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Robert Stern When I became dean in 1998, I set out to define our goals going forward, which included financial aid and endowments for various special activities. But on top of the list was the Art & Architecture Building’s future. The School of Art was already scheduled to move out of the Rudolph building in spring 2005. The A&A was a loved building, and frankly, in my opinion, it would have been torn down if it hadn’t been so expensive. Many in the university had no memory of it in its good days, no appreciation of its qualities. It was a lost child. At a public meeting at the school, I got president Rick Levin to say the goal was “renovate and restore the building,” and that was the key thing. Not to patch it, but to really bring it back. Sid R. Blal (Yale College ’50) then pledged a significant gift, and we began work with Richard Meier on the new Loria building and with David Childs (Yale College ’65, M. Arch ’67), of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, on the renovation of the A&A, as well as on the production drawings and project management for the entire project. For various reasons that strategy did not work out, and when the project was ready to move forward again, it was thought that perhaps a single architect would be more appropriate. Rick Levin, the facilities department, and I agreed that Charles Gwathmey was the right architect. To his great favor was a wealth of experience on some of the most nightmarish projects that you could imagine involving the renovation of additions to historic modernist buildings—additions to the Cloisters Art Museum and the Guggenheim. His love for Yale and his tremendous respect for Paul Rudolph made it perfectly clear that his selection was a no-brainer. Sid was very pleased with the choice. When Charles presented the first scheme to the president and the other officers, one and all were bowled over. By the time he was finished we were saying, “Let’s go ahead and move it to working drawings.”

Charles Gwathmey To me, the first priority was to carry out the true essence of Rudolph’s intention. In a way that meant pulling everything out that was vestigial, added, and compromised and making the building the pure diagram. With the new addition we could take the circulation and the elevators out and add a new service core with the bathrooms to make his building absolutely pure. Rudolph actually had proposed an addition off the core to the north.

RS Remember too that Jim Polshek (’55)—as the master-plan architect for 2000—had done a master plan for the new building and had made design concepts for the restoration.

CG Which I never looked at. As a designer I didn’t want to be influenced by them. The only plans I really looked at were Richard Meier’s, and I used them to initiate our first meeting with the library and the History of Art Department. I told them, “He’s a friend, this is a little awkward, but tell me, what don’t I work?” And they were very clear.

RS The Arts area committee, consisting of the deans from the various schools—art, architecture, music, drama, and the directors of the British Art Center and the Yale Art Gallery—was established to develop a workable plan that would improve all of the arts facilities according to a realistic timetable. When I became dean, the committee had already approved Deborah Berke’s renovation of the former Jewish Community Center as a home for the art school. Key to the plan was the Art Gallery’s need to expand into the Swartz Building and Street Hall. To make thisensemble, the History of Art Department had to move out of Street. Part of the plan also involved the Arts Library, which was over-sizing its available space in the A&A. Given that both art history and architecture had to be in this library, it was inevitable these two departments would come together, as they had been historically. The university owned two marginal buildings between the Yale Daily News office and the A&A Building and was prepared to take them down, creating the site that Rudolph always knew could be used to expand his building. Rudolph thought of the A&A Building as a residential college with a courtyard, which is what Charles has basically achieved.

CG In terms of program, each user group—architecture, art history, and the library—had its wishes. The library, to be the Robert B. Haas Family Arts Library, wanted to double its space, be contiguous, and have a street entry and presence. The History of Art Department was concerned about being perceived as “an addition” and wanted also to be distinguished through an architectonic resolution. They requested varied offices, without double-loaded corridors. For the School of Architecture, one of the critical things was to maintain the transparency and the views from the north-side studios, even with the addition, which generated the form of the two towers on the east and west, leaving the void in the middle, with the library as the bridge between departments, both literally and physically. These were clues for us as to how to solve the problem.

RS I think the disposition was very clear once we understood the library had to be on the ground and basement levels and that it was the connecting space. Then we took Rudolph’s ceremonial stair as the idea of entering the exhibition floor, with the entry to the new lecture hall and the History of Art Department reception, which established the vertical disposition. The offices for the History of Art Department in Loria start on the fourth floor and go up to the seventh, and then all the connecting links to the A&A from the new core were self-clarifying. Architecturally, you see Rudolph’s building in so many different ways, through glimpses and transitions between the two buildings, and you’re always looking back and forth at architecture, which reinforces the A&A Building and creates a dialogue. What was important to me also was the elevation of the fifth façade as the green roof over the lecture hall and the fourth-floor terrace interconnecting the two buildings, instead of looking down onto generic roofs. The great hall skylit roof of the library is also an elevation with content and memory.

RS When the dean’s design advisory committee—made up of the president, the officers, myself, and former deans Cesar Pell and Tom Beeby—had a meeting in which Charles presented his design, Cesar said, “I think you should consider limestone for the building.” Everyone looked like deer caught in headlights: “Limestone, that sounds very expensive!” But Cesar was very quiet and then he said, “Limestone is jaw-dropping; it’s fantastic.”

RS When I presented the building to faculty and students in September 2006, I felt heart sick because Vincent Scully said, “You should make it all glass.” M.J. Long said, “The elevation is not resolved.” Everybody said the plan and sections were amazing, but the facade didn’t do it. I drove back to...
consultants gave us good directions and was available. Charles is able to benefit from the drawing in his office. Sadly, Rudolph, which was the firm responsible at the time, Fred Bland ('72), of Beyer Blinder Belle, had already been approved, and they were going ahead. They were crazy. That was my student-teacher instinct; if it doesn’t read, you can’t explain it away. And I felt it wasn’t reading, despite all the different takes. So lifting the limestone and making it the same size as the Rudolph glazing was major. Bob was incredibly supportive.

RS: I’ve never been on a job as much as Charles has been on this job. When I couldn’t see him in New Haven, he called me up in New York to say, “I have to send this over to you.” And then two minutes later, “what do you think?” Charles has had great people on the project who should be acknowledged: Tom Levering, Elizabeth Skowronski, and Steven Foreman. And associate John Jacobson (’70), who coordinated the project on our end, is as passionate as Charles is about the building. He wanted to protect every square inch for the school because, when I was a new dean, we had to sign what I’ve come to see as a pact with the devil stating that we could have 57,000 square feet of space for the school and not a square inch more. Yet any school that is healthy is growing all the time. Another issue is that of the construction schedule. A thing I was committed to as dean was that no student was going to receive a degree from this school who hadn’t spent at least one year in the A&A Building. That is why I insisted that when we were in the Sculpture Building—which has been a perfectly good summer rental—we had to go back home in a year. The A&A is a fundamental part of the culture of the school.

CG: The other commitment of the university was to make the building sustainable. We had to air-condition it while maintaining the integrity of the original ceiling planes, which we hid all the new mechanics. In the end we decided to replace the windows, which wasn’t part of the original project. We didn’t even know if we could get the glass. RS: In 1984 the original windows had been replaced, and indeed Rudolph made a sketch of how the windows should be done. Fred Bland (’70), of Beyer Blinder Belle, which was the firm responsible at the time, has that drawing in his office. Sadly, Rudolph and Fred were constrained by what was then available. Charles is able to benefit from the incredible glass technology today.

CG: Atelier Ten environmental consultants gave us good directions and evaluated the solutions. The building had hung ceilings with asbestos that was ripped out in the 1970s. To create the effect of the original ceiling plans we adopted a European radiant ceiling panel, which both heats and cools and reduces the ductwork by 60 percent. We added two zinc-clad mechanical towers behind the Rudolph towers on the west side, that are almost like shadows you would never know they were there. Our lighting consultant, Robert Leiter, reinvented Rudolph’s lightwell into a fixture, which is incredibly efficient. The mechanical intervention was very inventive for Yale; they resisted it for a long time. The project is LEED Silver, which is amazing if you think in terms of Rudolph’s original building.

RS: In Rudolph’s day students plugged in an electric pencil sharpener, a lamp, and a radio and were in business. Today the most advanced electronics have to be threaded throughout the building. The A&A was environmentally challenged—uninsulated glass and exposed concrete made it difficult to regulate interior temperatures. Students used to wear mittens in the winter and bathing suits in the summer when thermometers would register 110 degrees; there was no way for the heat to be dissipated. The concrete was also a problem, with spawing, revealing rebars placed too close to the surface. New windows installed in 1994 were accompanied by pre-cast caps were used to cover over the worst conditions, like in dentistry when teeth are capped after grinding them down. But the caps had proven to be the wrong waterproofing solution, and it was much better to go back to the true concrete.

I can think of no more difficult task than the design of an architecture school. In this case, when you consider the number of people who teach here, want to school here, who are also leading designers and are heavily invested in this building. It’s like being out in the blazing spotlight on center stage: Charles has been a strong performer.

CG: It was very complimentary for me to have been asked to do this because I loved Paul and because of my time here. Paul used to recruit Der Scutt (’81) and me to look at perspective drawings of the building at night. As he designed, he struggled about being loved Paul and because of my time here. Paul and not a square inch more. Yet any school that is healthy is growing all the time. Another issue is that of the construction schedule. A thing I was committed to as dean was that no student was going to receive a degree from this school who hadn’t spent at least one year in the A&A Building. That is why I insisted that when we were in the Sculpture Building—which has been a perfectly good summer rental—we had to go back home in a year. The A&A is a fundamental part of the culture of the school.

CG: The other commitment of the university was to make the building sustainable. We had to air-condition it while maintaining the integrity of the original ceiling planes, which we hid all the new mechanics. In the end we decided to replace the windows, which wasn’t part of the original project. We didn’t even know if we could get the glass. RS: In 1984 the original windows had been replaced, and indeed Rudolph made a sketch of how the windows should be done. Fred Bland (’70), of Beyer Blinder Belle, which was the firm responsible at the time, has that drawing in his office. Sadly, Rudolph and Fred were constrained by what was then available. Charles is able to benefit from the incredible glass technology today.

CG: Atelier Ten environmental consultants gave us good directions and evaluated the solutions. The building had

Building Dedications

On Friday and Saturday, November 7 and 8, 2008, panel discussions, tours, and exhibitions will formally inaugurate the renovated and restored A&A Building, renamed Paul Rudolph Hall and the new home to the Art History Department as the Loria Center with the Haas Family Arts Library. The lecture will be followed by a reception in the Architecture Gallery. Concurrent panel discussions sponsored by the Art History Department and the School of Architecture will begin at 3 p.m. on Saturday, November 8, the Art History panel, “Art History in the era of Globalization,” focusing on methods of understanding trans-cultural exchange will be moderated by David Joselit, Professor and Chair, Department of History of Art and will include Yale History of Art professors, Mary Miller and Tim Barringer. Paul Mellon Professor of History of Art, as well as two graduate students Shira Birnbaum and Courtney Martin.

There will be two School of Architecture exhibitions of work from the Rudolph era beginning at 10:30 a.m. with Stanley Tigerman (’63), Allan Greenberg (’65), and Alexander Tzonis (’63). At 1:30 p.m. a second panel will be held on Rudolph’s legacy and include Sir Norman Foster (’62), Lord Richard Rogers (’62), and architect J. Carl Abbott, Jr. (’62). Both panels will be moderated by Paul Goldberger.

Student-led tours of the buildings will be held on Saturday morning. And Timothy Rohan will lead two tours of the exhibition, Model Cities. The Haas Family Arts Library will feature the exhibition, An Introduction to Arts Library Special Collections. The Dedication Ceremony and Ribbon Cutting will take place at 3 p.m. Welcome and remarks will be made by Dean Abbott and architect Charles Gwathmey (’63) who will speak on his design concepts for the building, Sid R. Bass (Yale College ’65), Jeffrey Loria (Yale College ’62), and Robert Haas (Yale College ’68) will make remarks, and President Richard C. Levin will dedicate the buildings.
What we are doing in Las Vegas is unusual in our industry. Historically, buildings in Las Vegas were fortresses; once guests were inside, they were not intended to go out. This contradicts demonstrated consumer behavior—people want to have a fun entertainment experience, including visiting an average of 5.5 resorts each day. We have acquired enough facilities and land to make it not only possible but desirable for customers to move from place to place. This new vision requires a more expansive approach to Las Vegas as to how real estate is organized. The 350 acres of contiguous land Harrah’s owns is prime real estate located at the heart of Las Vegas’ world-famous Strip. With nine resorts and more than 20,000 hotel rooms already in place, the objective of this development is to add new attractions while at the same time ensuring the contiguous resort’s intestinal space seamlessly connects the properties.

NR Has the attitude changed now that commercial and entertainment industries in Las Vegas have become more involved in urban-planning issues? How do you fit the Harrah’s complex into the urban design of Las Vegas and incorporate your concepts into creating a city?

CA I would say Las Vegas is growing up. It is now being developed around modes of transportation other than just the automobile. Historically, the major highway, the Las Vegas Strip, was for automobiles and not very friendly to pedestrians. Over time that roadway system became insufficient to carry all the traffic. Now there is another “roadway” to move people from place to place, the Las Vegas monorail. It is interesting because we will have architecture on both sides of the highway and both sides of the monorail. Now we have a mass transit system; it is possible for people to abandon the automobile. Further, the pedestrian experience can be much more vibrant as buildings are linked together in a number of places—all this is urbanization in my view.

NR See this as similar to the tendency to cluster various venues related to the same commercial urban condition, the way gateway districts develop in cities such as New York.

CA For us, it is all about guest experience; what makes our development unique is that we want to encourage people to enjoy a wide variety of experiences. One place might have a set of experiences designed around a particular demographic group, but those same people might also enjoy experiences with other demographic groups. That would never have happened ten years ago; guests would not have been encouraged to mingle and move about. Today the city is more enlightened about how people use entertainment spaces, so we now make it easy to move around.

DS David, how do you see Las Vegas from an architect’s perspective? Do you also feel it is in a new phase that recalibrates what is there and revises former mistakes?

David Schwarz One of the interesting things about Las Vegas is that there is a desire among very diverse communities to have a “real city.” The impetus is a broad-based desire for Las Vegas residents to look outside their borders and to understand urbanism. How do you create a neighborhood? Across all sectors of Las Vegas there is a desire to grow up. Harrah’s is choosing to capitalize on this desire to become an authentic place.

Charles Atwood, vice chairman of Harrah’s Entertainment, Inc., and the fifth Bass Visiting Fellow, and Davenport Visiting Professor David Schwarz (’74), an architect based in Washington, D.C., will be teaching a studio together on a site in Las Vegas. They discussed development and urban-design issues for Constructs. Charles Atwood will be teaching on August 28, at Yale.
facilities and how they want them to perform. We learn how to deal with our clients’ needs. We were attracted to Harrah’s because we consider our firm to be a populist firm and are less concerned with the architectural critical press than creating places people love. The client is an essential part of the team.

The arena in Dallas was a complex endeavor, particularly for the client. How do you create an important civic structure that has the necessary returns? The arena has the highest dollar value of indoor advertising of any arena built to date. How to measure revenue for architecture is a really important issue for people who are in the business. A concert hall is complex; the client wants world recognition and perfect acoustics. How do you give the client something that suits their personality? We learn together.

CA Chuck, how do you see the collaborative process with architects? Do you give them a specific assignment and then leave them alone, or do you work together? And how do you avoid the cookie-cutter development approach in casino design?

NR The process must be collaborative. While we can express how we want it to operate, we need assistance in helping our space come to life as a physical entity. We seek to avoid the cookie-cutter approach by understanding how different people want to use different spaces. Las Vegas has a very strong, already-built context. The physical constraints are strong, and we don’t want to repeat the same thing over again, so creative reuse is critical.

NR How do you make a building significant in a city full of iconic buildings? Do you want an iconic building, and does the architectural form matter to you?

CA That is a very interesting question, and it is not just a problem for Las Vegas. The number of developers who want iconic buildings is seemingly endless. There is a very similar feeling to the buildings in Las Vegas. The Las Vegas Strip is what unites these places today. A drive down the Strip will quickly give you a sense of that feeling. We will do something different, which is reuse existing buildings and tie them together with new entertainment spaces. In earlier times a developer would tear down a building to build another designed to be over-the-top. We are determined to reuse existing buildings and make them as over-the-top as new ones, by connecting them with interesting spaces. To do that, we’ve assembled a team that is sympathetic, yet has different visions of the place. What is critically important is to find people with a common vision of the outcome but still have sufficiently different ways to execute that work so they can produce a place with variety and excitement. We believe to create what feels like an authentic neighborhood requires a diverse set of views. The Las Vegas Strip has been built over time by different people, and we need to authenticate that. The trick to making it accessible is the art of collapsing time; we need to create something that feels like it has evolved over time. Our site is 350 acres, and half of it is built out today. How to make it feel like one place is part of the trick. You have to make people feel like they are in a place that is real and can understand the function of time in the creation of place.

NR How do you build in a desert environment, where there is a short supply of water? How do you create a comfortable, high-quality building in a harsh climate?

DS In Texas, which is like Las Vegas, we tend to focus on the heat but should focus on humidity. In Las Vegas it is quite comfortable in the shade. It isn’t whether it is hot or cold; it is the time of day. The question becomes, how do you design so the user follows the flows of climate? Being able to capitalize on the times when weather is a benefit is quite important.

NR Have you ever worked on a project where something unexpected happened? Have you allowed an element of surprise to come into a project?

CA My talent is on the money side, so virtually every project has unexpected aspects—some good, some not so good. I am always surprised but pleased to see a project built within the budget. We work very hard to be sure we design projects that are viable economically. But we must keep the excitement of the building. One way to accomplish that is to be very clear about project objectives, including target customers, program, and budget. And your role at the beginning of the project. We have found that talented people can collaborate to create very special places if they understand the problem constraints right from the beginning. Then it simply becomes all about iterating through the process of issue identification and resolution—all while keeping a clear idea of what makes the place special for the guest.

CA I intend to learn more than I teach. I have taught classes around strategy and finance but nothing so far out of the usual comfort level as architecture. David assures me that I will do well. Having a willingness to listen and accept many different points of view is interesting to me and has made our projects more interesting to guests. I trust that trait will make for an interesting studio.

NR What is your interest in Las Vegas as the studio site and subject, and why now?

CA It is the fortieth anniversary of Denise Scott Brown and Robert Venturi’s “Learning from Las Vegas” studio at Yale. It seems appropriate to visit the subject now as we have had a great deal of experience from the world at large and are interested in learning how the lessons we’ve learned in other places are applicable to Las Vegas. The world has changed significantly, and entertainment is a part of everything. I first became involved in Las Vegas when Oscar Goodman became mayor and just looked at downtown; he was always interested in urban issues. Las Vegas is a city in a very nascent phase of defining itself internally rather than externally. There is a desire to make Las Vegas a real place since the permanent population is much larger than it was ten years ago. How to make the Strip a more pleasant pedestrian experience is a fascinating question. It is interesting to look at human behavior and see how you take some of that indigenous excitement and instill it in placemaking. This is a real opportunity for students. We will expose them to the people involved in place-making in Las Vegas at the moment—businessmen, entertainers, architects, and planners—to give them real-life as well as design experience.

NR How do you see students contributing to Las Vegas? Are you interested in having the project results be provocative or pragmatic schemes?

DS We are interested in having the students do serious work, not a crazy building for the sake of a crazy building. We want intellectual justification for building in a certain location. The kinds of master plan students make will dictate the need for wild architecture, and as long as the justification for iconic architecture is real, I will be happy. There are lots of places on-site for fabric buildings and iconic buildings, so there will be a role for students to have the opportunity to do both. We do not have a prejudice to either.
Francisco Mangado, based in Pamplona, Spain, will offer an adjunct studio. He will give a lecture, “Left-Handed Architecture” on Thursday, September 11. For Con structs he discussed his recent work and issues in practice.


Nina Rappaport The notion of nationality for an architect has dissolved, for the most part, with the phenomenon of globalization over the past fifty years and more recently within Europe with the expansion of the EU. Has your work been influenced by this change, either formally or in terms of types of commissions? Or do you work to maintain a regional materiality and design identity?

FM In conceptual terms my architecture is nurtured by its context, its place. The specific is very important to the genesis of the project. Having said this, it is true that in the past few years Spanish architecture has been influenced by a global way of making architecture. This has not always been fruitful and positive and has resulted in certain superficial and calligraphic approaches to the solution of architectural problems. However, on some occasions it has enriched a way of working. For these reasons I think it is intelligent to maintain a specific contextual approach without undervaluing global influences.

NR How has the new European competition system played a role in your projects in terms of expanding your practice outside of Spain? Do you think the more open competition system is working?

FM We are participating in more and more European competitions. This summer we are preparing a proposal for the International Criminal Courts at the Hague, and we have projects in France and Portugal. We are also designing the highest tower in Buenos Aires. I firmly support the competition system in Europe, and particularly in Spain, through which all public commissions and many private ones are decided. It is the only system that permits one to maintain a level of originality and architectural quality in any country, as well as allowing many great young architects to produce architecture. I think the San Siro project in Milan is a perfect example of how the competition system has a lot to do with the competition system.

NR How are you involved in the direction of a new project? I understand that in competitions the client does not meet with the architect until after the architect is selected. At what point do you have input with the architect until after the architect is selected? Do you think this is a problem?

FM I believe part of the responsibility of the architect is to advise the client on the program and work together in a dynamic way. The architect is there not only to answer technical questions but to offer conceptual guidance. European architecture is a holistic enterprise. It combines client consultation, a program, and even the ethical questions of what is intelligent both constructively and financially.

NR Are there modes in which your projects change from cubic rectilinear to those surfaces that fold or bend to a more angular abstraction, such as the Leisaz project? How is this a result of your relation to the site?

FM I do not worry much about the geometrical component with which I express myself in each project. It is not the most important part, given that I am not very interested in the calligraphic aspects of architecture. I believe projects should be focused around questions of site, space, materialization, program, and even the ethical questions that present themselves at the time of making architecture—issues that allow for a serious and not simply a stylistic solution. The obsession to search for calligraphies that can be discerned as similar, project after project, is not an issue that interests me. In this context the rectangular or angular forms you refer to are based on the ideology of the project and its contents. For example, the majority of the more angular projects are in the Mediterranean, where the issue of light is critical and should influence every architectural proposal. One fascinating aspect of architecture in Spain is the layering of centuries and cultures, including the Moorish and Jewish traditions, along with contemporary aesthetics. How has this inspired your work, and how do the various aspects of each style manifest themselves today?

FM The conceptual and formal complexity involved in working in different places with preexisting histories is fantastic. It is the only way to understand a project or a problem. It is better to face these preexisting conditions with an open mind, without preconceived notions, and to be conscious of the time in which one lives to allow for the best results. Buildings such as Pamplona’s Convention Center and Avila’s auditorium can be understood only from this perspective. For example, the building in Pamplona physically incorporated its interiors as part of the Renaissance city’s walls, generating a spatial and formal richness. That has to be done from a certain distance, with the capacity of temporal abstraction, otherwise one could be guilty of simplistic readings.

NR Why are you interested in teaching at Yale, and where have you taught previously? What will be the focus of your studio topic?

FM I taught for four years at the Harvard Graduate School of Design, and I have a good friend at Yale who I admire and value. They have convinced me the school is full of life and challenges, and I am hopeful I can transform this fantastic opportunity into a great experience. The students will confront a studio in which investigation substitutes speculative, intelligence replaces imagination, and sensibility supplants calligraphy. I will try to teach them that what an architect needs is the intelligence to detect problems and the sensitivity to resolve them. The effects of mass tourism pose a significant architectural challenge to a large extent of the Mediterranean coast. The sudden increase in population density has facilitated economic growth, resulting in a disorderly, and visually chaotic urban environment, and a shortage of civic services especially in the area between the beach avenues and inland development. In the past few years, Spanish Mediterranean authorities have initiated a large-scale restructuring process that questions the degree to which architects can influence urban transformations with individual buildings, addressing both the architectural and infrastructural context. In other words, does the necessity of circumstance merit a re-envisioning of the Mediterranean area as a limitation? The studio will develop an urban design project (a public park and network of pedestrian streets) and then a specific architectural intervention (a mixed-use hotel) in Gandia, a city of the Spanish Levant, Valencia.
Next to food and sex, Yale is my favorite thing. I don’t know why food got first billing. Last time I gave a talk here I showed everything I did since my bar mitzvah, so tonight I thought I would show the buildings that never got built. I am going to leave it up to you students to go back and find the same ideas in the buildings that did get built, but I wasn’t consciously doing that. It was a process.

I started playing with chain-link fencing because so much of it is produced in our culture, and everybody hates it. I became fascinated with digital mechanics, which is what happens in our built environment. People hate the cities we’re in, hate what they look like; they don’t like the buildings, and they are always complaining. When then somebody does something different, they get pissed off. This denial thing is sort of the same as the chain-link.

I did a beach house in Malibu, and the people used it only on weekends. They wanted to be able to lock it up when they weren’t there, so I decided to make a chain-link fence around the house and use it as the architecture. It scared them, so they didn’t build it.

I was interested in the slapdash construction in California, the tract houses, and the energy it created. I started playing with that idea. This scared people.

Everybody was talking about solar energy, so for an auditorium project in a San Fernando Valley arts park, I decided to make the solar energy the decoration and play with that idea. I put a pineapple on top because I had just been to Sant’Ivo and saw Barroso’s pineapples, so it was an homage to the architect. The people of the San Fernando Valley thought I was making fun of them, so they fried me—because of the bloody pineapple.

I was fascinated with the idea in California that you could have a series of rooms that are individual buildings. This was my early urbanism: How do you put buildings together? I heard Philip Johnson give a lecture once about one-room buildings being the best architecture, and I took that to heart. I thought, I can do one-room buildings. I was still on the Philip kick of each building being a one-room building but touching one another. My clients went to the Bel Air Association and asked them to not approve the building because they were afraid to build it, and that didn’t want to tell me.

Bob Stern, Stanley Tigerman, and I did an AIA thing in Kalamazoo, Michigan. The downtown was pretty sparse, and they didn’t really need housing. The nicest thing I found there were tiny wood houses, so I decided that the downtown could have an amphitheater of little star-shaped wood houses that would look over a pond.

Then I started this fish fetish as my anger with post-modernism rose. I said fish are three hundred million times older than man, so if you are going to anthropomorphize, why not go to fish and start at the beginning. I started building those fish, and they took on a life of their own. And it wasn’t because of my grandmother’s fish in the bathtub.

One of my favorite things was a Leo Castell event that Barbara Jacobson organized. Everyone was to build a folly. Mine was for a rich guy in Beverly Hills who had everything. He would have a prison when he caught a burglar, and then the fish was a nice room where he could talk to the burglar until the cops arrived.

They tore down my building at the University of California Irvine last year. The word in the press was that they were temporary buildings, but I was never told that. They wanted me to protest, but I think you live and let live. I don’t go protesting things like that. Progress is progress.

In Turtle Creek, Dallas, I made condos and office buildings. I always liked this one. Some of the ideas of this are things that I have taken into the Brooklyn project.

Madison Square Garden had a competition, and I was on a team with David Childs of SOM and we played off of each other. I purposely set my building back so that it silhouetted against his. The outcry from the developer about doing this kind of rusty stuff was horrific because it was very expensive.

Peter Lewis’s house in Cleveland turned out to be a four-year study. I never expected him to build it, but it was fun to work with him on it. I started modeling things with red felt, and then I would spray it with wax and fix it, and then put it in the computer. I was fascinated with this kind of planning, with this figure that the plan became. A figure appeared that looked like some sort of pretentious horse’s head, which I was then able to use again. Philip Johnson did the guesthouse, which was a riff on Hermann Finsterlin.

Telluride is very conservative, and they don’t allow very much. In fact, the guy on the next lot in the middle of the 100-acre parcel, when he heard I was going to do a house for Jay Chiat, sold his lot. I then decided to do something a little more adventuroussome: I wanted to do it in black copper. I thought since he goes there only in the winter the black-copper figure against the snow would be beautiful. But we didn’t build it.

In Mexico City with David Childs and Ricardo Legorreta, David asked for the tallest tower because he is bigger. Riccardo’s was the most important because it was Mexico City, his home, so I took the smallest one. I am showing it in relation to the skyline thing in Brooklyn. So these ideas were percolating.

The Time Warner people came to me in L.A., and they wanted to put a store at the bottom of One Times Square, in New York. They wanted to brand the building, and they had to leave the advertising. I called a zoning lawyer and asked him, “What can you do?” He said, “Anything that is temporary you can do.” I thought we could use the mesh and pull it tight against the building, and then take the twenty-six figures of Time Warner—Bugs Bunny, Superman, Batman—and make a big cuckoo clock; at noon Superman would push out and then at night Batman would go out, and it could light up. All night the figures would be soaring; you could hear the building sneeze. I went wild with it. We had smoke puffing out for Bugs Bunny so Elmer Fudd could shoot him. Time Warner came back with pictures of the model and said, “Frank Gehry, you are a genius; this is so great.” They got in their cars and left, and I never saw them again.

The Corcoran Museum, in Washington, D.C., had a space between two buildings, and I wanted to knit them together. We won the competition, but of course when we found out the real program I started playing with different kinds of ideas. You would enter on one side, cross over the arts school in the basement so you could see the art students. I was very sorry about this one.

For The New York Times competition that I did with David Childs, we didn’t lose and we didn’t win because we pulled out before they selected anybody. I thought we were being selected, but I went to a meeting with the contractors and they told me I had to be in New York every Tuesday at ten o’clock, and I said, “I live in L.A., so I can’t.” They said, “That is the only way you can do the job,” so I said, “Well, I guess I’m not going to do the job.” I called The New York Times and withdrew. I suppose I was petulant at the moment; I could have stayed in and struggled with it, but I didn’t.

I collaborated with Greg Lynn on a competition for Santosa Island, off the coast of Singapore, with an aquarium, hotels, a children’s park, and, buried in there somewhere, a casino. We did a garden with interactive robots. We worked with Peter Arnell, who has done a bunch of these crazy things. He invented these weird figures. The guy who did Free Willy was going to build figures as robots, and they would be in the aquarium and you could call them—a kid could call his figure, and it would come to him. Originally these were going to be for show, so they could do acrobatics and have Cirque du Soleil. We actually got into a very real collaboration so I don’t know where all that is going and I start, and where I start and he stops. Michael Graves won the competition.

Along time ago in Hannover I did a tower with a little twist in it, and the reason for the twist was to walk in from the plaza. There put three of them together, one on top of the other, as a twisting tower. I did a vodka bottle with my son, who is an artist, and during the competition anyone asks me to work with him it’s hard to refuse. I did a bunch of buildings studies using twists. I did hundreds of them, and none of them are going to be built. The thing that isn’t going to be built is my house. I bought a lot in Venice to build a house, and I got so excited about these big pieces of lumber and doing something interlocking, like the great Roman bridges that go over the Whole wood. I must have done fifty schemes. I can’t build it, and I don’t know why. I need another architect to help me.

Eero Saarinen Visiting Professor Frank O. Gehry gave a lecture at Yale School of Architecture, called “Work,” on April 10, 2008 which is published here.
The Glass Half Full

“The glass half full” may seem a particularly optimistic view of a world close to running on empty, but it captures the guardedly hopeful tenor of “Sustainable Architecture: Today and Tomorrow.” It might have gone differently. In that time, the architects designing the buildings, the Yale School of Architecture didn’t open a window, but pulled down walls. What could have been a revealing dialogue of statistical graphs, thermal imagery, maps, and cautionary rhetoric instead coalesced into a body of abstract ideas and information. The speakers constructed a platform, not for new kinds of buildings—that would be premature—but for new ways of thinking about the building as an artifact.

In her seminal essay “No Building Is an Island,” [Harvard Design] Magazine, 26, Spring/Summer 2007, symposium organ- izer Michelle Addington set the conceptual parameters wide, effectively dispelling any lingering illusions that buildings might be entities unto themselves. Her conviction was mirrored in the breadth and scope of the other participants’ expertise. Framed by United Nations emissary and former Danish prime minister Dr. Gro Harlem Brundtland’s eloquent keynote address, the conference themes telescoped from molecule to mass. Nevertheless, the paper presented by the architect provided the granular foundation for the much-discussed work in the field of environmental science, law, and landscape ecology. Likewise, the particular nature of architecture was inextricably linked to provocative conversations about the nature of the architect’s education and scope of engage- ment at the zone of uncertainty without narrowing the power of poetics in the interdisciplinary approach. Otherwise we will fail to capture the power of poetics in the interdisciplinary approach. Otherwise we will fail to capture the power of poetics in the interdisciplinary approach. Otherwise we will fail to capture the power of poetics in the interdisciplinary approach. Otherwise we will fail to capture the power of poetics in the interdisciplinary approach. Otherwise we will fail to capture the power of poetics in the interdisciplinary approach.

That said, it’s worth recalling the effectiveness of the national antilittering campaign during the Johnson administration in the 1960s and the energy-conservation measures of the Carter administration in the 1970s. American presidents can be enormously persuasive. The problem comes when they leave office. Carter may have persuaded Americans to lower their thermostat, but they shot right up again under Reagan in the 1980s.

Political activism can influence public opinion and encourage long-lasting behavioral changes. However, Esty’s call “to narrow the zone of uncertainty” without narrowing the scope of research or practice. The fourth opportunity is culture, both of design and of places. The symposium speakers’ frequent references to sustainable design in socially minded countries such as Sweden and Canada implicitly pointed to the role of culture. However, the habit of citing these models as “best practices” risks not only a lack of knowledge about what Kristin Hill, associate professor and director of Landscape Architecture at the University of Virginia, called the “meta-critical-critical-critical” nature of objects and places. Esty reminded the audience that designers need to meet the demand for hot showers, automobility, and even cold beer—not the presumed demand for thermostats, cars, or refrigerators. If they do not question existing parameters and typologies or—as architect Ken Yeng pointed out—the systems that govern architectural education, designers simply reinforce the status quo. The challenge for architects and designers is to “narrow the zone of uncertainty” without narrowing the scope of research or practice. The third opportunity was in the area of restructuring practice, and this is the real goal of the Hines Endowed Fund. Offer- ing a future-forward perspective on the possibilities for ubiquitous computing, Joseph Paradiso of MIT Media Lab’s Responsive Environments Group, showed how a building’s virtual architecture can supply the means to “unmake our dangerous liaisons with nature that lies within it.”

Politics was the second opportu- nity to be stressed. As Brundtland noted, the influence of the United States is still palpable, that and the absence of anti- environmental rhetoric from President Bush means that America can no longer be the “world’s excuse” to ignore carbon emissions. Yale Hillhouse professor of Environmental Law & Policy Daniel Esty echoed Brundtland’s call for political leadership, not just at the national level, where regulation is sorely needed, but increasingly demanded (by corporations), in other states. Citing California governor Schwarzenegger’s efforts to reduce emissions, Esty pointed out that local governments often have more autonomy than the federal bureaucracy. That said, it’s worth recalling the effectiveness of the national antilittering campaign during the Johnson administration in the 1960s and the energy-conservation measures of the Carter administration in the 1970s. American presidents can be enormously persuasive. The problem comes when they leave office. Carter may have persuaded Americans to lower their thermostat, but they shot right up again under Reagan in the 1980s.

By the 1960s the nation was faced with a range of issues social justice, public health, and environmental science, law, and landscape ecology. Likewise, the particular nature of architecture was inextricably linked to provocative conversations about the nature of the architect’s education and scope of engage- ment at the zone of uncertainty without narrowing the power of poetics in the interdisciplinary approach. Otherwise we will fail to capture the power of poetics in the interdisciplinary approach. Otherwise we will fail to capture the power of poetics in the interdisciplinary approach. Otherwise we will fail to capture the power of poetics in the interdisciplinary approach. Otherwise we will fail to capture the power of poetics in the interdisciplinary approach. Otherwise we will fail to capture the power of poetics in the interdisciplinary approach.

The sympo- sium “Sustainable Architecture: Today and Tomorrow” was conceived to mark the inauguration of the Hines Endowed Fund for Advanced Sustainability in Architectural Design at Yale on April 4–5, 2008, and was organized by professor Michele Addington. The two perspectives here represent many diverse approaches to the current issues and the potential for future research.

While advocacy efforts need to recognize different urban value systems, climate change is undeniably a shared phenomenon. To respond to this challenge of culture in the twenty-first century, we need to move beyond the discredited univeralism and paralyzing pluralism that characterized late-twentieth- century thinking. Here, Princeton Lawrence S. Rockefeller Professor of Philosophy Kwame Anthony Appiah’s approach to cosmopolitanism may be useful. He calls for a partial cosmopolitanism—one that honors local practices within a culture of mutual respect for human life. Even though Appiah’s book Cosmopolitanism is largely a response to culture wars fought over artifacts, its relevance to issues of sustainability is indis- putable. For today’s nature is artifice—shaped by the consequences of human actions. The condition of artifice now has no laws, only behaviors. We make the world and it makes us. We are now responsible for unmaking our dangerous liaisons with harmful products, practices, and, yes, buildings.

Paraphrasing Addington, we need to dismantle the building as microcosm and reconstruct it in the macrocosm of interdisciplinary research, to which this writer would add only one caveat: Don’t discount the power of the poetics in the interdisciplinary approach. Otherwise we will fail to capture the power of the poetics in the interdisciplinary approach. Otherwise we will fail to capture the power of the poetics in the interdisciplinary approach. Otherwise we will fail to capture the power of the poetics in the interdisciplinary approach. Otherwise we will fail to capture the power of the poetics in the interdisciplinary approach. Otherwise we will fail to capture the power of the poetics in the interdisciplinary approach.
Sustainability in Perspective

As we come to terms with the enormity and complexity of the environmental issues we face, a syndrome such as “Sustainable Architecture: Today and Tomorrow” will become increasingly important. One of the problems faced by architects—indeed by all professions—in trying to negotiate a sustainable future is understanding the scope of their potential contribution. The presentations provided an opportunity to understand how relative research to a sustainable imperative is carried out in other fields.

In discussing networked sensor technology, MIT Media Lab’s Joseph警务 by Barber (MED ’05) is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Montreal; and Yale’s Fred Cowan’s 1995 “Five Principles of Ecological Design” or William McDonough’s “Hanceur Principles,” of 2005, do so in the name of a moralistic resistance or designing “in harmony with nature.” Seemingly important economic, political, or technological innovations are also environmental or at least have engaged with problems related to the climate system. As William Odell, principal of HOK and co-author of the landmark HOK Guidebook to Sustainable Design, has pointed out, our current attempts at managing climate conditions through efficient buildings are really just about buying time—until there is better technology; until clients are better educated about environmental impacts; until our “comfort needs” reflect those of future generations, and until we are all, in effect, “environmentalists.” However, recent trends are not encouraging.

As Michelle Addington pointed out in setting the stage for the day’s discussions, environmental design is a catalytic role in creating measurable standards, which were generally appreciated for their catalytic role in creating clear goals. Thus Ken Yeang’s insistence—in his comments preceding the panel—on a clear separation between the “art of architecture” and the “science of building” can be seen as one of the central conflicts in attempts to transform the architectural profession. Indeed, those architectural proposals that intentionally resist the techno-determinist perspective, for example the “City Nature” at the Ministry of Health Building in Rio de Janeiro, have demonstrated the difficulty of applying objective scientific standards to a condition of rapid development overwhelmed by various political, cultural, and economic patterns—more evidence of the effort required to harness the intellectual power of the scientific field toward the end of increasing sustainable practices.

Daniel Este, one of the most prominent voices in the environmental discourse, has played a significant role in the geopolitics of palm-oil harvesting in Borneo, Lisa Curran, director of the Tropi- cal Resources Institute at the Yale School of Forestry, demonstrated the difficulty of applying objective scientific standards to a condition of rapid development overwhelmed by various political, cultural, and economic patterns—more evidence of the effort required to harness the intellectual power of the scientific field toward the end of increasing sustainable practices.

As the emphasis on architec- tural science has provided us with many. In the past few years the environ- mental condition of our environmental movement titled “The Death of Nature” has been popular. In the past few years the environ- mental condition of our environmental movement titled “The Death of Nature” has been popular. In the past few years the environ- mental condition of our environmental movement titled “The Death of Nature” has been popular. In the past few years the environ- mental condition of our environmental movement titled “The Death of Nature” has been popular. In the past few years the environ- mental condition of our environmental movement titled “The Death of Nature” has been popular.
The seminar role Yale buildings have played in the history of American collegiate architecture was apparent at the symposium “Building the Future: The University as Architectural Patron,” where a dozen architectural historians, architects, and administrators discussed their experiences at several dozen universities, on January 25 and 26 at the Yale Art Gallery’s McNair Lecture Hall. Almost everyone showed buildings as they discussed their own work and the history of the genre. While pictures of Thomas Jefferson’s University of Virginia and an image or two from Harvard appeared again and again, no school’s campus was as ubiquitous as Yale’s. The symposium grew out of discussions about the history of the architecture undertaken at the Architectural League, in New York, in 1997 titled “The Diamond in Painting and Architecture,” the installation included diamond-shaped paintings by Slutzky and schemes for houses, as well as a museum based on diamond-shaped plans by Hejduk, and reflected the fruits of their intensive cross-fertilization. Hejduk would move on soon afterward to his Wall House projects, and under new influences like Aldo Rossi and the inquest climate of postmodernism his path and Slutzky’s would begin to diverge as he left behind his abstract architectonic teachings and embraced the previous two decades for more narrative and autobiographical architectural poetica.

Yet it is worth observing that Hejduk’s Venice projects of the second half of Modernism—particularly the 1980s date from the same period as Slutzky’s paintings of Venice hanging in the Yale Art Gallery, Nor is it difficult to read in Slutzky’s painting, despite its origins in the austerity of Albers’s “Homage to the Square” of the 1950s. Consonant with Bauhaus philosophy, Hejduk and Slutzky’s close personal friendship that plays with architectural-meta-
College. Things “changed frighteningly in the 1940s and 1950s,” he said, showing Mies van der Rohe’s IIT Chapel with its black charcoal and Walter Gropius and TAC’s Graduate Center at Harvard. By the late 1960s “the United States took the lead in moving away from the International Style,” exemplified by Paul Rudolph’s A&A Building and Louis I. Kahn’s Richards Labs at Penn. “Unfortunately this period of fruitful thinking about architecture came to an end in the late 1970s,” he said, embarking on a cautionary period when “Harvard and Yale both expanded their libraries by building underground.” But “there is one exception—Kahn’s British Art Center.” Also at this time historic buildings began to be preserved. “Inspired by the feeling perhaps that architects could not be trusted.” That feeling led to the post-modern movement and a new era of ambition, illustrated by Robert A. M. Stern’s Spangler Building at the Harvard Business School, Robert Venturi’s Gordon Wu Hall at Princeton, Frank Gehry’s Stata Center at MIT, and Tod Williams’ Billie Tsien’s new Shinkankai Hall at Penn, all in one enormous slice.

Brownlee ended with a series of “axioms,” which included: “We must take care of the great architecture we have. Build for change. Improvise and adapt within walls made to serve a different purpose. We can learn from mistakes. The canals can be acceptable. Laboratories and libraries should never be built on landlocked sites. Landscape defines the notion of campus. Never count on Phase Two; I don’t believe I’ve ever seen one built.”

Architecture Versus the Campus Plan

The next day’s panel, “Not Good Buildings, Make Good Education!” turned into a debate about the primacy of a plan. As architect advisor Brown University’s board of trustees, Frances Halsband said she believes that “the campus plan is more important than individual buildings.” Although as a partner in R. M. Kliment & Frances Halsband Architects she has designed college buildings, at Brown “the planning effort was to create the spaces and then do buildings around them. The campus is defined by greenward.”

In contrast, Chris McVoy, a partner at Steven Holl Architects, argued that a building should incorporate a plan. “His firm placed Seattle University’s St. Ignatius Chapel slightly off the axis of the main quadrangle, where it was intended to go, so that it could also activate several other quads. The firm also located the new University of Iowa’s School of Art and Archaeology on a different site from the one proposed, distilling it over a lagoon across the river from the main campus.”

Mack Scogin, of Mack Scogin Merrill Elam Architects, also promoted an individualistic approach. “At times, to make great architecture, you have to suspend the criteria of function and maintenance,” he said, shooing off his own work but a romantic wooden amphitheater at Swarthmore College where trees can block views of a performance. He believes that architecture today “is about celebrating the interdiscipli- nary condition. . . . It’s not just about creat- ing classrooms,” he said, referring to William Alsop’s laboratories at Queen Mary School of Medicine and Dentistry at the University of London, where a two-story orange blob containing a learning center is suspended over scientists’ workbenches. Slaicing another sacred cow, Scogin said, “Flexibility is the death knell of creativity.”

Agreeing with Brownlee that functions change over time, Halsband, said, “Program matters for the first fifty years.” She foresees conflicts as campuses expand to new urban areas—as Columbia, Harvard, and Penn are doing—because “campus spaces do not include cars. You have to know you won’t get run over.” Yet, “that will be a problem in cities because we have learned that taking cars out is bad.”

The University as Architectural Patron

Yale is in the middle of the biggest building program since the 1930s, with more than fifty renovations and sixteen new build- ings, as well as buying the 136-acre Bayer Healthcare complex in West Haven for $109 million,” Sandy Iesensztad noted in the introduction to the afternoon session. The university is spending more than $3 billion—an average of $300 million a year—three times the expenditures of the city of New Haven.

Karen Van Lengen, dean of the University of Virginia School of Architecture, talked about the downside of a powerful architectural legacy. Jefferson’s Rotunda has become “a branding device—our logo.” Although several speakers had criticized Charles McKim for terminating the lawn’s open vista, she said he had opposed the idea. University administrators chose the library site to screen the campus from a troubled African-American neighborhood.

That fact has been obscured in UVA’s mythol- ogy, which is still alive and well. When it came time to expand the School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, one board member told Van Lengen, “You will build a Jefferson building, or you will not build at all.”

But building she is—expanding and renovating Campbell Hall, a 1970s structure by Pietro Belluschi that “everyone on the Board of Visitors hates,” though it “is actually quite workable, with double-height studios with big glass windows.” And she has hired faculty architects—Warren Byrd, W. G. Clark, William Sherman, Tim Elison, and Paul Walman—as well as the firm of Dean Wolfe of New York and Yale’s Joel Sanders, who is designing the central lounge.

A former dean of University of Cincinnati’s College of Design, Art, Archi- tecture, and Planning, Jay Chatterjee talked about the ambitious building program during his nearly twenty-year tenure, which coincid- ed with that of university president Joseph Steiger. He explained how he had convinced the president to make architecture a priority when $1.5 billion of public money became available because the municipal school had become a state university. The university then commissioned work from Peter Eisen- man, David Childs, Michael Graves, Henry S. Cobb, Leers Weinzapfel, Frank Gehry, Gwathmey Siegel, Moore Ruble Yudell, and Bernard Tschumi (all collaborating with local firms) and instituted a new “major campus design plan” by Hargreaves Associates. They did not hesitate to remove existing buildings, the oldest dating from 1899, and asked, “Who wants pseudo-Georgian and pseudo-Gothic buildings like those at Miami University, (Cincinnati’s nearby rival, and Duke?” Dean Stern has a Business School building under way at Miami raised his hand.

William J. Mitchell (MED ’70), former dean of the MIT School of Architecture, explained how new buildings there—Steven Heit’s Simmons Hall, Frank Gehry’s Stata Center, and Charles Correa’s Brain and Cognitive Sciences Complex—relate to the institute’s programs. MIT scientists gave the Stata Center “a huge amount of construction innovation. Their 3-D computer modeling provided the capacity to do a very large building in a nonpressive way for roughly the cost of a standard building.” He emphasized that a university shouldn’t allow architecture at less than the highest level of cultural ambition any more than it would accept second-rate history or science.

Dean Stern recounted more Yale history, arguing that it does not have a “campus” like Princeton’s (where the term was first used because Yale’s quadrangles are integrated into the city. He said John Russell Pope was commissioned to develop a plan to link the humanities and sciences. “The genius of Science Hill is that it looks like the rest of Yale. At Yale scientists don’t wear colored stars.” Delano & Aldrich’s Gothic Sterling Chemistry Laboratory of 1932 “has a very modern space plan.”

How those interdisciplinary connec- tions will continue when Yale expands onto the new 136-acre West Campus seven miles away—not linked to public transportation—did not come up. With wetlands, seventeen buildings, and 550,000 square feet of labora- tory, office, and temperature-controlled warehouse space, the former Bayer site presents a tremendous opportunity—and an even bigger challenge.

David Joselit began the summary session by noting, “We have not talked explicitly about the criteria for a great build- ing.” He then asked for the pros and cons of open competitions, which he felt would be interesting in terms of both aesthetics and education.

Yale’s university planner, Laura Cruickshank, responded, “My experience is that whatever comes out of a competition has been done in a vacuum,” adding that she worries about how to compensate architects too. David Brownlee offered that a charrette could accomplish some of the same objec- tives more quickly and cheaply. Cruickshank maintained that Yale’s trustees and its president are committed to great architecture and want to see all buildings in the context of campus and town.

—Jayne Merkel

Merkel is an architectural writer and the author of Ears Saarinen (Phaidon, 2009).
The Challenges and Opportunities of Going Green: The Case of Kroon Hall

Designed by Hopkins and Partners, London, the new home of the School of Forestry and Environmental Studies at Yale will have the smallest carbon footprint of any building on an American campus within the context of global warming and other environmental issues. As a result of the building’s overall architectural strategy and sustainability vision, the design achieved LEED Gold certification—a recognition of sustainable design, and the features available for environmental education and research.

The building’s design specifications on time and within budget included:

- A mechanical, electrical, and plumbing system designed to minimize energy consumption.
- A sustainable design that includes passive, active, and restorative environmental design techniques.
- A landscape design that integrates the building’s design with the surrounding environment.
- A sustainable construction process that includes the use of recycled materials.
- A sustainable operation process that includes the use of renewable resources.
- A sustainable maintenance process that includes the use of environmentally friendly products.
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- A sustainable design that includes passive, active, and restorative environmental design techniques.
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- A sustainable operation process that includes the use of renewable resources.
- A sustainable maintenance process that includes the use of environmentally friendly products.
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The building’s design specifications on time and within budget included:

- A mechanical, electrical, and plumbing system designed to minimize energy consumption.
- A sustainable design that includes passive, active, and restorative environmental design techniques.
- A landscape design that integrates the building’s design with the surrounding environment.
- A sustainable construction process that includes the use of recycled materials.
- A sustainable operation process that includes the use of renewable resources.
- A sustainable maintenance process that includes the use of environmentally friendly products.
In the Field

Ideology vs. Pragmatism in New Urbanism

Equipped with the tools of the dispassion ate eye of an educator and the curiosity of a born of years of listening to trash talk about the GSD between Andrea D’André and Rick Koddo —I traveled to Austin, Texas, with two principal architects to see the new New Urbanism (CNU) in April. What we discovered was a relatively affiliated group of people who share a strong belief that suburban sprawl is the biggest problem facing American culture, and they’ve all got things to sell them things. Unlike other industry associations, such as the AIA or the American Institute of City Planners, CNU brings a wider variety of professionals under a single tent to push a surprisingly broad range of agendas within the strongly principled but flexible framework of the organization.

The culture is both deeply pragmatic in its approach and almost entirely in its conviction. What remains is that a polity of intellectual agenda emerges precisely at the moment that CNU morphed from a polemical think tank into an industry conference. According to attendees of the conference to learn more about form-based planning, CNU was awarded a planning commission for Boston’s Back Bay. By the time of the conference, CNU had become a well-organized and respected force in the urban design world. In fact, it was the disconnect between the expected trenchant rhetoric of the organization and the thoughtful pragmatism on display that was the most striking. As Duany pointed out during an excellent presentation about CNU’s stance on green initiatives, its antipodal polity has no value at the point-of-sale in American consumer culture. He instead suggested that the marketplace, in the guise of a better lifestyle choice rather than policy, was the best way to go.

In the same vein, Dan Solomon gave a crisply argued account of the typological history of the perimeter and slab blocks of the twentieth century. He made a cogent argument that environmental design criteria, carried to the logical extreme, include built-in contradictions. The use of the postwar residential perimeter block —the basis for CNU’s urban agenda, for example—would be based on the directional bias of solar orientation. William Dunster’s BestZed Project in England was offered up as a green gem. So with every pint that the sustainable design and social agenda had good intentions, the urbanism that resulted from running the building extrusions in a single direction was an urban “disaster” because front doors did not face each other across streets and the public spaces were poorly designed.

Solomon ended his talk by presenting a new project for a residential complex in China that attempts to reconcile the unique challenges of a consistent solar orientation in the living spaces. It achieves this by orienting the edges of the block that face east and west to provide a south-facing window into every unit. In Solton’s exposition of his design criteria, this was achieved by establishing a design principle—the so-called “solar module,” which defines the perimeter block—with a willingness to innovate architecturally to solve the relevant structural and social technical criteria. By way of presenting a new project for a residential complex in China that attempts to reconcile the unique challenges of a consistent solar orientation in the living spaces. It achieves this by orienting the edges of the block that face east and west to provide a south-facing window into every unit. In Solton’s exposition of his design criteria, this was achieved by establishing a design principle—the so-called “solar module,” which defines the perimeter block—with a willingness to innovate architecturally to solve the relevant structural and social technical criteria. By way of presenting a new project for a residential complex in China that attempts to reconcile the unique challenges of a consistent solar orientation in the living spaces. It achieves this by orienting the edges of the block that face east and west to provide a south-facing window into every unit. In Solton’s exposition of his design criteria, this was achieved by establishing a design principle—the so-called “solar module,” which defines the perimeter block—with a willingness to innovate architecturally to solve the relevant structural and social technical criteria.

The range of design thinking of the New Urbanists is impressive. For example, Pasquarelli’s desire to work within the vernacular Mediterranean villages. For them and many New Urbanists, urbanism is a Gesamtkunstwerk that involves the full range of urban forms and social patterns. As such, it is a clear statement that this model of practice is not about casting aside large and complex ideas, but rather an opportunity for the next generation of architects to experiment with new ideas and techniques.

The hopefulness of these efforts is not entirely in “detail,” since it implies gullibility rather than distinctness. The idea of collaboration doesn’t make particular sense to them (less because they aren’t against it than because they don’t want it shoved down their throats), and more significantly, they feel that digital technology gives too much control to theKiwi heart. Even so, there was a sense that this model of practice is not about letting the next generation of architects to experiment with new ideas and techniques.

Failing that, the Kiwi heart. Even so, there was a sense that this model of practice is not about letting the next generation of architects to experiment with new ideas and techniques.

New Zealand’s “Concept and Detail”

From May 24 to 24, the New Zealand Institute of Architects organized its annual conference, “Stand and Deliver: Concept and Detail,” around the theme of new technology and practices. Four international speakers were featured: Greg Pasquarelli, of SHoP and Yale’s 2005 Kohn Visiting Assistant Professor, Brett Steale, director of the AIA’s Center of Learning, and Barry搜集参考文献

—Peggy Deamer

Deamer is professor at Yale.
The Tennessee Valley Authority: Design and Persuasion

As the world watches the transformations and environmental devastations under way along Chinese rivers, it might be useful to recall there is, in the Tennessee River Valley, a certain historical precedent to planning efforts done on a monumental scale. Whereas the Tennessee dams represented twentieth-century progress in an ascendant America, the Three Gorges Dam, in China, not only radically amplifies the scale of intervention but also signals twenty-first-century political boundaries and straddle seven states, providing the region with flood control, recreation, and economic vigor. So, in 1933, as part of Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal, Congress passed the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) Act, which created the agency responsible for providing the region with flood control, reforestation, exploration, and development, and jobs. However, the massive regional plan was met with resistance and conflicts since it imposed an enormous structure on an agrarian landscape and demanded the displacement of long-time residents. As the landowners caught in the path of proposed roads, power plants, and reservoirs found themselves stripped of their rich soils and vitality, poor farmers and timbering families might ask how in the world was the architecture of Modernism as a stylistic appliqué, without acknowledging its own contribution. As the years under discussion, the 1930s and 1940s, were well trod territory, it might be useful to reexamine the photographs, site plans, and drawings, it is evident, as Britton observes, “Ossipoff was at work on what were to become landmarks of Modernist architecture, an unusual brand of Modernist architecture, an architecture of public relations than an architecture of design history interwoven with Culvahouse’s own perspective. As a descendant of a long-time Tennessee River Valley landowning family, he recounts his childhood exploration of the area with his grandfather. Culvahouse, a San Francisco-based architectural writer and consultant, assembled an impressive team of collaborators, including Christine Macy, Jane Wolff, Barry M. Katz, Steven Heller, Todd Smith, and Jennifer Baker, along with the photographer Richard Barnes, whose separate photo essay documents the Tennessee River Valley’s contemporary condition.

The book presents a glimpse of design history interwoven with Culvahouse’s own perspective. As a descendant of a long-time Tennessee River Valley landowning family, he recounts his childhood exploration of the area with his grandfather. Culvahouse, a San Francisco-based architectural writer and consultant, assembled an impressive team of collaborators, including Christine Macy, Jane Wolff, Barry M. Katz, Steven Heller, Todd Smith, and Jennifer Baker, along with the photographer Richard Barnes, whose separate photo essay documents the Tennessee River Valley’s contemporary condition. The TVA was guided by a singular plan, and each writer addresses a component of it, from the regional strategy down to the typeface.

Tim Culvahouse
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It's an elegant object, this black-and-gray Perspecta with its marquee title “Beautiful Monster”—the Monster comes alive at Night! Between the covers we find a satisfying mix of text and image, and architectural ideas, both intrinsic and peripheral to received definitions. From the well-known Nordenwind warning of cold war politics from the 1970s. Here is our world as a constantly mutating and changing entity, and condition and changes leapfrog from the nearly forgotten past into an impending future. Just when we think some body of work is passed, kaput, interned, up it pops to surprise us with renewed significance.

The monstrous progeny of 1980s Post-Modern largely escape disposition; instead there is a focus, as in John McMorrough’s “Ruinization,” on the 1970s. Leon Krier contributes an all too short reminiscence, and the great Jim Stirling, that monster saint of Gloucester Place: “I applied for a job because Leicester and Sheffield were the meccas of modernism!...” Following on from anatomical diagrams of Gama, Kereon, Butten, and fantastical Japanese monsters, Emmanuel Petit delivers a timely reappraisal of Arata Isozaki, from post二战 Modernist structures straddling giant classical ruins to his sunny sunlit arrival, in 1979, of the Campbell Center north of Tokyo. Petit points out that Stirling also envisaged a sunken plaza “as a sort of necropolis for the dead.” That 1975 proposal for Cologne’s Waltraud Richard Museum and that Hollein’s Palais des Congrès-Strasbourg (1962–64), both projects for the low}
Rudolph Model Cities Exhibition

In his 1958 inaugural speech, Paul Rudolph (1918–1997) proclaimed that urban worship should engage as chairman of the Yale architecture department: “We must find ways of rendering our cities fit for humans and develop the aesthetics of change. This will be our first concern at Yale.” New Haven and Yale offered Rudolph many opportunities to experiment with urbanism. Known as the “Model City” for its leadership in urban renewal, New Haven was used by Rudolph for more than two decades as a large-scale architectural model to develop ideas about the primary themes of post-World War II Modern architecture.

Thirteen projects by Rudolph will be the focus of the exhibition: Model City: Buildings and Projects for Yale and New Haven by Paul Rudolph, which will open with the rededication of the Art & Architecture Building on November 7–8, 2008. Curated by Timothy Rohan, the show will include original drawings, photographs, and ephemera from the Paul Rudolph Archive at the Library of Congress, the Yale Manuscripts and Archives, and private sources. Since the shift in cultural values of the late 1960s caused his reputation to decline, Rudolph has often been dismissed as a formalist whose buildings were singular but impractical. This exhibition seeks to challenge that notion by placing these structures in the context that shaped them.

Known as the Model City because it received the most federal funds for redevelopment per capita by the early 1960s, New Haven became a place for urban-design experiments. Soon after Rudolph became chairman of Yale’s architecture department, Mayor Richard Lee and his administrator, chairman of Yale’s architecture department, formed the New Haven Redevelopment Commission (1958–68). He surrounded himself with new structures such as the unique confluence in the late 1950s and 1960s of modern architecture, statewide, Polynesian culture, and the new age of jet travel.

The son of a Russian diplomat, Rudolph was born in Vladivostok, Russia, and grew up in Japan, where he survived the Kanto earthquake in 1923. He completed his architectural education at the University of California, Berkeley, in 1931 and then moved to Honolulu to begin a career that spanned six decades. He designed residences for Clare Booth Luce and Linus Pauling, Jr., built award-winning religious structures for the Punahou School and Hawaii Preparatory Academy, and was the chief design architect of the Honolulu International Airport. Upon his death Osipoff was deemed “the dean of Hawaiian architecture.”

The exhibition, designed by Sakamoto, includes a documentary by KDN Films and features thirty Ossipoff buildings organized in five design themes portrayed in historic black and white photographs by noted Hawaiian photographer Robert Wierman, as well as Julius Shulman and others; original drawings by the Ossipoff office; newly commissioned color photographs by Victoria Samburundu (MFA ’99); fifteen analytical scale models made for the exhibition by Dean Sakamoto Architects LLC; and many international publications in which Ossipoff’s work was featured in the past several decades. The show includes a comprehensive catalog (see review page 16). Feature stories on the show made the cover of Metropolis (May 2008) and Moderni- 

Jordan River Competition

On Monday, May 12, Yale faculty members Alan Plattus, Diana Balmori, Jim Arley, Hilary Sample, Myeong, and students Latha Brown (08’), Gabrielle Ho (08’), and Ben Smoot (08’) boarded a Jordan-bound bus in Tel-Aviv. Assembled by the Yale Urban Design Workshop with the support of the provost’s office of Yale University and the School of Architecture, the team chose for their expertise in landscape architecture, ecology, and design traveled to participate in collaboration with Jordanian, Palestinian, and Israeli architects, engineers, and students in a four-day international design workshop to create a vision for a peace park on the Jordan-Israel border. The Jordan River Peace Park will be the first of its kind in the region, straddling the border and the Jordan River, and aims to provide an economically and environmentally beneficial strategy for communities on both sides. A project of Friends of the Earth Middle East (FoEME)—the Jordanian, Palestinian, and Israeli organizations of the region—the park concept has the support of authorities from both countries.

Hawaiian Modern Exhibition at Yale

Hawaiian Modern: The Architecture of Vladimir Ossipoff, a comprehensive exhibition of the Modernist architect, will be exhibited at the Yale School of Architecture Gallery from August 28 through October 24, 2008, and is curated by Dean Sakamoto (MFA ’08), the school’s exhibition director.

The complex of the projects on view will contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between Rudolph’s architecture and postwar Modernism and urban renewal in America. The projects also emerge as case studies in how to create bold modern structures and spaces for both the campus and the city that are sympathetic yet not sentimental about the traditional fabric.

The show will also feature new architectural models by Yale students and a documentary video focusing on Rudolph’s relationship to urban renewal in New Haven, produced by Elhu Rubin, Daniel Rose’s ‘13. "Visting Assistant Professor of Urbanism, with his film group, American Beat. A symposium, “Rudding Rudolph: Architecture and Reputation,” will be held at the School of Architecture on January 23–24, 2009.

—Timothy M. Rohan, Ph.D.

Rohan is an assistant professor of architectur- nal history at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. His dissertation for Harvard (2001) focused on Rudolph’s academic buildings.

The exhibition by Sakamoto, includes a documentary by KDN Films and features thirty Ossipoff buildings organized in five design themes portrayed in black and white photographs by noted Hawaiian photographer Robert Wierman, as well as Julius Shulman and others; original drawings by the Ossipoff office; newly commissioned color photog- raphy by Victoria Samburundu (MFA ’99); fifteen analytical scale models made for the exhibition by Dean Sakamoto Architects LLC, and many international publications in which Ossipoff’s work was featured in the past several decades. The show includes a comprehensive catalog (see review page 16). Feature stories on the show made the cover of Metropolis (May 2008) and Modernism (winter 2007), and it was reviewed in numerous publications including the Archi- tects Newspaper and Wallpaper.com. The book received an honorable mention from the Hawaii Book Publishing Association. The exhibition will travel to the Deutsche Architekturmuseum, in Frankfurt, from March to June 2009.
Near the site, the concrete wall between Israel and the West Bank yields to the Israeli-Jordanian border along the Jordan River. Although it is only four miles from the sea of Galilee, its historical source, the river here is sickly brown and slow-moving because it no longer flows from the sea and is composed of runoff and raw sewage. According to Glen Bromberg, Israeli director of FEIME and a 2007 Yale World Fellow, the Peace Park is the first of its mission to clean up the river through a series of cross-border initiatives following a cutting-edge strategy in sustainable development called “environmental peacemaking.”

We arrived midmorning in Naharayim (Two Rivers) in Hebrew, the northern entry to the site, where the Yarmouk River flows into the Jordan from its southern home on the Syrian Golan Heights. Some biblical scholars argue that Naharayim was the gateway to the Garden of Eden, but the area today is yellow and scrubby, smattered with dry agricultural fields. Just across the border in Jordan is Peace Island, a special area only to which Israelis can pass without a passport or visa. It was created in the 1980s by the Palestine Electric Corporation (PEC) engineering works, along with canals, a dam, a lake, and a hydroelectric plant. Early explorers had a cross-border cooperation in the region, the PEC was involved in the approval of TRANSjordan by a Palestinian company, but the 1948 Arab-Israel War interrupted its operations when the site became contested territory. The 1994 peace treaty gave the site “special regime” status, allowing for Israeli ownership of Jordanian land. As part of the Peace Park, the island—along with Naharayim and Old Gesher, where an Ottoman British Mandate bridge and a 2,000-year-old Roman bridge cross the Jordan River—will become a bird refuge and eco-resort accessible from both sides of the border.

A drizzly day following the site visit, the international team occupied a Jordanian youth camp in nearby North Shunah, where up to eighty children worked around the clock. A Tuesday morning visit to tour the PEC power plant cemented our desire to find a design strategy that would preserve thesubtdefinitequalityofthesite’sruins.Rustlingstainlessmachinesseemedtohavebeencarefullypositionedinthe landscape, set off by fields of golden wheat and thistle dappled by red poppies, while the plant itself conjured Turner’s painting of Tintern Abbey, its vast scale dwarfing everything.

In the afternoon, Alan Plattus facilitated introductions and a first round of discussions. Divided into four multinational groups, each coordinated by a Yale faculty member, we had produced and presented our master schemes based on our experiences of the site. Each proposal represented a different understanding of the project and taking on the role of moderator and taskmaster. Ideas moved fluidly among the groups, and everyone’s voice was heard. By Thursday morning the pieces were complete, and we focused on consolidating diagrams, plans, and illustrations into a compelling argument for what the park could be like, one that could be used by FoEME as it moved forward to generate political and financial support for the project.

On Thursday afternoon we headed for Wild Jordan in Amman, home of the Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature, where we presented the project to an audience of Jordanians; embassy staff from Japan, England, the United States, and France, and the Royal Minister of the Environment. Our reception was friendly but restrained, and the audience’s questions were not without tension. The following week we presented the plan to a large audience of journalists, architects, environmentalists, and other interested parties in Jerusalem. We accomplished a great deal with our Israeli, Jordanian, and Palestinian counterparts in a compressed period of time, and we hope that our work will have a positive impact on the future of this complex region.

Andrei Harwell

On Wednesday, the team worked through specific tasks and prepared documents for the presentations in Amman and Jerusalem. My team prepared the master plan, Diana Balmori and Jim Axley prepared ecological and environmental concepts, Hilary Sample focused on architectural design, and Alan Plattus pulled the pieces together, finding a structure for the presentation and taking on the role of moderator and taskmaster. Ideas moved fluidly among the groups, and everyone’s voice was heard. By Thursday morning the pieces were complete, and we focused on consolidating diagrams, plans, and illustrations into a compelling argument for what the park could be like, one that could be used by FoEME as it moved forward to generate political and financial support for the project.

On Thursday morning we headed for Wild Jordan in Amman, home of the Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature, where we presented the project to an audience of Jordanians; embassy staff from Japan, England, the United States, and France, and the Royal Minister of the Environment. Our reception was friendly but restrained, and the audience’s questions were not without tension. The following week we presented the plan to a large audience of journalists, architects, environmentalists, and other interested parties in Jerusalem. We accomplished a great deal with our Israeli, Jordanian, and Palestinian counterparts in a compressed period of time, and we hope that our work will have a positive impact on the future of this complex region.

Andrei Harwell

Andrei Harwell (’06) is a critic at Yale and is project manager of the Yale Urban Design Workshop, the organizer of the charrette.

Layered Urbanisms, published in the spring, features the work of the first three Louis I. Kahn Visiting Associate Professors, which was endowed in 2004 to bring young innovators in architectural design to the school. The book includes the projects of the advanced studios of Gregg Pasquarelli in “Versorong 6.0,” Galia Solomonoff in “Brooklyn Civic Space,” and Mario Goedden in “Global Typologies.” It was edited by Nina Rappaport with Julia Stanat (’05), designed by Mgmt. design, and distributed by W. W. Norton.

The Human City: King’s Cross documents the participation of Roger Madelin—the third Edward Bass Visiting Fellow—in an advanced studio. Madelin, the director of Agent LPC, based in London, co-taught with Davenport Visiting Professor Demetri Porphyrios and George Knight (’95), assistant teacher. The studio site was King’s Cross, in London, and addresses issues of creating an organic city designed by many hands, master-planning on a large scale, and making the city human. Edited by Nina Rappaport and Aaron Taylor (’06), the book will be published in October 2008 by the Yale School of Architecture and distributed by W. W. Norton.

Paul Rudolph, Writings on Architecture will be published in November on the occasion of the rededication of the A&A Building, now Paul Rudolph Hall—Rudolph was chairman of the department of architecture (1956–1965)—and will be illustrated with many previously unpublished images. Designed by Pentagram, it will be published by the Yale School of Architecture and distributed by Yale University Press.

Building (in) the Future: Recasting Labor in Architecture, edited by Peggy Deamer and Phil Riesman (Yale College ’79), 10 Arch ’83, will be published in spring 2009 by the Yale School of Architecture and Princeton Architectural Press. The book, based on a symposium held at the school in 2007, examines the fundamental human relationships that characterize contemporary design and construction. Contributors including numerous designers, engineers, fabricators, contractors, construction managers, planners, and scholars examine how contemporary practices of production are reshaping the design/construction process. Designed by Jeff Ramey, the book is produced with the support of Autodesk Inc.


The Yale Building Project: The First 40 Years, by Richard W. Hayes (’86) with contributions from Ted Witten (’02) and other Yale alumni, was published by the Yale School of Architecture in 2007, distributed by Yale University Press, and designed by MGMT.design. The book received the AAGA book design award in “50 Books/50 Covers” and will be exhibited at the AAGA headquarters on Fifth Avenue, in New York, in the fall; it will become part of its permanent collection. Hayes has been lecturing widely on the book in England and the USA.


Eero Saarinen: Shaping the Future, edited by Eva-Lisa Pellenen (MED ’94) and Donald Albrecht, received the Philip Johnson Book Award of the Society for Architectural History in April 2008. As reported previously, the book also received the Banister Fletcher Award of Author’s Club in Mayfair, London in 2007. Published by Yale University Press in 2007, the book also received an award from AAGA’s “50 Books/50 Covers.” The exhibition of the same name was at the National Building Museum this summer and will travel to the Minneapolis Institute of Art and Walker Arts Center from September 14–January 4, 2009.
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To a solution. As a student, you sit there by seductive, that there is a creative individual my lecture this evening because I don’t I’m going to grapple with the title I’ve given “Belief and Doubt” Thomas Heatherwick of each house.
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zoom back, what we are doing is metabolism
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fed up with—but the fact is we have to manage risk
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attitude of craft to me is all about giving a
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paranoid—that he frantically sought to re-

control and the vertical forces that made the US-led vision of the global 1990s so successful.

So it is this three-way relationship between mobility, creativity, and security that I would propose as the way to think of the conference’s concept of “mobile anxieties” as a key to the understanding the global world we live in today. All three may well be necessary in some way to the successful functioning of a global economy and society, but all three can easily spill over into excess. The dynamics of mobility and creativity, in other words, might be resilient and attractive enough to curb anxiety and reduce

reflexes of security that threaten to poison them. A lot will depend on whether that open vision of the country can appeal to more. A dynamic and hopeful, winning out over the old, backward looking and inward. And among those different neighborhoods and draw the city out to the edge.

Craft is the socialization of the process between the people who build and design the buildings and how they work together to achieve that end goal. The

the notion of music as an authorial, authorized, identical reproduction of sound is a recent historical acquisition; for centuries, even when music was

itself was an endlessly variable medium—

a recent historical acquisition; for centuries,

an intense as the discourse on hypersurfaces, nonstandard, and topological geometries was ten years ago. Interconnective

might include human participants as well as machines of all sorts, and technical interaction between networked (or smart) machines (a development that some have called the “Internet of things”) has recently come to overshadow social collaboration between humans. There are some reasons for this. For one, responsive technical environments may include exciting new forms of teamwork in architecture is hardly a new topic. To the contrary, digitally enhanced or networked architectural design has always been a delicate act of negotiation and balance between many participants, personalities, and committees, the individual and the collective.

Mario Carpo

Self-Assembly and the Internet of Things

Mario Carpo

Digital Twins, Historical Thoughts from Abroad

April 14, 2008

Technology keeps changing, and today new techno-social developments invite new users and change new challenges. The CAD/CAM of the 1990s was mostly based on controlled proprietary networked environments, and the emphasis was on the vertical integration at all different phases of design and production. The potentiality that this seamless continuity offered for the design of singular complex objects and the production of serial variations. But in recent years the networked environment has evolved from earlier, mostly monodirectional information technologies to a fully symmetrical bidirectional information framework. This technical development is being exploited for a variety of purposes, some purely technological (such as P2P and distributed processing networks) and some with vast social implications. Indeed, some of this software is appropriately called “collabo-

ative” or even “social.”

interactivity and “participation” are in fact the catchwords of the day, and the architectural discourse on these matters is as intense as the discourse on hypersurfaces, nonstandard, and topological geometries was ten years ago. Interconnective

might include human participants as well as machines of all sorts, and technical interaction between networked (or smart) machines (a development that some have called the “Internet of things”) has recently come to overshadow social collaboration between humans. There are some reasons for this. For one, responsive technical environments may include exciting new forms of teamwork in architecture is hardly a new topic. To the contrary, digitally enhanced or networked architectural design has always been a delicate act of negotiation and balance between many participants, personalities, and committees, the individual and the collective.

self-assembly and the Internet of Things, Mario Carpo
nen. They were asked to address issues of the urban context and the merging of culture and technology in the 21st century. The students attended concerts at Avery Fisher Hall and met with Zarin Mehta, director of the New York Philharmonic, and Frank Gehry’s Bard Center for Performing Arts, where they met with Leon Botstein. They also met with Yale Symphony Orchestra and listened to the ringing of the Harkness Tower Carillon. On their trip to Amsterdam and Berlin, the students attended concerts at the Concertgebouw and Schauspielhaus’s Berlin Philharmonie, which became a source of inspiration. Back at Yale, designers from Gehry’s office met with the students each week to discuss their progress.

At midterm reviews the students evaluated how the explorations into the program were affected by place, the flow of space, the drama of the procession, spatial hierarchies, and the connections between orchestra and audience, all of which they transformed into a personal interpretation in materials, form, and composition. They embraced new interpretations of the classical concert hall and the radiating presence a cultural institution can have on its environment. A trip at spring break included visits to Gehry’s office and the Disney Concert Hall, in Los Angeles, where the students had to design a flexible and specific space that would accommodate diverse art forms for a museum without a permanent collection. How can a museum work in dialogue with the art houses if its contents change continuously? On their trip to southern Germany the students visited Baroque churches such as the Wieskirche Forum, in Schwenkstadt, and Ulm Stadthaus.

Returning to work on the siting of the project, most of the students separated their project from Meier’s but used its 17-meter height as their building’s maximum. Artists such as Frank Stella and David Balls, and architect Peter Eisenman provided interpretive inscriptions in addition to their participation in the final review with the additional juror—Barry Bergdoll, Mario Campos, Peter De Souza, Kurt Forster, Sam Girard, Harris, Arlane Lourie, Thom Mayne, Cesar Pelli, Emmanuel Perrot, Chris Sharpley, and Timm Wirth. In the one tower scheme, Michael Krop projected a vertical response to Frankfort’s iconic downtown towers on the footprint of the Villa Metzler. Other students created a building as landscape. Marc Cucuzzo designed a continuous extension of open-air courtyard spaces around which the gallery’s roof is tiered to direct pedestrians across an urban landscape of framed views and open portals. Sara Murado-Arias’s proposed placing most of the gallery space within one large box and a smaller room for a green roof with open views into the galleries from above. Other students were concerned with the exterior skin and architectural language issues of circulation, servant and served spaces, interior enclosed spaces, and accessibility. The collage and the site were appropriate to the dominant fabric of the development, and the tower to the signature buildings. The tower’s energy concept, with a communal strategy and a winter garden, creates a living, working building.

First, the students drew Corfu’s vernacular architecture, gridded it onto the historic Venetian city plan, and then developed a variety of typological solutions for multi-storied residential buildings. Resolving issues as daylight, privacy views, and efficient layouts, they assembled their prototypes into urban blocks and investigated the environmental envelope and the role of classical music in contemporary culture. On their trip to Corfu the students saw the distinctive “finger blocks” and the piazzas dating from the Venetian occupation of the island and how they plugged into the landscape of the town and its public space, and met with the head of the antiquities department and the developers. Upon returning from Corfu, the students developed independent proposals. Some embraced the waterfront and the promenade leading to the old town, where they cited public programs. Proposals addressed issues such as vehicular movement; major ingress and perimeter routes; distribution of retail, office, and public programs, and the integration of the new buildings into the existing fabric, as well as the hierarchical urban organization. Returning to work on the siting of the project, most of the students separated their project from Meier’s but used its 17-meter height as their building’s maximum. Artists such as Frank Stella and David Balls, and architect Peter Eisenman provided interpretive inscriptions in addition to their participation in the final review with the additional juror—Barry Bergdoll, Mario Campos, Peter De Souza, Kurt Forster, Sam Girard, Harris, Arlane Lourie, Thom Mayne, Cesar Pelli, Emmanuel Perrot, Chris Sharpley, and Timm Wirth. In the one tower scheme, Michael Krop projected a vertical response to Frankfort’s iconic downtown towers on the footprint of the Villa Metzler. Other students created a building as landscape. Marc Cucuzzo designed a continuous extension of open-air courtyard spaces around which the gallery’s roof is tiered to direct pedestrians across an urban landscape of framed views and open portals. Sara Murado-Arias’s proposed placing most of the gallery space within one large box and a smaller room for a green roof with open views into the galleries from above. Other students were concerned with the exterior skin and architectural language issues of circulation, servant and served spaces, interior enclosed spaces, and accessibility. The collage and the site were appropriate to the dominant fabric of the development, and the tower to the signature buildings. The tower’s energy concept, with a communal strategy and a winter garden, creates a living, working building.
and design methods incorporated from boat and street. The vast form of the boat facilitated the functional spaces and dynamic elevations that faced three surrounding buildings. Students were asked to design a chapel, reflecting pool, community center, and sidewalks for a progressive or nonconformist religious order on one of Toronto’s verdant ravines.

After the studio trip to New Delhi brought the students to the apex of high-performance design. The city of Tokyo has proposed to relocate the Odakyu Station underground in a government redevelopment plan that has stirred local opposition. In an architectural approach to an urban problem, students provided armatures for many uses to both the neighborhood and meet with local representatives, the students returned to develop their projects, focusing on the issues of scale and urban heterogeneity. Conventional assumptions about the boundaries between public and private space, landscape and urban fabric, and architecture and infrastructure were challenged.

Students presented a broad range of concepts to the jurors—Keller Easterling, Kurt Forster, Jeffrey Inaba, Masami Kobayashi, Keith Krumwiede, Giuseppe Lignano, Joel Sanders, Brittle Shim, and Marc Turumaki—at the final review. Some projects focused on the materialization of affect, while others explored how profiles of the institutional and corporate players could be disrupted.

The idea of a folded-roof railroad station could be as fundamental as a catalyst for urban activity. Todd Fenton’s folded vertical landscape centralized the commercial program. Sherr Methskin’s urban landscape formed a continuum, crimping the architecture to allow the program to nest in a folded structure that knitted the neighborhood with a black market and youth culture.

Other projects, such as Garrett Gardner’s, merged walls with a canopy to extend the urban fabric and revitalize the market by expanding it along the platform. Integration of infrastructure was a focus for others. Jennifer Dubon picked up on the station as a catalyst to restitch the urban fabric, rather than as existing as an autonomous object. Dylan Sauer’s station hovered over the ground plane. New programs were introduced in projects such as Benjamin Smoot’s, who incorporated a formal and functional approach to an urban problem, students provided armatures for many uses to both the neighborhood and meet with local representatives, the students returned to develop their projects, focusing on the issues of scale and urban heterogeneity. Conventional assumptions about the boundaries between public and private space, landscape and urban fabric, and architecture and infrastructure were challenged.

Students presented a broad range of concepts to the jurors—Keller Easterling, Kurt Forster, Jeffrey Inaba, Masami Kobayashi, Keith Krumwiede, Giuseppe Lignano, Joel Sanders, Brittle Shim, and Marc Turumaki—at the final review. Some projects focused on the materialization of affect, while others explored how profiles of the institutional and corporate players could be disrupted.

The idea of a folded-roof railroad station could be as fundamental as a catalyst for urban activity. Todd Fenton’s folded vertical landscape centralized the commercial program. Sherr Methskin’s urban landscape formed a continuum, crimping the architecture to allow the program to nest in a folded structure that knitted the neighborhood with a black market and youth culture.

Other projects, such as Garrett Gardner’s, merged walls with a canopy to extend the urban fabric and revitalize the market by expanding it along the platform. Integration of infrastructure was a focus for others. Jennifer Dubon picked up on the station as a catalyst to restitch the urban fabric, rather than as existing as an autonomous object. Dylan Sauer’s station hovered over the ground plane. New programs were introduced in projects such as Benjamin Smoot’s, who incorporated a formal and functional approach to an urban problem, students provided armatures for many uses to both the neighborhood and meet with local representatives, the students returned to develop their projects, focusing on the issues of scale and urban heterogeneity. Conventional assumptions about the boundaries between public and private space, landscape and urban fabric, and architecture and infrastructure were challenged.

Students presented a broad range of concepts to the jurors—Keller Easterling, Kurt Forster, Jeffrey Inaba, Masami Kobayashi, Keith Krumwiede, Giuseppe Lignano, Joel Sanders, Brittle Shim, and Marc Turumaki—at the final review. Some projects focused on the materialization of affect, while others explored how profiles of the institutional and corporate players could be disrupted.

The idea of a folded-roof railroad station could be as fundamental as a catalyst for urban activity. Todd Fenton’s folded vertical landscape centralized the commercial program. Sherr Methskin’s urban landscape formed a continuum, crimping the architecture to allow the program to nest in a folded structure that knitted the neighborhood with a black market and youth culture.

Other projects, such as Garrett Gardner’s, merged walls with a canopy to extend the urban fabric and revitalize the market by expanding it along the platform. Integration of infrastructure was a focus for others. Jennifer Dubon picked up on the station as a catalyst to restitch the urban fabric, rather than as existing as an autonomous object. Dylan Sauer’s station hovered over the ground plane. New programs were introduced in projects such as Benjamin Smoot’s, who incorporated a formal and functional approach to an urban problem, students provided armatures for many uses to both the neighborhood and meet with local representatives, the students returned to develop their projects, focusing on the issues of scale and urban heterogeneity. Conventional assumptions about the boundaries between public and private space, landscape and urban fabric, and architecture and infrastructure were challenged.

Students presented a broad range of concepts to the jurors—Keller Easterling, Kurt Forster, Jeffrey Inaba, Masami Kobayashi, Keith Krumwiede, Giuseppe Lignano, Joel Sanders, Brittle Shim, and Marc Turumaki—at the final review. Some projects focused on the materialization of affect, while others explored how profiles of the institutional and corporate players could be disrupted.
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Bade Stategian Cox, Independence Care System, Brooklyn

Martin Cox, critic in architecture, with his firm, Bade Stategian Cox, recently completed a 15,000-square-foot campus for the Children’s Museum in Brooklyn for Independence Care System, which provides services to wheelchair users. The firm’s Art Cave space was awarded a 2008 Lumen Award for excellence in architectural lighting by the New York Section of the Illuminating Engineering Society. The firm is currently working on an art gallery, in Chelsea, and a number of residential projects, in New York and Connecticut.

Keller Easterling, associate professor, was granted the (SOGI) for the Humanities Fellowship at Cornell for fall 2009. In June she taught a master class and delivered a public lecture at the Berlage Institute, in Rotterdam. Easterling was invited to participate in A+ Weil’s Ordo 100 project, which has gathered 100 architects from around the world to design a residential/art neighborhood in Inner Mongolia. In the spring she lectured at the ETH, SCI-ACI, the New School, the Jan van Eyck Academy, and the University of Pennsylvania. Her article “Oil: The Many” was published in Log (Winter 2008), and an interview, “Without Claims to Purity” was published in a.n. (vol. 1:2 Winter 2008). Easterling’s piece “Crystal Island” appeared in Arquitectura (Summer 2008), and an article about mega-projects appeared in the Polish architecture journal Architektura.


Makram at Kad, critic in architecture, with his firm, LEFt, is designing a printing-press factory in Kuwait City and a residence for the Saudi ambassador to the UAE. He is the design consultant for a 1.2 million-square-foot mall in Dubai.

Kurt W. Koller, Scully Visiting Professor, received the Meret Oppenheimer Prize from Switzerland’s Federal Office of Cultural Affairs, which is named for the Swiss Surrealist who fostered the culture of foci and curator of the new Marianne Boesky Gallery, West Chelsea, New York. She also designed the new Marianne Boesky Gallery, along the High Line in west Chelsea.


Turner Brooks (Yale College ’65 and M.Arch ’70), associate professor, with his firm, Turner Brooks Architects, designed the Drawing Center exhibition “Frederick Kiesler: Co-Realities,” at the Art Institute of Chicago, as well as the exhibit “Mystery of the Modern Museum,” which was exhibited in the A+D Museum in Los Angeles (Summer 2008), and a cover article in The New York Times Magazine.

M. Proctor Gage (’10), assistant professor, with his firm, Gage/Clemenceon Architects, New York, was selected as a winner of the 2008 Future Awards of the New York’s Young Architects Forum and had work displayed in the related group exhibition, Resonance at the Urban Center. Work from the firm was also included in the exhibition Figuration, at the Institute of Contemporary Art, as well as at the Deutches Architektur Zentrum Gallery, in Berlin. The firm’s projects were published in the New York Times, Time Magazine, Metropolis, Viewpoint, Future, Wonderland (U.K.), Marie Claire (Italy), Vogue (Italy), PDQ: Costa Rica, (and in Steven Heller and Millic tic’s book, Genius Movers: Icons of Design in Architecture, 1980-2004). Deborah Gans, critic in architecture, had the work of her New York-based firm exhibited in the A+D Museum in Los Angeles as part of the show After the Flood. She was also selected as part of a team with William Mckown, A.O.L., and Terry Cruz to curate the American Pavilion at the Venice Biennale, opening in September, with the exhibit Into the Open: Possessing Practice. Gans lectured at IIT and at the Drawing Center, in New York, in connection with the exhibition Frederick Kiesler: Co-Réalités. After completing a master plan for the Graham School, she has been retained for a new cafeteria/campus center.

Alex Gavvin, before and after images of 24th Street, Omaha, Nebraska.

Alex Gavvin (Yale College ’63 and M.Arch ’67), architect, with his firm, Alex Gavvin & Associates, conducted various master planning and public design workshops. One project, covering 700 acres in DeKalb County, Georgia, over six months, looked at a large proposed redevelopment and made recommendations for public-real improvements involving consultation with county officials and community leaders and monthly public meetings. In an economically depressed area of north Omaha, Nebraska, Garvin investigated strategic investments, both public and private, that could help to revitalize its streets and embrace its rich cultural history. His firm is also working on the legacy master plan for the 2012 Olympic Games, in London, with the management consulting and accounting firm Grant Thornton LLP.
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Emmanuel Petit, assistant professor, published “’Object Architecture’ in Benjamin Maillefer’s book, Architext: The thesis of the 25 CONSTRUCTS at the Architectural League (Yale, 2006),” and “Architecture Beyond Building” in the fall issue of Archinect. His essay “The Automatic Image” was published in Verb Crisis (Rizzoli, 2008). He also lectured at Sci-Arc in Los Angeles on “New Architectural Grotesque Since 1990: Transition from Form to Function.” In spring 2008, he received a grant from the European Studies Council at Yale’s Mac- leri Center for International and Area Studies and also from a Girard-Fellowship Grant for research on postmodern architecture at the German Architecture Museum, in Frankfurt. He received “first mention” for a collaborative competition design with Rafitza Petri and JP Architectures of a national pavilion for the 2008 World Expo in Shanghai, which was published in Wettbewerbe Aktuell (October 2007, 37–39). Petit and his partner exhibited their designs last December in Sofia, Bulgaria, and were awarded the 2007 Prize of the Bulgarian Union of Architects.

Hilary Sample, assistant professor, served as juror for the American Institute of Architects (AIA) national convention in May. Her paper, “Abject Architecture” in the form of momentary constructions, visions can offer some concrete forms or seductive images.” The Venice Biennale will feature such participants as M-A-D (Yansong Ma, 1976), Zaha Hadid (Zaha Hadid Architectural Institute), in Los Angeles. His essay “The Automatic Image” was published in Verb Crisis (Rizzoli, 2008).

Betsy Direks 11th Venice Biennale

Aaron Betsky (Balye College ‘79, M. Arch ‘83) was selected to direct the 11th Venice Architecture Biennale, on September 12- November 23, entitled Out There: Architecture Beyond Building. According to Betsky the challenge of this biennale is to “collect and encourage experimentation in architecture. Such experimentation can take the form of momentary constructions, visions of other worlds, or the building blocks of a better world. This biennale does not want to present buildings that are already in exist- ence and can be enjoyed in real life. It does not pose to abstract solutions to social problems but wants to see if architecture, by experimenting in and on the real world, can offer some concrete forms or seductive images.”

The Venice Biennale will feature such participants as M-A-D (Yansong Ma, 1976), Zaha Hadid (Zaha Hadid Architectural Institute), in Los Angeles. His essay “The Automatic Image” was published in Verb Crisis (Rizzoli, 2008).
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1980s

Robin Karsan (’81) published A Genius for Place: American Landscapes of the Country Place Era (University of Massachusetts Press) in 1980. She collaborated on the book with her partner, Michael Burch (’82), principal of Michael Burch Architects, and Dan Wiley (’81), who had just purchased a new office building in Boston.


1990s

David Levin (’91) was appointed director of the master's of architecture program at Parsons The New School for Design. The program had a strong reputation for its focus on design and the development of professional skills, as well as its emphasis on critical thinking and innovation.

The firm employed seven Yale graduates—Architectural Record said that the firm was “one of the most sought-after in the country.” The firm’s work had been featured in Architectural Record, the AIA Journal of Architecture, and several other leading publications.

The firm’s design for the Magaz Waterfront International Competition, in Seoul, Korea, won third prize this summer.

Marc Turk (’94) and Morgan Hare (’89) have expanded their partnership with the addition of Shawn Watts (’97) to their New York-based firm of Studio Street. The firm employs seven Yale graduates—Yale Alumni News said that the firm was “one of the most sought-after in the country.” The firm’s work had been featured in Architectural Record, the AIA Journal of Architecture, and several other leading publications.

The firm’s design for the Magaz Waterfront International Competition, in Seoul, Korea, won third prize this summer.
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Eugene Nalle 1916–2008: A Tribute

After three unspiring years as a pre-med student and one year as a Beaux-Arts student at Case Western Reserve University, in Cleveland, he decided to join Eugene Nalle’s vigorous, stimulating, and often futurist-first-year studio at Yale. It was 1941, and Nalle’s radical studio was centered principally at Yale and Harvard. From his very first lecture, Nalle’s studio was a remarkable place. He used a variety of graphic aids—many of the drawings were made on graph paper. The atmosphere of the below-grade Studios was remarkable for its complexity and convolution will animate the future teaching of architecture.

Student Work On Exhibit

Archipel International 2009, in Uruguay, will present the winning project for Sunil Bald’s Shimokita competition curations. The Architecture Biennial Beijing 2008, now featured Fieldman Prize winning projects by Dylan Sawyer (’08), Gamma Kim, and Nao Kix. The under-graduates pitch their projects “Methods & Forms II,” led by Sophia Gryuzis and Dean Sakamoto (RED 189), was on display in the exhibit. The Installation: Reconsidering the Architectural Joint and the Body, a show from 1978 Chapal Chess Street, from February 18 to April 18.

David Reinfurt at Whitney Biennale

David Reinfurt (MFA 1998), graphic designer with his firm ORG, designed Constructs from 2000–2007, has passed the design of Constructs to designer Jeff Ramsey. Reinfurt continues as graphic designer of the school’s exhibition catalogs. He has joined Stuart Bailey to form Dexter Sinister, a design collective whose many projects range from book design to Internet-based publications to running a sometimes bookstore in Manhattan’s Lower East Sides. Dexter Sinister was featured in the 2008 Whitney Biennial with their project “True Mirror,” which created misleading press releases for the Biennial, and for their installation “Rumor’s Room of the Arsenale.” The name, Sinister Dexter, echoes the reflection also seen in unobtrusively placed mirrors that show the viewer not their reflection but the “true” way one is seen by others. Their operation was tailored to the Commander’s Room, which fit with the site-specific and process-oriented methodology. They have also had their work exhibited at the AA, Leeds, Amsterdam, and Los Angeles.

YSOA at the ICCF

Full-scale chair prototypes designed by Nalle and built by Yale School of Architecture students in the advanced studio of Massimo Scolari, the Davenport Visiting Professor fall 2007, were featured this spring at the International Contemporary Furniture Fair (ICCF), in May at the Jacob K. Javits Convention Center, in Manhattan. These fine-crafted, mostly in industrial design programs, are invited to apply for the opportunity to showcase student work. This year the Yale School of Architecture was selected, along with three other programs.

Dana Getman (’98), a member of the Scolari studio, organized submission to the ICCF jury, which consisted of twelve chairs designed and built with studio assistance by Timothy Newell (’07) and fabrication director Donald Scolari. Nalle himself is not only an architect but also a furniture designer who produced a line for Georgetti. The studio project centered on the funereal architecture of King Djoser, in Saqqara, Egypt. It was built around 2700 B.C. Nalle most prized was Eugene Nalle, who was one of the “true believers” (or at least those who suspected belief), as idée.

This early part of my education proved to inform my entire life. To encounter a great teacher in a lifetime is a gift. Nalle opened up minds as only great teachers can. His methodologies were memorable. One was his “portable” collection of postcards of various paintings. There were his own as well as others. He would flip through to a Juan Gris or a Katsushika Hokusai to emphasize a point about composition, color, light, or optical quality of line work. His personal arsenal also included his collection of Prismacolor pencils. Our mandala-ed drawing style involved constructed perspectives rendered with pencil prencil. Nalle’s preferred approach was the overlapping of multiple layers, and the use of an eraser to selectively expose previously applied layers.

At Yale Nalle would return to the subterranean studio and work on our drawings, occasionally making notes and always improving them. Frank Lloyd Wright’s renderings were his precedents, as were Japanese prints. Drawing was the true language of this very quiet and reserved man. In his nineties, as his body deteriorated, his eyes and hands remained remarkably servient to the task at hand, and he was always prepared to draw.

Who was Nalle really? Other than the few quotes in this tribute, historians who knew him and students who studied with him will probably write the most about Eugene Nalle’s personal qualities remain indelible. He was modest but magnetic, never played favorites, was lucid and demanding, one of the many strong opinions but was diplomatic in expressing them. In the end he was a pragmatist who never lost his obstinate contradictions and enigmas.

James Stewart Polshek

The late founder of the New York-based Polshek Partnership.

My wife, Ellyn, and I feel it important to make a gift that would allow the Drawing Studio in the newly renovated A&A Building to be named after this remarkable man and his work. His studio was a key place to me, a place where my ideas was matched by an obsession for the smallest details of pure constructive technique.

The atmosphere of the belo grade studio in Street Hall was remarkable for its unorthodox box. The emphasis on drawing was a radical departure from everything the curriculum—with one exception—over the curriculum. In the history of philosophical musings of our studio master. In these talks Nalle would casually invoke Orthogon or Spencer’s Decline of the West. Like Kahn, the master was not only in language. The contrast between the mystical aspect of these talks and the actual work could not have been greater. What united both the “sacred” (words) and the “profane” (drawing) was the belief that this unique studio critic was totally committed to preparing us to understand the authenticity of architecture. The empiricism and rigidity of the exercises—including identical sheet size, compositional rules, lettering style, title block, and a number just out of college. It was this latter approach, encouraged by a few art historians, to form an intellectual structure and not an art form. Interestingly, Neil Levine, in the introduc- tion to Modern Architecture and Other Essays, states, “One could ascribe Scully’s sensitivity to the concern for materiality and intellectual structure to his contact with Eugene Nalle.” The professor had title patience for those interested in personal expression, and he often evoked one of his favorite devota- tory phrases—“determined originality”—to describe a particular piece of work. Nalle also employed “memory overly” to warn of the dangers of current architecture magazines with their project “True Mirror,” which created misleading press releases for the Biennial, and for their installation “Rumor’s Room of the Arsenale.” The name, Sinister Dexter, echoes the reflection also seen in unobtrusively placed mirrors that show the viewer not their reflection but the “true” way one is seen by others. Their operation was tailored to the Commander’s Room, which fit with the site-specific and process-oriented methodology. They have also had their work exhibited at the AA, Leeds, Amsterdam, and Los Angeles.
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Top, Todd Fenton, and bottom, Dana Getman, Chairs from Massimo Scolari Studio, fall 2007.
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Who was Nalle really? Other than the few quotes in this tribute, historians who knew him and students who studied with him will probably write the most about Eugene Nalle’s personal qualities remain indelible. He was modest but magnetic, never played favorites, was lucid and demanding, one of the many strong opinions but was diplomatic in expressing them. In the end he was a pragmatist who never lost his obstinate contradictions and enigmas.

James Stewart Polshek

The late founder of the New York-based Polshek Partnership.

My wife, Ellyn, and I feel it important to make a gift that would allow the Drawing Studio in the newly renovated A&A Building to be named after this remarkable man and his work. His studio was a key place to me, a place where my ideas was matched by an obsession for the smallest details of pure constructive technique.

The atmosphere of the belo grade studio in Street Hall was remarkable for its unorthodox box. The emphasis on drawing was a radical departure from everything the curriculum—with one exception—over the curriculum. In the history of philosophical musings of our studio master. In these talks Nalle would casually invoke Orthogon or Spencer’s Decline of the West. Like Kahn, the master was not only in language. The contrast between the mystical aspect of these talks and the actual work could not have been greater. What united both the “sacred” (words) and the “profane” (drawing) was the belief that this unique studio critic was totally committed to preparing us to understand the authenticity of architecture. The empiricism and rigidity of the exercises—including identical sheet size, compositional rules, lettering style, title block, and a number just out of college. It was this latter approach, encouraged by a few art historians, to form an intellectual structure and not an art form. Interestingly, Neil Levine, in the introduc- tion to Modern Architecture and Other Essays, states, “One could ascribe Scully’s sensitivity to the concern for materiality and intellectual structure to his contact with Eugene Nalle.” The professor had title patience for those interested in personal expression, and he often evoked one of his favorite devota- tory phrases—“determined originality”—to describe a particular piece of work. Nalle also employed “memory overly” to warn of the dangers of current architecture magazines with
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Lectures begin at 6:30 p.m. in Hastings Hall (basement floor) of Paul Rudolph Hall, 180 York Street, unless otherwise noted. Doors open to the general public at 6:15 p.m.

Charles Atwood
Edward P. Bass Distinguished Visiting Architecture Fellow, Thursday, August 28, “Follow the Money: Sex, Greed, and Architecture in Las Vegas”

Francisco Mangado
Eero Saarinen Visiting Professor, Thursday, September 11, “Left-Handed Architecture”

Colloquium

“Hawaiian Modernism: An Introductory Colloquium”

Kenneth Frampton, Stephen Little, and Marc Treib, Monday, September 15, 6:30 p.m.

This colloquium is organized in conjunction with the exhibition, Hawaiian Modern: The Architecture of Vladimir Ossipoff.

Walter Hood
Timothy Egan Lenahan Memorial Lecture Thursday, September 18 “Urban Landscapes and Provocations”

Robert Campbell
Brendan Gill Lecture Thursday, October 2, “Why Architects Need Critics”

Roisin Heneghan
Shih-Fu Peng, Monday, October 20, “Transparency”

Carlos Jimenez
Thursday, October 30 “Reflections and Recent Works”

Peter Eisenman
Louis I. Kahn Visiting Professor, Thursday, November 6, “Rudolph Then and Now”

Timothy Rohan
Friday, November 7 “The Enigmatic Architecture of Paul Rudolph”

Matthew Coolidge
Myriam Bellazoug Memorial Lecture, Thursday, November 20, “Understanding Anthropogeomorphology: Programs and Projects of the Center for Land-Use Interpretation”

The School of Architecture’s fall lecture series is supported in part by Elise Jaffe + Jeffrey Brown, the Myriam Bellazoug Memorial Fund, the Brendan Gill Lectureship Fund, and the Timothy Egan Lenahan Memorial Fund.
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Hawaiian Modern: The Architecture of Vladimir Ossipoff August 26–October 24, 2008

Model City: Buildings and Projects by Paul Rudolph For New Haven and Yale

November 3, 2008–February 6, 2009

Hawaiian Modern: The Architecture of Vladimir Ossipoff was organized by the Honolulu Academy of Arts with guest curator Dean Sakamoto.

This exhibition, its accompanying publication, and programs are made possible with generous support from the Harold K. L. Castle Foundation; Mrs. Marshall Goodsell; the Atherton Family Foundation; Cooke Foundation; Limited, First Insurance Company of Hawaii Charitable Foundation; Group 70 International; Armstrong Companies; Hawaii Council for the Humanities; Donald and Laura Goo; State Foundation on Culture and the Arts; Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts; McInerny Foundation; Ameron Hawaii; Jean Rolles, and Thurston and Sharon Twigg-Smith.
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