
Journal of the Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada
Le Journal de la Société pour l'étude de l'architecture au Canada



With a Past View from Winnipeg
Thoughts on the Evolution of Canadian Interior Design Education

Dorothy Stern

Volume 44, Number 1, 2019

Women and Architecture

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1066283ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1066283ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

SSAC-SEAC

ISSN

2563-8696 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Stern, D. (2019). With a Past View from Winnipeg: Thoughts on the Evolution of Canadian Interior Design Education. *Journal of the Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada / Le Journal de la Société pour l'étude de l'architecture au Canada*, 44(1), 57–74. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1066283ar>

Copyright © SSAC-SEAC, 2019

This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/>

Érudit

This article is disseminated and preserved by Érudit.

Érudit is a non-profit inter-university consortium of the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Its mission is to promote and disseminate research.

<https://www.erudit.org/en/>

WITH A PAST VIEW FROM WINNIPEG

Thoughts on the Evolution of Canadian Interior Design Education

> DOROTHY STERN

DOROTHY STERN is an educator, interior designer, architect, and urban planner. She is currently a professor in the Interior Design Department at Algonquin College in Ottawa. Prior to becoming a full-time educator, Dorothy practised as an interior designer, exhibit designer, and urban designer, in Canada as well as internationally. At Algonquin College, she has been instrumental in spearheading several accreditation and curricular initiatives. She has twice been recognized with awards for excellence by the Algonquin College Students' Association. She is a Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA) site visitor, a registered member of the Association of Registered Designers of Ontario (ARIDO), Interior Designers of Canada (IDC), and Interior Design Educators Council (IDEC). Dorothy holds a Bachelor of Interior Design from the University of Manitoba, a Master in Environmental Studies from York University, and a Master of Architecture from McGill University.

FOREWORD

I am honoured to have this paper published in this special issue of the Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada (SSAC) journal. It was written in 2010 while I was a graduate student in architecture at McGill University in Montreal. On the basis of this essay, I am also honoured to have been awarded by the SSAC the 2011 Martin Eli Weil prize.

As this paper was written several years ago, it is important to note that it is a historical piece. Primarily focused on the history of interior design education and practice, particular emphasis was placed on the influential founders of the Interior Design Program at the University of Manitoba, the influence of architectural theory as well as a feminist theory during that period, and the evolving nature of both the curriculum and professional interior design practice until 2010.

I am unable to comment on the current structure of the interior design curriculum at the University of Manitoba. However, I am pleased to note that there has been progress with respect to the notion of a “new perspective for a combined and thoughtful” relationship between interior design and architecture at the professional level—at least in Ontario. Although not specifically “a situated architecture,” in 2016 the Association of Registered Designers of Ontario (ARIDO) was informed by the Attorney General that the Ontario Government supported implementation of the regulation of the profession of Interior Design. The recommended approach by government is




FIG. 1. ENTRANCE HALL IN THE POMPEIAN STYLE. STUDENT WORK 1939-1940. | HARLAND AND STIRK, *THE HISTORY OF INTERIOR DECORATION*, P. 18.

the integration of this new regulation within the existing *Architects Act*, bringing a new partnership between the architecture and interior design professions within the coming year.

Joan Harland, the first female Chair of both the Interior Decorating and Interior Design programs (University of Manitoba), passed away in 2016. Her *Winnipeg Free Press* obituary noted that “[s]he believed strongly that her future life will continue in the activities/contributions of her students and the appreciation by others of the works of art she has been involved in creating.”¹ The publication of this paper is evidence of the accuracy of Professor Harland’s intuition regarding her future life and continued influence on the interior design profession in Canada.

Interior design, being within architecture, is necessarily less big than architecture, but not necessarily less deep.

—Abercrombie, *A Philosophy of Interior Design*, p. 166.²

As an interior design educator for over twenty years, and now as a student of architecture at McGill University, I have often thought appreciatively of my early years as an undergraduate in the Interior Design Program at the University of Manitoba (1968-1972). Housed within the School of Architecture, that program offered a unique and robust modernist design education. As a result of that firm foundation, I was able to pursue a wide range of interior design, architecture, and urban design opportunities both in North America and abroad. Originating in 1948 from the previous interior decoration diploma program, the Bachelor of Interior Design (BID) was the first professional baccalaureate credential to be offered

in Canada. How and why that approach to design education evolved particularly at the University of Manitoba has always been of interest to me and is the subject of this study. Also of relevance is the story of the first professors of architecture and interior decorating who initiated that distinctive program, and the relationship of the fledgling Interior Design Program to the much larger architecture program to which it was and still remains affiliated. The role of Professor Joan Harland, the first female Chair of both the Interior Decorating and Interior Design programs, is also of significance, particularly in terms of the history of feminism from the beginning of the twentieth century, the historic uneasy relationship between the interior design and architecture professions, and the numerous advances in interior design pedagogy and professionalism over the past seventy years.

While several scholars have focused on gender in the architecture profession, next to nothing has been written about the origins of Canadian contemporary interior design education. It is only within the past few years that this complex discipline has been investigated internationally beyond the scope of glossy coffee-table books and ubiquitous “how-to” manuals. Consequently, critical enquiry into the intersection of gender, social, political, psychological, and philosophical discourses as well as the influence of architectural theory on interior design pedagogy has only recently formed part of that scholarship.

One reason for the lack of research is the current fractured state of the profession itself. We designers are a confused bunch, with enormous philosophical divisions about the definition of what interior design actually is and what it should become; how it should be taught and how it should be practised. The situation

has become so critical that at a recent 2006 conference entitled *Thinking Inside the Box*,³ designers from across the globe met to discuss one basic question: What is interior design? Compared to the solid historical theoretical bases of other professions, to ask this question so “late in the game” seems a sad commentary on the state of interior design affairs at the start of the twenty-first century. From my viewpoint, at least the question is finally being asked. Further, as a specific design discipline only officially established in the late nineteenth–early twentieth century, I suggest asking questions such as this now is rather timely, and particularly appropriate in this era of postmodern skepticism and questioning of mainstream structuralist hierarchies.

From its inception as a formalized course of study, North American interior design has had many identities and corresponding titles, including interior decorating, interior architecture, interior environments, to name a few. It has been and continues to be taught from the perspectives of various disciplines such as fine art, home economics, environmental studies, and architecture. That sundry approach has resulted in a history which is “patchy and contested,”⁴ and worse, one which has created an ambiguity to the profession which has left it not easily defined. Because of the wide variation in interior design context and practice, it is therefore important to note that this is a study based solely on the pedagogy of one unique Canadian⁵ school of interior design; it does not necessarily reflect the view from any other school.

Interior design is a profession predominantly practised by women. Until recently, architecture schools were traditionally dominated by male students. Yet during my recent leave of absence as an architecture student at McGill University, I could

not help but notice the very high numbers of females enrolled in the Architecture Program.⁶ Why this has occurred and how that trend might impact both interior design and architectural education in the future is also an area of reflection.

1938-1948: THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR DECORATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

In the words of Emeritus Professor Joan Harland [1914-2016], Chairman and Professor of the University of Manitoba Interior Design Program for over forty years (1939-1980), during that early era the program was:

one of the most modern, and through its association with an Architecture Faculty, [it] seemed to provide the best background. Basic Design, Theory and Drafting were the best foundation subjects, as long as they were directed towards Interior Design concepts and requirements and the total Interior Design course was being taught by professional Interior Designers.⁷

Like most other interior decorating programs in North America, the diploma program at the University of Manitoba was an outgrowth of an earlier social history. Originating around the mid-point of the nineteenth century, interior decorating was an activity for women which was originally grounded within the historic Victorian framework of separate public (work) and private (domestic) spheres for men and women. Focusing exclusively on domestic interiors, early twentieth-century American decorators such as Elsie de Wolfe [1865-1950] and Dorothy Draper [1888-1969] were the first to professionalize their unique abilities to the extent that by the end of World War I, “the female interior decorating profession was well established, with a number of individuals having set up highly successful

decorating businesses.”⁸ Along with de Wolfe, Draper, and others like them, and as a result of growing female emancipation and interest in social status, the interior decorating business continued to grow, although at a much slower pace in Canada.⁹ Following in the footsteps of Americans such as Edith Wharton, and as authorities of “good taste” with an interest in expensive furnishings, fine fabrics, and historic European styles, eventually professional decorators in Canada also capitalized on the importance of the home as an important “marker of acquired social status.”¹⁰

The fact that this profession enabled women of that era some independence is well documented, although it often insinuates that these decorators were little more than wealthy dilettante socialites with good taste. However, the following quote from novelist Virginia Woolf, written in 1930, disputes this image and provides an interesting glimpse into the actual responsibilities of at least one female decorator working at that time. In describing the interior decorator Sibyl Colefax [1874-1950], Woolf wrote:

No red on her nails, and merely lying in an armchair gossiping and telling stories of this sale and that millionaire, from the professional working-class standard, as might be any woman behind a counter . . . Sibyl has transformed herself into a hardhearted shopkeeper—now, literally, at work, in sinks, behind desks, running her finger along wainscots and whipping out yard measures from 9:30 to 7:00.¹¹

During the period between the two World Wars, large numbers of women continued to become interior decorators. The enormous interest was largely a reaction to the patriarchal social constructs of an era in which being a “decorator” was a socially acceptable way of finding a

modicum of independence. Yet the belief that this type of work was not to be taken seriously remained. Design historian Peter McNeil noted that, “[r]ather than describing it as work, interior decoration was frequently characterized as an expansion of women’s natures, directly compared to the female compulsion to colour-blend complexion and costume.”¹²

In addition to reinforcing the idea of women as biologically suited to superficial, somewhat instinctive activities, such gendering of what constitutes appropriate behaviour also served to perpetuate a historic cultural distinction between the sexes: one which reinforced the oppositional dualities of male rationality and female intuition. That bias prevailed not only in terms of interior designers; it also carried over to those women who were pioneers in the field of architecture. Joan Harland, the 1938 recipient of the Gold Medal in Architecture at the University of Manitoba, noted: “I was advised by the head of an architectural firm to take a stenographic course so that I could become a valuable secretary [in an architectural firm].”¹³

In spite of this misogynistic perception of interior decoration, from an academic perspective, the 1930s were an important era in the history of interior decoration/design in North America, so much so that the demand for decorators with knowledge of historic European and American residential styles resulted in the creation of several formalized courses of instruction. Following the historic lead of the New York School of Fine and Applied Art,¹⁴ and also focusing to a certain degree on the teaching of historic interior styles, in 1938, the University of Manitoba inaugurated its three-year Diploma in Interior Decoration (Dip. D.) within the newly established Department of Interior Decoration. Created to meet the demand



FIG. 2. PERIOD STYLES ITALIAN RENAISSANCE. STUDENT WORK 1941-1942. | HARLAND AND STIRK, *THE HISTORY OF INTERIOR DECORATION*, P. 18.

for training in this highly popular subject, it was the first university in Canada to create such a program at the diploma level.

Noteworthy in terms of future Canadian interior design education was the fact that the program was largely created by architect John Russell, Director of the School of Architecture at the University of Manitoba.¹⁵ Professor Russell, heavily influenced by his own modernist architectural education, came to the University of Manitoba from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)—an institution which was well known as a leader in introducing modernism to America.

Beginning with his 1936 appointment as Director of the Department of Architecture, and eventual appointment to Dean of the School of Architecture in 1946, Russell was to have an enormous and continuing impact on the shaping of the Faculty of Architecture until his death in

1966. In fact, the importance of his influence on both the schools of Architecture and Interior Design at the University of Manitoba as well as on the City of Winnipeg¹⁶ cannot be overemphasized.

While conducting research for this study, I discussed Russell's history and dedication to the promotion of a modernist architectural and design philosophy in Winnipeg in a recent interview with University of Manitoba emeritus professors Joan Harland and Dianne Jackman. In addition to describing his "extreme open-mindedness" and "wide vision"¹⁷ with regard to the relationship between architecture and interior decorating, as well as the need for an interior design profession distinct but equal to architecture, it is interesting to note that Russell's enthusiasm extended to the repeated use of his own family wealth to bring numerous exhibitions and guest speakers to Winnipeg. In this regard, Canadian art historian Serena Keshavjee stated in her book *Winnipeg Modern* that

Russell also worked to counteract Winnipeg's isolation by bringing in a first-rate roster of lecturers and exhibitions. From the Walter Gropius Exhibition (1954) to the Le Corbusier exhibition (1959), and speakers, including Sibyl Moholy-Nagy . . . and Buckminster Fuller, Winnipeggers had little trouble keeping up with current intellectual and design trends. According to a number of architects, Manitoba's School of Architecture was "the only school that mattered during this period" . . .¹⁸

With a firm belief in the modernism of the mid-twentieth century, and strong connections to American universities, Russell was also able to recruit a stellar group of like-minded faculty to teach at the University of Manitoba from international schools of architecture such as Harvard, the Architectural Association

School of Architecture, and the University of Pennsylvania.¹⁹

Russell's influence as a visionary modernist educator also included encouraging architecture students to continue their learning beyond Canadian borders. According to Harland, in the mid-1930s,

the Department of Architecture was already offering a well-established, progressive four-year baccalaureate degree in architecture. The philosophy of the Department of Architecture was the development of modern logical thought in planning with application to building design and construction, based on a strong background of historical knowledge.²⁰

As a result of that philosophy and Russell's American contacts, several students from the School of Architecture also studied with some of the most important architects of the twentieth century, including Ludwig Mies van der Rohe in Chicago, Eero Saarinen, Buckminster Fuller, and Louis Kahn at MIT.²¹ It is not surprising, therefore, that the architectural philosophy of the fledgling Interior Decorating Program, although cognizant of the history of interior decoration, was also heavily inspired by modernist theory.

A review of three statements of intent and philosophy for the Interior Decorating Program over its ten-year history (1938-1948) clearly reveals the evolving influence of Russell's architectural pedagogy.

1938-1939 – Statement of Intent and Philosophy

The three-year Diploma course in Interior Decoration is arranged to give the student a cultural background in the History of Architecture and Art, practical studio work in drawing and painting . . . and the application of these designs to practical problems of a varied nature. To make the course




FIG. 3. LIVING AREA. STUDENT WORK 1946-1947. | HARLAND AND STIRK, *THE HISTORY OF INTERIOR DECORATION*, P. 19.




FIG. 4. INTERIOR DRAWING B AND PATTERN DESIGN. STUDENT WORK 1946-1947. | HARLAND AND STIRK, *THE HISTORY OF INTERIOR DECORATION*, P. 19.

complete . . . it offers the necessary study of scale, balance, colour, furniture, textiles and design. Upholstery and fabrics, metal . . . are considered for their effectiveness and use in modern design. The period styles adaptable to modern use are studied for their proportion, detail, construction and finish.

1944-1945 – Statement of Intent and Philosophy

The three-year course in Interior Decoration is designed to prepare the student to enter professionally the field of Interior Decoration. The subjects are closely allied to architecture . . . the course includes necessary study of scale, balance, colour, historic background . . . Informal talks, instruction, supervision and criticism are given in connection with studio problems.

1947-1948 – Statement of Intent and Philosophy

The three-year course in interior decoration is designed to prepare the graduate to enter the professional field of Interior Decoration. The interior designer is more than a mere "decorator." He must be equipped to analyze the requirements of the client and to interpret them in a planned arrangement

of integrated spaces for use. Further, he must be able to create interior settings . . . to provide an appropriate setting and background for specified human activities. To do this . . . he must be acquainted with the historic background and development of architecture . . . but he must have a knowledge of architectural form, building construction . . . and the many materials, old and new, which are available . . . To meet these requirements, the curriculum is closely allied to that in architecture . . .²²

Of particular note is the gradual shift in terminology from an emphasis on architectural history and applied elements of interior decoration such as "upholstery," "practical studio work," and "application" (in 1938) to the use of the terms "interior design" and "allied to architecture" as well as more analytically oriented expressions such as "serious" and "criticism" in the 1944-1945 calendar. Finally, in the 1947-1948 calendar, the inclusion of statements such as "the interior designer is more than a mere 'decorator'" and terms such as "building construction," "background for human activities," and a definitive statement unequivocally stating that "the curriculum

is closely allied to that in architecture" indicate a complete transition to a modernist architectural philosophy as well as the start of a clearly defined professionalism specific to the discipline of interior design.

Russell's use of the pronoun "he" to differentiate the interior designer, and the distinction of interior designer from "mere decorator" in these statements also cannot be overlooked as these terms continue to speak to the desire to overcome the impression of interior decoration as a superficial, bourgeois activity undertaken primarily by capricious women. Further, the fact that Russell accepted interior decorating as a professional, legitimate endeavour, while encouraging, seems to have been largely borne out of his belief that it was allied with the more legitimate, intellectual, and powerful architectural profession. In fact, in 1948, of the nine faculty teaching within that program, two thirds (six) were architects (five men and one woman) and only one third (three) were female fine arts or interior decorating graduates.²³

Nonetheless, and despite the high concentration of architects teaching within the

program, Russell's ongoing and enthusiastic²⁴ support of the interior decoration/design profession should be recognized as an important step in its early struggle for legitimacy. Although the relationship between interior decorating and architecture was perhaps clumsy at best and misogynistic at worst, in 1948 it led directly to the introduction of a new four-year Bachelor of Interior Design (BID) Program. With ten students enrolled, it was the first of its kind in Canada.²⁵ The subsequent 1954 creation of the Interior Design Institute of Manitoba (IDIM), through an Act of the Manitoba Legislature, furthered the legitimization of the profession, at least in that province.

Any account of the history of interiors cannot escape discussion of feminism and gender because of the profession's earliest association with women. For that reason, it is interesting to note how clearly this early account of the Interior Design Program at the University of Manitoba (1938-1948) followed Western Canadian first-wave feminist achievement. From a political perspective, it is noteworthy that, in 1916, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta were the first provinces to grant women the right to vote. From an educational and professional perspective, in their book *"Designing Women": Gender and the Architectural Profession*, Annmarie Adams and Peta Tancred stated that during the 1930s and 1940s, one half of Canadian women registrants to provincial architectural associations had graduated from a western university, and during the period between 1920 and 1970, "one third of all [these] Canadian-educated women registrants graduated from the University of Manitoba."²⁶ In explaining the high number of female registrants, Adams and Tancred also noted the existence of the Interior Decorating Program, writing that through the 1940s and 1950s,

no fewer than four women were on the faculty at that time of whom two were themselves graduates of the University of Manitoba and two others of U.S. institutions. Their presence may have been linked to the founding at the University of Manitoba of the first course in interior decoration in Canada.²⁷

Just as nineteenth-century art critic John Ruskin "encouraged women to play their part in the 'beautiful adornment of the state,'"²⁸ so did architect John Russell encourage twentieth-century women to be active, creative, and professional.

It is not coincidental therefore, that given this region's history of socialist public policy, the legalization of women's right to vote and the high number of women on faculty in the Department of Architecture took place firstly on the Prairies.²⁹ For Russell, arriving in Manitoba during that period of egalitarianism, the logic and democracy of the modernist paradigm was undoubtedly a perfect fit, and one which was readily accepted by mainstream Winnipeg society. As a result of the steady stream of modernist buildings designed by Winnipeg architecture firms, by the end of the 1950s, architecture style on the Prairies was soon christened the "Manitoba School of Modernism." Additionally, many of the buildings constructed in Winnipeg at that time "won awards and provided a graceful, elegant and generally sympathetic counterpoint to the surrounding . . . neighbourhoods and streets."³⁰

1948-1966: THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR DESIGN

That Russell was a male modernist architect who created and taught within both Interior Decoration and Interior Design programs was an unusual circumstance.³¹ Aside from its implicit recognition of the

equality and importance of both exterior and interior design, perhaps his willingness to participate was because modernist theory signalled an openness to acknowledging that the entire interior space (rather than simply products such as furniture, fabrics, and accessories), and not just the exterior shell, could be understood within a rational, functional approach. Proof of that paradigm is found in Le Corbusier's statement that the "interior is always an exterior."³² Moreover, as noted by Penny Sparke, "Linked, openly now, to the concept of lifestyle in the domestic setting . . . the interior had the potential, its creators now fully understood, to encourage modern experiences and behaviours."³³ Although mainstream architectural practice at the time distrusted any form of decorative connotation, Russell encouraged a renegotiation of interior decoration within a modernist framework. It was therefore Russell's strong belief in a place for interior decoration within architectural modernism, as well as the modernist linkage of interior to exterior, that had combined to legitimize interior design at the University of Manitoba.

Russell's authority validated much more than interior decorating and design. As a leader in the community, his influence extended well beyond the School of Architecture and into the broader cityscape. Numerous Winnipeg buildings (residential, commercial, governmental, and institutional),³⁴ adapted to the prairie topography and morphology, were designed by graduates of the School of Architecture and remain a legacy to the International Style which he so firmly embraced. When I asked professors Harland and Jackman why Winnipeg became such an important site for modernist architecture and design, they replied that it was because "there were no barriers" as in Eastern Canada.



FIG. 5. BLANKSTEIN RESIDENCE 1956. | KESHAVJEE (ED.), *WINNIPEG MODERN*, P. 89.



FIG. 6. WINNIPEG INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT 1964. | KESHAVJEE (ED.), *WINNIPEG MODERN*, P. 88.



FIG. 7. MONARCH LIFE BUILDING 1961. | KESHAVJEE (ED.), *WINNIPEG MODERN*, P. 140.

When asked to expand on that thought, they posited two explanations. Firstly, Winnipeg was a perfect city for budding modernists because it was essentially a “blank (architectural) slate”; secondly, because it was not a wealthy city and was located in a relatively young province, there was no history of elaborate Victorian architecture to uphold as in Eastern Canada. Further, from an interior furnishings perspective, they indicated that the popularity of traditional maple colonial-style furniture in Eastern Canada had not taken hold in Western Canada, leaving a population open to a new aesthetic and style of manufacturing. Winnipeg was therefore “ready and willing” to embrace modernism’s new aesthetic.

Unfortunately, the research I have undertaken includes little mention of the contribution of graduate interior designers to Winnipeg’s modernist legacy (while focusing heavily on architectural achievement), yet it is clearly within that ideological framework that

the Bachelor of Interior Design Program was created. The work of Grant Marshall (BID 1955) is an exception; particularly with respect to contracts such as the John A. Russell School of Architecture building and Winnipeg’s Monarch Life Building. The achievements of another graduate, Alison Hymas (BID 1954), have also been noted on a national level. While working for the Toronto architecture firm of Webb Zerafa Menkes Partnership (now WZMH architects), she designed a highly successful model suite for Habitat ’67 in Montreal. As a testament to her modernist training, in the September 1967 issue of *Canadian Interiors*, Hymas explained her solution as requiring “architect-type furniture which represented continuation of the architectural forms . . . Because the architecture creates such a strong impression of the interior, there was reason to use it to advantage . . .”³⁵

Despite the tensions in interior design between followers of rigid modernism and those still working within other

styles which took place during the 1920s and 1930s, by the early 1950s mid-century architectural modernism had openly acknowledged the interior to the extent that it had almost completely overtaken the idea of a distinct interior. Although “the initial Canadian response to modernism was somewhat reserved and moderate,”³⁶ modernist furniture, fabrics, and accessories had entered the marketplace by that time. In fact, along with a conceptual affiliation with the architecture curriculum, the physical design of the new (1959) University of Manitoba architecture building ensured a cross-pollination of ideas that was reinforced by a structural link between the two disciplines. As a student there from 1968 to 1972, I vividly remember the proximity of the architecture studios, only separated from those of interior design by an open-plan lounge where both architecture and interior design students met to discuss numerous studio projects, further reinforcing the integration of a holistic view of space into both programs.



FIG. 8. HABITAT '67, INTERIOR DESIGNED BY ALISON HYMAS. | "12 HABITAT SUITES," *CANADIAN INTERIORS*, P. 48.



FIG. 9. VIEW OF STUDENT LOUNGE, JOHN A. RUSSELL ARCHITECTURE BUILDING 1959. | KESHAVJEE (ED.), *WINNIPEG MODERN*, P. 140.

However, despite the enormous influence of the Architecture Department, the fledgling interior design curriculum was created with an awareness of both the discrete requirements of interior problem-solving as well as potential job opportunities for graduates. Within the Winnipeg community, due to the cultural bias against female interior design graduates in favour of male architecture graduates, fewer than fifteen percent of the graduating class was employed by architectural firms, with most design graduates working in department store sales.³⁷ In order to ameliorate the situation and to create a distinct skill set related to interior environments, courses concerned with drafting and drawing

for architecture were changed from courses which focused on the exclusive drawing of exterior volumes to courses in which interior spaces/volumes and furnishings formed the pertinent topics. Similarly, studio courses adapted from the Architecture Program focused on the "particular activities of humans in detail, within the space and the furnishings and equipment necessary for those activities, rather than the construction of the shell that contained them."³⁸

The modification of architecture courses to better suit interior design interests was not undertaken with the intent of simplifying subject matter. Rather, it was a deliberate act intended to strengthen the existence of an interior vocabulary distinct to that of architecture. It should therefore be understood as a conscious act designed to further empower the new program and the many women enrolled in it. Although courses were adapted to the scale of interiors, the strong link to modernism remained a fundamental theoretical premise.

As the Gold Medal graduate of the Architecture Program and a protégé of John Russell, Joan Harland was asked in 1939 to become the Chairman of the Department of Interior Design. In her own words, this was because, although it was "natural to have three architects teaching interior design in the 1930s and 1940s" and there was "no stigma or barrier at the time," John Russell and Milton Osborne³⁹ "decided that they better have a woman architect on board."⁴⁰ The comment that "there was no stigma at the time" may have been reflective of the "wide vision" and "prairie thinking"⁴¹ at the University of Manitoba, but that was certainly not the case in the rest of Canada. At McGill University and the University of Toronto, not only were women not "on board" in terms of

leadership positions, but they were not even admitted into these programs as students until the 1940s.⁴²

The influence of Joan Harland's own professional work is also noteworthy in the restructuring of studio projects from largely residential to those more varied and more representative of the recognition of interior design as a discipline concerned with matters other than curtains and lampshades. Having worked for the T. Eaton Co. planning and construction office in Winnipeg, Harland introduced student projects based on store planning and fixture design, as well as on the design of Eaton's restaurants and coffee shops. Similarly, John Russell contributed ideas for upper-year projects which originated with his own professional work within the community, two examples being the Deer Lodge Hospital Complex project and a "theatre lobby" project based on his philanthropic work in the establishment of the Royal Winnipeg Ballet. Such integration of commercial projects with residential is also symbolic of the modernist lack of distinction between residential and commercial spaces. Within the Interior Design Program, the insistence on "unadorned interiors, emphasis on spatial articulation and use of new materials such as tubular steel,"⁴³ as evidenced in examples of student works in figures 10 and 11, was once again typical of the dominant philosophy of the school.

The creation and success of the Bachelor of Interior Design Program at the end of World War II was also a response to the huge numbers of female veterans who were returning to Canada after having "contributed to life aside from homemaking—especially in skills and professional expertise as a result of the educational and employment opportunities that had opened to them."⁴⁴ Comfortable with their new roles, many

women were anxious to further their employment opportunities through a university education. Evidence of the popularity of interior design as a suitable course of study and eventual profession for these women is found in the numbers who graduated from the University of Manitoba in the immediate postwar years. Of the twenty-seven graduates in 1950, fifty percent were women, including the recipient of the University Gold Medal. Of the eighteen graduates in 1951, seventy-two percent were women, and finally, in 1952, fifteen out of twenty, or seventy-five percent of the graduating class were women who were eager to enter the workforce.⁴⁵ Although women's emancipation, in general, was to eventually suffer setbacks resulting in a return to inequality and limited opportunities for them in the late 1950s and 1960s, the professionalization of interior design at that time showed enormous progress.

Within the design curriculum, the decades between 1948 and 1968 saw a distinct strengthening of the corporate and commercial aspects of interior design: evidence of a further distancing from the domestic interior and interior decorating sectors. As the following 1958 design studio summaries illustrate, upper year projects emphasized larger complex interiors focusing on commercial, corporate, and retail spaces:

Third year: larger interiors with inter-related spaces: larger numbers of people, varied special effects, sustained character developed. Commercial projects included: a shop in a block of sales outlets, a restaurant with entrance lobby and kitchen, a lounge/reception area in a hotel lobby, office planning.

Fourth year: complex large interior spaces: . . . the sales floor of a department store with all sales areas planned, the




FIG. 10. A TRAVEL AGENCY. STUDENT WORK 1958. | HARLAND AND STIRK, *THE HISTORY OF INTERIOR DECORATION*, P. 52.




FIG. 11. LAKAWANNA LEATHER SHOWROOM, LAKAWANNA LEATHER CO. COMPETITION, THE DESIGN OF A LEATHER SHOWROOM. STUDENT WORK 1958. | HARLAND AND STIRK, *THE HISTORY OF INTERIOR DECORATION*, P. 53.

ground floor of a hotel complex . . . office landscaping for a large firm, a city club, or spaces with special requirements such as a hospital or senior citizen accommodation.⁴⁶

While the interior aspects of the curriculum were further strengthened, the 1966-1967 course calendar still showed the ongoing curricular influences of being a part of a School of Architecture, as corroborated in the following three course descriptions:

Theory of Design III – ID: that the course consists of "the study of planning requirements




FIG. 12. OFFICE BUILDING LOUNGE BOARD ROOM. STUDENT WORK 1960S. | HARLAND AND STIRK, *THE HISTORY OF INTERIOR DECORATION*, P. 87C.




FIG. 13. RENOVATION OF AN OFFICE BUILDING. MAIN LEVEL – COFFEE SHOP, DESIGN SHOP, FASHION SALON, TRAVEL AGENCY, MEN'S SHOP. STUDENT WORK 1960S. | HARLAND AND STIRK, *THE HISTORY OF INTERIOR DECORATION*, P. 87B.

of commercial areas with discussion and analysis of several approaches to design as expressed by contemporary architects."

Building Materials and Equipment: Qualitative study of basic structural principles, qualities and uses of structural and finishing materials, standard architectural construction systems and mechanical equipment systems . . .

Interior Detailing: Sketches and working drawings, emphasizing design of construction and finishing details as logical, problem-solving assignments.⁴⁷

While the curriculum was becoming more architectural in nature and concerned with public rather than private (domestic) spaces, women continued to dominate enrollments. A survey of student lists from the early 1960s still indicates a disproportionately high number of women graduates within the program. For example, in 1963, eleven out of thirteen students (eighty-five percent of the graduating class) were female. Similarly, in 1965, it was the case for seventeen out of twenty-one (eighty-one percent of the class), and, in 1964, a full ninety-two percent (twenty-two out of twenty-four) of students were women.⁴⁸

As classes grew and the curriculum matured, fewer male and more female faculty were recruited to teach. From 1958 to 1967, there were a total of nine full-time and six part-time faculty, that is, ten women and five men. Only two were architects (one male, one female), with the others holding degrees in either interior design or fine art.⁴⁹ However, while the 1940s and early 1950s were decades of “full support, understanding,” with “a separate budget and active help from Dean Russell,”⁵⁰ the 1960s and 1970s were described as years of intense struggle for legitimacy and recognition. Not coincidentally, John Russell passed away in 1966, leaving the Interior Design Program without a strong defender of its hard-fought professionalism. Again, according to Harland,

It was a time of the worst patriarchy. Dean Russell had been a strong support for Interior Design, believing in the integrity of the profession and offering his full support. It was due to his efforts that the Department was established and developed and his death was a very heavy loss.

Fortunately by that time, the Department of Interior Design was well established with

a strong enthusiastic staff, most of whom were totally committed to the development of the profession . . .⁵¹

While clearly tragic, perhaps Russell’s death was a kind of litmus test for the nascent program’s independence from architecture. No matter how well-meaning and supportive (or benevolent) Professor Russell may have been, the time had come for the women (and men) of the Department of Interior Design to “stand on their own two feet,” without the benefit of an architectural father-figure to provide protection against the male domination of the Department of Architecture. It is not surprising, therefore, that participation in professional interior design organizations at that time began to become an important part of the interior design faculty’s focus, with several faculty holding office and involved in professional organizations and continuing education. For example, similar to architecture faculty who were actively involved in the Manitoba Association of Architects (MAA), interior design faculty also held office in the Interior Design Institute of Manitoba (IDIM).

A particularly noteworthy development in terms of this professional activity was the interior design faculty’s participation in a meeting of the American Institute of Decorators (AID) in Grand Rapids, Michigan, in 1962. Although just a few educators (thirty-four, including Harland) attended that meeting, they “opted to form their own group, feeling they didn’t want to have strong links to any organization of a large group of practicing decorators.”⁵² The result was the creation in 1963 of the Interior Design Educators Council (IDEC), which still exists to this day. Beyond the strong desire to distance themselves from interior decorators and, more importantly, to proclaim their validity against the domination of

architecture, of significance was the fact that at IDEC meetings in both 1964 and 1965, interior design faculty were asked to present the University of Manitoba’s unique architecturally based curriculum as a model program of study. At a time when most American universities awarded a Bachelor of Fine Arts or Bachelor of Home Economics with a major in interior design, University of Manitoba interior design faculty were pleased to be commended for having

one of the best organized and most modern [program], and one which provided a more complete training than most schools on the continent . . . Association with an architecture faculty seemed to provide the best background. Basic Design, Theory and Drafting were the best foundation subjects, as long as they were directed towards Interior Design concepts and requirements and the total Interior Design course was being taught by professional Interior Designers.⁵³

One cannot help but notice the defensive tone of the above quote. The recognition of the program as the “best-organized and most modern,” yet with the clearly cautionary “as long as” warning (with regard to the teaching of an architecturally based curriculum within the framework of interior design concepts taught by professional interior designers) cannot be overlooked.

As a profession dominated by women practitioners, and from a feminist perspective, the tenor of that quote in its call for a strong, independent interior design profession also reflects the struggles of 1960s and 1970s second-wave feminists who were, at the same time, actively seeking full societal recognition for women. I suggest that this quest for professionalism, differentiation, and regulation of the interior design profession is a direct

reflection of the overarching societal struggle for women to achieve equality with men. As a corollary to the previously described influence of late modernism as a liberator of the interior, second-wave feminism can be seen as a further impetus for this phase of the profession's maturation and independence.

This urge to become professionalized in order to gain power through improved status has been the subject of study from business, economic, and sociological perspectives. The work of sociologist Margali Sarfatti Larson on the "rise of professionalism" is of particular interest. According to her, "professions are occupations with special power and prestige."⁵⁴ That definition seems particularly relevant in light of its reference to occupation versus profession: interior decoration was an outgrowth of the craft guilds or occupations of artisans such as cabinet makers, upholsterers, and weavers. In her book *The Rise of Professionalism*, Sarfatti Larson focuses upon the centrality of the "cognitive dimension" in the composition of the ideal profession, writing:

The cognitive dimension is centered on the body of knowledge and techniques which the professionals apply in their work, and on the training necessary to master such knowledge and skills; the normative dimension covers the service orientation of professionals and their distinctive ethics, which justify the privilege of self-regulation granted them by society . . . underscoring the professions' singular characteristics of autonomy and prestige.⁵⁵

While reflecting on that quote, one can appreciate the strong relationship between the attributes Sarfatti Larson has identified and the increased regulatory activities of interior design professionals during the second half of the twentieth century that were (and

continue to be) actions by which interior designers could simultaneously establish themselves and differentiate themselves from architects and interior decorators. Sarfatti Larson further explained this phenomenon: "The distinctiveness of the profession appears to be founded on the combination of these general dimensions . . . [They are] concretely identified by typical organizations and institutional patterns: professional associations, professional schools, and self-administered codes of ethics."⁵⁶

Although I am jumping ahead of myself in terms of the chronology of the interior design profession's historic desire for recognition, the relatively recent phenomenon of provincial "Titles Acts" and "Practice Acts," beginning in the late 1990s, comes to mind. These legislative initiatives, which legalize the term "interior designer" and regulate specifically who can practice interior design in various jurisdictions across North America, are perfect examples of the types of initiatives⁵⁷ which have recently been created to bring a much sought after sense of power, prestige, and protection to the interior design profession.

From the perspective of power, when one considers the historic tensions between the largely feminine interior design profession and the largely masculine architecture profession, there is an important difference in the basic strategies of the two stages of design liberation which took place from the 1930s through to the end of the 1960s.

In the first stage (from the late 1930s though the 1950s), interior decorators and designers aligned themselves with the architecture profession and the philosophy of modernism as a means of emancipation and legitimization of their own profession.

In the second stage (encompassing the late 1960s and even into the early 1970s), female interior designers, while still retaining a focus on the rationality and functionality of modernist principles, used regulation and standardization (also characteristics of modernism) as well as professional activities to protect their agency and to separate themselves from the dominant power of the architecture profession. A prime example of this regulation is the 1974 establishment of the National Council for Interior Design Qualification (NCIDQ), an organization which "issues professional certificates to competent interior design professionals who have passed rigorous examinations which attest to their qualifications for employers, state regulators and the general public."⁵⁸ In other words, at the time of first-wave feminism, an initial *alliance with* the power of male-dominated architecture enabled essentially powerless women the ability to work outside of the domestic environment; yet, it was the strength of second-wave feminism which bolstered women's ability to subsequently pursue *separation away from* the power of architecture in their desire to carve out a distinct interior design profession. At the same time, modernist principles such as the harmony of interiority/exteriority, along with principles of strong organization and composition, provided a durable theoretical framework for these efforts toward autonomy—from both philosophical and practical perspectives.

Despite their best efforts for autonomy and recognition during the 1960s and 1970s, unfortunately the domination of the Architecture Program at the University of Manitoba continued to grow as did the marginality of interior design. While design faculty were cementing their own professional status across the continent, in Winnipeg, the

more powerful Architecture Department was restructuring itself to a six-year program consisting of a three-year Bachelor of Environmental Studies (BES) degree leading to a three-year architecture specialization, which ultimately culminated in a six-year Master of Architecture credential. Although tremendous pressure was exerted on the Department of Interior Design to become swallowed into that structure, the University eventually allowed the interior design faculty to choose their own trajectory. Not surprisingly, most of the interior design staff voted to maintain the four-year program and remain separate. However, this autonomy was to be continuously scrutinized over the next half century, ultimately ending with the cessation of the independent four-year Interior Design Program at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

1976-1998: TURMOIL AND THE FIGHT FOR AUTONOMY

The period between the 1970s and the end of the twentieth century continued to be a time of tremendous turmoil which saw the Interior Design Program valiantly try to defend its integrity. While still retaining its name, it nevertheless slowly eroded in terms of its distinct and specialized curriculum. Evidence of that turbulence is found in the fact that during that time the Interior Design Department had no fewer than six heads of the department.⁵⁹ Thus there were many changes to the formulation of the interior design/environmental studies/architecture curricula and structure; to enumerate all of them is beyond the scope of this paper. However, as noted by Harland, “the question of change was always present,”⁶⁰ with the most pervasive problem being the prospect of an enforced merger of the four-year Bachelor of Interior Design Program

with a four-year Environmental Studies Program, and the subsequent loss of the program’s Council for Interior Design (CIDA) accreditation.

What that constant threat did emphasize, however, was the sense of disorder and confusion created by the new focus on a holistic notion of “environmental design” as a preferred, common pedagogical foundation to be shared by the design and architecture disciplines, in contrast to the strong desire for each individual discipline to maintain its distinct vocabulary, pedagogical integrity, and area of specialization. That is apparent in the not-so-subtle shift in the description of the Interior Design Program’s philosophy and subject matter. Despite the use of the term “interior designer,” a more broad-based, architecturally oriented vocabulary was increasingly used to describe the concept of space. Along with a reduction in the number of course hours devoted specifically to interior design topics, examples of that shift can be found in a comparison of the 1983-1984 and 1990-1991 statements of intent and philosophy:

1983-1984 – Statement of Intent and Philosophy

The interior designer is concerned with the immediate environment and works to provide designed space that will best suit the client’s requirements, both physical and aesthetic. The interior designer must be able to analyze the problems completely, develop the best solution, supervise installation, and work in co-operation with other specialists in the architectural field.⁶¹

1990-1991 – Statement of Intent and Philosophy

The professional interior designer is one who is qualified by education and experience to identify, research and creatively solve problems relative to the function and

quality of man’s proximate environment . . . The technical development of the interior designer includes knowledge of structure with emphasis on construction, knowledge of building systems and all related codes, equipment and components, and ability in communication skills and in quantitative and administrative skills.⁶²

The change in emphasis is particularly striking when one compares these statements of intent and philosophy to those written at the start of the program in 1948 (see above). As Harland writes, “The name ‘interior design’ [was] rarely mentioned in the course descriptions. The term ‘design’ is found, but ‘design’ can refer to environmental design as easily as to interior design or any general abstract exploration.”⁶³ She goes further in her description of the negative impact of the changes:

It also appeared that as well as a common first year in the professional course, a large part of second year design was being joined with Environmental Studies. Courses such as colour and lighting were cut in the number of hours . . . and the “package teaching” of some courses seemed to be occurring. The [Interior Design] Curriculum Committee seemed powerless. One noticed a drop in teaching information specific to the profession of Interior Design. Thus one feels that the course was being weakened to accommodate other agendas.⁶⁴

Perhaps the ultimate indicator of the degree of discord within the faculty at that time was the 1976 removal of Harland as the head of the Department of Interior Design. Although she remained on faculty until 1980, she was officially relieved of her administrative responsibilities. Correctly or not, a complete shift away from of the specialized boundaries of a distinct interior design curriculum had effectively taken place.

Just as modernist theory had a significant impact on the interior design curriculum during the first half of the twentieth century, it is interesting to speculate on possible linkages between the postmodernist movement of the 1970s and 1980s, and the corresponding turmoil within the School of Architecture. To be sure, there is no abundant physical evidence of postmodernism in Winnipeg—in contrast to the richness of modernist architecture previously described. Yet just as the functional and formalized rigidity of the modernist movement was clearly transferred to the culture of the early establishment of the school, so may the diversity and ambiguity of built forms typical of the postmodern movement have found their way into the very pedagogical structure of the school itself. Evidence of that trend are the similar over-experimentation with curricular form and content as well as a fragmentation of pedagogical viewpoints amongst faculty. While the move away from the reified discussions of the modernist era allowed for more openness and a willingness to embrace a “less is a bore” doctrine in architectural form, from a programmatic perspective this resulted in constant flux, while the opportunity for interior design to take on a more important, vibrant, and distinct role in that new, more communicative expression of space all but evaporated.

And what of the feminist movement during the 1980s and 1990s? Why had the experience of second-wave feminists not prevented or at least buffered the loss of power for the Interior Design Program at the time? One possible answer is that, as a result of the gains in terms of economic equality which had been made during the 1960s and 1970s, feminist activity had by the 1980s already begun to move toward third-wave feminist concerns which emphasized gender discrimination related to issues of “ethnicities, nationalities,

religions and cultural backgrounds.”⁶⁵ Having achieved a significant level of success, the employment parity concerns of second-wave feminists had essentially been “put on the back burner,” shifting more toward issues like biological determinism and the sociology of gender.

Nonetheless, the positive effects of second-wave feminists’ struggle for workforce equity could be noticed in the make-up of the interior design faculty. From 1977 to 1988, there were ten male and ten female faculty teaching within the Department of Interior Design. At least from that perspective, equality had been achieved.

Student enrolments, however, did not reflect gender equilibrium and, in fact, had swung even more disproportionately out of balance. Of the graduating class of 1979, eighty-three percent of graduates were women (eight out of forty-seven graduates were men); in 1988, ninety-two percent of the class was female (four out of fifty-two graduates were men).⁶⁶ While the curriculum had shifted toward a more neutral, pedagogically open architectural stance, the student composition of interior design classes became even more lopsided than at the inception of the program prior to World War II. Despite over fifty years of the women’s liberation movement, and significant achievements with regard to interior design academic and professional recognition, women continued to flock to interior design and men continued to avoid it. This suggests that while the University of Manitoba academic community had embraced a more broad-based, inclusive view of design education (albeit begrudgingly, painfully, and certainly controversially), the general public had not. Within the mainstream, interior design was still perceived as the logical choice only for women interested in the field of design.⁶⁷

1998-2010: BACHELOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN, MASTER OF INTERIOR DESIGN

Still more adjustments to the structure of the Interior Design Program at the University of Manitoba have occurred during the past decade, along with recent changes to the leadership of both the interior design and architecture departments.⁶⁸ As it is presently configured, all students within the Faculty of Architecture must graduate from the four-year Bachelor of Environmental Design Program⁶⁹ and then apply to one of four graduate programs of their choice (landscape architecture, interior design, architecture, city planning). Since enrollments are limited to approximately thirty students in each area of specialization, candidates are not guaranteed placement in their first choice. For example, a student whose preference is interior design and who chose the interior design option in the third and fourth years of the undergraduate program may be placed in architecture (or even city planning) at the graduate level due to enrolment restrictions. Such a structure therefore signifies a singular pedagogical and philosophical belief in the overall cross-pollination of the design and architecture professions. Within that hybridized undergraduate environmental design curriculum, all specific reference to interior design has been removed: all studios and lectures at the undergraduate level have now been integrated.⁷⁰ As indicated in the following quote, at the masters level, an interior design specialization does reappear, although still within an interdisciplinary framework:

Interior Design is uniquely placed in the Faculty of Architecture with professional masters programs in Landscape Architecture, City Planning and

Architecture. The interdisciplinary nature of the Faculty offers excellent opportunities for extending collaborative perspectives and theoretical understanding.⁷¹

The notion of a distinct interior design pedagogy has therefore been completely abandoned, or at best relegated to an adjunct, specialized position at the end of a standardized program of learning. After half a century of negotiating firstly equal professional recognition, followed by a distinct pedagogy and body of knowledge, the teaching of interior design as a separate discipline has been eliminated completely.

What conclusions can be drawn from that latest framework for curriculum configuration? What has happened to interior design as a separate discipline? As in the previous discussion, can a link be found to both contemporary architectural theory and current feminist discourse?

From an architectural perspective, one could argue that just as anti-modernist theory led to the architectural post-modernism of the 1970s and 1980s and a sense of ambiguity within the program structure, so perhaps deconstructivist theory has now filtered down to contemporary curriculum structure.

As the functional and geometric aspects of basic modernist form have been “deconstructed” and reconfigured in deconstructivist architecture, so has the original modernist, discipline-based program model now been deconstructed within Manitoba’s School of Architecture. Although specialized content has been broadly maintained, it is now reframed and reassembled to appear at the end of the educational cycle rather than at the beginning. In that sense, the particular elements of individual disciplines, customarily studied early on in the outlay of the

curriculum, have now been flipped into a new geometry consisting of an undergraduate hybrid (that is, the Bachelor of Environmental Design program) with a disciplinary specialization, such as interior design, appearing at the graduate level in a kind of final deconstructivist flourish of complexity.

At the same time, third-wave feminism has largely been focused on a questioning of whether or not biological determinism even exists and the effects of societal culture upon gender distinction. That emphasis, accompanied by an increasing societal acceptance of fluid sexuality in the workforce, has contributed to increasing cohorts of women in schools of architecture and a gradual repositioning of architecture from a male-dominated profession to a more open environment in which gender is less of an issue. As anthropologist Angela Bratton writes, “being categorized as a woman no longer supersedes other distinctions and roles.”⁷² The large number of women enrolled in Canadian architecture programs also promises a future shifting of emphasis for those who practice interior design: one which moves from the traditionally antagonistic binary framework of male-dominated architectural primacy versus the supplemental, inferior position of female-dominated interior design, to a platform of shared intellectual and multifaceted creative activity without disciplinary or gender boundaries and without the need for an “interior specialization” fused to the end of the learning process. Architecture and interior design education could therefore become a single, merged discipline.

To be clear, in suggesting that new model, I am not envisioning a further under-evaluation of interior design stature nor an emulation or dilution of current architectural thought to suit an interior

design body of knowledge. Nor is this a blending of two disciplines into a third ambiguous format called “environmental studies.” Rather, I am suggesting that a future grouping of the two fields may finally be devoid of the old feminine/masculine binaries and territorial differences and be merged into “more of a discipline of multifaceted, more nuanced and certainly more complex analyses and interpretations, similar to the growth of feminist inquiry in general.”⁷³ Since increasingly more projects within the design continuum cross the boundaries of these disciplines and many others, to me, such an open dialogue seems like a reasonable idea.

2010: THE FUTURE

A reframing of the work of design historian Lucinda Kaukas-Havenhand presents an intriguing approach to the merging of these two professions. In her paper entitled *A View from the Margin: Interior Design*, she suggests a solution to the constant “assignment of interior design and the feminine to the position of ‘other,’”⁷⁴ and by extension, the assignment of male-dominated architecture to a position of superiority. Based on Donna Haraway’s interpretation of “feminist standpoint theory,” Kaukas-Havenhand posits that in order to be accepted, interior design must recognize and value its marginal position relative to architecture and use its “otherness” to break away completely from the perpetual domination of architecture. She argues that this is also a response which would solve the constant battles for recognition that have plagued interior design departments (for example at the University of Manitoba) since the beginning of the twentieth century. Although I agree with Kaukas-Havenhand’s argument that it is time to reconsider that historic struggle, I propose an alternative

solution: one which does not remove interior design from architecture, but rather positions interior design within a “situated architecture.”

In “*A Feminist Approach to Architecture: Acknowledging Women’s Ways of Knowing*,” architect Karen Franck states that “as the early experiences of women and men and their relationship to the world differ in significant ways, so too will their characteristic way of knowing and analyzing.”⁷⁵ Building on the work of feminist philosopher Nancy Hartsock, Franck describes the differences in the ways of knowing and analyzing as:

The masculinity that boys must achieve is an ideal not directly experienced in the home and family but reached only by escaping into the masculine world of public life . . . In contrast, the female sense of self is achieved within the context of home and family, and hence embraces and values everyday life and experience.⁷⁶

In architectural terms, that description of the feminine sense of self can be translated to a focus on the smaller-scaled concerns of human factors, user needs, and emotional concerns associated with the interior design profession.

In a parallel vein, Donna Haraway has argued that the gendered nature of accepted knowledge is deeply flawed in that it is based on a cultural, (male-dominated) power-laden perspective; one which does not recognize the “standpoints” of differentiated and “other” ignored perspectives. In her paper entitled *Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective*, Haraway addresses the issue of the marginalized:

The standpoints of the subjugated are not “innocent” positions. On the contrary,

they are preferred because in principle they are least likely to allow denial of the critical and interpretive core of all knowledge . . . “Subjugated” standpoints are preferred because they seem to promise more adequate, sustained, objective, transforming accounts of the world.⁷⁷

If one connects Franck’s argument of the oppositional ways in which the fields of (male-dominated) architecture and (female-dominated) interior design are perceived, to Haraway’s viewpoint espousing the benefits of a subjugated or “situated” standpoint, the convergence of interior design and architecture seems like a perfect place from which to combine these two disciplines into a position of equality and enhanced objectivity. A “situated architecture” would question the power of the current architectural stance, embrace the subjugated viewpoint of interior design, and in so doing bring forth a new perspective for a combined and thoughtful architectural education. I would welcome that approach, particularly as it would give a different voice to the interior design profession. As a very pragmatic discipline with little theoretical foundation, interior design has unfortunately “lacked a rigorous intellectual framework and a critical discourse since its inception.”⁷⁸ It would also end the nearly obsessive need for interior designers to define precisely what they do. The constant search for the right place to “fit” interior design would cease to exist.

What is in it for architecture? A wider, more robust architectural position that recognizes the importance of a feminine standpoint, examines architecture from an intimate as well as a public perspective, and embraces the complexity and diversity of a situated “other” viewpoint.

Having reflected on the influence of modernism, postmodernism, and deconstructivist theories on previous architectural pedagogy, how this proposed model of “situated architecture” might be produced in the built forms of future building is unclear; but I have no doubt that there will be a noticeable impact. However, considering that one day soon it will likely be women who lead architectural discourse and pedagogy, I may not have to wait too long to see precisely what this impact might be.

CONCLUSION

The original focus of this study was a historical examination of Canadian interior design education through an analysis of the history and people who created the first-degree program in this discipline at the University of Manitoba. My intent in undertaking this research was to better understand the future of contemporary design education as well as my own longstanding interest in interior design as part of architectural discourse.

Although completely unintended, but as a result of research and first-person interviews with a few of the key visionaries who were founders of the School of Interior Design during its early years, my investigation also became a study of both the influence of gender and dominant architectural theory on the evolution of interior design education. In particular, evidence of the extremely strong link between the modernist thought of the first professors of the School of Architecture and their influence on the creation of the School of Interior Design pointed to the possibility of a (however unintended) historical link between further architectural theory and the corresponding restructuring of architecture and design curricula throughout its history.

Similarly, strong links were discovered between the history of women's liberation, current issues with regard to gender identity, and the continuing struggle for recognition on the part of the interior design profession. Along with the realization that women now form the majority of student bodies in both interior design and (previously male-dominated) architecture schools, these facts led to a call for a new model of combined interior design and architectural education which I have termed a "situated architecture": one which recognizes the benefits of a renegotiated, open perspective and which respects the positions of both points of view.

Finally, the impetus to write this paper was primarily the result of a letter I received from Professor Joan Harland in November 2009. Then 96 years old, retired from the University, yet still extremely vital and concerned about the future of interior design education, she continued to study and write from her home in Winnipeg. Thinking about her future, this is how she ended her letter to me:

Our funeral service has a part where it is said: "In my father's house there are many mansions. I go to prepare a place for you." All right for the men who were writing the Bible to think of owning a house, but I have never liked the idea of "dusting" some "house" throughout eternity . . . ⁷⁹

As an interior designer, "dusting some house throughout eternity" is a role that I too do not relish. This paper's call for a new educational collaboration between those who have historically "dust[ed] the house" and those who have "own[ed] the house" might allow us both to stop worrying. I think Professor Harland would approve.

NOTES

1. See [https://passages.winnipegfreepress.com/passage-details/id-238629/HARLAND_JOAN], accessed February 14, 2019.
2. Abercrombie, Stanley, 1990, *A Philosophy of Interior Design*, Boulder, CO, Westview Press, p. 166.
3. This conference was organized by Interiors Forum Scotland in 2006.
4. Interiors Forum Scotland, 2007, *Thinking Inside the Box*, conference brochure.
5. Formalized interior design education in Canada began much later than in the United States. In 1906, Frank Alvah Parsons founded the first academic Interior Design Program in the U.S. at the New York School of Fine and Applied Art, eventually renamed the Parsons School of Design.
6. The percentage of female students registered in the first years of the McGill University School of Architecture has consistently been over 50%: 2005 – 60%; 2006 – 72%; 2007 – 65%; 2008 – 76%; 2009 – 60%. Interview with Mary Lanni-Campoli, McGill University School of Architecture, Professional Program and Student Advisor, February 2010.
7. Harland, Joan and Ruth Stirk (eds.), 1997, *The History of Interior Decoration I Design at the University of Manitoba (1938-1997)*, Winnipeg, MB, self-published, p. 68. It is interesting to note that despite her insistence that interior design be taught by professional interior designers, Harland herself was an architect.
8. Sparke, Penny, 2004, "The Domestic Interior and the Construction of Self: The New York Homes of Elsie de Wolfe," in Susie McKellar and Penny Sparke (eds.), *Interior Design and Identity*, Manchester, UK, Manchester University Press, p. 72-91, at p. 73.
9. Although there were several renowned early American decorating pioneers, there were no decorators of equivalent status within the Canadian experience at least until well into the second half of the twentieth century. Even now, the number of internationally recognized Canadian interior design professionals can be counted on one hand.
10. Sparke, "The Domestic Interior and the Construction of Self," p. 73.
11. Anscombe, Isabelle, 1984, *A Woman's Touch: Women in Design from 1860 to the Present Day*, New York, NY, Elizabeth Sifton Books, Viking Penguin Inc., p. 80-81.
12. McNeil, Peter, 1994, "Designing Women: Gender, Sexuality and the Interior Decorator, c. 1890-1940," *Art History*, vol. 17, no. 4, p. 631-657, at p. 631.
13. Harland and Stirk, *The History of Interior Decoration*, p. iii.
14. Since 2005, this school has been renamed Parsons The New School for Design.
15. John Russell was primarily responsible for the creation of the interior decorating curriculum. However, professors Milton Osborne and Joan Harland, both faculty within the School of Architecture, were also deeply involved in its conception.
16. Using his personal finances from the family's timber interests in New Hampshire, Russell was also instrumental in the creation of the Royal Winnipeg Ballet and the Banff School of Fine Arts. From "1959-1999 Honouring the Legacy: Celebrating 40 years of Design Education at the John A. Russell Building," Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba, November 7, 1998.
17. These expressions were repeated several times in response to questions about Russell's architectural vision for the Department of Architecture as well as his philosophy regarding the creation of both the Interior Decorating and Interior Design programs within the School of Architecture.
18. Keshavjee, Serena (ed.), 2006, *Winnipeg Modern*, Winnipeg, MB, University of Manitoba Press, p. 12.
19. Several of these faculty (such as A.J. Donahue, Mario Carvalho, Peter Forster, and Knut Hangsoen) had studied directly with giants of Modernist architecture (for example Walter Gropius, Marcel Breuer, and Ludwig Mies van der Rohe).
20. Harland and Stirk, *The History of Interior Decoration*, p. 2.
21. For specific names of students, see Keshavjee, *Winnipeg Modern*, p. 11.
22. Harland and Stirk, *The History of Interior Decoration*, p. 3. Although the program title was changed to Interior Design, that same *Statement of Intent and Philosophy* was used to describe the four-year Bachelor of Interior Design Program in calendars from 1949-1950 until 1958-1959.
23. Architects teaching were Milton Osborne, John Russell, John Graham, James Donahue, Roy Sellors, and Joan Harland. Carol Feldsted and Wilhelmina Elarth had degrees in fine arts

- and Elizabeth Spence had an interior decorating diploma.
24. Russell's unwavering endorsement of the Interior Decorating and Design programs was validated repeatedly in interviews with professors Harland and Jackman.
 25. At the same time, curriculum content for the four-year Bachelor of Architecture Program was increased, that is, extended it to five years.
 26. Adams, Annmarie and Peta Tancred, 2000, *"Designing Women": Gender and the Architectural Profession*, Toronto, ON, University of Toronto Press, p. 18.
 27. *Ibid.*
 28. Anscombe, *A Woman's Touch*, p. 12.
 29. In Saskatchewan, this public policy led to the creation of both socialized medicine and the establishment of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF) party and, in 1944, the first socialist government in North America.
 30. Crossman, Kelly, 2006, "The Meaning of White," in Keshavjee (ed.), *Winnipeg Modern*, *op. cit.*, p. 132.
 31. In 1938, Russell was joined by Milton Osborne (B. Arch. Ohio State) and Joan Harland (B. Arch. University of Manitoba) in creating the Interior Decorating Diploma Program.
 32. Stone, Andrew, 2007, "The Underestimation of the Interior," in John Gigli, Frazer Hay, Edward Hollis, Andrew Milligan, Alex Milton, and Drew Plunkett (eds.), *Thinking Inside the Box: A Reader in Interiors for the 21st Century*, London, UK, Middlesex University Press, p. 227-240, at p. 228.
 33. Sparke, Penny, Anne Massy, Trevor Keeble, and Brenda Martin (eds.), 2009, *Designing the Modern Interior: From the Victorians to Today*, New York, NY, Berg Publishers, Ltd., p. 9.
 34. Examples of these buildings include the Winnipeg Clinic (1942-1962), the Gerson residence (1947), the Shaarey Zedek Synagogue (1948-1949), the Blankstein residence (1956), The Bridge Drive-in (1958), the John A. Russell School of Architecture Building (1959), the Monarch Life Building (1961), the International Airport (1962-1965), the Winnipeg City Hall (1964), and the St. John Brebeuf Church (1965).
 35. Hymas, Alison, "12 Habitat Suites," *Canadian Interiors*, September 1967, p. 48.
 36. Gottlieb, Rachel and Cora Golden, 2004, *Design in Canada: Fifty Years from Teakettles to Task Chairs*, Toronto, ON, Key Porter Books, p. 3.
 37. Personal interview with Harland and Jackman, February 26, 2010.
 38. Harland and Stirk, *The History of Interior Decoration*, p. 30.
 39. Milton Osborne, B. Arch., M.Sc., joined the faculty of the School of Architecture in 1938 but resigned in 1946. Personal interview with Harland, February 26, 2010.
 40. Personal interview with Harland and Jackman, February 26, 2010.
 41. *Id.*
 42. Adams and Tancred, *"Designing Women,"* p. 18.
 43. Sparke et al., *Designing the Modern Interior*, p. 70.
 44. Wikipedia, *History of Feminism*, n.d., n.p., [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_feminism], accessed February 23, 2010.
 45. Data based on University of Manitoba *Brown and Gold* yearbooks, University of Manitoba Archives, accessed February 25, 2010.
 46. Harland and Stirk, *The History of Interior Decoration*, p. 32-33.
 47. *Id.*, p. 47.
 48. *Ibid.*
 49. *Id.*, p. 60.
 50. *Id.*, p. 66.
 51. *Id.*, p. 68.
 52. *Id.*, p. 65.
 53. *Id.*, p. 68.
 54. Sarfatti Larson, Margali, 1977, *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press, p. x.
 55. *Ibid.*
 56. *Ibid.*
 57. Other initiatives include the creation of the Foundation for Interior Design Education and Research (FIDER) in the 1970s, now renamed to Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA), and the creation of the professional internship program entitled Interior Design Experience Program (IDEP) in 1993.
 58. [<https://www.cidq.org/cidq>], accessed March 2, 2010.
 59. The directors of the Interior Design Department during that period were Joan Harland, John Graham, George Fuller, Michael Cox, Grant Marshall, and Dana Stewart.
 60. Personal interview with Harland, February 26, 2010.
 61. Harland and Stirk, *The History of Interior Decoration*, p. 113.
 62. *Id.*, p. 179.
 63. *Id.*, p. 194.
 64. *Id.*, p. 218.
 65. Wikipedia, n.d., n.p., [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Third-wave_feminism], accessed March 3, 2010.
 66. Harland and Stirk, *The History of Interior Decoration*, p. 165-167. Even though there is a general movement toward more women enrolled in professional faculties, the overwhelming numbers (92%) go beyond that trend.
 67. At the same time, the student composition of the School of Architecture was also lopsided—but this time in favour of men—even though more women were also entering the Architecture Program. As noted by Adams and Tancred in *Designing Women* (p. 138), during the corresponding years of 1981 and 1986, only 4.3% of architects in Manitoba were women, while in 1986, the numbers had risen, but only to 9.8%.
 68. The head of the Interior Design Program in 2010 was Mary-Anne Beecher. Kelley Beaverford is the current head of the program (2019). The position of Director of the Architecture Program was vacant in 2010. At the current time (2019), the Head of the Department of Architecture is Carlos Rueda, Ph.D. [https://umanitoba.ca/faculties/architecture/facstaff/faclist/DoA_academic_staff_list.html].
 69. The Bachelor of Environmental Design Program consists of two years of interdisciplinary studies and two years of "option" courses where students can choose from one of three streams: architecture, interior environments, or landscape and urbanism.
 70. Personal interview with Mary-Anne Beecher, February 25, 2010.
 71. See: "About," n.d., n.p., [https://umanitoba.ca/faculties/architecture/programs/intdesign/about_ID.html] and [<http://www.umanitoba.ca/faculties/architecture/programs/intdesign/index.html>], accessed March 4, 2010 and August 20, 2019.

72. Bratton, Angela, n.d., *Feminist Anthropology*, posted May 1998, [<https://www.scribd.com/document/338386656/Feminist-Anthropology>], accessed March 4, 2010.
73. Ahrentzen, Sherry, 2003, "The Space Between the Studs: Feminism and Architecture," *Signs*, vol. 29, no. 1, p. 179-206, at p. 184.
74. Kaukas Havenhand, Lucinda, 2004, "A View from the Margin: Interior Design," *Design Issues*, vol, 20, no. 4, p. 32-42, at p. 33.
75. Franck, Karen, 2000, "A Feminist Approach to Architecture: Acknowledging Women's Ways of Knowing," in Jane Rendell, Barbara Penner, and Iain Borden (eds.), *Gender, Space Architecture: An Interdisciplinary Introduction*, New York, NY, Routledge, p. 295-305, at p. 295.
76. *Id.*, p. 296.
77. Haraway, Donna, 1988, "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective," *Feminist Studies*, vol. 14, no. 3, p. 575-599, at p. 584.
78. Chalmers, Lynn and Susan Close, "But Is it Interior Design? Considering the Intervention of Theory into Disciplinary Practice and Education," in Gigli et al. (eds.), *Thinking Inside the Box*, *op. cit.*, p. 77-83, at p. 78.
79. Harland, personal communication, November 2009.