just as in English the word ædification has come to take the usual, metaphorical, meaning of edification rather than the creation of edifices. This is where I began. (And beyond my opening quotation, Paul Valéry weaves a symphony of images around this issue for 75 more pages.)

---

[11] *The Architects' Journal*, 4 May 1988.

So every architect is somehow taking over this 'natural' power, and is entrusted with the control of this deep structuring of our lives. Easily dramatised, as in Tracy Kidder's *House*[12], this relation touches a nerve in us all. Hence our awful, painful laugh when it goes so wrong - as with the adventure of Spinlove[13] the architect or, much more, with Blandings[14] the client and his dream house. And herein is the strength of Viollet-le-Duc's famous fable *How to Build a House*, which became the frame for a polemic on architecture and the architect.

This[15] is an explicit and virtuosic apologia for architecture as the epitome of constructive common sense. It was not just that Viollet (or at least Eugene, the eponymous hero of his book), like Segal, felt knowledge to derive from empirical study; the springs of their creativity were essentially grounded and rooted in what C. G. Jung calls the sensation function. Like Viollet's hero, Segal's power was exercised through direct knowledge and contact with the sensate world of things. By radically thinking things through to first principles, Eugene's house was also full of little details based on this 'common sense' ingenuity[16].

Segal's method is identical. It is not part of a polemic of expression. And so, although it runs alongside the bunch of traditions of 'honestly expressive building', from Ruskin, the Arts and Crafts movement and Muthesius, to Hugo Häring in Germany in the 1920s, it is distinct from that tradition. Many of Häring's thoughts have an echo in Segal's work: "We should not try to express our own individuality, but rather the individuality of things; their expression should be what they are."[17] That is, Häring goes on, their function and their material. And this idealist search for true forms becomes quite metaphysical when he talks of ornamentation as "infringing an object's rights."

So really Häring's 'neue bauen' is a theory of architectural expression; it is not one of building, of how and why buildings are put together. It is a theory of form and image making; while Segal, by contrast, essentially is not interested in a theory of expression, but repeats the common-sense adage as if it had no loading on it:

> "The products of our time exist without the ritualistic symbols of the primitives. A building need not 'express' more than it actually is. A book is a book: it has no need in its appearance to offer 'cultural and symbolic' expression of its contents. The normal jacket makes no such pretences."

\+ + + + +

---

12 Kidder, T., *House*, London, 1986

13 Creswell, H. B., *The Honeywood File, An Adventure in Building*, London 1929

14 Eric Hodgins, E., *Mr Blandings Builds his Dream House*, London, 1947 and the later film.

15 Viollet-Le-Duc, E. E., *How to Build a House. An Architectural Novelette* (London, 1874), translated from his *L'Histoire d'une Maison* (Paris, 1873). It has been described as "one of the most moving pleas ever made for the profession of architect;" Jean Jacques Aillagon, "Viollet-Le-Duc and the Role of the Architect", *Architectural Design*, 3/4, 1980, p27
(In mid August 1875, Viollet, perhaps Europe's leading architectural thinker of the age, conducted his translator Bucknell on a tour of Mont Blanc. Segal remained an inveterate Alpine skier almost to the end of his life.)

16 He even devised his own way of slating roofs, using copper hooks to hold the leading edge and resting the slates on diamond-shaped battens. Viollet's brief discussion - arguing against traditional nailing by looking at the problems of movement and difficulties of repair; and arguing for his system which was more firm in high winds, more rain-proof, and as cheap and simple as the traditional technique - is an epitome of his empirical method, and of his concept of "appropriate technology", utterly analogous to Segal's operation a century later.

17 Häring, H., *Approaches to Form*, 1925

Viollet, remarkably like Segal in our 20th Century, said he "started straight away with contractors in a practical fashion"[18], having been angered by the ideology of architecture put over in the Ecole. "Very often young architects have asked me what treatise on building I should recommend [says the hero of *How to Build a House*]. "There is none, I tell them..." However,

> "in architecture there is a *method* to be followed in all cases that present themselves, but there are no definite prescriptions or rules of procedure. This method is none other than the application of your reasoning faculty to all particular cases;.." "How must I begin?" asks the pupil. "By acquiring the habit of observing everything, and reflecting on everything you see, hear or read."[19]

And here is the key: Viollet-le-Duc's essay is a discourse on method: the method of common-sense, rooted in experiential reality. It shows a man fully conversant with all aspects and stages of construction; material, technical, aesthetic, legal and economic; his power is exercised through direct knowledge and contact. He is a man of the site, its material possibilities and processes; he draws only to explain ideas which he has already worked out. This could be a description of Walter Segal, a century younger.

Valéry and Viollet, each in their own way, make clear an image of the architect as the epitome of the creative man. What Segal is allowing, on the other hand, is for this archetypal power - of building ourselves by dint of building our edifices - to be shared by us all, returned from the professional domain of architects to women, men and even children. He went much further than Viollet-le-Duc; for Segal's was not just a system of architectural knowledge, but was integrated into a world-view, exemplified in his understanding of the place of housing, the enabling role of designers, and the creative potential of anyone to construct their own dwelling. This is demonstrated in his own career.

Segal always loved his material, 'seeing through' it to reveal unexplored potential[20]. Now, in his last phase, the self-builders were his material. So he delighted in their improvisation and adaptation, made possible by his precise rules. "We have freed ourselves from the architect-designed facade at last" he would say, as the inventor of a game marvels at those who master and exploit it.

His final group of 13 separate, similar but not identical chalets cascading down among the trees, show Segal's nearest approach to that goal of equipotential space: balanced, poised in a dynamic equilibrium, speaking both to community and individuality - so reminiscent of his lovely image from 1934 of Deya in Mallorca. "Casually fitting into an existing non man-made environment, building into trees, on sloping land..." as he had said, many years before having the chance to create this himself. This place, with the social cohesion of inhabitants involved in their place-making not in shaping a made place, makes for a stronger public realm than Krier-like neo-historical street morphologies[21]. But it is visually much less assertive, speaking to those who deserve to hear.

---

18 Viollet-le-Duc, op. cit., p.61

19 Viollet-le-Duc, op. cit., p. 152-3

20 He often used products for other purposes than those for which they were marketed

21 See the writings of the brother Robert and Leon Krier; Leon Krier became masterplanner for Prince Charles at Poundbury, a 1990s nostalgic faux-vernacular development at Dorchester, Dorset.

So there, in Lewisham (1985) the threads of Segal's guiding principles come together. He separates the modern principles, first, from their subversion by authoritarians and elitists, second, from the 'morality', social engineering and 'brutalism' and, third, from 'economy-of-scale' crudity and the overweight construction industry mafia. He holds to the equality of access, to an equivalence of amenity: rational, unassuming, likeable houses which semi-skilled people could fabricate and dwell in, within the processes of which they could themselves grow: self building, building selves.

Of course even 'Segal method' building is hard work, especially when fitted into weekends and summer evenings; it takes courage, but there is a deep certainty that it can be comprehensible. "His concept," said one self-builder "is that if he makes you sit down and think about the drawings, you will understand what to do." [22] "He taught us to think for ourselves and gave us such confidence when we finished our houses we felt we could go on to do anything we sent our minds to - he literally changed our lives."[23]

The first self-builder from a public housing waiting list, Ken Atkins, a floor layer by trade, said to me in May 1988: "Basically he taught you that you can conquer the world if you put your mind to it. That's what I learned from him. Changed my world." It is as close as practical reality has come to the motto of W. R. Lethaby, whom Segal so admired: "an artist is not a special kind of person, but every person is a special kind of artist."

In his house planning, Segal looked for balance. He used the word repeatedly, and it can be seen in his plans. Shying from pattern making and from generalising, he thought of groups, individual families and individuals, and always sought a balanced optimum rather than a panacea. Balance in layout between rigidity and romanticism, balance essentially of community and privacy.

> "I think architects must enlist a much wider support for those things which we believe have relationships both with the world of things and with the world of human beings. And for that, I think we must seek much closer contact with people."
>
> "If architecture is to reach the mind - beyond the fleeting visual impressions - there must come into action a meaningful background against which all this action can take place. This happens when a building can display a fuller understanding of its users than is achieved by mere serviceability; and when, in turn, it is likewise understood by them; in such reciprocal rapport a level of relationship is produced which is conducive to mutual well-being..."

The notion that architecture has become a profession with its closed circle of legitimacy[24] - the notion simply stated in G. B. Shaw's 'conspiracy against the laity' - was something Segal felt instinctively. Like the best scientist, he was wary of rule by experts, preferring to trust to an informed laity. "The technician's job is to clarify the technical possibilities so that the people's demands can become more precise and lead to action," was a principle printed with underlining in *Homes for*

---

22 quoted in Charlotte Ellis "Walter's Way", *The Architectural Review*, March 1987, pp. 77-81

23 quoted in Sutton, P., *Study of 17b Longton Avenue*, Polytechnic of North London, March 1987.

24 well discussed by Till, J., "Contingent Theory", *STOA* (EAAE Journal), No 1, Février 1996, p.69.

the People[25] which Segal co-authored in the 1940s. Walter Segal held to this motto throughout his life.

The architectural profession, he felt, in its obsession with form making had lost its central role as catalyst for the convivial provision of building. And here the final ingredient is designing a building process which itself is convivial. Segal's work rests on stronger epistemological foundations than those simply encompassed by ideas of 'simple honest building' or of 'decent housing provision,' admirable as each of these is.

> *Shall we forever resign the pleasure of construction to the professional carpenter? What does architecture amount to in the experience of the mass of men?*
>
> *H.D. Thoreau, Walden (1845-7)*

John McKean March 1997 4347 words

Published in *Architecture and Teaching: Epistemological Foundations/ Architecture et Enseignement: Fondements épistémologiques*, Les Cahiers de l'enseignement de l'architecture/Transactions on Architectural Education, No. 02, Geneva, 1998, pp. 111-125

[25] *Homes for the People*, by "A Committee of The Association of Building Technicians", 11 authors including Walter Segal, London, 1946