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A GOLDEN PEDIGREE: FINDING MIES IN NEW ZEALAND MODERNISM THROUGH THE WORK OF EDWARD ERICKSON

Mies van der Rohe is one of modernism’s golden boys. He is celebrated for many reasons, among them his use of fine materials: marbles, onyx, and travertine, to name a few. But at the Illinois Institute of Technology (I.I.T.) from 1938, it was his Bauhaus approach that dominated, particularly in his teaching.

This paper considers Mies’s impact and influence as a teacher, by exploring the life and work of one of his students, Edward H. Erickson. Erickson trained at I.I.T. in the late 1930s and then travelled to New Zealand as a soldier. He married a local woman, and lived and worked in New Zealand until 1963, when he and his wife decided to settle in United States, in Malibu.

It is rare in New Zealand modernism to find an architect who trained under Mies. Others went to Harvard, while Bill Alington chose the University of Illinois, and met Mies while there, but did not train under him. More than rare, Erickson is also unknown among New Zealand architectural historians; this is the first paper to reflect on his life and work.

The paper presents and analyses two of Erickson’s New Zealand houses, both of them in the west Auckland suburb of Titirangi. They were designed and built between 1953 and 1957. The paper shows that Mies’s influence can be found in the Auckland houses, including in their fenestration and their use of singular materials, notably local basalt rocks sourced from a South Auckland quarry.
Introduction

Travel and migration are important themes in the history and development of New Zealand architecture. The earliest immigrant architects were often British, but among them also some French, at Akaroa in particular, and much trafficking between Australia and New Zealand, for example in conjunction with the Victorian and Otago gold rushes. Migration patterns were more diverse in the twentieth century. European émigrés had a major impact from the late 1930s on. The United States, too, was an increasing source of immigrants as well as a destination of growing interest for those raised and educated locally.

Americans who lived and worked in New Zealand included Roy Alstan Lippincott. Lippincott moved to Auckland from Australia upon winning, with Edward Fielder Billson, the competition for the University of Auckland's Arts Building in the early 1920s. Others, such as Edward Erickson, arrived during World War II as soldiers with the American Army. Some of the soldiers stayed for longer than the duration of the war. Transiting in the other direction, Gordon Wilson, Edmund Anscombe and Tibor Donner were among those who travelled to the United States, visiting key buildings and returning to New Zealand with American influences. Bill Toomath, Jim Beard and Bill Alington were among the New Zealand architects who completed postgraduate study in the United States in the 1950s - Toomath at Harvard's Graduate School of Design; Beard at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M.I.T.) and then Harvard; and Alington at the University of Illinois - all of them coming into contact with internationally significant architects while there, and producing fine modern buildings upon their return to New Zealand. Franz Iseke - born in Singapore but of German descent - was another who studied under Gropius at Harvard after World War II. He worked in Australia before migrating to New Zealand.

This paper considers the life and work of Edward Erickson. Erickson is little known among New Zealand architectural historians, but his name has long been familiar to one of this paper's co-authors, Gina Hochstein, because his Bardwell House is her parental home. He is of immediate interest for the reason that he trained at the Illinois Institute of Technology (I.I.T.) under Ludwig Mies van der Rohe. To have been taught by Mies is rare among the mid-century modernists who lived and worked in New Zealand. At Harvard, Bill Toomath was taught by Walter Gropius and then worked briefly for Gropius in The Architects' Collaborative, and for I.M. Pei. Jim Beard, who studied city planning at M.I.T. in 1951-2 and then landscape architecture at Harvard, acknowledges that his 1955 house in the Wellington suburb of Karori, with its commitment to the grid, was initially inspired by Mies's thinking. Bill Alington completed a Master of Architecture at the University of Illinois. He met Mies while there, and the two discussed architectural philosophy, but he did not train under him.

This paper presents a brief biography of Erickson before considering the education system and practices introduced at I.I.T. by Mies. It then identifies and discusses two of Erickson's New Zealand houses from the 1950s, both of which are in the west Auckland suburb of Titirangi. Titirangi was, and still is, at the far western reaches of the city, in the hills and thick with native bush and trees. It was home to many artists and also has a particularly rich heritage of mid-century modern houses. A discussion of the suburb and its communities helps to contextualise Erickson and his New Zealand work.

The main question, however, is the extent to which Mies's influence was or was not apparent in Erickson's later work. While not all architects carry the traces of their teachers long term, Mies's enduring influence on many of those he taught has been recognised by others. His student A. James Speyer, for example, recollects: "Mies's students ... would absorb Mies's principles [i.e. his teachings] and I don’t believe that my architectural expression would be what it is today if I did not have those principles.... I feel beholden to Mies in any architectural expression I may make. I feel grateful for the principles with which I was imbued". Pauline Saliga agrees, "What I think is so interesting about looking at the careers of the people who have come out of I.I.T., is that they prove what you said to be true: that Mies provided a set of principles for people to use in their architecture". The paper shows that Erickson was one such student. Mies's influence can be found in the fenestration of the Auckland houses and in Erickson's use of singular materials.
Edward H. Erickson

Edward H. Erickson was born in Chicago in 1915. Details of his early life are sketchy, although it is known that he completed the final two years of his architecture degree at I.I.T., studying under Mies van der Rohe in 1938-39. He enlisted in the United States Army in March 1941. He became a captain in the 25th Infantry (Combat Engineers) and served in the Pacific during World War II, arriving in New Zealand in December 1941. In recognition of heroic service during the war, he was awarded a Bronze Star.

While serving in New Zealand, Erickson met Norma Fleet, a relative of his friend Cecil Scarborough. Erickson and Fleet married in 1944. His marriage to a local woman explains his decision to stay in Auckland at the end of the war. He secured a job with the architecture firm of Llewellyn Piper & Son, and he and Norma soon had two sons. It is not known whether Erickson worked for any other practices during his time in New Zealand. Ultimately, in 1963, he, Norma and their boys moved to the United States. The family settled in Malibu, where Erickson continued to practise for another 43 years, designing mainly libraries and shopping malls. He died in Malibu in 2011, at the age of 96, followed by Norma in 2013, aged 97.

Llewellyn Piper & Son was a successful Auckland practice, designing a range of public, commercial and industrial buildings. The best known of these is the Auckland Electric Power Board (A.E.P.B.) Building in the commercial area of Newmarket (1946-50). With its unadorned surfaces, flat roofs and large expanses of glass, the building is a bold expression of modernity. This was observed in reviews at the time of completion. More than this, it demonstrates a shift in the work of the practice, from classically influenced to distinctly modern design. Piper was aware of and interested in European modernism. Robin Byron suggests interests in Gropius, Erich Mendelsohn, J.J.P. Oud and Alvar Aalto. Piper must have been impressed by Erickson's pedigree, and Erickson's presence in Piper's office opens up the possibility that he contributed to the shift in the work of the practice that is apparent in the A.E.B.P. Building, helping to realise the firm's most radically modern design.

While working in Piper's office, Erickson is also known to have designed at least two houses on his own account. As mentioned, both are in the west Auckland suburb of Titirangi: the Erickson House, for himself and his family (1954), and the Bardwell House (1958). A third house has been suggested, in south Auckland, although no details of it have been located to date. Given the length of his time in New Zealand, it is likely that more of Erickson's houses will emerge in the future.

Erickson at I.I.T.

Erickson's name appears on the published list of architecture staff and students who worked and studied at I.I.T. between 1938 and 1958. This document lists all the students who were taught by Mies. It confirms that Erickson undertook his senior two years at I.I.T. in 1938 and 1939. He took papers, or courses, numbered Architecture 407, 408 and 410, all in the senior band of subjects. Architecture 407 and 408 were both taught by Mies himself from 1938 to 1947. The 410 course, on city planning and the theory thereof, was taught by Charles Dornbush in 1939 and 1940.

Prior to Mies' arrival at I.I.T. in 1938, the school adhered to Beaux-Arts traditions and practices. Mies, in contrast, was a renowned modernist. He had conceptualised the Weissenhofsiedlung, earned international attention with the Barcelona Pavilion, translated its aims and ideas into the Tugendhat House in Brno, and run the Bauhaus from 1930 until its closure in 1932. He was not politically motivated, as is apparent in Philip Johnson's comment that “Mies didn’t give a damn about who was running the government, but Hitler liked pitched roofs.” Thus he was forced to leave Germany, following Gropius in accepting an American professorship.

Mies's intentions at I.I.T. were clear from the outset. At the conclusion of his inaugural address in 1938, he quoted St. Augustine in saying that “Beauty is the splendor of Truth”. He meant truth to materials, and truth to the epoch and technology in which he and his students were living. Architecture was not to be clothed in forms of the past, but was to give expression to the industries and technologies of the day. Thus, he immediately began to remodel the I.I.T. programme, replacing the old Beaux-Arts system with a modernist, or Bauhaus, one. Newly emphasised was the three-fold expression of structure, modular organisation and construction details. Mies wanted his students to be able to integrate structure, plan and beauty. He wanted to teach them “what is possible in construction, what is necessary for use, and what is significant as art.”
Over the first three years, the learning was intended to be cumulative, with an overlapping sequence of seven modules, addressing form, space, proportion and colour, among other things. The final two years concentrated on the application of the earlier learning to architectural design. Design progressed in linear fashion from rooms with a single function to houses, then buildings within a community and then the multi-functioning city. Throughout, there was much attention to materials and construction methods, and students were imbued with grids, with Mies asserting that “Orderliness was the real reason” for his own consistent use of the grid. His aim at I.I.T. was that by the end of their studies, the students would be proficient in designing and building simply and clearly, while also being able to address the particularities of site. The comparatively small size of the classes ensured close contact between Mies and the senior students in his classes.

Erickson in Titirangi

While order was important to Mies, the part of Auckland in which Erickson and his wife chose to live - Titirangi - was anything but. It was outlying, hilly, thick with lush bush and, in the middle of the twentieth century, still felt removed from Auckland’s western suburbs, and more so from the city centre. As roading was gradually improved, smaller shacks and baches gave way to more permanent structures. Land remained cheaper than in many parts of Auckland. This was part of the appeal for many of the artists and designers who chose to live there. Among them was Colin McCahon, one of New Zealand’s most celebrated painters. It was in Titirangi that he explored themes of national and personal identity in his “I AM” series in the 1950s. Another resident, landscape painter Louis McIvor, recalls that “the creativity and the aesthetic feeling in Titirangi was quite remarkable and very unusual at the time”.

Clearly it was an artistic community, and those who could afford to also supported architectural experimentation by commissioning modern houses from Auckland’s younger architects. For example, landscape architect Odo Strewe and potter Len Castle both commissioned houses from Group Architects, with Bill Wilson designing the Strewe House (1954-5) and James Hackshaw designing the Castle House (1959). Interior decorator John Crichton’s house became something of a show home for the new pan-Pacific modernism (which he was also selling at his Kitchener Street design store). There are many more: architect Tibor Donner’s own house (1947), with its curving and heavily glazed front façade; architect Bill Haresnape’s own house (1955-8), known for its demonstration of American influences, particularly its debt to Richard Neutra; William Chick’s Scarborough House, for Erickson’s friend and landscape contractor Cecil Scarborough (1957); Mark-Brown and Fairhead’s House for the Sub-tropics (1956) and their slightly later Orr-Walker House (1965); Rigby Mullan’s Greer/Frith House (1960), in the tradition of the glass-walled pavilion; and Imi Porsolt’s woody Pollard House in Wood Bay (1962). Confirming the tradition some fifteen years later was the Japanese-inspired house that Ron Sang designed for photographer Brian Brake (1977).

Erickson designed the Titirangi house for himself and his family in 1954. It is timber framed, clad with vertical board-and-batten, and has a long, narrow, rectilinear footprint and a shallow, mono-pitched roof. Entry is on the long south side, where the road is. Other than the front door, the only openings on the south elevation are fanlight windows, and thus on approach the house appears comparatively closed. Extensive glazing and a lengthy deck on the north then open it up to both sun and views. Here the land slopes away, and an exposed concrete block foundation wall becomes more visible. The slope of the roof echoes and speaks to the slope of the land. Cantilevered eaves, extending out on the northern side by 1.25 metres, provide shade from the summer sun, while allowing the winter sun to enter the interiors. The northern glazing is distinctive, comprising large sheets of glass above about hip height and groups of three smaller windows below. The smaller windows are top-hung, opening out like louvres and, in conjunction with the southern fanlights, allowing for cross-ventilation.

In plan, the Erickson House is direct. Entry is into a hallway, which offers the choice of turning left, to the west, where social spaces are clustered, or right, to the east, where the private spaces are grouped. The living and dining areas are partially open to each other, separated only by a centrally placed fireplace and chimney. This is in the tradition of Frank Lloyd Wright’s Prairie houses, with which, it is reasonable to assume, Erickson would have been familiar. All spaces and rooms then open out onto the northern deck, providing easy connections between inside and out, as well as panoramic views to the city. To allow for maximum space, and the opening up of one space to the next, sliding doors are used throughout.
Erickson used a range of local materials and textures in the house, notably timbers, contrasted by stone. The timbers include exposed Oregon rafters, diagonally laid Douglas fir sarking and polished tawa floors. The regular spacing of the rafters becomes the module which guides the placement of internal walls. The walls in the living area and the main bedroom are of knotty pine, with open bookshelves strapped to some of the walls. The sliding doors throughout are also wooden. At the bedroom end of the house, the hallway has a length of sliding doors, concealing storage cupboards. Contrasting all of this timber is the free-standing stone fireplace and chimney that divide the living and dining areas, complete with a cantilevered hearth seat.

The Erickson House was published in the *Auckland Star* in 1961, as a winning entry in a house of the year competition, and also appeared as a double-page spread in the Spring/Summer issue of *Vogue New Zealand* in 1961. The *Auckland Star* commented that the house "would look equally as distinctive among the celebrated American contemporary homes as it does in its Auckland setting," and suggested that it "reflect[ed] the changing pattern of New Zealand life." This article also confirms the use of colour in the house: in the living area, one wall white; and in the dining area, one wall in dark blue and another in red.

Lynn Cox, who owned the house in the 1970s, recalls the open plan affording a view from the living area all the way down the hallway to the main bedroom. She also remembers hosting a party at which she and her friends did the conga down the hallway and around the dividing stone wall. The current owners, Marc and Inge Vergroesen, particularly like the eaves design for their way of living.
The Bardwells commissioned Erickson to design their Titirangi house in 1958. It is a sizeable two-storey house, timber framed and clad with shiplap weatherboards. The overall form is more complex than that of the Erickson House, although still with a largely rectilinear form, entry from the south, and large windows and doors opening onto northern decks. Again, there is strong demarcation between the social and private zones within the house, with the social (living and dining rooms and the kitchen) located upstairs and the private (three bedrooms and the bathroom), downstairs. All upstairs rooms open onto the first floor deck, which is shaded by projecting eaves and has distant views to Auckland city.

A larger-than-normal front door provides entry into a hallway space. From here, an angled wall at approximately 45 degrees opens into the living room, notable also for its large plate glass window and vertical stack of three top-hung or louvre-type windows. Next door to the living room, the kitchen pushes slightly out onto the deck, effectively dividing it into two distinct seating areas – one with double doors from the living room, and the other accessible from the dining room – and only a narrow link between.

Timber is again used internally, with heart rimu for the floors and the sliding doors. Exposed beams and timber sarking do not appear here. As a result, modular planning is less overt here than at the Erickson House, but the logic of a grid still underlies the positioning of walls. Stone is again used for a substantial fireplace and chimney. The stone does not divide space here, but instead fills the entire south wall of the living room, and has a dark concrete cantilevered seat running its full length. The stonework was executed with the help of Cecil Scarborough, Norma Erickson’s relative, who had introduced the couple to each other some years earlier. One of the current owners of the house, Manfred Hochstein, is a retired geophysicist with extensive knowledge in geology and identifies some of the stone as sourced locally, from Drury, south of Auckland, and the bluestone (basalt) from the South Island.

The Bardwell House has much built-in furniture: bookcases line two walls in the living room; a wall of storage and display shelves lines the dining room; and there is plenty of cupboard space throughout, including a built-in pantry plus a storage nook in the kitchen. The kitchen also had a new and novel labour-saving design, incorporating a sink-erator as well as unusual work surfaces that were fitted with a raised edge so that no liquid could spill onto the floor.
In sum, while the Erickson House is the more radical of the two, with its strongly linear form and spaces that are open from one to the next, the two share a number of elements: a considered approach to siting; predominantly rectilinear floors plans; the order of underlying grids; the clustering of social spaces and private spaces, and the separation of the two zones from each other; the extensive use of timber, contrasted by stone for a substantial fireplace and chimney; and the use of triple windows – horizontally and vertically – for heightened control over ventilation. Both have an elegance to them, and were designed for comfort and liveability.

Erickson in New Zealand Architecture

While the post-war period gave rise to a host of new ‘-isms’ internationally, from the New Empiricism to the New Primitivism and the New Brutalism, New Zealand modernism in the 1950s was in large part dominated by international modernism on the one hand and regional modernism on the other. International modernism was characterised by flat roofs, large expanses of glass, clean lines and minimal ornamentation. In New Zealand houses, it is often associated with the work of émigré architects. Regional modernism, on the other hand, sought to incorporate references to local culture and precedents, to use local materials and to respond to the local climate. It was woody, sometimes also with brick or stone. The clearest expressions of regional modernism are in domestic architecture. In Auckland, Group Architects are most closely identified with the term, although an enthusiasm for regional modernism was in fact shared by many in the 1950s and beyond.

Regional modernism had already challenged international modernism in the United States. In 1947, Lewis Mumford wrote in the *Architectural Review* that functionalism was not enough; there was a need to incorporate “feeling” into buildings. It grew from Frank Lloyd Wright’s emphasis on site-specific architecture and the broader search for a distinctly American identity in architecture. Californian architects led the move towards regionalism, in Los Angeles and in San Francisco, where the term Bay Area was soon applied to buildings built in timber, with exposed structures, contrasting stone walls, low-pitched roofs, over-hanging eaves and plans which accommodated informal ways of living. Such were the common threads between the various regional modernisms that it essentially became another kind of international language.

In their chapter, “Buildings for the Sub-tropics: The Group and Other Moderns”, Bill McKay and Julia Gatley have questioned the dichotomy between the international and the regional in New Zealand modernism. They present a series of examples demonstrating regionalist influences and elements within work historically considered to be internationalist, and a series of examples of internationalist influences and references in work historically considered to be regionalist. This included the Group’s admiration for Le Corbusier; similarities between Rigby Mullan’s Greer House (supposedly internationalist) and the Group’s All-Pine Prefab (supposedly regionalist); and the timber, pitched-roof houses of some émigré architects, particularly Imi Porsolt.

Edward Erickson’s work continues in this vein, blurring the lines between the internationalist and the regionalist. He was American; he trained under Mies van der Rohe, who, like Le Corbusier, was central to the universalisation/internationalisation of modern architecture. Yet he came from Chicago and his New Zealand work also suggests an interest in Frank Lloyd Wright’s Prairie houses. From Mies, we can see rectilinear forms, painted white externally yet with bold colours used internally (as at the Barcelona Pavilion and the Tugendhat House); simplicity and clarity of design with no extraneous ornament; linear footprints, with a sense of closure on the street façade and openness on the garden side (as at the Tugendhat House); and top-hung windows set low to the ground (as at the Farnsworth House). From Wright, and subsequent others, we see the extensive use of timber, and the hearth as the heart of the home and built in stone, in conscious contrast to interiors otherwise dominated by timber. And in the Erickson House, the fireplace and chimney are freestanding, requiring users of the house to make conscious decisions about going left or right to move from one space to the other (as at the Robie House and various others). The use of a stone fireplace and chimney in an interior that was otherwise largely in timber was a device shared by several of the Titirangi houses mentioned above: Bill Haresnape’s own house; William Chick’s Scarborough House; and Imi Porsolt’s Pollard House. At James Hackshaw’s Castle House, the hearth and chimney were in brick rather than stone, but still provided the desired contrast with the timber. The interweaving of particular internationalist and regionalist influences is useful in understanding each of the modern houses individually. The west Auckland houses are also important collectively. This research on Erickson contributes to the growing understanding of the Titirangi collective and the connections that existed within it.
The final finding from this paper relates to the work of Llewelyn Piper & Son during Erickson’s employ. It reveals various elements that are common to his two Titirangi houses and to some of the work produced by Llewelyn Piper’s office. First, the A.E.P.B. Building in Newmarket originally featured bold colours internally. Walls were painted dark blue, deep maroon and white in the showroom and other offices.58 Second, the firm remodelled a house in the Auckland suburb of Mission Bay, using the same colour scheme that Erickson used in his own house, but with natural wood in place of the white walls.59 And third, in the remodelling of the Mission Bay House,60 and in the Clark House in Titirangi (1956),61 the firm used the same triple windows that Erickson used in his Bardwell House. Research to date suggests that Erickson may well have been responsible for these elements, because a shift in Llewellyn Piper & Son’s work coincides with his arrival at the firm; because the elements were already known to him from his background and training; and because he liked them enough to use them in work he produced on his own account.

Author’s note: The research and writing for this paper was supported by a University of Auckland Summer Research Scholarship, awarded to Gina Hochstein by the Faculty of Creative Arts and Industries in 2015.
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