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David Chipperfield

David Chipperfield is the Lord Norman Foster Professor in Architecture at Yale for the fall term. Now based in his London office in the spring, he will give a lecture on November 3 at Yale.

Nina Rappaport You have often said that architects don’t need to study math or science but rather anthropology, philosophy, and sociology. How do you bring other disciplines to your approach to architecture?

David Chipperfield I start by being highly suspicious of design. Architecture has suffered from being self-referential, and schools have suffered from talking to themselves. The shock of being in a big commercial world is that when you leave school you can’t see the connection. I’m slightly confused in a sense. Then I brought up with the idea that architecture is as much about problem solving as it is about making a statement. Architecture today is very much about making a statement, but it’s more about the architecture than it is about the architecture. I’m of the school that says, “If you don’t need to do something, don’t do it.” I think there is a part of design that is about elaboration—making more out of something—so there is a certain contra-
diction that relates to care, thought, and consideration about the task that you have already identified. There is the danger that architecture becomes a separate thing, just a decoration. Therefore, it is the architects striving to show how clever they are by achieving what no one else can do. Can we all need to fit with them? No, we don’t. I start with a highly causative and ascetic idea about the power of architecture, and then I’m happily surprised by how highly effective architects can be.

NR What are some of your methods to materialize your ideas?

DC How you materialize and give physical presence to ideas is an intuitive process. We are building at a time when the construction industry is resistant to the traditional qualities of construction. Buildings go up as quickly as possible. And therefore notions of permanence and solidarity sound obsolete. However, I don’t think as individuals we have become a separate thing, just a construction. Therefore, it is the architects striving to show how clever they are by achieving what no one else can do. Can we all fit in? We do. Can we all need to fit with them? No, we don’t. I start with a highly causative and ascetic idea about the power of architecture, and then I’m happily surprised by how highly effective architects can be.

NR What are some of your methods to materialize your ideas?

DC It is not that you can’t get good construction in the U.K. We developed our habits in another culture, so when we come to the U.K. we get impatient. In Germany, what would be like falling out of bed requires persuading a British or American contractor to do, and it is a pretty easy way of frightening a commercial client.

NR A significant example of your approach is in design and construction is the adaptation and preservation of the Neues Museum, in Berlin, which has received much deserved attention both in the architecture and preservation communities. It is fascinating that your design insertions establish a dialogue between new and old. By preserving the former museum you also reveal the building as an archaeology while creating new elements? We had to be sensitive to the fact that it was a war ruin, which centered the discussion on whether or not the design transforms the building into a memorial of a darker side of twentieth-century German history. The question was the validity of the existing material and whether, in terms of the war, we were moving from memory to history. Fifty years later, it had become more of a secular ruin than something with a profound meaning.

NR What was your strategy in terms of historical insertions? How did you decide what to build while also giving identity to the new elements?

DC We basically decided to maintain the volume and the identity need to be modified slightly depending on where the insertion or intervention is built. If it’s a big, autonomous piece, it can be done in one way, but if it’s a small gap, then maybe it has got to be done another way.

NR How does your strategy for the Neues Museum, which is like a mini-city, relate to your contextual urban work and approach in general? What did you struggle with in terms of historical exactitude and the basic preservation issue of which date to restore the building to?

DC We do the tasks for ourselves the way we did because it coincided with the way we work: taking the ruin as context both historically and geologically. It was part of a spectrum of options that ranged from total reconstruction to leaving it as a total ruin. So we considered the history of the building, what the building was originally, its original plans, interventions, and concepts, especially in terms of museology. But there was also the desire to respond to it as a geological context distinct from its personal history, like a Piranesian confection of rubble. The damage had created an unintended physical dimension that wasn’t a part of its planned history but was part of an accidental one. Therefore, responding to the physicality of the project was just as important, if not more so, than responding to its historical context. If we had just taken an academic approach, we might have ended up with something that didn’t quite work. It had to have strong physical elements. We had to be concerned with what it looked like, and we had to make decisions. There are moments where you realize that the right decision isn’t the one that looks best. We were required to take an ideological approach to materialize your ideas.
path, but we found ourselves wanting to deviate. It was an issue of context, and in that sense we turned the Neues Museum into a contextual project beyond the academic one of going over historical drawings. The ruin was a starting point, and because it had stood that way for sixty years, it had nearly stabilized. It was comfortable with itself as a ruin, and it was quite beautiful. We would have destroyed all of that if we taken a straightforward, academic approach. I think there was a motive for us to engage the less tangible and more emotive qualities of what we found. It was an important part and made the project successful because people could relate to it on all sorts of levels. In that sense, it fits into our work better than I thought it was going to.

NR How did you work with the old to establish a new formal language?

DC What was surprising about the Neues Museum was that the easiest rooms to deal with were those with more architectural form. The ones that had vaults and domes were easy to bring back. Their qualities were so embedded in their form that they didn’t need decoration. It reminded me in some ways of the poverty of Modernism and the richness of architectural form and figure in space.

NR And would Carlo Scarpa’s approach fit to the project? The issue of appropriateness comes into play here, as his insertions are more autonomous than in a strict preservation project.

DC Of course I’ve been through a Scarpa phasis. But indeed, for this project, we went the other way. We didn’t want gaps; we didn’t want things to be autonomous or pronounced. With Scarpa’s interventions, you could nearly unbolt them. It’s a very clear approach that became a standard solution for Modern Italian architecture and spawned a whole generation of bad projects.

NR How has the Neues Museum project affected your work in the architectural world and your attitude toward architecture in general?

NR Did my experience with it ongoing and has put me in a very privileged position, but what I’ve enjoyed most about the experience is working in a culture in which the notion of things meaning something is completely understood: your actions mean something, Architecture means something, and while we’ve had a period of very fascinating architecture, we’ve also had a period of terrible urbanism and uncontrolled development. I think there is a universal crisis now—and not just in the quality of autonomous individual buildings. There are plenty of architects who are good at doing that. How can we have a bigger influence on our environment, what our cities look like and what they mean? Those are things we’ve nearly given up on. We’ve given up on social housing and public infrastructure, we build office buildings and luxury condos. But does it improve our cities or quality of living? You could argue that those things bring big benefits to their inhabitants, but as we saw two years ago when the economy disappeared overnight, there’s a sort of Houdini act—like, where the hell did it all go? A beautiful building or painting is here for life—they are things that never lose their value overnight, like stocks. We’ve told all the time that architects and painters are dreamers, and that the real people are businesses, but it seems like we’re dealing with reality, and they’re dealing with fantasy.

NR In terms of collaboration, how do you work with consulting structural and environmental engineers?

DC We never set big tasks for structural engineers. I think they’re very disappointed with us, because in conventional projects structure is not the lead. However, that doesn’t mean the integration of engineering and architecture shouldn’t be well negotiated. We have a very collaborative process, as much with cost consultants as engineers. Collaborating on costs is just as important as design, if you don’t control costs, you don’t control design, and then you fall into the trap that the construction industry sets for architects. Basically, the judgment needs to endure that the architect doesn’t go over budget. This is the great construction conspiracy since it suits them to be responsible for costs, and our profession has given up leadership in this respect, which means giving up leadership all around.

NR How do you work with the existing urban context, and where have you been challenged in creating urban or public space? For example, how did you incorporate public space into the Ciutat de la Justícia (City of Justice) in Barcelona for example?

DC The Anglo-Saxon planning system is done building by building, and there’s very little coordination. Our free-market mentality says, “You have that site, and you negotiate as hard as you can to build whatever you can.” It’s very unusual to be in a situation where you can do more than an object. We strive to make public space all the time. And of course most of the work has been on a small scale, so it often operates in a context where you can do something.

For Barcelona, we created an urban scale. It was the issue of finding a way to integrate a single institution with a monolithic center in the city structure. We broke the building down into smaller pieces and separated those that could have public walkways. So it is a way to cheat by taking an institution that is fairly impenetrable because of security and giving it the atmosphere of a more permeable public building.

NR You use natural light as a significant design element, which is evident in the Kupfergraben Gallery, in Berlin. How has light become an essential ingredient in architecture for you?

NR Daylight and views are things that confound an architect’s potential to put you in a nice place. I think architecture is, in a way, the most humanist of all the arts, and it should be about the individual. Architecture creates, mediates, and positions you in a comfortable place. I don’t think it has to keep reminding you of how clever it is; I think it should be comfortable, so that after a while you think, “Actually, this is a very nice place to be.” But I don’t think it has to hit you in the face the first time.

I think our built world is a substitute for the natural one. I grew up on a farm and still remember all of the physical places, and I would like architecture to be like that. When you are looking for a place to picnic you say, “Well, let’s stop here.” You choose that place for the view and the light, and you have a wonderful picnic. Architects make things where you go, “Wow!” And there are some architectural experiences where you need to do that, but the world isn’t only cathedrals.

NR Is there a visceral feeling that results from your spaces, if for you, light is that evocative material, how are you not focused on the idea of creating a dramatic effect?

NR I think light humanizes and keeps you in touch with what’s going on. It’s something we work on very hard, not just technically but also regarding its meaning. If you start with modest ambitions for architecture, you can be slightly more precise about what each thing you do means. I am conscious of how, in some ways, our work is a bit boring, which I think is just a consequence of the ambition and responsibility about the meaning of each outcome. I am not doing it just for effect. Michelangelo used to say that the measure of a good sculpture is to make things where you go, “Wow!” And there are some architectural experiences where you need to do that, but the world isn’t only cathedrals.

NR Can you picture your buildings as ruins, the way Joseph Gandy depicted John Soane’s work?

NR There’s a long tradition of that. What we’re trying to do is shape something. I ask my students to imagine the wind blowing hard and all the bits that aren’t interesting getting blown off. What’s left is a project that will survive, and for me, that is architecture. My worry is that architecture has tended to put lots of stuff on top so that when you roll it down the mountain, you’re left kind of disappointed.
Shelley McNamara and Yvonne Farrell, of Grafton Architecture, are the Louis I. Kahn Visiting Professors for Fall 2011. They will give the lecture “Architecture as the New Geography” on September 8 at Yale.

Nina Rappaport How did you come together to start your practice in Dublin, and what does the firm’s name refer to?

Yvonne Farrell Shelley and I are at University College Dublin from 1993 to 1974, and started our practice in 1978 with three other colleagues as a cooperative on Grafton Street, the main pedestrian street in the heart of Dublin. We’ve been working, building, and teaching since then.

NR As Irish artists and architects, how do you identify with Ireland, a place with strong historic and cultural traditions, and as a global practice? How would you define contemporary Irish architecture—is there a cohesion with subtle influences of modern architects, or is it about an architecture grounded in place?

YF We see ourselves as Irish, part of Irish culture and contributing to it and influencing it. Architecture is part of the bigger picture, so as architects we see each new place as a part of a continuous culture.

Shelley McNamara Modern and contemporary architecture didn’t have a strong presence in Ireland. Within the last few generations of architects, contemporary trends have become quite strong through the schools. In teaching, we have been having a conversation about contemporary architecture for the last twenty-five years, and a cohesive architecture movement has developed that’s been good to be a part of.

SM There are different strands in Ireland, such as the practice of Scott Talton Walker, which is influenced by America and Mexico, and other Irish architects, for example, whose architects studied in the USA and are influenced by Louis Kahn. Our generation is influenced by Le Corbusier, and the next by James Stirling and Leon Krier. It has been kind of a mixed bag, but I think, over time, there has been a lot of adaptation of modern ideas, and having to do with an interest in culture, place, craft, and continuity that is more a way of thinking than a style.

YF What is amazing, is that although we are on an island, our connections to Europe are very strong.

NR Do you think your work has evolved more from influences of the natural or urban landscape?

SM It’s a very interesting question. The landscape is an unconscious presence, but our active world, possibly because of accidents or opportunities, has had to do with the landscape of the city. Peter Carl, who used to teach at Cambridge University and is now teaching at the London Metropolitan School of Architecture, talks about James Joyce’s Ulysses as the most relevant contemporary description of city in terms of describing its layers and richness. We are more of that context.

YF There’s another ingredient. We often say architecture is the new geography. Since 2008, more people live in cities than in the country, and our responsibility as architects is to embed the pleasures of landscape within the built form. In the Luigi Bocconi School of Economics, in Milan, and in the current project for the School of Economics, in Toulouse, we are actually carving into the earth. In Milan, we excavated nine meters into the ground and brought light down in a beautiful stone down on the corner—that we excavated on the main corner, which was a contradiction through when we put an expressive element outside of the building. But it also came through when we put an expressive element on the main corner, which was a contradiction to do—to put a space that needed silence on the busiest corner. And then we won the competition. A couple of weeks later the client asked us, “What stone are you going to use?” And we said we saw a beautiful stone down on the corner—that we had never seen anything like before—and the client got out a book to identify it. He said, “Well, that stone is really cheap. Do you realize that you’re in Italy, and we’ve got marble and all sorts of things?” We selected it because it felt like it belonged in Milan.
How are you working with the client and adjusting the program?

YF: It’s about making the ordinary extraordinarily. In Milan, the client needed offices for a thousand professors, an aula magna: an auditorium for a thousand people and five seminar rooms for two hundred to three hundred people—an enormous project, equivalent in size to a small hill town. You mentioned the importance of section: the sketch that describes the Milan project thesis shows two layers: the professors’ offices become a suspended matrix, held between the sky and the ground, through which light pours in. There’s the client’s requirement, and then there’s structural capacity. We refer to the infrastructural capacity as a matrix in which things can happen. As non-compositional space, it is a matrix in which things happen. Architecture is a silent language; it is an experiential phenomenon. The most important place for us to stand in the Milan building is under the twenty-two-meter cantilever of the aula magna, which hangs over a space dug five meters into the ground. It is a kind of primal space where you can feel all that weight above you while the city is pouring down into this space below. It is that relationship between pressure, cantilever, force, and void. The space is a consequence of other decisions, especially that space below ground.

NR A consequence or simply unexpected?

SM It has a primal quality that we didn’t really anticipate. Its force and the diagonal relationship with the space above and below, which are threaded by light. The way the city enters in is much stronger than we imagined: it’s like a big mouth that opens up.

YF The issue of the unexpected is important. You can anticipate and make models and know what space will be there. But the feeling of the space and its strength has to be actual. There’s something about it that people dance there—it has a force. It’s like Peter Zumthor’s Vals Therme. Some of those beautiful baths with floating rose petals make you want to sing.

NR It is a visceral space that has to be experienced, not just imagined. I’m interested too in how you make it a piece of the city. The building is both what you have called, “anchor and animation”; it’s solid but so annotated that it is a piece of design integrated into the city. Is that something you’re doing with other projects now?

SM Yes, we believe in the continuity of public space—the space between threshold and interior where the city comes in with you. The most successful public spaces, even if they are residential, are those that are ventilated by the feeling of the city outside, even if they are secure. In Milan we started with the idea of the floor of the city being made of stone, and bringing that plate of stone into the university made it feel like a piece of the city. As a marketplace, the university inspired a landscape continuing into the city. It’s a funny contradiction: it is a very solid building without a front door on the main street; instead, you round a corner and enter into the middle. In a sense it’s like lock gates in a canal: it holds the solidity of the streets and the city comes in all street level, and then the cracks and aperture of the walls give you views out. It’s an internalized worldly hovering over the city.

NR How does the School of Economics at Toulouse—the same program in a smaller complex—compare to the Milan building in terms of connecting with the city fabric?

SM Toulouse is a different kind of city. It’s very picturesque, so one wants to be visually connected. The city has a gravitational pull that invites links at every level, whereas in Milan, it happens more on the ground and at lower levels. It is that intense becomes of the research world feeding the public sphere of the building. Toulouse was an extraordinarily difficult project because we were breaching a five-meter-high medieval brick wall, in which there were a number of confluences of different geometries. It was a very particular kind of challenge.

NR Returning to your question about Irish culture, the way we were educated and the way we have been teaching and making small projects in Dublin allows us to render a place that is as much subject as object. You find things to use that move you. For example, in Toulouse, we loved the big brick buttresses and cloisters, so we tried to make a collage of all those elements, which leads to a language.

YF There are two other parallels between Milan and Toulouse. In Milan, the construction allowed us to make the diagram real. Placing the structure on the roof and hanging the offices allowed a blurred line between the city and campus. However, in Toulouse, it is also about working with the known to make an unknown, as well as the socialization in the buildings. It’s about looking at the sections and finding the places where people will bump into one another. The clients requested that insight of overlap, and that’s something we tried hard to capture.

NR Out of the big questions in education now is, why bother going to an institution when you could stay home with your laptop and talk via Skype? The role of architecture is more as a social vessel, and our role as architects is to heighten that sense of overlap. If you’re going to make a research building—or any building—you have to ask what’s the pleasure? I think we’re interested in the pleasure component.

NR Returning to the issue of place, how do you teach a sense of place to students who are absorbed with computer and engage them with the site?

YF Shelley uses the term detective for when you scrutinize a place for physical realities. To do that, you actually have to go and stand in places.

SM I suppose it’s also about teaching students to fuse and develop their senses, to know how to look at something, how to see it, how to scavenge it, steal it, and use it. It’s like teaching someone how to recognize that something is amazing. But it is no good unless you use it. It is a combination of personal observation and an ability to look, see, record, and find things. When you actually find something, your eyes become heightened as you interpret and apply it.

YF As humans, we are part of a collective. As a discipline, a huge part of architecture is about continuity, and the structure is also personalized. Simple things such as sketching and drawing and having a few things to hand to help to connect us, we often ask students to make very spontaneous drawings and then ask them to describe from their memory places that maybe can affect what they are designing. It’s amazing what’s inside an individual person’s memory and experience. We have to remember not to drown a human being within the huge body of architecture.

NR Why do you teach, and what do you hope to impart to your students?

YF Architecture is a creative act. We need to actually get outside and experience life—we need to get our boots muddy! The clinical separation of the computer can make an antiseptic kind of world. We teach from belief. As a student, you might not know exactly how to do it, so let’s go on a journey together to try and find the answers. When we talk about cultural inspiration or references, we are not talking about giving a contemporary surgeon a timber utensil from the medieval times to use in an operation—that’s crazy! It’s about finding the modern equivalent of continuity.

SM Last semester, a student told us that we had made him dreamy about architecture.

YF He’s Portuguese and has such a lovely way of using language.

NR I hope you can make the Yalies dreamy, too.
All of us except for Daisy are architects who studied at the Royal College of Art (RCA). Daisy completed a master's degree in cultural memory, having previously read languages at Cambridge. We started to work together on competitions while teaching at Nottingham University, the Welsh School of Architecture, the Bartlett, and then at London Metropolitan University, where we've taught for the past six years.

Daisy: Before setting up our practice, Polyopoly, working with local communities, allowed us to explore regeneration creatively, we developed Polyopoly, game that functioned like the inverse of Monopoly. It allowed us to explore regeneration strategies with non-professionals while getting them to think of how to create non-monetary forms of value from creatively tweaking the existing infrastructure.

NR: Did you stress that architects don't need to know their heritage or how to engage a community in meaningful and constructive ways as an aspect of design.

Or it gets reduced to being what happens when you have your first set of designs, and you put them up and ask, “What do you think?”

GS: Historically, there's been quite a disconnect between architects who are interested in engaging people and those who are interested primarily in form. We're interested in putting the two together. I think the role of architecture is about being a real strong object that allowed a participative process to happen.

NR: But the design component is not just a game. I saw it exhibited at the 2008 Venice Biennale at the “Experiential Architectural Design” section of the Italian Pavilion, where I picked up some of the Monopoly cards.

GS: We designed the notations and the interaction in an exhibition format. People could visit the first six stops along the board and were encouraged to propose various futures for Venice.

NR: So often in Europe there are opportunities for young architects to start small with competitions and then build a firm. It's a way of getting out your ideas, mind and can work together.

GS: We had a turning point at the RCA when Tom, Vincent and I had an intense review without any tutors, and realized the potential for a richer component of design. It is one of the reasons there is an absence of hierarchy and a strong sense of trust. We then became committed to the idea that our projects would be a lot better than one individual.

NR: How does brainstorming become a collective design process?

GS: We've explored different ways of forming teams, but the result is often when it's difficult to tell who did what. The desire to lose individual authorship is an important part of our practice, and so we've developed a way that the designer is too. The finished board, it can be too claustrophobic.

NR: We like how James Joyce's idea of using style—as in Ulysses, where every chapter is written in a new language, to support the narrative. This can be carried through into architecture by developing a process of entering and exiting.

GS: We always try to work with an open, participatory process. If the hand of the designer is too strong, it can be too claustrophobic.

NR: This narrative aspect of your work is obviously potent in presentations.

GS: We think it's powerful because of the way we engage the intended viewers. For many projects, we developed a spatial constitution, a drawn brief, and an assemblage of ready-mades that provides a stepping stone between the user's needs and the architects' technical solutions.

NR: Did this method ever create problems? Telling your clients to design things themselves or to be picking and choosing colors and shapes as they are inseparable from the building or place as a whole. But if you do everything, you don't do it well enough. Why is this?
Kevin Roche: Architecture as Environment

The exhibition Kevin Roche: Architecture as Environment, curated by associate professor Eva-Lisa Pelkonen, was on display at the School of Architecture Gallery from February 7 to May 6, 2011.

Kevin Roche: Architecture as Environment is the first comprehensive exhibition dedicated to the Hamden, Connecticut, architectural firm. Responsible for completing the work of Eero Saarinen after his death in 1961, Kevin Roche John Dinkeloo and Associates (KRJDA) has a list of prominent commissions from the 1960s and 1970s. (Knights of Columbus, the Oakland Museum of California, the Ford Foundation: a group of significant commissions in the 1970s and 1980s (Uncon Carbide, General Foods, Continental, J. P. Morgan); a large selection of buildings from the 1990s to the present, many built abroad that have not generally found their way into the architectural press. All together the exhibition includes about one hundred projects and completed buildings. Based on the firm’s project numbers, that is roughly ten percent of its output. Take it on board: they are remarkably productive.

Display and Spectacle, “Workspace and Productive.” The exhibition of a living architect must keep its practicality in mind. The documentary evidence is already rather slim. Alternative designs for One United Nations Plaza (1969–73) suggest the importance of having control over the systems he developed that could facilitate design. The building was “a beautiful monster created by monstrous economists,” according to Ada Louise Huxtable, and the adjustments to the plan are a fascinating study in what Roche saw as possible. In both instances, we seem to stand close to what the curator, Eva-Lisa Pelkonen, brilliantly defines as Roche’s “unrelenting analytical pragmatism.” When I first read this statement I thought it oxymoronic, but the more I listened to Roche speak about his architecture—the more sense it made.

Contemporary films that feature Roche discussing or illustrating projects provide the glue that holds the exhibition together. There are a number of original photo presentations, some with spoken commentary, others simply a series of changing images. Roche has a compelling modesty about the way he sees his work. He has the beautiful ability to vanish in the calm of the new corporate culture. And why not? These are the spaces of the twenty years of practice. Could he have sustained his sensibility in light of the new forms of corporate patronage and the cost cutting of value engineers?

It is not clear the assembled works of KRJDA provide a clear answer: Roche lacks the poetic gene that makes Saarinen so special. Perhaps as a result—though it is no easy matter—comprehending Roche’s prodigious career is all the more important. For those willing to take the time to make the connections and to draw on the evidence themselves rather than the product of systems analysis. He left Roche’s list of honors tells us that we wanted to know how he got the job. In the 1976 film made for the employees of Union Carbide in Danbury, Connecticut (1976–82), Roche starts with a paean to the beauty of the surrounding countryside; his building site demonstrates his respect for the topography. He illustrates how offices have been planned to take full advantage of the site for the benefit of the workers, constructing arguments against shifting geometries. It all seems thoroughly reasonable—perhaps some critics would thusly hide a “sprawling metallic beast” (as Paul Goldberg called the building), Union Carbide’s 3,000 employees, and their cars without any cost to the environment whatsoever. The dissonance between the “seductive” explanation of the architecture (with background music that seems to come from the NFL film archives) and the reality of the building, but that is not the direction of the exhibit: the wall labels recount the main outlines of the history of the commission and leave the response to you. If at first I was surprised by this stance, longing for some red meat—a poetic flight or a stinging quotation—I soon came to appreciate it. This is a gracious exhibition, but not an indignant one. It argues, for example, that Roche is significant for his recognition of the negative consequences of Modern architecture and all as for his incorporating landscape into architecture. The great landscaped, semi-public atrium—from the Ford Foundation to your local mall—seem banal today but were a surprise forty years ago. For these, Roche can claim some credit. The exhibition also presents Roche as one of the first to address the needs of a mass audience in museums, with examples from his four decades working on New York City’s Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Some positions only fully emerge as one traverses the exhibition. In the area titled “Context and Community” are the Wesleyan University Center for the Arts (1965–73), still a striking space; the (near invisible) renovation to the Jewish Museum, in New York City (1985–93); and the Knights of Columbus Headquarters and the Veterans Memorial Coliseum (1965–72), both in New Haven. Community? It is true that iconic and monumental buildings bordering on excess can create urban identity, and the plans for the coliseum foresee a degree of community engagement never properly realized under its great Cor-Ten frame. But it would be hard to argue that the surrounding environment creates representations rather than the terms with the negative consequences of Modernism. In their noted 1973 interview with Roche, John W. Cook and Heinrich Klotz called the dual profile of the Knights of Columbus “inhumane,” and Roche was at the time largely indifferent to their charge. Perhaps they missed the point. The exhibition keeps its own counsel. And why not? These are the spaces of our world and our time, after all. Even if we have not visited the neo-Baroque headquarters of the Bourges Corporation in Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines (1962–87), I know—or think I know—comparable grand corporate campuses, squarishly-clean buildings in wide-open spaces. The polished mirrored surfaces (a favorite of Roche’s) in the Union Carbide lobby have so completely filtered into today’s corporate vernacular that we hardly notice them. But do we think to search for their origins? There is clearly a moment when, as Francesco Dal Co observed in 1987, Roche’s works “appear obsessed, not so much by the nature of the figures they suggest, but by the possibility of obtaining instant effects.” Roche’s list of honors tells us that we wanted instant effects, too.

In writing the history of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, I was often met with skepticism: why work on a firm so enmeshed in corporate culture? From my perspective there is little that is more important. This is the world we created, either by active involvement or by disdained or indifference. Even our taste for brand-name products and convenience contributed something. I thought a lot about Chuck Bassett (1922–1999) as I walked through the exhibition. Like Roche, he was an alumnus of Saarinen’s office, he was deeply concerned with the nature of the work experience inside the new rural corporate office, and his client profile was comparable. Buildings such as the Weyerhaeuser Headquarters, in Tacoma, Washington (completed 1971), are the products of similar studies of workplace habits and needs. However, Bassett’s plans developed from another place, out of the architect’s inspired interpretation of site rather than the product of systems analysis. I left Saarinen after being told his renderings were too important to the firm for him to be allowed to design, so he moved to the firm that most clearly prided itself on modern research methods. He contributed his artistic vision to their corporate works for another thirty years. (Wouldn’t an exhibition of Saarinen’s disciples tell us a lot?) I wonder too much about Saarinen would have tarnished his reputation with another twenty years of practice. Could he have sustained his sensibility in light of the new forms of corporate patronage and the cost cutting of value engineers?

Nicholas Adams

Adams is a professor of art history at Vassar College and the author of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill: SOM Since 1936 (Phaidon, 2007).
The symposium “Thinking Big: Diagrams, Mediascapes, and Megastructures,” the first 2011 J. Irwin Miller Symposium, was held on February 17-19, 2011. It was organized by Elena Lisa Pelkonen in conjunction with the exhibition, Kevin Roche: Architecture as Environment.

What are the stakes for architecture today? At the conclusion of her Thursday evening address initiating the J. Irwin Miller Symposium, Pelkonen suggested that we ask ourselves this question while examining architect Kevin Roche’s fifty-year body of work. Kevin Roche: Architecture as Environment, the exhibition and catalog Pelkonen and collaborators have produced, will undoubtedly help introduce the work of Kevin Roche (John Dinkeloo & Associates [KRJDA]) to both a new generation of architects and the general public. Nevertheless, at the conclusion of the three-day symposium, Pelkonen’s challenging initial question remained largely unanswered. In fact, two significant omissions from the conversation—John Dinkeloo and KRJDA’s body of work after the early 1980s—suggest that most of “Thinking Big” may not have been about thinking (or building) big after all.

“Architecture as Environment”

The symposium began with the introductory lecture “Architecture as Environment,” by organizer Pelkonen, followed on Friday by a talk on “Diagramming the World.” Kevin Roche and Los Angeles Times architecture critic Christopher Hawthorne. In her talk, Pelkonen suggested that, as much as “thinking big” may not have been about thinking (or building) big after all.

“New Environments” / “Diagramming the World”

The remainder of the symposium meandered loosely around several general themes: “New Environments” and “Diagramming the World.” The morning’s speakers focused on issues of scale, image, control, and ambition in Roche’s work. Pelkonen introduced her talk by reminding her audience that Kevin Roche died, Dinkeloo—the firm’s technical director and head of execution—pulled the office until Saarinen’s sudden death, in 1961. Roche explained that, after Saarinen died, Dinkeloo—to the firm’s technical director and head of execution—pulled the office together, convincing Roche and other partners to join him in carrying on. While completing a number of Saarinen’s unfinished commissions (including both the J. Irwin Miller House and the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial (1965), in St. Louis—Roche and Dinkeloo began to amass imagery and execute notable commissions of their own. They launched their own practice in Hamden, Connecticut, in 1966; thus began the second, much longer chapter of two overlapping careers.

KRJDA’s simple, large-scale forms should not be seen as an attempt to maintain control over the external forces that shaped the object into consideration—be it the client’s needs and opinions, financial constraints, or building regulations. In this model, creativity had less to do with inventing new forms than with the ability to let these constraints spark typological, structural, and formal ideas. As she suggested, this is the tendency to view architecture as deriving from external factors and environments—both man-made and natural—that situates Roche and Dinkeloo firmly within modern architecture’s so-called Third Generation (along with James Stirling, Robert Venturi, and others).

Further striving for new forms or not, these early projects are doubtless formally bold. However, the remarkable and meticulous qualities of Roche’s side projects: projects through which Roche explained the projects both to clients and the public even the most extreme architectural gestures as logical and seemingly inevitable responses to the particular constraints and challenges at hand. Perhaps, Pelkonen suggested, Roche’s approach to architecture as a hyper-rational “matter of organizing” (to quote Timothy Rohan) reveals that “both types of architectural language, Roche used state-of-the-art HVAC systems and the diagram” and analyzed Saarinen’s 1957 Ford Foundation interior garden—to lent support to this argument, exploring how Roche used state-of-the-art HVAC systems to control massive interior spaces—such as the Ford Foundation interior garden—to “rebuild nature” in the late modern city, Baatz COLUMBIA (Princeton University), in “Environments of Global Governance,” argued against associating Roche with Kroothinghouse’s Bigness, but, rather, “the spatiality, calibration, and refinement in interior space. He noted, for example, that the approaches the large-scale forms for KRJDA’s simple, large-scale forms should be seen as an attempt to maintain control over the external forces that shaped the object into consideration—be it the client’s needs and opinions, financial constraints, or building regulations. In this model, creativity had less to do with inventing new forms than with the ability to let these constraints spark typological, structural, and formal ideas. As she suggested, this is the tendency to view architecture as deriving from external factors and environments—both man-made and natural—that situates Roche and Dinkeloo firmly within modern architecture’s so-called Third Generation (along with James Stirling, Robert Venturi, and others).

In “Almost Anything,” Kazys Neumann suggests—“Braaazt COLUMBIA (Princeton University), in “Environments of Global Governance,” argued against associating Roche with Kroothinghouse’s Bigness, but, rather, “the spatiality, calibration, and refinement in interior space. He noted, for example, that the approaches the large-scale forms for KRJDA’s simple, large-scale forms should be seen as an attempt to maintain control over the external forces that shaped the object into consideration—be it the client’s needs and opinions, financial constraints, or building regulations. In this model, creativity had less to do with inventing new forms than with the ability to let these constraints spark typological, structural, and formal ideas. As she suggested, this is the tendency to view architecture as deriving from external factors and environments—both man-made and natural—that situates Roche and Dinkeloo firmly within modern architecture’s so-called Third Generation (along with James Stirling, Robert Venturi, and others).

In “Almost Anything,” Kazys Neumann suggests—“Braaazt COLUMBIA (Princeton University), in “Environments of Global Governance,” argued against associating Roche with Kroothinghouse’s Bigness, but, rather, “the spatiality, calibration, and refinement in interior space. He noted, for example, that the approaches the large-scale forms for KRJDA’s simple, large-scale forms should be seen as an attempt to maintain control over the external forces that shaped the object into consideration—be it the client’s needs and opinions, financial constraints, or building regulations. In this model, creativity had less to do with inventing new forms than with the ability to let these constraints spark typological, structural, and formal ideas. As she suggested, this is the tendency to view architecture as deriving from external factors and environments—both man-made and natural—that situates Roche and Dinkeloo firmly within modern architecture’s so-called Third Generation (along with James Stirling, Robert Venturi, and others).

In “Almost Anything,” Kazys Neumann suggests—“Braaazt COLUMBIA (Princeton University), in “Environments of Global Governance,” argued against associating Roche with Kroothinghouse’s Bigness, but, rather, “the spatiality, calibration, and refinement in interior space. He noted, for example, that the approaches the large-scale forms for KRJDA’s simple, large-scale forms should be seen as an attempt to maintain control over the external forces that shaped the object into consideration—be it the client’s needs and opinions, financial constraints, or building regulations. In this model, creativity had less to do with inventing new forms than with the ability to let these constraints spark typological, structural, and formal ideas. As she suggested, this is the tendency to view architecture as deriving from external factors and environments—both man-made and natural—that situates Roche and Dinkeloo firmly within modern architecture’s so-called Third Generation (along with James Stirling, Robert Venturi, and others).
for which Roche played a leading design role. Identifying this project as one of the earliest shifts away from International Style architecture in America, Eisenman credited Roche with influencing a generation of younger architects, such as John Zuk, Robert Venturi, and Eisenman himself, who each went on to explore the possibilities of the nine-square grid inspired by what was one of the earliest—and smallest—of Roche’s designs.

“What are we really thinking about?” To answer this question, Roche summarized and clarified his ideas in a keynote address given at the conclusion of the symposium, Roche rose from the audience and, after thanking everyone for their attendance, stated with the barest hint of a smile, “You know, I did not die in 1980.”

The omission of Dinkeloo may relate to several factors that have influenced the way KRJDA was remembered during the concluding panel discussion, says Inaba. “The question of Dinkeloo is a lack of access to the process and complex- ity of architectural practice. We just don’t know enough about the decisions in the office.” Roche has certainly been the man out front throughout KRJDA’s history, leaving historians, critics, and commentators likely to omit Dinkeloo and later partners Philip Kinsella and James Owens from the narrative. This is unfortunate because the projects discussed during the symposium suggest there must be something particularly compelling about KRJDA’s work up until Dinkeloo’s sudden death, in 1981. For example, the technical aspects of KRJDA’s work—construction, and structural solutions—were notable and occasionally highly innovative. After Dinkeloo, the technical aspect of KRJDA’s work begins to fade, as even a cursory comparison of the Knights of Columbus and the J.P. Morgan Towers demonstrates.

In fact, on this point it is worth contrasting the presentation of these two projects in Francesco Dal Co’s 1985 Kevin Roche monograph. The Knights of Columbus Headquarters (1965–69) is explained through a detailed axonometric drawing and section perspective that celebrate the various systems working in concert across multiple scales to produce the tower’s distinctive form. The Morgan Bank Headquarters (1983–89), on the other hand, is explained with a series of line-drawing perspectives from an imaginary distant and unobstructed viewpoint, celebrating the overall form of the tower against the downtown Manhattan skyline. While J.P. Morgan was admittedly still under development when the Dal Co monograph was published, the comparison of the imagery combined with the built results suggests the increasing dominance of pure form over tectonics in KRJDA’s work over time, the result of machinery being the predominant force, and images that remain somewhat iconographic from afar, but which become less compelling up close at the scale of human experience. It seems unlikely to be mere coincidence that Roche corresponded with the departure of KRJDA from a renowned head of technical design.

However, if Roche’s opinion could be argued that this shift in the firm’s work was the result of a changing construction industry in the United States. As Roche explained in the 2006 interview that I conducted for Perspectives 40, “In the Sixties, when we were working on General Motors at Saarin’s office, virtually everything was inverted. . . That is quite different now. A curtain wall, for instance, is really an off-the-shelf element . . . what is lost is the individual inventive aspect.” While this may be true, one cannot help but wonder if an architect with Dinkeloo’s interests and skills would have addressed the challenge. Clearly, he had large-scale ambitions relative to the construction industry that he projected in an address delivered at the 1967 AIA Convention (quoted in Pelkonen’s essay in the catalog), in which he wrote, “We have thousands of manufacturers, subcontractors, and general contractors but proba- bly lack a few very large organizations, the automobile industry, and it would disrupt our way of doing things and disrupt the setup completely.” Dinkeloo continued, “The architect has to find ways of creating teams of people that can take on the equivalent of a project—the mayors, CEOs, and board presi dent—begin to disappear. The advent of full-time client project managers throughout the 1980s, but—to quote Roche again from the Perspectives interview—“would not surrender. . . And if you want an architect’s role in society became curtailed.”

There was once a time when an architect had a position in society and in the culture, where people paid mind to what the architect had a right to make deci sions and could be relied on to produce a significant work of art. Nowadays you, as an architect, get pushed around by the client—very severely—as if you were a draftsperson and didn’t really have any particular skills.

While the narrative repeated by Roche, Ouroussoff, Pelkonen, and Rohan—that there was a time when the American public and its leaders thought big, architects could think big, and the work was consequently more compelling than what we might be able to do today—is on the verge of becoming a truism, I doubt it accounts for why “Thinking Big” omitted the vast majority of KRJDA’s later oeuvre. Roche himself has always remained remarkably consistent in his stated ambitions and design approach. A comparison of interviews from the 1970s and the 2000s illu trates this, as does Varnelis’s demonstration that, despite an evolving client base, KRJDA continues to produce large-scale iconograph ic forms, ranging from the pure geometries of College Life Insurance to the historical and columnar references of J.P. Morgan. Furthermore, it would be difficult to argue that KRJDA’s projects have become programmatically less complex over time or that they have become smaller (as the 1990 Merck Headquarters or currently in-progress Santander Central (Spain) campus demonstrate). Based upon Roche’s statements, the symposium, and the work itself, it seems doubtful the architect or his clients have stopped “thinking big.”

Perhaps the fact that the firm’s later work goes ignored has less to do with the common apprehension that we are in a crash interest in thinking big, programmatic innovation, civic engagement, and the role of architectural authority, and a great deal more to do with the simple fact that “vintage” Roche appeals to current prevailing archi tectural aesthetic sensibilities, while the later work—especially the more historical and contextual projects—does not. The attra ctive novelty power wielded over contemporary architects and the equally repellent power of historicism are respectively overestimated (and nearly all of the speakers at the symposium were architects by training). And, indeed, vintage KRJDA does look good when judged by contemporary standards of architectural taste, which hold in such high esteem the similar aesthetic of the firms OMA, MVRDV, REX, BIG, and the like. The similarity in appearance between vintage KRJDA and a certain strand of contem porary practice—one that is probably not coincidental if stories of Koslow’s interest in KRJDA going back to the early 1970s is true—makes sense given how much architecture today, especially commissions won through the public design competition process, have consumed via images. As vintage KRJDA used strong and quickly legible forms to claim “imageability” in an environment where elements need to be designed as a whole, much of today’s architecture uses the same tools in the pursuit of the same goal. Questioning and designing at the most massive scale briefly while scrolling through architecture blogs, websites, or on competition Web sites.

Ultimately though, the omission from “Thinking Big” of Dinkeloo, who seems to have been ignored largely on aesthetic grounds, begs a question: as architects affiliated with academia, do we really care about thinking big? If the answer is yes, individual archi tects who make building big possible (e.g., Dinkeloo) must be acknowledged and their contributions to the work more carefully examined. Aesthetic preferences and pressures should be examined, and there should probably be more syndrome dedicat ed to those practices (e.g., AECOM) that are operating and designing at the most massive scales today. If, however, the answer is no, then we should admit what we’re really inter ested in—even if this includes uncomfortable topics such as architectural fashion and the way things look—so that a real conversa tion can take place. As demonstrated by the shortcomings of “Thinking Big,” only by examining accurately can begin to have a chance at addressing what the stakes really are for architecture today.
Middle Ground/Middle East: Religious Sites in Urban Contexts

The symposium “Middle Ground/Middle East: Religious Sites in Urban Contexts” was organized by Karla Britton on January 21 and 22, 2011.

“Middle Ground/Middle East,” a symposium held on January 21–22, 2011, organized by Karla Britton and hosted by the Yale School of Architecture, the Yale Divinity School, and the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies gathered scholars, architects, critics, and conservators to discuss religious and contested sites in the contemporary Middle East. Panel discussions inquired into the region as an exemplary middle ground—an intersection between past and present, destruction and spectacle, the three Abrahamic religions, and the East and West. Set in the post-secular wake of elevated interfaith tension and a resurgence of religious identities, the symposium positioned religion’s holy precincts as anchors for urban structure and the lens through which their inhabitants have understood themselves. The symposium sought a common ground for an issue that generally divides society.

The path to a middle ground is fraught with obstacles, and in his Friday keynote address, Nasser Rabbat (MIT) provided an overarching structure to the political and social issues at hand by first establishing the loss of relevance of the term Middle East—a colonially derived Eurocentric designation with postcolonial consequences. Drawing on napkins by imperial powers, enclosing what are now weak states, Rabbat’s speak encapsulated a view in which many speakers would augment, attempt to refute, and try to resolve: that the “middle-ness” of the Middle East has entirely dissolved. In “The Fundamentalist City: Medievality Now,” Karen Alimay and LC Berkley, discussed today’s harsh reality, underscoring religion itself as the fundamental theme that emerges from the middle ground. Focusing on urban dynamics, he argued that in regions where religious groups and societal needs left unattended by state bureaucracies, exclusionary spatial practices obfuscate what is otherwise a clear relationship to the city. Often initiated as peripheral tumors, fundamental religious movements infiltrate urban areas and ultimately fragment urban citizenship, causing a de facto secession existing outside the state. The creation of the “fundamentalist city” questions the inevitability of progress in the search for a middle ground. This is a reality that the urban planner and the architect must take seriously.

In “The Case of Beirut,” known for its religious pluralism and numerous rebuild- ing initiatives, the city is fascinating for its transitional turf for religious structures. As Makram El-Kadi of Yale joked, it is a place where “religion is a national sport.” In the current rebuilding of Beirut, Sarkis argued that mosques and churches are beginning to disappear in an otherwise highly articulated building environment. Religious pluralism, Sarkis contends, manifests itself only in rituals, not in space. He attributed this to the unapprised architect, the initiative romanticized the site and dwelled on legendary antiquity instead of acknowledging the painful reality of a displaced populace and a thorny urban context. Throughout the symposium, most speakers enumerated the obstacles in the path of a middle ground, but several attempted to harmoniously find a new direction for architecture and re-establish the architect’s role as the mediator between ideological aspirations and their tangible fulfillment. In “Background to the Middle Ground: Spirituality as a Redeeming Paradigm in Early Modern Architecture,” 1913–27, Kenneth Frampton, Ware Professor of Architecture at Columbia University, directed the conversation to the role of the modern architect as a practicing spiritualist, shifting the discussion from religious architecture to architecture as religion. Frampton reconsidered the history of architectural spirituality beginning with the Middle Ages, when religious structure integrated organically into the urban fabric. He then moved to Modern architecture, where new middle grounds were expressed technically and came to embody a new spirituality. In terms of practicing architects, Frampton commented on Al-Assad’s presentation on using architecture to redefine notions of the sacred. He noted that the
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Nasser Rabbat described a contemporary Middle East that injects religious identity into all aspects of daily life so that religious architecture has become a weapon in a cultural tug-of-war. Architect and historian Mohamad Al-Akad, in “Retreating into the Background: Mosque Architecture in the Early Twenty-First Century,“ saw things somewhat differently when he compared present-day mosques with those in the Arab world of the early 1980s and 1990s, when architects committed themselves to address- ing the dichotomy between the trend of modernization and a religion deeply rooted in the past. Despite minimized ornamentation, simplified masses, and abbreviated extremites, architect expressed both an identity and the vernacular. This approach is in contrast to current practice, as mosques are surprisingly devoid of character. Inspired to position themselves in the global current of “starchitecture,” current architects are designing mosques that are neither architecturally nor contemplative. Largely absent from the portfolios of practicing archi- tects, the mosque is approached as a neutral visual form.

This state of affairs is surprising, considering the prominent roles that religion often plays in defining society, culture, and politics. Hashim Sarkis (Harvard GSD) expanded on this position in “No Faith in Architecture: The Case of Beirut.” Known for its religious pluralism and numerous rebuilding initiatives, the city is fascinating for its transitional turf for religious structures. As Makram El-Kadi of Yale joked, it is a place where “religion is a national sport.” In the current rebuilding of Beirut, Sarks argued that mosques and churches are beginning to disappear in an otherwise highly articulated building environment. Religious pluralism, Sarkis contends, manifests itself only in rituals, not in space. He attributed this to the unapprised architect, the initiative romanticized the site and dwelled on legendary antiquity instead of acknowledging the painful reality of a displaced populace and a thorny urban context.

Throughout the symposium, most speakers enumerated the obstacles in the path of a middle ground, but several attempted to harmoniously find a new direction for architecture and re-establish the architect’s role as the mediator between ideological aspirations and their tangible fulfillment. In “Background to the Middle Ground: Spirituality as a Redeeming Paradigm in Early Modern Architecture,” 1913–27, Kenneth Frampton, Ware Professor of Architecture at Columbia University, directed the conversation to the role of the modern architect as a practicing spiritualist, shifting the discussion from religious architecture to architecture as religion. Frampton reconsidered the history of architectural spirituality beginning with the Middle Ages, when religious structure integrated organically into the urban fabric. He then moved to Modern architecture, where new middle grounds were expressed technically and came to embody a new spirituality. In terms of practicing architects, Frampton commented on Al-Assad’s presentation on using architecture to redefine notions of the sacred. He noted that the
Moreover, the monuments personified a many other speakers vehemently opposed. and patriotism, a union that Rabbat and East. First, leaders patronize these buildings that this paradigm would be challenged. This power. He emphasized the fruitless struggle religions as national traits and expressions of the labyrinth of heads of state flaunting their discarded in favor of psychoanalysis: the transformation was marked when ritual was the problematic middle ground is lost in a the symposium confirmed this act of urban appropriation. Moreover, exclusionary spatial practices are evident in the lack of discussion about gender. In a region where the most orthodox iterations of the three Abrahamic religions exist, a stringently segregated usage of religious space is enforced in which women are excluded from the central framework. Here, little can be done architecturally without an ideological image. and be engaged in abstract dialogue to the quotidian are evident in the infinite variety and magnify the people, the unprecedented size and superlative ornamentation of the Egyptian architect Abdel-Wahed El-Ewiwi, architect critique for The New Yorker. An impres- sive image display illustrated the variety of El-Ewiwi’s architecture, including more than fifteen mosques constructed largely in the Middle East, such as the Daba Mosque and the Miqat Mosque, both in Medina, and the King Saud Mosque, in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. Vincent Scully has noted that, whereas Le Corbusier and Louis Kahn the sacred is savage sacrifice, “El-Wakil embodies a more architectonic than any of the others. And, in his view, that particular function of the region is compromised if they are not. He found El-Wakil’s musings to be idiosyncratic distractions from the constructional subtlety that makes the Miqat Mosque, both in Medina, and the King Saud Mosque, in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. Vincent Scully has noted that, whereas Le Corbusier and Louis Kahn the sacred is savage sacrifice, “El-Wakil embodies a more architectonic than any of the others. And, in his view, that particular function of the region is compromised if they are not. He found El-Wakil’s musings to be idiosyncratic distractions from the constructional subtlety that makes the Miqat Mosque, both in Medina, and the King Saud Mosque, in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. Vincent Scully has noted that, whereas Le Corbusier and Louis Kahn the sacred is savage sacrifice, “El-Wakil embodies a more archi- tectonic than any of the others. And, in his view, that particular function of the region is...
Fugitive Geographies
MEd Symposium Spring 2011

It is a truism repeated by any number of detectives, police officers, sheriffs, and forensic scientists: the perpetrator always returns to the scene of the crime. The site is cordoned off with the notorious yellow tape as the corner wheels away the body and evidence is carefully collected in small Mylar bags. So what is about the crime scene? Criminal activity is often the matter of negotiating space: think of the bank robber planning the quickest path to the vault, or the dark alleyway where the informant sets up the sting. Of course, these are all clichés from any number of detective movies and prime-time television dramas. Beyond serving as the mere backdrop for criminal activity, as so often happens, space and architecture become accomplishments in criminal acts. Unlike murderers, thieves, and con artists, architectural partners in crime cannot be brought to justice in the back of the police car or to trials before a jury. The issue of architecture and its relation to crime was the subject of “Fugitive Geographies,” a graduate symposium that featured papers delivered by students from eight universities. It was organized in collaboration with the MEd Colloquium of Contemporary Architectural Discourse on the theme “Space, Crime, and Architecture,” satirizing Biegfried Giedion’s book title. The class was organized around an alternative to time as a criticism of architecture. Ornament, as a manifestation of nostalgia for the past, was a crime in the eyes of Adolf Loos. But in today’s post-ideological and liquid modernity, in which history blends with heterotopic stories, the passing of time can’t help in understanding the multiplicity of a globalized society, neither as norm nor as crime. Today’s ultimate crime occurs when architects trangress the law, when they literally commit a crime or enable it as accomplishments. Therefore, the class investigated the relationship between architecture and use, studying the techniques and dynamics that allow crime to happen in a particular place. This notion served as a background to the MEd symposium.

This forum’s greatest strength was its focus on the liminal nature of spaces occupied by fugitives and those on the run from the law, with several papers addressing the spatial ambiguity that is often part of life on the run. In following the symposium’s directive to understand architecture and the built environment from the perspective of an individual attempting to escape or allude capture, the conference was organized thematically into three sections: “Textual Manifestations,” “Borders,” and “Geopolitical Strategies.” The first examined literary representations of the spaces that the fugitive often inhabits, opening with a paper by Gabrielle Guise, a Ph.D. student in Yale’s American Studies Program, titled “Herman Melville’s Benito Cereno as True Crime Fiction.” Guise took as the subject of analysis the writer’s novella in which a ship piloted by New England merchant Amasio Delano encounters a British slave ship carrying slaves from Africa who had mutinied and murdered the crew, sparing only Captain Benito Cereno. The ship in Melville’s novel is thus transformed into a crime scene, with clues provided throughout the story. Guise examined the fluidity of spaces in which the crimes occur as the ship becomes crime scene, getaway vehicle, safe house, and finally the courtroom in which justice is administered.

Where Guise focused on the slave ship’s ability to switch seamlessly among a number of roles as both criminal accomplice or administrator of justice, the next session, “Borders,” examined what happens when the ambiguous space of the fugitive is indicative of a larger political and ideological struggle. In “Interloction: Standards, Codes, and Access,” Adam Bandler, a student at Columbia University’s Critical, Curatorial, and Media Studies Program, examined the evolution of the Berlin Wall as a space of ideological ambiguity with the ambiguous space of the fugitive. He pointed out that the earliest descriptions of space and crime in Western literature are in the Book of Genesis, in which the Garden of Eden is transformed into a crime scene as Adam and Eve become fugitives from the laws of God. Bandler argued that the very origins of architecture grew from the couple’s expulsion from paradise, marking a consciousness of both clothing and space. In becoming aware of their position outside the Garden of Eden, Adam and Eve seek to build a shelter for themselves, thus bringing forth architecture to aid them as fugitives.

Crimes and the fugitives they produce persist, and the presenters at the conference all addressed the ever more complicated nature of crime and the increasingly ambiguous act of fleeing one space in favor of another. More importantly, the conference called into question the very nature of what a fugitive is and where fugitives can be found, an issue raised by Thomas Levin, a professor at Princeton University, who delivered the symposium’s keynote address. “Typography of Elusion,” a talk on surveillance and crime in New York City, Levin described round-the-clock camera surveillance programs in places such as Manhattan, a city transformed into a kind of crime scene in which everyday acts are subject to the same scrutiny as criminal activity. And far from the stock characters of police dramas and detective novels who hide in shadows and alleyways, the fugitive is really a more surprising and complex character who begs us to ask of ourselves, What are we running from?

—Matthew Gin (MEd ’12)

Yale’s Fab (ulus) Lab
Exhibition Spring 2011

Yale’s Digital Media and Fabrication Lab is a machine in itself, constantly evolving and adapting along with the changing landscape of new digital production technologies. It is no surprise that the Fab Lab, as it is known, also commands an increasing presence in the School of Architecture. It was therefore fitting that the spring 2011 exhibit at the school, titled “Exploring the Beauty,” showcased student work from three courses that partnered with the lab over the past two years, revealing the investigative nature of the coursework while summing up an impressive range of student talent. The exhibit focused on design developed at building scale. In John Eberhart’s course “Computation and Fabrication,” for example, students were taught static, parametric, and scripted modeling paradigms to produce full-scale constructed pieces, such as a flower-shaped lamp or a computer case. The symposium, Disassembly and Assembly,” the third of four visualization courses, taught by Ben Pati and John Eberhart, pushed real-world application even further: conceived as supplement to Yale’s Fab Project, the course focused on the design, fabrication, and assembly of component-based projects, culminating with full-scale prototypes assembled in situ throughout Rudolph Hall.

Often, the most eye-catching work alters patterns that we see in the natural world. In Mark Gage’s course, “Dishveled Geometries: Towards a New Rustication,” the student work evoked a pseudo-naturalism in the form of wavelike honeycombs and reptilian skins. In addition to its formal innovation, the far-reaching nature of Yale’s fabrication classes extend to the Massimo Scolari studio, in which each student designs and fabricates a chair, many of which have been featured as part of the International Contemporary Furniture Fair in New York City.

However, unlike many exhibits of student work, “Exploring the Beauty” represents more than simply beautifully executed designs. On display were a host of operational techniques and material effects describing the wide range of possibilities brought on by the coupling of digital design and fabrication. From scalelike and reptilian to honeycombed or crystalline, the work draws attention to the relationship between design intent and physical reality, and demonstrates that these works are becoming increasingly intertwined with one another and throughout the culture of the school.

—Jamie Chan (’08)
The exhibition Ceci n’ est pas une rêverie: The Architecture of Stanley Tigerman

The exhibition Ceci n’ est pas une rêverie: The Architecture of Stanley Tigerman will be on display at the Yale Architecture Gallery from August 25 to November 4, 2011, and then it will travel to the Graham Foundation’s Madlener House, in Chicago, in 2012. Curated by associate professor Emmanuel Petit with the assistance of David Rihner (MED ’11) and designed by exhibitions director Dean Sakamoto, the show comprises over 190 original drawings, paintings, sketchbooks, and cartoons, as well as thirty models and other objects designed by Tigerman (B.Arch ’60 and M.Arch ’61) over five decades of his career in Chicago, from 1960 to today.

The exhibition is organized thematically, grouping projects according to a series of conceptual motifs, including “Utopia,” “Allegory,” “Death,” “Humor,” and “Division,” beginning with Tigerman’s bachelor’s (’60) and master’s (’61) theses developed under Paul Rudolph at Yale. Also represented are other projects, both built and unbuilt, such as the Five Polytechnic Institutes, in Bangladesh (1966–75); the Urban Matrix proposal, on Lake Michigan (1967–68, unbuilt); the humorous Daisy House (1976) and Dante’s Bathroom Addition (1980, proposal); the Commonwealth Edison Energy Museum, in Zion, Illinois (1987–90); the Park Lane Hotel, in Kyoto (1980, unbuilt); apartment buildings for Belgrade (1990) and Fukuoka (1988–89); tableware for Swid Powell, designs for Cannon Fieldcrest and Alessi, and jewelry for ACME and Cleto Munari. In addition, there are oil paintings from Tigerman’s “I Pledge Allegiance” series of the mid-1960s; “Architoons” and travel sketches beginning in the 1970s. Completed projects—such as the Berlin Wall (1988) and the recently inaugurated Holkcaust Memorial Foundation of Illinois (2000–09), among many others—are included with drawings and models.

Historical video footage of Tigerman’s lectures and interviews—along with a new interview with the architect and others, produced by Karen Carter Lynch—will animate the exhibition gallery.

The exhibition celebrates the transfer of Tigerman’s drawing archive to Yale University’s Manuscripts and Archives in 2012 and coincides with the publication of the book Schelling Through Ambivalence: Essays on an American Architectural Condition (Yale University Press), a collection of his writings from 1984–2011, edited and with an introduction by Emmanuel Petit. Tigerman’s autobiography, Designing Bridges to Burn: Architectural Memoirs by Stanley Tigerman (ORO Editions), will also be released at the show’s opening.

Gwathmey Siegel: Inspiration and Transformation

The first museum exhibition of the work of Gwathmey Siegel and Associates Architects, Gwathmey Siegel: Inspiration and Transformation, was initiated by the Cameron Art Museum, in Wilmington, North Carolina, where it was on view this spring. Curated and designed by Douglas Sprunt, it will be displayed at Yale from November 14, 2011 through January 27, 2012. The show concentrates on the close relationship between art and architecture emphasizing transitional examples selected from the firm’s more than forty-five years of practice.

Charles Gwathmey was the only child of noted Social Realist painter Robert Gwathmey and Rosalie Hook Gwathmey, a respected photographer and member of the Photo League. The architect met his future partner, Robert Siegel, at the High School of Music and Art, in New York City. Gwathmey studied architecture for a year under Louis Kahn at the University of Pennsylvania and then went on to study and work under Paul Rudolph at the Yale School of Art and Architecture, where he was awarded, after graduation in 1961, a Fulbright grant to research the work of Le Corbusier in Europe. Siegel studied architecture at the Pratt Institute and received a master’s degree from the Harvard Graduate School of Design. The two recon- nected while working in the office of Edward Larabee Barnes, in New York City, before founding their own practice, based on the success of the house and studio Gwathmey designed for his parents in Amagansett, New York (1965–67).

The exhibition focuses on projects in which art is an integral part of the program, whether it creates art in the spaces or displays it. These include the Gwathmey House and Studio and the de Menil Residence, East Hampton, New York (1983); the Bechtler Residence, Zürich, Switzerland (1993); Glenstone, Potomac, Maryland (2006); and the Yale School of Architecture renovation/restoration and Lori Canter addition (2008).

The restoration and renovation of Whig Hall, Princeton University (1973); the Guggenheim Museum renovation and addition, New York City (1992); and the addition to the Fogg Museum, Harvard University (1991) demonstrate the architects’ reckoning with the history of architecture and their mentors’ masterworks. The art associated with these projects is exhibited to demonstrate the broader cultural currents in American modern art and architecture, as well as the more specific inspiration and meaning of the art incorporated in each commission.

The exhibition consists of original architectural drawings, sketchbooks, reprod- uced drawings, models, and photographs. Artifacts and documents from the personal collections of Gwathmey and Siegel, includ- ing Gwathmey’s scrapbook from his family’s tour of Europe in 1949–50 and his Fulbright Grant notebook from 1962–63, provide additional first-hand material.

An illustrated catalog accompanies the exhibition, with an essay by architectural historian Stephen Fox of the Rice University School of Architecture as well as interviews with the architects and selected clients by Sprunt, that address the architects’ design philosophy and process, their professional practice and relationships with clients, and contextual information about time and place.
“Johnstown to Southampton,” ink on bond paper, 8 x 12”, 1985.


Jugaad Urbanism

Jugaad Urbanism: Resourceful Strategies for Indian Cities (on view at the Center for Architecture in New York City, from February 10 to May 21, 2011) calls a sampling of projects from the streets of some of India’s most populous cities: Delhi, Mumbai, Ahmedabad, Kolkata, and Pune, to name a few. Jugaad translates from Hindi roughly as “creative” or “resourceful,” and curator Karu Agrawal (MED ‘04) selects a spectrum of work that evokes this type of approach to design at all scales. The show’s premise is that crowded and impoverished cities call most for jugaad approaches, and that, with a projected 590 million people living in India’s cities by 2030, such thinking is both urgent and essential.

Winding through the spaces of the Center for Architecture, the exhibit tightly groups projects around spheres where jugaad interventions are most necessary—water, energy, transportation, and land—with models, drawings, and videos popping up to display the breadth of ingenuity within each category. The projects stem from necessity; they combine and repurpose available resources to meet basic needs in a part of the world where the scale of the need is extraordinary. An exhibition wall tells us that roughly 400 million people in India do not have access to electricity, ninety million more may not have access to clean water, and many in the entire population of the United States do not have access to plastic materials.

Jugaad design always delivers a whole greater than the sum of its parts, and we see this in devices like the E-Charka, a traditional handloom in another context. The weaving of fibers held in place by resin maintains distinctions between multiple materials. This difference is described geometrically: the alignments and patterns of fibers are an index of the paths of load-bearing functions without multiple components. Variations in material thickness, fiber orientation, and the ratio of fiber to resin can be designed to account for load paths within the material itself. This allows smooth transitions between vertical and horizontal or multi-directional and linear spans. When joints are necessary, they take the form of laminated and laced connections, producing seamless material changes and flux transitions rather than mechanically expressed junctures.

As seamless materials that can take on nearly any form, plastics and composites throw into question the traditional formal logics that stem from material limitations. Rather than distinguishing components and materials, plastic adhesives, melts and merge them together. Alternately hard and soft, stiff and malleable, plastics are like a brick: its basic durability, its malleability, its ability to take on any form, and its potential for tectonic expression, not as a set of diagrammatic dichotomies, but as a logic of incorporated complexity better suited to a discipline ever more relevant for contemporary architecture.

The dualing plastics conferences held in the past. Lynn’s composite projects extend his ideas on topology and tectonics to materials and composite materials, which occur both naturally and artificially. The material scientist George de la Torre, who began a Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program for plastic materials is becoming indecipherable to the making of the material itself, allowing architects to exert finer and finer control.

Johan Bettum, who began a Ph.D. on carbon fiber a decade ago, also argued that composite materials have blurred the boundary between architecture and material structure. Pointing out that materials like geotextile and carbon fiber have a wave large enough to see and feel, Bettum described composite materials as emblematic of difference rather than monolithic sameness. The weaving of fibers held in place by resin maintains distinctions between multiple materials. This difference is described geometrically: the alignments and patterns of fibers are an index of the paths of load-bearing functions without multiple components. Variations in material thickness, fiber orientation, and the ratio of fiber to resin can be designed to account for load paths within the material itself. This allows smooth transitions between vertical and horizontal or multi-directional and linear spans. When joints are necessary, they take the form of laminated and laced connections, producing seamless material changes and flux transitions rather than mechanically expressed junctures.

As seamless materials that can take on nearly any form, plastics and composites throw into question the traditional formal logics that stem from material limitations. Rather than distinguishing components and materials, plastic adhesives, melts and merge them together. Alternately hard and soft, stiff and malleable, plastics are like a brick: its basic durability, its malleability, its ability to take on any form, and its potential for tectonic expression, not as a set of diagrammatic dichotomies, but as a logic of incorporated complexity better suited to a discipline ever more relevant on material and digital technologies.

The dualing plastics conferences mark a confluence of material technology, aesthetic culture, and the evolution of computational software. The aesthetic tendency among architects and designers toward intricate formal patterns is wide-spread and codependent with the growing accessibility of computational software. Computation treats multiple objects or parts like the fibers of a composite surface, as a series of variable spacings and orientations that are articulated individually, but bound by consistent relationships across the entire structure. Computing is often defined by both absorbing and articulating the complexity of structural load, plastics, together with computation, remove the essential and reductive qualities of tectonic expression, making tectonics more relevant for contemporary architecture.

—Brennan Buck

Buck is a critic in architecture at Yale and heads the practice FahrenheitBuck in New York and Los Angeles.
Anne Tyng: Inhabiting Geometry

The exhibition Anne Tyng: Inhabiting Geome-
try—shown in two parts: at the ICA at the Univer-
sity of Pennsylvania, January 13–March 20, 2011, and at the Graham Foundation, April 15–June 18, 2011—presented a long-
overdue focus on visionary architect and theorist Anne Tyng (b. 1920), best known for her work with Louis I. Kahn, until her death in the 1950s (when Kahn taught at Yale)—in particular, her research behind the inhabitable space–frame architecture for the seminal City Tower (1952–57). Indeed, the exhibition highlighted Tyng’s lifelong research into geometry, displayed at various scales, from the design of a small house (Walzworth Tyng House, 1950–53) to large-scale urban plans (Urban Hierarchy, 1969–71).

Fundamental to Tyng’s work is a study of the five Platonic solids—the tetra-
hedron, cube, octahedron, icosahedron, and dodecahedron—and the dynamic relation-
ship between them. In summer 2010, she worked with curators Ingrid Schaffner (ICA senor curator), William Whittaker (curator and collections manager, Architectural Archives, University of Pennsylvania), and Srdjan Jovanovic (DCA assistant professor; Tyler School of Art, Temple University) in a week-
long charette at the Architectural Archives to consider and curate the Klein Collection, who designed the workshop with Tyng, used to produce the Platonic solids as human-scale geometric shapes, for example, so we can read the space between the sculpture and the surfaces of the room. The most powerful was the “icosahedron with Nested Cube.” The sculptures resonated within these pleasingly propor-
tioned spaces, in which a corresponding palette of natural wood with areas painted white created an interplay that made the sculptures shimmer, thus reinforcing Tyng’s ideas of the dynamic nature of geometry.

In 1965, Tyng was awarded a Graham Foundation grant to develop the Penn exhib-
ition research into a finished manuscript, with artwork created by photographs, titles, and images of her work. She was a lecturer in architecture at Penn starting in 1968, earned a Ph.D. in archi-
tecture there in 1973, and taught at Penn until she retired in 1996.

The installation at the Graham Foundation, in Chicago, was significant on various levels. Director Sarah Herda and Delfit Martinez, former chair of the Penn Design Architecture Department, initiated ideas for an exhibition on Tyng based on both the Anatomy of Form manuscript and the archives. (Sadly, Martinez died on January 13, 2011, the day of the exhibition opening at the ICA.) This exhibition brought to light the extensive first-hand research into a finished manuscript, which is the key to understanding the complexity of Tyng’s notion of dynamic symmetry and evolving geometric structures. These pages were framed and placed around the perm-
eter of the lower-level galleries, the Music Room and the Living Room. Models float-
ing on pedestals and drawings for specific projects were displayed in the various second-floor galleries.

The most exciting aspect of the installation was the placement of the Platonic solids in the exhibit of the Graham Foundation’s Maderlein House. The sculptures resonate within these pleasingly propor-
tioned spaces, in which a corresponding palette of natural wood with areas painted white created an interplay that made the sculptures shimmer, thus reinforcing Tyng’s ideas of the dynamic nature of geometry. Cubic (2010), the simplest of all, was placed in the garden. The others, such as “Octahedron with Nested Cube,” were more complex, and their placement in simple recta-
gular volumes created a second, similar geometric event. Just as we are to look at the negative space between the cube and the octahedron as a powerful and geometrically precise shape, for example, so we can read the space between the sculpture and the surfaces of the room. The most powerful was the “icosahedron with Nested Cube,” set in the Dining Room, activated by framed views of the street, the luminous parquet flooring, the wood-paneled walls, and the intricately carved, coffered wood ceiling. Here, matter met geometry to breath-
ing effect.

—Alicea Imperiale

Imperiale is an associate professor at the Tyler School of Design.

Machu Picchu: Artifacts Return Home

The year 2011 marks the centenary of the rediscovery of Machu Picchu by American explorer Hiram Bingham III (Yale College, 1931). In 1911, Bingham’s team left New Haven and Yale School of Architecture graduate Elizabeth Morgan (’07), of Kuhn Riddle Archi-
tects, arrived in Cuzco, Peru, on July 24 to oversee the installation permanent exhibit of artifacts from Bingham’s expedition, Machu Picchu: Unveiling the Mystery of the Incas—a catalog documenting its activities and discussions will be published in fall 2011. www.newusersgroup.com

—David Sadighian (BA ’07, MEd ’10) and Daniel Bobzien

Machu Picchu installation in Cuzco, Peru, 2011. Photograph by Elizabeth Morgan.
No More Play: Conversations on Urban Speculation in Los Angeles and Beyond


I was wasted / I was a hippie / I was a dropout / you know I was out of my head / I was a surfer / I had a skateboard / I was so heavy man / I lived on the strand —“Wasted” by the Circle Jerks band

do not be able to hold a public” (p. 55).

The book is well executed and organized, allowing readers to be engaged with the social fabric of Los Angeles and beyond. It is a valuable resource for both those interested in urban speculation and those interested in the social and cultural history of Los Angeles.

Architecture in Uniform: Designing and Building for the Second World War


The twenty-first century comes into relief both for its incomparable achievement in the arts and for what Peter Sloterdijk notes as three singular and incomparable features that constitute the originality of the era: the practice of terrorism, the concept of technology, and environmental thinking.

The argument is delivered through a palimpsest of images and discussions designed beautifully by Julie Cho.

Catherine Opie’s discussion of documenting the radical outcomes of gentrification in Korea Town, Matthew Coolidge’s discussion of the speculative character of resources, and Edward Soja’s surveys the recent political landscape of the city. I was a young woman at the time of this writing, and my relationship to the city as a young woman has continued to evolve. I have come to understand that the city as it exists now has no real past. The city is a never-ending now.

Maltzan’s thoughtfully composed questions articulate a view of L.A. as an open framework for exploration. The conversations further Maltzan and Varner’s development of Los Angeles as a city for the new urban laboratory for the future brings me back to the Circle Jerks lyrics, which, for me, present an urban space that is a site of resistance. Los Angeles is a moving target, so take aim and see it anew for yourself.

—Andrew Lyon (’96)

Lyon works in the New York City office of Nicholas Grimshaw and Partners.
Neo-avant-garde and Postmodern: Postwar Architecture in Britain and Beyond


It is hard to think of any labels for architecture that have inspired as much critical cataract as the description of modernist, postmodern, and postmodernism. These labels are convenient devices that only entrench and easily support positions, as well as major reinterpretations of known topics. One of the best examples is Martino Stierli’s piece about Denise Scott Brown’s trip to London in the early 1950s; it uses photographs as a basis for discussion at the Architectural Association to lend new insight into her becoming one of architecture’s most spoken pop ideologues. Although Stierli considers this topic using normative methods of archival research and formal analysis, other essays begin to claim new territories and demonstrate how the writing on a particular history elucidates contemporary conditions. Zimmerman argues for the beginnings of a transition from an exchange which modernism “returned” back to Europe from the United States in the form of images published in important American publications. She focuses on how images of Mies van der Rohe’s Chemical and Metallurgy Building, at the Illinois Institute of Technology (1945–46), were important points of reference for German and French avant-garde and postmodern, and even modernity and late modernity, from the end of the 1950s. The placing of complicated aesthetic trends and practices into discrete periods blurs our historical sensibilities and our ability to appreciate an architecture in its intention in the collection of the essays offered by this particular book. Aside from modernist architects, artists, critics, and historians such as Alison and Peter Smithson, Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown, Edward Taddeo, James Stirling, Reyner Banham, and others. The end result is what the editors label “a better explanatory correction” for understanding postwar architecture’s theoretical and historical development.

As the book’s title indicates, Crinson and Zimmerman’s “contrapuntal” is regionalist in its focus on the precise British context from the 1960s to 1990s in Britain as a proving ground for a thesis that asks, generally, whether British postwar avant-garde and postmodernist practices reflect the representational shifts placed a new, troubling relationship into the historical perspective or periods—discerning how images within discrete periods influence and shape the architectural practices discussed in these essays. While some of the essays may not be of the same architectural practice, the book is neither a monograph on how to achieve a specific approach nor on how to achieve a specific new approach to the vernacular’s contemporary instrumentality, rather its “subversive” potential is still active. The essays in this volume differ from those of the previous generation in its methods of research and its methodological implications for historical writing. The crux of the problem is that the editors have made a conscious decision to use the vernacular as a core theme within the essays, and that the essays are not merely a collection of scholarly pieces, but rather a series of interconnected essays that explore the intersection of the vernacular and modernism.

The editors have organized the essays into thematic chapters that hint at an intellectual but not exclusively historical trajectory. The first, titled “New Brutalism and Pop,” starts with essays devoted to practices recognized as “signature” first moments of emerging modernist and architecture practices in postwar Britain. Alex Pott’s examination of the seminal exhibition This is Tomorrow, at the Whitechapel Art Gallery in 1956 and the subsequent development of the “Smithson”s development of “their streets in the air” approach to building circulation in Robin Hood Gardens forms the chapter’s introduction. In their discussion of how the Smithsons’ street patterns emerged as a new kind of urban form, the editors point out that the Smithsons were interested in the idea of the vernacular as a form of urban design. However, the question the editors have to ask is how these volume is quickly and convincingly, and whether the reasons for this are the same as the reasons for the different forms of the same idea. Hence, the editors have made an important argument that the vernacular’s contemporary instrumentality, rather its “subversive” potential is still active. The essays in this volume differ from those of the previous generation in its methods of research and its methodological implications for historical writing.

The editors have organized the essays into thematic chapters that hint at an intellectual but not exclusively historical trajectory. The first, titled “New Brutalism and Pop,” starts with essays devoted to practices recognized as “signature” first moments of emerging modernist and architecture practices in postwar Britain. Alex Pott’s examination of the seminal exhibition This is Tomorrow, at the Whitechapel Art Gallery in 1956 and the subsequent development of the “Smithson”s development of “their streets in the air” approach to building circulation in Robin Hood Gardens forms the chapter’s introduction. In their discussion of how the Smithsons’ street patterns emerged as a new kind of urban form, the editors point out that the Smithsons were interested in the idea of the vernacular as a form of urban design. However, the question the editors have to ask is how these volume is quickly and convincingly, and whether the reasons for this are the same as the reasons for the different forms of the same idea. Hence, the editors have made an important argument that the vernacular’s contemporary instrumentality, rather its “subversive” potential is still active. The essays in this volume differ from those of the previous generation in its methods of research and its methodological implications for historical writing.
Vincent Lo
Edward P. Bass Distinguished Visiting Architecture Fellow
"Superblock/Supertall Developments in China and Hong Kong"
January 6
One of my dreams has always been to come to the East Coast to lecture, and I’ve been waiting for your invitation for a long time. What I want to try to do today is examine why China’s urbanizing in such a big way and why some of the solutions to this boom, China has a need to urbanize. But why? What’s happening? If you look at the figures, it’s mind-boggling: 36 percent of China’s population lives in urbanized areas in the year 2000, which is 459 million people. But this year, it’s already 635 million people, or 47 percent of the entire country. That’s an increase of roughly fifteen million people a year.

Unfortunately, China has a lack of land. The amount of buildable landmass in China is about the same as it is in the United States. With this shortage of land, urbanization is going to create a lot of different problems. That is why we need very dense development. A traditional city block in Shanghai is walkable and mixed usage, and there is a lot of history and culture there. But it doesn’t have the needs of today. ‘There is very low efficiency, and the buildings are basically obsolete.

Our solution in Shanghai was the Xintandi development. Before we started our development, it was dilapidated, old stone houses, an architecture style unique to Shanghai. In 1996 I engaged Skidmore, Owings, & Merrill to do a master plan and participated very heavily in the planning process. I knew that Shanghai had very high aspirations to become a thriving international center, so we designed Xintandi to respond to that need around the existing spine.

Kristina Hill
Timothy Egan Lenahan Memorial Lecture
"Beauty or the Beast: Design and Infrastructure"
January 10
With infrastructure, we make decisions about dynamics in space. It is always about flow, and then we behave around and naturalize it. I often refer to infrastructure with my students and then we behave around and naturalize it. With infrastructure, we make decisions about the dynamics in space. It is always about flow, and we call that the ‘body politic’; there is the building level, which we call the ‘spatial political’; and there is the scale of the urban, which we can call ‘geopolitical.’

Edward P. Bass Distinguished Visiting Architecture Fellow
"Infrastructure"
January 13
I often refer to infrastructure with my students and then we behave around and naturalize it. With infrastructure, we make decisions about the dynamics in space. It is always about flow, and we call that the ‘body politic’; there is the building level, which we call the ‘spatial political’; and there is the scale of the urban, which we can call ‘geopolitical.’

Nasser Rabbat
Superblock/Supertall Developments in China and Hong Kong"
January 16
When I moved to the United States in 1989, I was a Fulbright scholar in Stuttgart. I studied with my students at Harvard, I was a Fulbright scholar in Stuttgart. I studied with Agran, critic in architecture at Yale.
names and aims inevitably results in a double-pronged impoverishment, architecturally and civically.

Thomas de Monchaux
Myriam Bellazoung Memorial Lecture “Seven Architectural Embarrassments” February 10

Embarrassment is different from its colleagues, shame, and humiliation. Shame primarily connotes an awareness of ethical failure, the direct point of index from which virtue arises. humiliation, as opposed to humility, which is the virtue of sidestepping hierarchy altogether, connotes extreme differences in power between its partici- pants. It may be that all humiliation is shame- ful, or it should be, but embarrassment is distinct from both. Although it is potentially rich in ethical and powerful content, its etymology is remarkably spatial and pornog- raphic and, therefore, architectural. The borrowing of the word is the same that we

Peter Eisenman
Charles Gwathmey Professor in Practice “Wine Architecture? The Time of the Site” April 7

I have presented here is neither a justifica-
tion nor an apology for what I do. It is a fact that our time is a late moment. I do not, however, believe we are at the end of ideol-
ogies, as many people think. On the contrary, I believe architecture is still important and very much political and, therefore, quite relevant. Indeed, one could argue that architecture is an important discipline today because its relevance lies somewhere other than what it does in law or business. It is a complexity and a condition of space and time—the many crises we face. But in order to do so, to act politically and criti-
cally, an architect must first have an idea, or, in other words, an architectural project as opposed to a mere design. The temporal concept of the site is a project concerned with architectural ideas, which in themselves are inherently critical and ideological.

Unfortunately, political discussions in architecture today only seem to be about sustainability, LEED certificates, parametrics, and so on. But I often wonder whether they argued about sustainability when Borromini did San Carlo or Sarl’io, for example. I don’t think so. Clearly those are "sustainable" projects in that they are still here, but their importance to architecture lies in their critical differences and not in their relation to some marketable current trend. This is not an argument against sustainability, but sustainability is not what animates an archi-
tectural idea.

I was recently reminded of some-
things Daniel Burnham said: “Make no little things; they have no magic to stir men’s blood.” Today it would seem that many of our politicians have very little desire to stir anybody’s blood. But architecture does have that capacity. Architecture can stir reaction and movement. So what I am doing today is trying to give you a little insight into why I am optimistic about the future of archi-
tecture. I hope this brief presentation will in some way clarify what it can mean to be an architect, and, in particular someone like you today, entering school as in a moment of lateness and also a period of economic downward. I was not unlike you; after all, I was born in the Depression, lived through the downturns of 1972 and of 1983, and started my practice at the moment of an economic downturn. Remember, economic downturns don’t last forever. But in 1968 we didn’t have an education and if you don’t continue to believe in the future as the present, then you will always be in an economic downturn. Archi-
tecture matters. Don’t squander that legacy.

John Patkau
Charles Gwathmey Professor in Architecture “Buildings/Projects/Competitions 2009–2011”

In my last lecture at Yale, I made the argument for architecture as form-finding and something shaped by circumstance. I described how at the outset of our practice, my partner, Patricia, and I often initiated a project by searching for what we called "profound retention:’ those aspects of site, culture, climate, building context, program, or local culture that would facilitate the development of an architectural form that was evocative of circumstance. The result of this approach was that individual projects often took on distinct identities in response to circum-
stances. Consequently, the conceptual relationship between our projects was loose at best. To us, this was an appropriate expression of the diversity within which we work. This year, my Yale studio takes as its operational assumption the somewhat more completely expressed notion that architecture arises from the synthesis of circumstantial consid-
erations through the act of imagination. This act of imagination can take many forms. For Patricia and me, this imagination can be personal and idiosyncratic. However, it is more commonly an expression of cultural meaning and purpose, formal analogy, or an expression of an environmental response in construction and technology. The more inclusive the imagination is to the diversity of circumstances, the closer the imagination relates to the creation of architecture.
Addington, Tom Coward, Alishan Demirtas, the transportation network of the city. The city, ultimately juxtaposing the mosque with gradual integration of the mosque with the in a variety of projects, this method led to a created a new typology of social housing possible. The conflation of mosque and housing project, in turning students toward the "every-matically, some projects explored a social architect Oscar Niemeyer, in 1962. Program-Permanent International Fair, originally designs for a site that was part of Tripoli's relation to contemporary Islamic discourse. Students dissected each building's history and visiting cities along the proposed rail plan for the Punjab capital can be sustained in the context of contemporary economics, investigate the viability of utopian planning students investigated topography, building and Brennan Buck asked their students paths that engaged the ecological system. A discussion of infrastructure as a dynamic space in a new typology for transit engaged the jury, which included Thomas Beeby (’95), Aimee Brazil, Mark Gate (’01), Keith Krumwiede, Joel Sanders, Raffle Samach, Galia Solomontou, Erin Ruiz-Guel, and Richard Schuman.

John Patkau
John Patkau, Norman Foster Visiting Profes- sor and Timothy Newton (’07) asked students to design the Whitney Academy, a "school for inventors," as part of the Whitney Museum and Workshop, in Hamden, Connecticut. Located at the edge of a dam, the academy responds to the unaddressed educational needs of gifted 15- to 18-year-old students who cannot thrive in a conventional academic setting and learn best with hands-on projects.

Patkau asked the students to consider the site's architectural and industrial contextual, the current condition, and the cultural and programmatic objectives of the museum and workshop. Using a variety of media, students investigated topography, building envelope, and structural and environmental systems at a variety of scales. They also were inspired by significant works of architecture, which they visited during the travel week in Barcelona, including the work of Gaudi, Enric Miralles, and Enric Ruiz-Guei.

Some students designed incorpo-rated studio spaces, theaters, offices, and workshops in scattered buildings; others created "mixing chambers" with natural light and ventilation via light-wells or rolling roofs. One student constructed an elevated bar-shaped building across the river. Another employed cellular hexagons for individual programs, and others integrated the building with the landscape of riparian rings and public paths that engaged the ecological system. The diverse projects were presented to the review critics: George Baird, Tom Coward, Cynthia Davidson, Anthony Field-man, Kenneth Frampton, Vincent James, Joeb Moore (’91), Patricia Patkau (’78), Raymund Ryan (’87), and Adam Yarinsky.

Peggy Deamer
Peggy Deamer’s studio, "Chandigarh: A Contemporary Urban Utopia" (Spring 2011) challenged the students to investigate the viability of utopian planning in the context of contemporary economics, material exchange, and politics to determine which aspects of Le Corbusier’s utopian plan for the Punjab capital can be sustained today. Students chose the site, program, and scale of their intervention after visiting Chandigarh and learning about contemporary urban issues.

Most of the students chose to address ways to manage Chandigarh’s growth, given that the aim of its original planners to limit its size and preserve its boundaries a greenbelt has long since been violated. A few took on the issue of the virtually dysfunctional capital complex; some confronted the issue of "boundary" as a mere generic condition of both Chandigarh and utopianism. In all cases, the students had to deal with the tension between a systems approach to environmental and economic viability and a local, space-specific situation. They all also learned to establish the difference between a utopian approach and good planning, determining the virtue of thinking over the other in light of Chandigarh’s sustainable future.

Among the various ways in which the students developed their schemes— whether government-building expansions, technical parks, forests, sustainable integra-tion of building and land, elimination of cars—the feedback from the jury of George Baird, Kadambari Baxi, Deborah Gans, John Patkau, Vikram Prakash, Vyayamathi Rao, Moshe Safdie, Michael Sorin, and Staniusla von Moos indicated that either utopianism was a red herring in terms of a future Chandigarh or that Chandigarh was a red herring for thinking through a contempo-rary utopia.

Demetri Porphyrios
Demetri Porphyrios, Louis I. Kahn Visiting Professor, and George Knight, a Dhaka, a studio focused on designing a large-scale, high-end resort along a restored lakeshore on the outskirts of Jaipur, the first planned city in India and the cultural capital of Rajas-than. Students informed their designs for new programs by studying local building precedents, such as the palace, the fort, and the haveli—a traditional building type derived from the private mansion.

In the third week, the group went on an intensive study trip to Delhi and sites such as the Jaipur City Palace, Jai Mahal, Deep Water Palace, Amber Fort, the Taj Mahal, several step-wells, the mosque and palace quarters of the Mogul city Fatehpur Sikri, and their studio site in Jaipur. The group also visited several haveli in which schools, shops, homes, police stations, theaters, workshops, and mosques are now housed.

The midterm presentation of the precedent studies was a parallel of large posters that followed a common scale and graphic format to foster comparison. Students dissected each building’s history and speculated on the future adaptability of the traditional typologies according to the preliminary master plans. During the second half of the semester, each student selected a specific building or complex within their master plan to design using the program requirements of hotel, food services, entertain-ment amenities, and retail spaces.
The plan of Fatihbahar Siber, for example, inspired a project that incorporated a series of discrete, private residential courts. The ancient Indian typology of the step-well influenced the design of a project organized around a central atrium descending toward the lakeshore. The design of a multi-cellular courtyard hotel, situit amid a series of urban blocks and a waterfront promenade, was influenced by the naval residential typology.

Students presented the final projects with their precedent schemes and 3-D digital fabricated models of the historic buildings to a jury including Ben Botgar, Albert Chan, Paul Kitz, Barbara Littenberg, Steve Mouzon, Larry Ng (84), Alan Plattus, Jaquelin Robertson (61), Michelangelo Sabatino, and Jannie Vlekmper.

Tom Beeby
Tom Beeby ('65), Bishop visiting professor, asked the students to design a prototype infill house for inner-city neighborhoods in Chicago, where the number vacant lots has been rising due to foreclosures resulting from tax delinquencies.

Since schools are often the focus of urban neighborhoods, and all Chicago City employees are required to live within the city limits, Beeby proposed that the municipality underwrite the financing for housing near schools in the interest of rebuilding a desirable urban structure that would allow crime while stabilizing the tax base.

The students immediately attacked the architectural problem through the process of analysis and trial designs, adding a self-imposed sustainability requirement. A tour of Chicago’s neighborhoods gave the students a sense of the urban context. Many students put to the use the knowledge they gained in the Block Building Project as first-year students. Some designed elongated houses that filled the site with gardens and terraces, providing additional private outdoor space; others created minimalist concrete designs focused on use of space, use of light, and lack of excessive formalism. At each phase of the design, the students were asked to analyze and articulate their intentions. The specific program was for an urban commercial incubator including offices, a coffee shop, a conference center, and a clinic for medical tourism on one of two sites in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Two design teams worked on the Santos Dumont City Airport—for a synthesis between the city’s infrastructure and superstructure.

After a visit to Rio, students began to understand the site as belonging to the city and simultaneously being detached from it. Students worked in teams of two. One team conceived of the project as an outgrowth of a major Rio street system and looped the infrastructure through the airport to contain a conference center, located in a bay hopping over the water, to allow the visitor a view of the skyline in the distance. Another project team is a triumphal arch as a point of relief and as a monument in the urban landscape, extending the infrastructure across the city to the water’s edge at the cruise-ship terminal site. Another team designed a cascading terraced site over the water, under which boats would dock. Other students echoed the logic of the waterfront by exploring with negative spaces at the airport site.

The students were required to develop a process overview diagram showing the potential for new paradigms with a jury, composed of Margret Fosse, Arno Dinkelacker, Nima Dubae, Arndram Eli Kadi, Peter Eisenman, Terman Evans, Mark Gage (51), Steven Kall, Arlene Loume Harrison, Ralitzta Petitz, Ingeborg Rockier, and Stanislaus von Moos.

Composites, Surfaces, and Software: High-Performance Architecture

Composites, Surfaces, and Software: High Performance Architecture, edited by Greg Lynn and Mark Foster Gage (01), with Steven Nielson (99) and Nina Rappaport showcases the intersections between technology, aesthetics, and offers a multidisciplinary approach to cutting-edge, performative technology explored in a Yale studio with essays by Frank Gehry, Lies Anne Couture, Chris Bangle. The book was designed by Jeffery Rams and distributed by W. W. Norton in 2011. The July 2011 issue of Architectural Record features a review, and in June, the book was presented at the Center for Architecture's grand opening. The “Docus Book” series hosted by the New York Chapter of the AIA. On October 17, an event will be held to celebrate the release of Docus Book. Watch for details at www.architecture.yale.edu.

Just released: Fall 2011

Turbulence

Ali Rahm, William Sharps, Christopher Sharps, Louis L. Kahn Visiting Assistant Professor, Nina Rappaport and Leo Stevens (98), the book is designed by MGMT Design and distributed by W. W. Norton, 2011.

Turbulence is the third School of Architecture book featuring the work of Louis Kahn Visiting Assistant Professor, an endowed chairmanship to bring young innovators in architectural design to the Yale School of Architecture. This book includes the advanced studio research of Ali Rahm of Contemporary Architecture Practice in “Migrating Coastallines: Emergent Transformations for Dubai,” Christopher Sharps of SHoP Architects in “New Formations: Airport City,” and William Sharps of SHoP in “Beyond Experience: Spaceport Earth.” It features student projects, interviews with the architects about the work of their professional offices, and essays on the themes of their studios.

A release event will be held at 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, September 7, at the Trepsa Design Center at 62 Greene Street in New York City. Please RSVP to turbulenceRSVP@gmail.com.

Urban Intersections: São Paulo

Katherine Farley, Edward P. Bass Visiting Architecture Fellow and Eliza Higgins (10), the book is designed by MGMT Design and distributed by W. W. Norton, 2011.

The sixth in a series, Urban Intersections: Sao Paulo documents the collaboration of Katherine Farley, senior managing director of the international real estate developer Tishman-Speyer, with architect Deborah Berke, assisted by Noah Belkin, for the Yale School of Architecture. Farley and Berke guided a group of Yale students in spring 2010 to explore potential design and development ideas for a mixed-use community in São Paulo, Brazil. The feature book features ideas for this rapidly growing global city, with all its attendant vitality and contradictions. Featured projects consider a diverse range of approaches for combining residential, cultural, and commercial programs located within a 500-block area between the center and periphery of São Paulo. The work engages the development issues of scale, phasing, risk, sustainability, value, and density, along with the architectural issues of form, material clarity, articulation, use of color and texture, and the relationship of building to landscape. This book includes an interview with Farley and Berke, an essay on urban growth in the city, and discussions about the projects from the jurors.

BIM in Academia

Edited by Holly Deamer and Phillip G. Bernstein (83), designed by Klooper- Ramsay, and published and distributed by the Yale School of Architecture, this book will be available as the school’s first digital book. Check the schools Web site on October 5.

This book complements Building in the Future, published in 2010 and distributed by Princeton Architectural Press. It features a collection of essays by educators and practitioners on how Building Information Modeling (BIM) should be taught in architecture schools in the United States. The essays are divided between those that look at the larger pedagogical issues raised by teaching BIM (Is it an advanced technique layered on top of the traditional education?) or those that provide examples of BIM-centered courses, some within traditional M.ARch programs and others in cross-disciplinary programs that combine architecture with construction management and engineering and landscape. In all the essays, the excitement of exploring the implications of BIM while integrating its use into the curriculum is evident. In conventional education (and production) it is palpable. Check www.architecture.yale.edu for ordering information.

Recently released

Learning in Las Vegas

Charles Alwesh, Edward P. Bass Visiting Professor, and David M. Schwartz, Edited by Nina Rappaport, Brook Denison (07), and Nicholas Hanna (99), designed by MGMT Design, and distributed by W. W. Norton, 2010.

This book documents student projects for a pedestrian-friendly urban design of Las Vegas featuring a studio led by developer Charles Alwesh and Washington, D.C.-based architect David M. Schwartz (74). Using the framework of the original 1968 Yale Las Vegas studio, Alwesh and Schwartz asked students combat Las Vegas’s lack of street-oriented urbanism by using what they learned from other cities. Assisted by Brook Denison (07) and Danin Cook (89), students were asked to develop designs for areas extending from the intersection of Las Vegas Boulevard and Flamingo Road. The book includes essays on Las Vegas and original photographs by Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown; it narrates the process of research, analysis, and design in the world’s premiere themed playground.

Constructing the Ineffable: Contemporary Tented Architecture

Edited by Kati Cavatorta Brion, Charles Atwood, Edward P. Bass Visiting Professor, and David M. Schwartz, Designed by Think Studio, the book is published by the Yale School of Architecture and distributed by Yale University Press, 2010.

This book features a series of essays which analyze sacred buildings by their architects, such as Peter Eisenman, Moses Sadies, Stanley Tigerman, placing them in dialogue with essays by scholars from the fields of theology, philosophy, and history, such as Kenneth Frampton, Vincent Scully, Miroslav Volf, and Jamie Lala, to raise issues on the nature and role of sacred space today. Essays call attention to Modern architecture’s history of engagement and experimentation with religious space and address expressions of sacred space in landscapes, memorials, and museums. This book was reviewed in Architect in June 2011 and in Architects Newspaper in September 2011.
Michael Addington, Hines Professor of Architectural and Urban Design, is a member of the research team that received a gift of $25 million from Louis S. Raving and Peter Baldwin (Yale College ’78) to establish the Institute for the Preservation of Cultural Heritage on Yale’s West Campus. Addington will be using this portion of the grant to build and staff an architectural research lab to investigate discrete thermal micro-environments and solid-state lighting. Addington, the founding director of this research program, is also directing the design for a new building of the Connecticut Department of Transportation, planned to be completed over the next five years on the Capitol Green campus in Hartford. The building will house facilities for the Departments of Transportation and Environmental Services, and The Connecticut Transportation Research Center. The research lab will be housed in the new building, which is scheduled to be completed in the spring of 2014. Addington is also currently working on the design of a new research lab for the National Institute of Standards and Technology in Washington, D.C., which is scheduled to be completed in the fall of 2014.
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Dolores Hayden, professor, gave the keynote for a March conference at Connecti- cut College, “Smart Cities: Social and Environmental Implications,” and lectured at MIT on her book Building Suburbia. She has articles forthcoming in the Journal of Urban History and the Yale Review and an exhibi- tion of her work at the American Institute of Architects. Hayden organized a panel on “Poets’ Landscapes and Sense of Place” and delivered a presentation on “Scale, and Spatial Imagination,” at the June conference “Exploring Form and Narra- tive,” at West Chester University. She has also given readings from her newest collection of poems, trumpet, Dusk, and Spinner at several Connecticut public libraries and the Rutgers MFA conference.

Keith Krumwiede, associate professor, published the essay “[A] Typical Plan[,]” a reconsideration of redaction and reconstruction of Rem Koolhaas’s “Typical Plan” essay, in Perspectives 43: Taboo. It was also presented at the “Flip Your Field” conference in Chicago last October. He also presented the lecture “The Home of the Brave” at the October 2011 conference “Beyond the Horizon: The Future of Architecture,” held in Log 22: The Mount in 2011. Freedmandist, a (satirical) ideal- city project was published this summer in 3000 architects (Editor). He also completed the design for a renovation of an historic house in the Fall of 2011.

Edward Mitchell, adjunct assis- tant professor, will publish the essay “Pits and Piles,” in his book Urban Planning in the Appalachian Mountains, in the book After Urbanism (Syracuse University Press, 2012). Project work in office is also featured in Fast Forward Urbanism (Princeton Architectural Press, 2011). This fall, Mitchell is advisor and judge for Shift Boston’s competition “Why Stop,” focused on the South Coast rail lines, the subject of his studies at Yale. He will also be a peer reviewer and panelist for the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture conference on urbanism at MIT. Mitchell’s office is currently finishing residential projects in New Haven.

John Moore (’91), critic in architec- ture, with his firm, Jobs + Partners Architects, has been selected by Residential Architect as one of the top five residential architects in the United States. His firm’s project “Oil Rig” is included in “The Whole Book Architecture Now! Houses 2 (2011).” An article on the firm’s work in sustainable design was published in Banx Magazine (spring 2011). In addition, PL44, Spiral House, and Bridge House were featured in ArchDaily earlier this year. Moore travelled to Cyprus in the spring as a member of the academic advisory committee for the University of Nicosia.

Ben Pat, critic in architecture, gave a talk in the Yale Graduate School of Design. His New York City practice, PellOverton, has recently started construction on a house in the eastern shore of

Yale Urban Ecology and Design LAB

A spring party to celebrate the opening of the Urban Ecology and Design LAB (UEDLAB) for faculty from the Yale School of Architecture (YSOA) and the School of Forestry and Environmental Studies (F&ES) was planned.

The film “Robert A. M. Stern: Presence of the Past” will air on PBS on October 9. The film “Robert A. M. Stern: Presence of the Past” will air on PBS on October 9. This fall, he will give the keynote speaker for “FLOW,” a conference on sustainable design, landscape, and infrastructure projects. The lab will be conducted with YSOA and led by Alex Felson, who teaches in both schools. Coincidently, the UEDLAB also occupies a Paul Rudolph building, Galey Memorial Labora- tory (1950).

Yale Urban Ecology and Design LAB

A spring party to celebrate the opening of the Urban Ecology and Design Lab (UEDLAB) for faculty from the Yale School of Architecture (YSOA) and the School of Forestry and Environmental Studies (F&ES) was planned.

In creating Van Alen Books, we’ve been guided by two principles: first, the wish to ensure that in the future there will be possibilities for accidental, physical encounters with books. The experience of perusing an Amazon preview or an online aggregator cannot substitute for the mid-sized analog experience of browsing around a bookstore. Van Alen Books does not sell books with convenience in mind but offers readers something the internet cannot do: the promise of discovering books by listening to architects or by sharing, say, your latest zine, a quirky object, or a handmade notebook for the next passersby. As a space in which architecture books are read, sold, discovered, and discussed, Van Alen Books is ultimately a project in public architecture. A city without bookstores—and especially without public spaces for discovery and encounter—is an impoverished city. If this is an obsolete idea, the question is whether the bookstore is dead, long live the bookstore.

In Praise of the Obsolete

We’ve seen it happen again and again: economies change and technologies evolve; things that seemed scientific yesterday be- come the new norm. The search, almost a fetish, for the new and improved seems to make everything obsolete. Rarely do we stop and wonder about the future, the no-longer-remote, immediately, unconsciously to the design discipline.

Van Alen Books is an experiment that consciously—and perhaps unconsci- ously—heads in the wrong direction. At the same time, a number of other bookstores such as Kind, Nook, and iPad are racing one another to become the next gizmo of choice, online bookstores are poised to take over the market book, and physical bookstores before we become a thing of the past. We at The Van Alen Institute decided to open an architecture bookstore—a very real one, not a digital one. The bookstore, everyone tells us, is obsolete, new technologies have made it so. We believe that reports of the bookstore’s death are greatly exaggerated. We wager that bookstores, “traditional” physical spaces in the city, will remain, and that Van Alen Institute’s headquarters at 30 West 22nd Street in Manhattan, the bookstore’s death are greatly exaggerated. As an experimental installation evolved the steps of Times Square’s TKTBS, an iconic project originated through Van Alen Institute’s 1999 design competition.
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Alumni News features reports on recent projects by graduates of the school. If you are an alumnus, please send your current news to: ConSTRUCTS, 180 York Street, New Haven, Connecticut 06511 or to construct@yale.edu.

1960s
David Collins (67) was featured in “The Best Architecture in 2011,” in the Guardian (January 3, 2011), for his design for One World Trade Center, whose topping-off ceremony is planned for fall 2011.

Craig Hodgetts (67) and his Los Angeles-based firm, Hodgetts + Fung, helped honor Gardener Elementary School’s one hundredth anniversary by working with students to build a replica of the Holly-wood Bowl. The firm, which completed the renovation of the famed outdoor concert venue in 2003, built the miniaturized version out of PVC pipe and polystyrene. The structure was completed on the school’s playground and will serve as a museum to display historic photographs during the school’s anniversary celebration.

1970s
Stephen Glassman (75) was appointed president and CEO of the Community Design Center of Pittsburgh (CDCP) in May 2011. The appointment comes after many years spent in both private practice and the non-profit sector. For the past twenty-five years, Glassman has headed Art+Architectural Designers, a firm based in Pennsylvania and Maryland, while also serving as chairman of the Pennsylvania Human Rights Commis-sion. At CDCP, he will develop designs and planning strategies to aid the economic and environmental growth of communities.

David Waggonner (70) was highlighted in the June 2011 edition of Architectural Record for “The Dutch Dialogues,” a series of conversations he initiated about using natural flood-mitigation systems rather than artificial barriers in New Orleans. Waggonner’s project recently received 2 million dollars in funding from the Louisiana Office of Community Development’s Disaster Relief Recovery Unit and the U.S. Depart-ment of Housing and Urban Development.

Audrey Matlock (79) will be a speaker in New York at Architectural Record’s November 2011 “Innovation” conference, which will focus on the theme “Crossing Borders/Disciplines.” Along with pianist Thom Mayne, of Morphosis, she will discuss how American architects can work in foreign countries.

1980s
Charles Linville (83), principal of the San Francisco-based firm STUDIOX Architecture, won a 2010 AAA New York State Award for Grey Group, a marketing agency based in New York City. The project challenged the firm to develop a new configuration for an office that called for a 90:10 ratio of open to closed space. It has also been highlighted for its attention to acoustical concerns in a large, open, loft-like space.

1990s
Louis Harpman (93), a clinical associate professor at New York University’s Gallatin school, and principal of Specht Harpman Architects, organized a symposium at NYU this spring, titled “Global Design: Elsewhere Envision,” which focused on reconciling global and local environmental and infrastructural concerns. Speakers included Stanford Kwinter, Bjare Ingels, and Daniel Barber (MED ’05).

Robert Young (94) is the design director of Perkins + Will’s Washington, D.C. office and is working on the master plan for the re-use of the Walter Reed campus in the district, as well as critical-care hospitals, and a small gallery for the Newseum, which was one of his last projects before leaving Polshek Partnership (now Ennead Archi-tects). His last project with Polshek Partner-ship, the National Museum of American History, opened in Philadelphia in November 2010.

Alex Barrett (97) and his firm, Barrett Coates and Development, completed and sold all units at 25 Carroll Street, a 17-loft residential project, which he designed and developed in Brooklyn, New York. The build-ing is the former manufacturing facility of the Brooklyn Macaroni Company, and the firm incorporated the original raw masonry and timber in the design.

Edgar Kahan (99) appeared in the June 2011 edition of RealMades magazine, which documented the process of renovating his home in Portland, Oregon.

2000s
Frederick TH. Cooke (00) has a New Jersey-based practice with his father Caswell Cooke (67) that is working on The Design for an organic supermarket, a live-work artist residence in Jersey City, a school for the developmentally disabled in Ghana, a community theater, and a streetscape improvement project in Newark. Frederick has been teaching studios for the past five years at New Jersey Institute of Technology’s College of Architecture.

Shily Glit Robbins (00) and her husband, David S. Robbins (Yale College ’89, MArch ’94) from Manhattan located on the outskirts of the city. Shily taught at the National University of Singapore (NUS) Department of Architecture and owned SfG Courses, an architecture edu-cation education company for students in both local and international schools. She recently returned to israel, where she teaches at the Shenkar College of Engineering and Design and is designing residential interiors and an addition to a multi-family residential building in Sliq oasis. David was an associate principal for Moshe Safdie Architects & Planners, leading the design and construction of the ArtScience Museum, Crystal Pavilions, and Marina Promenade at the recently completed Marina Bay Sands.

Traville Davies (Yale College ’94, MArch ’93) recently completed his first office building, Traville Davies + Toews, a design partnership based in Dumbo, Brooklyn. They have been working with the PARC Foundation/David Deutsch on a Bathhouse Pavilion at the Cupsuptic Campground, in Oquossoc, Maine; “TENTSTOP: An Urban Camping Proposal,” exhibited at the New Museum Festival of Ideas for the New City in May; and the design of a Linear Park, in Hudson, New York. Davies is also a critic in architecture at Yale School of Architecture.

Elizabeth Morgan (01) won the 2010 Honor Award of Western Massachusetts AIA for a modern vernacular residential project designed in collaboration with her Kuhn Riddle Architects colleague Ann Marshall. Morgan is an adjunct faculty member at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, where she designed a 15,000-square-foot building for the Minuteman Marching Band. to be completed in spring 2012.

Jessica Vaner (08), who works at Michael Maltzan Architecture, co-edited No More Play: Conversations on Urban Specula-tion in Los Angeles and Beyond, by Michael Maltzan, Hamij Ganz, 2011 (see page 18).

2010s

Bradley Bays (11) started Zoko, a social networking program that forms “dinner co-ops” wherein people within various groups take turns hosting a meal. Zoko was recently selected by Betaspring, a start-up accelerator, as one of ten projects the company will invest in.

Dignit Fitrega
The August 2011 issue of Architectural Digest features articles on the last house designed by Charles Gwathmey (62) before his death in 2009, as well as the Bay House designed by Morgan Hagee (92), Marc Turkel (92), and Shawn Watts (92) of Leroy Street Studios; and a pool house designed by Gil Shater III (58).

New York Dozen: Gen-X Architects

A June 2011 report by the Center for an Urban Future (Gilles, David “Growth by Design”), on the impact of architecture and design on New York City’s economy asserts that the city “has the largest collec-tion of architecture firms of any city in the U.S.,” with over eight percent of the nation’s architects and more than 1,300 architecture firms: moreover, the number of designers working in the city has almost doubled in the past decade. This density and diversity of talent makes singling out particular archi-tects a difficult task, but Michael J. Crobbie, chair of the Department of Architecture at the University of Hartford, has taken it upon himself to highlight a dozen young offices that are emblematic of their generation in the early days of the twenty-first century.

Inspired by the popular 1972 book Five Architects: Eisenman, Graves, Gwathmey, Hadid, Mek—nominated the “New York Five” by then New York Times archi-tect critic Paul Goldberger—Crovbie’s “New York Dozen” includes Andrei Kikloki, Architect, Architecture in Formation, Arts Cooperative Society, Studios; DeWaal Beirnmen, Leroy Studio Architecture, LEVENBETTS, MO, R+ARCHITECTS, StudiOCA, Work Architecture Company (WORKac), and WXY Architecture. Many of these firms have Yale connections as either graduates or of teachers at the school. Crobbie was also inspired, in a different way, by another former Times critic, Nicolas Ouroossoff, who asserted—in an article on August 23, 2009, marking Charles Gwath-mey’s death—that in the decades since the “New York Five,” the country’s creative energy shifted to Los Angeles, nurturing a younger generation of architects without equal in New York City. (The next day, Andrew Berneberg, one of the “New York Dozen,” penned an open letter to Ouroossoff, in the Design Observer, challenging the critic’s assertion.) This collection of fifty projects by twelve firms clearly shows that some of the best architecture of this generation is being created in New York City, be it installations, interiors, houses, apartment buildings, or ambitious unbuilt projects of various types. Like any list, Crobbie’s is definitely open to debate, but this semi-objective methods referencing MoMA PS1’s Young Architects Program and AAVA’s Dulcis journal, in particular) have yielded a diverse yet representative crop of architects who embrace collaboration, social and environmental responsibility, and experimentation.
Doug Garofalo

August 1, 1958–July 31, 2011

Chicago’s cutting-edge architect Doug Garofalo died peacefully at his home the day before his 53rd birthday.

A fellow of the American Institute of Archi-
tects, he received the AIA Chicago Young Architect Award in 1996. He received his bachelor’s of architecture degree from the University of Notre Dame in 1981 and acquired his master’s degree from Yale University in 1987. Doug was a tenured professor at the University of Illinois at Chicago, serving as acting director from 2001–03, and he also assisted in the co-founding of ARCHWORKS, an alterna-
tive design school focused on social cause. Shortly after receiving the Young Architect Award, he was published in Metropolis for an innovative project in the Chicago suburbs. I had the pleasure of working with Doug’s approach and was quoted saying, “He is at once practical and theoretically charged, and these traits feed each other. Doug doesn’t compromise, but he’s able to use the crappy materials young architects get stuck with and make them look as if they were bearing fruit from the rich theoretical materials of his mind. Doug doesn’t come from a lot of money or pretension—he listens, he’s not dogmatic, he’s not attitude-laden . . . with a little luck, in ten years, he’ll tell us the architecture will contend with.”

Doug was a lightning rod for young emerging talent. Among his built projects are the award-winning Korean Presbyterian Church in New York, his collaboration with Greg Lynn and Michael McInruth, a project that gained international notoriety as the first building truly conceived and executed with digital media and because it represents an alternative solution to adaptive reuse; the Hyde Park Corner project, and numerous residential projects. His unbuilt designs include a gateway in Visionary Chicago, Architecture, published in 2006; housing for Chicago’s 2016 Olympic bid; and an urban design for Roscoe Village, in collaboration with Xavier Vendrell, in a forthcoming book titled Designs on the Edge: Chicago Architects Reimagine Neigh-
borhoods sponsored by the Chicago Architec-
ture Foundation.

Doug’s professional honors include the “Emerging Voices” program at the American Institute of Architects, New York in 2001; a one-person exhibition at the Art Institute of Chicago in 2008; a Chicago AIA Distinguished Building Award and Driehaus Foundation Award for Architectural Excel-

lence in Community Design for his Hyde Park Arts Center in 2007; being awarded a United States Artists Fellowship in 2008 and named a University Scholar for 2009–12 by Univer-
sity of Chicago.

Bodil Somol, director of the School of Architecture at the UIC, is quoted, saying, “In addition to his professional accomplish-
ments and teaching excellence, Garofalo is tireless in his service to the university and larger architectural community . . . along with his increasing national and international acclaim, [Garofalo] continues to be one of the most generous and dedicated members of the university and the architectural community.”

Zurich Exposito, executive director of the Chicago Chapter of the AIA, added that, “Doug was a shooting star and always ahead of most. We are only just now starting to understand everything he was moving forward in design. His recent absence from the practice was palpable. His death is a huge loss for our entire field.”

He is survived by his wife, the artist Chris Garofalo; his parents, Armando and Carol Garofalo; his sister, Valerie Garofalo; his siblings, Karen Hassett, of Lancaster, Pennsylvania and Janice Baidya, of Clifton Park; his nieces and nephews; his twin, Marc Garofalo, and, Teddy Baldyga.

—Stanley Tigerman, FAIA, 80, M. Arch ’61

Tigerman is a principal of Chicago-based Tigerman McCurry Architects.

Doug Garofalo: A Tribute

For those who knew him, his long list of accomplishments and contributions to many outstanding institutions—Yale, the University of Illinois Chicago, Architypes—apart defines him as a significant figure in the archi-
tectural community. His life and career as a designer ended much too early, cheating us out of what would likely have continued to be a unique and often brilliant voice, just begin-
ing the transition from quirky and joyous private design commissions to larger-scaled public work.

For Doug’s peers, he was a guiding light, always a step ahead in wrestling with the physical travails and triumphs of establishing a practice, finding unexpected discoveries and new challenges in built work. For all of us, especially for many younger architects who came under his mentorship, he was generous with advice, enthusiastic, and full of humility. As Ben Nicholson once said to me, “I want to work for Doug so that I can learn how to be a real architect.” He paved his way to success with no outside influence of money or power, but rather by retaining his individual vision, generously bringing clients, bars, and his fellow Chicagoleans along for the parade. With Doug there was only his special talent, a great belief in the power of architecture, a true little corner of the endless Midwest-

For his friends, and there are many, the loss is even more profound. Doug and Chris—his immensely talented and heroic wife and fellow artist—made Chicago a special little corner of the endless Midwest-

For Doug’s peers, he was a guiding light, always a step ahead in wrestling with the physical travails and triumphs of establishing a practice, finding unexpected discoveries and new challenges in built work.
Lectures

Unless otherwise noted, lectures begin at 6:30 p.m. in Hastings Hall (basement floor) of Paul Rudolph Hall, 180 York Street. Doors open to the general public at 6:15 p.m.

25 August

Stanley Tigerman

"Displacement"

29 August

Agents of Change, (Geoffrey Shearcroft, Daisy Froud, Tom Coward, Vincent Lacovara), Louis I. Kahn Visiting Assistant Professors

1 September

Emmanuel Petit, Associate Professor, Yale School of Architecture

"Scaffolds of Heaven: On Tigerman"

8 September

Grafton Architects: Yvonne Farrell and Shelley McNamara, Louis I. Kahn Visiting Professors

"Architecture as the New Geography"

20 October

Joel Kotkin, Brendan Gill Lecture

"The American Landscape in 2050"

27 October

Film Screening, "The Last Dymaxion"

3 November

OPEN HOUSE

David Chipperfield, Lord Norman Foster Visiting Professor in Architecture

"David Chipperfield Architects: Recent Work"

4–5 November

Symposium: "Catastrophe and Its Consequences: The Campaign for Safe Building" This symposium is sponsored by the Shelley and Donald Rubin Foundation.

10 November

Keith Krumwiede, Assistant Professor and Assistant Dean, Yale School of Architecture

"Freedomland"

17 November

Kenneth Frampton, Brendan Gill Lecture

"Gwathmey Siegel: Form and Counterform"

Exhibitions

Exhibition hours: Monday–Friday, 9:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m. Saturdays, 10:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m. The Architecture Gallery is located on the second floor of Paul Rudolph Hall, 180 York Street, New Haven.

Ceci n'est pas une rêverie: The Architecture of Stanley Tigerman

August 25–November 4, 2011

Gwathmey Siegel: Inspiration and Transformation


Ceci n'est pas une rêverie: The Architecture of Stanley Tigerman is supported by the Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in Fine Arts, Elise Jaffe + Jeffrey Brown and the School’s generous donors, including the Paul Rudolph Publication Fund, the Robert A.M. Stern Fund, and the Rutherford Trowbridge Memorial Publication Fund.