Annabel Wharton, William B. Hamilton Professor of Art History at Duke University, is the fall 2014 Vincent Scully Visiting Professor of Architecture at Yale, where she will be teaching two seminars. She will be giving the lecture “Manipulating Models” on October 30.

Nina Radapop I am fascinated with your trajectory of interests: You were the paradigmatic architectural historian focused on the Byzantine era with a very rigorous approach, then moved to working with the Hilton hotels in a newly globalized world, and now you are focusing on architecture in Jerusalem and the Middle East as well as the relationship to architecture! Can you describe your path?

Annabel Wharton I think, for most academics, as authors, everything one writes is autobiographical. I started studying the Middle East largely because my parents lived there while I was growing up; I felt familiar with the people and comfortable in the milieu. I even did some hitchhiking there in my youth. I’ve also been interested in space from the time I played with my father’s Anchor stone building blocks as a child. Perhaps that’s what made me an architect if I had been better at mathematics. When I was a student, I traveled extensively, sketching buildings and other groups into my sketchbook as I went, and I did a bit of archaeology. I occupied it. Good training. I attend still to the historical materiality of the object and the way that love transforms the way I see it. I’m happiest when I’m in situ. But now I carry one small digital camera and wait until buildings are being used by people before photographing them.

NR Why did the Modernist architecture of the Hilton hotels grab your interest in the first place?

AW While my father was living in Iran, I often traveled to see him some place between Pittsburgh, where I was to attend school, and Tehran. We would meet in Athens, Istanbul, or London, almost always staying at a Hilton. I knew nothing about hotels; I was only vaguely familiar with them. I had casually started revisiting Hiltons. Being a poor student, I couldn’t afford to stay in them, but I was intrigued by the design, which at that time was owned by Ladbroke’s, a betting firm in London. My letter just happened to get to the right person, an older vice president who could write an interesting article, so I wrote to him about my interest. I was actually embarrassed by my interest when I’m now. I have a bit of a complex about my interest. I gathered enough material that I thought I could write an interesting article, so I wrote to the general manager, which at that time was owned by Ladbroke’s, a betting firm in London. My letter just happened to get to the right person, an older vice president who had worked for Conrad Hilton. He was very interested in the project and made it possible for me to spend time in the Hilton archives as well as in the first generation of international hotels—Tokyo, Cairo, Athens, London, Berlin, Tel Aviv, Jerusalem—and the article turned into a book. For a medievalist, writing a book that more than eight people actually read is very addictive.

NR These shifts in your focus toward the hotel industry and the Middle East are making your recent research more inclusive, and you incorporated issues of economics, materialism, and cultural studies in the study of the hotel. How do you think that is developing into rigorous academic disciplines.

AW I was very fortunate to teach at Duke where the wisdom of those disciplines was representative of the historical, cultural theory and interdisciplinary. I was reading Stanley Fish and Fred Jameson beginning in the early 1980s. It’s interesting: I found it to be become rather more sophisticated theoretically than I was at one time. I think of theory as being very similar to an archive. When I go to an archive, I never find what I am looking for, but I inevitably discover something quite different that makes me rethink my project. It’s the same thing with theory. You might try to use a theory to support an idea you have, but if you take theory seriously, it, too, offers obstacles to your preconceptions. Both theory and archives inveigle me to reconsider my assumptions.

NR In your book Selling Jerusalem, you detail the effects of commodification from late antiquity to the present. Has your experience of Marxist thinking, in terms of its impact on your analysis of art and the economy, shifted from the material to the immaterial?

AW My interest in economics came with the Hilton book. To understand the discussion of aesthetics, I had to understand the company’s contracts. Those contracts reveal the invention of an elite functionalism that was profitable. That’s when I became involved in projects with Duke’s economic historians. I’ve always been a materialist, so that fits perfectly into my mental framework.

NR How does architecture as a commoditv or as a certain kind of cultural diplomacy get treated in your work? And what is your perspective on the place of commodiy in cultural terms?

AW I use the term commodification in a narrow sense as defined in the Oxford Dictionary of Economics: as an utterly fungible thing—a like of soup or barrel of oil—that has had its history erased in the process of its production. Selling Jerusalem is organized around the idea of commodification now. And that difference is embodied in the objects themselves. Sacred things are embodied agents, and I don’t mean metaphorically. Every building, like every commodity, has been drained of their instrumentality by being reduced to fungible things—like a can of soup or barrel of oil—like a can of soup or barrel of oil—like a can of soup or barrel of oil—like a can of soup or barrel of oil—like a can of soup or barrel of oil.

NR How is this discussion furthered in your forthcoming book, Architectural Agents: The Delusional, Addictive Lives of Buildings?

AW The new book works to put life back into objects—namely, buildings—that have been drained of their instrumentality by modernity. The basic argument is that buildings are embodied agents, and I don’t mean that metaphorically. Every building, like every human, is unique. Buildings, in contrast to say, books, paperweights or chairs, resist commodification. You can talk about spaces that seem to act like commodities, being bought and sold as though they were identical, like floors in a speculative office tower or houses in Levittown, but every one of those spaces has a different orientation, a different light, a different history, a different effect. And I found it a little easier to make an argument about buildings as actors by investigating ones that behave badly.

NR But why focus on bad buildings when most in the field are trying to find a way to make them more habitable?

AW I think most people expect buildings to last. You try to find ways to last. At structures that engage in murder, prevarication, and seduction might have a greater effect on how seriously people take architecture. Buildings that are pleasant don’t make a conscious impact; buildings that are obnoxious get our attention. I found it impossible to seriously engage bad spatial behaviors without coming to terms with the digital sphere in order to learn a whole new world of things. Noise? I’m a pretty good gamer. I play Assassin’s Creed, hang out in Second Life, and reconstruct historical sites with Google Sketchup. The learning curve was very steep, but very fun.

NR Are you discussing these buildings in terms of their representation in the virtual realm or in other types of representation, as well? In pairing up different building types for the book, how do you deal with the digital type?

AW Architectural Agents is organized by pathologies: death, disease, and addiction. It is in the last of these sections that I treat Las Vegas and the digital worlds of slot machines, video gaming, and immersive worlds as spaces offering those cures that I encounter in the last section. NR What are you teaching in your Yale seminars this semester, and what are you working on next?

AW One seminar will focus on models, the subject of my new project. Models are wonderfully ambivalent. When you say something is a model, do you mean that it is an active, dominant thing that dictates the form of its copies or that it is the passive diminution of an archetype? The model’s ambivalence between acting dominantly or passively is my subject of investigation. We’ll consider different models—diagnostic (architectural and scientific), normative (super models), phenomenological (toy), manipulative (ideological), illusionary (film and digital)—all models that are meant to affect the way people act or think. Models contribute to identity formation, illusion, and analysis. I am interested in thinking about what each one of many different varieties of models can teach us about the complex functions of the architectural model.

NR Is there an interesting example of a model that has a function other than representing a building that will be constructed in the future that you have discovered in these terms?

AW The British Museum has four very beautiful early modern models of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem. They are made of olive wood, mother-of-pearl, and camel bone, and I used them to think of them as decorative super-souvenirs. The curator was kind enough to let me play with them. They are like puzzle boxes: tops come off, the walls slide out, doors open. Research suggests that they were not souvenirs but were produced by Christian Palestinian craftsmen in Bethlehem at a time when pilgrimage was almost erased by the Reformation and counter-Reformation. The Franciscans of the Holy Land Custody used them as cultural capital, gifts for the elite and powerful to remind them of the existence of Jerusalem and to promote a new crusade. These models not only powerfully represent politics, but also their “purpose” is to create a sense of discovery encountered in the actual church. The Holy Sepulcher is a mess—a destroyed—and often rebuilt. It is a labyrinth occupied by seven traditional Christianities that are hostile to one another. Handling these models very much affects how I think about them. These sixteenth-century structures provide an example of the kind of historical specificity I want to introduce into an otherwise rather theoretical study of models. In the seminar, students will consider a particular model of their choice, one that they can actually manipulate as well as analyze within a broad theoretical framework to better understand how a model models its observer.

NR That way, you can integrate your interest in the new digital models and spaces from your current book along with game software modeling the students can try.

AW The game Assassin’s Creed: Revelations has a reconstruction of the Hagia Sophia that offers the best understanding of the structure apart from being in the building. As a player, I can become a tourist, getting a sense of the space and studying the mosaics. I’m hoping to get someone from Ubisoft to talk to the seminar about the digital production of such historical models.

NR Will your other class be related to your work on Jerusalem?

AW The other seminar is an investigation of Jerusalem, working toward a theory of the relationship between topography and power: heights with their connection to religion and state dominance; warrens that are underprivileged and overpopulated; peripheries, the site of colonization; and breaks, the dangerous rifts between neighborhoods. I am addicted to Jerusalem, and I mean that quite literally. I am repeatedly drawn back to the city by my human friends and architectural intimates there, but Jerusalem is not good for me. I always come back from the Holy Land deeply dejected by its unholy violence.

I look forward to my seminar at Yale. Because Duke doesn’t have a school of architecture, I haven’t had the opportunity to teach architecture students. I anticipate learning a great deal from them.


Prefabricating parts in a factory reduces and our impacts on the wetland there.

work in a beloved and ecologically sensitive place. We understand and plan the process. The downside of this early approach was in the enormous pressures of time and cost it intro-

duced. At that time, we conceived of a building and then actually produce it, design conceptualization can become something of a casualty in the process. We’re still learning how to do both.

Lisa Gray I think there’s important feedback between the clients and the architects, finding the most appropriate and compelling set of solutions. When a project comes to our studio, it’s often to help us imagine how that problem could be solved in wood, because we have special experi-

ence with it and we feel it’s a great material for environmental reasons. But we love the texture and richness of the material—how it per-

mits us to do the things that are important to us in our practice as well as our buildings. Each project has its own particular set of constraints, so wood may not always be the right choice.

NR How has your design-build shop, JIG, become a separate firm from your architecture firm,GRAY Organschi, and how do the two practices relate?

AO Although the work of Gray Organs-

chi Architecture and JIG is still deeply intertwined, insurance requirements for a design-build firm that was built off of our work were giving our insurance company fits and finally reconciled to partition the business, a move that was met with mixed responses. We gave JIG a contract with the City of New York through the DDC Design Excellence Program. And it turned out to have made a lot of sense because now JIG is doing its own fabrication projects and construction management. Design is where I direct JIG, is currently supervising a private-house project, and JIG is performing the construction management for the Steep Rock Bridge. Everybody in the office loves being involved in some aspect of fabrication or construction. So, there is a business division but not a conceptual or spiritual one. In the future, we might decide to have JIG work with other architects, as well.

LG We’re increasingly interested in buildings that we don’t have to own. All archi-

tects can actually have more agency by acting as orchestrators of a large group of players. Public buildings are obviously going to public bid and will be built by other entities. For instance, we’ve proposed using glu-lam construction for the Staten Island Bridge. Everybody in the office loves being involved in some aspect of fabrication or construction. So, there is a business division but not a conceptual or spiritual one. In the future, we might decide to have JIG work with other architects, as well.

LG We’re increasingly interested in buildings that we don’t have to own. All archi-

tects can actually have more agency by acting as orchestrators of a large group of players. Public buildings are obviously going to public bid and will be built by other entities. For instance, we’ve proposed using glu-lam construction for the Staten Island Bridge. Everybody in the office loves being involved in some aspect of fabrication or construction. So, there is a business division but not a conceptual or spiritual one. In the future, we might decide to have JIG work with other architects, as well.

AO How has your early experience with structural mass timber—heavy engineered wood systems—rather than more conventional light wood framing has led us away from a flat approach to a more industrial one. And that has shifted our thinking to the impacts of building at a more global scale. The Common Ground High School is a teaching school, often inner-city kids through an ecological curriculum that understands the relationship between local actions and global effects. The client is incredibly sophisticated and has embraced the exploration of a new sustainable material culture as well as the long-term performance of their own building.

LG It is a privilege to work with mission-

based clients; this particularly well-informed and very thoughtful group selected us because they felt we would help them realize a building that would be good for their commu-

nity. A high-performance building like this one costs more, and it’s extraordinarily that a public-funded school could become a model in a new environmental building culture.

AO That’s an important point: in our more public projects—whether the Little League grandstand, the new high school, or the Jesuit home and community-center—we’ve been fortunate to have clients who are trying to convey a message to a larger community about what it is that they want to be. It makes the design process more than a pragmatic exercise in program-

matic control with formal or cost savings. These groups came to us with clear constraints and demands, but they asked us to make something beautiful that tells the story of their community or institution. Their mission, and the particular sites they chose to build in, lead to a new conceptual basis of our work.

NR Alan, how has your research into the properties of high-performance timber been incorporated into the new school building?

AO The project brief challenged us to make a building that articulated environ-

mental principles to the students who would use it. Early on we have been forced to contend with the provenance and proper-

ties of materials—where they come from, how do you get them here, what does a material do when you change its shape or apply it in a particular way. Slowly, we shifted those questions from the more immediate issues of craftsmanship to larger issues of environmental impacts and resource alloca-

tion. The school was a chance to use new material systems with the lowest possible embodied energy and CO2 emissions while still achieving the highest feasible standards for air quality, thermal performance, and day-lighting. The story of a panel of black spruce cross-laminated timber is pretty straightforward, easily traced, with very visible and therefore comprehensible environmental impacts. The process of assembly is obvious; the expertise of the people in the spaces of the finished building is unmedi-

ated. The students can look out a window and see a tree. They can make the connec-

tion. It’s pretty elemental.

AO In our first ten years working on houses, we learned from construction managing and design-building that we needed to design the whole building-delivery process, not just the building form and materials. And I’m very interested in all of these processes. What do you set in motion when you make a set of drawings—what are you really asking people to do? How conscious are you about the requirements you are proposing? I think the architectural profession has to take ownership of the huge amount of consumption we’re demanding.

AO Lisa uses the term orchestration, and that characterizes the improvisational side to our work. We are not manufacturers of building products. But we like to understand the processes so we can manipulate them where possible. Not everything can be a one-off—although, as designers, we do like to try to reinvent the wheel from time to time.

NR How has your education at Yale—or your teaching of the Jim Vlock Build-

ing Project influenced you? What drew you and your teaching of the Jim Vlock Build-

ing Project influenced you? What drew you and your teaching of the Jim Vlock Build-

AO At first, New Haven was a way station between larger cities until we realized that it was a great place to work. We discovered the great opportunities it afforded a young practice, and teaching here followed from that. We started the school at the school—one of them, Lisa, is now my partner—and some really important teachers. We got the opportunity to teach in New Haven, and how has the place shifted, growing urban demographic and the global environmental imperative of reducing CO2 emissions in the building sector.

LG The students will design a live-work dis/rect on a site along the Mill River in New Haven, a timber innovation zone centered in a once robust but still functioning manufactur-

ing sector while responding to America’s growing urban demographic and the global environmental imperative of reducing CO2 emissions in the building sector.

3.
Bruno Latour

“What is there to say that they don’t know?”

The Whitney Center for the Humanities at Yale invited Bruno Latour to deliver the Tanner Lectures this spring.

When Bruno Latour announced to the U.S. customs official that he was entering the country to give the 2014 Tanner Lectures at Yale, the official replied, “What is there to say that they don’t know?” When Latour recounted this anecdote, at his lecture, the Yale audience laughed. They had cued up for the opening anecdote of any lecture, this time amplified by what appeared to be a deviation from a world-renowned figure. And they were also pretty sure that they had understood the lecture so far.

Yet was part of the joke lost on this audience? Just before the anecdote, Latour offered a caution about the format of his talk by reading a quote from A. N. Whitehead: “The critical school confines itself to verbal analysis within the limits of a dictionary. The speculative school appeals to direct insight and endeavors to indicate its meaning by further appeals to situations which promote such specific insight.”

There is a chance that Latour left many behind at this initial fork in the road between understanding what he characterized as “safe” and “adventurous” thought. The U.S. customs officer could be excused for thinking that was certain of what it knows—a reservoir to which it is myopic to borrow from the “marginal” that we commonly call a “computer.” In an example Latour has used previously, it was the customs official that he was entering the country to give the 2014 Tanner Lectures this spring. Latour expressed some discomfort with the title of the series, “The Tanner Lectures on Human Values.” Putting the podium as if it modeled something like the sturdy pile of foundational knowledge that the lectures hoped to accumulate, he questioned his willingness to contribute to a conversation that stabilized “human values.”

In the second lecture, the pressing collisions of scientific observations and human “values” with regard to climate change were more intensely present as both content and the fuel to ignite political action and scientific inquiry. One of the best questions after the lecture, from architecture PhD candidate Kyle Odegaid, compared two of Latour’s seemingly contradictory admonitions. While Latour had advocated working with evidence slowly and painstakingly, he had also repeated the Homeland Security dictum (in a country of climate change deniers), “If you see something, say something.”

Thus, the ambition to discover can foster the opposite of discovery by obscuring the very information it hopes to reveal. “You have to show what it does,” Latour argued, “in order to know that it is useful.” He moved through evidence while opening doors on an expanded territory of investigation. Latour concluded, “To be a subject encountering an object is no longer a viable position. At least, it is no longer the only one that allows us to decide where in the world we stand.”

While claiming to know very little about architecture, Latour graciously agreed to join some architecture students and faculty for a discussion the following day. He is widely read in schools of architecture, and architects made up a significant portion of the audience for both Tanner lectures. Latour is read in part because architecture and urbanism contribute to the social and technical space about which he and his colleagues have productively speculated. His work is also nourished by long-standing speculations about the powers and additional valences of objects. Latour theorizes and implements expanded powers of form-making—aesthetic and political field of manipulation surrounding this object form. When no object can be seen without its actions, spatial practitioners can shape its actions—its active form as well as its object form—with some sense of the consequences of those actions. For some in the architectural community, this expanded power is unfamiliar. Rather than enhancing the powers of the object, actions and relations are regarded as a challenge to the exclusive primacy of the object. By placing Latour’s theories in a false opposition to metaphorical questions—a duel as category mistake—some have used Graham Harmon and “object-oriented philosophy” to dissect or confirm his theories as not presenting a challenge to this more narrow view of form. Harmon—who has attached himself to Latour as an interlocutor and constructs philosophy in a style that embraces his subject under an insufficiency appears—argues that objects may retain some qualities of objecthood beyond their network of associations. Offering more of a puff of smoke than a duel, these arguments do not fundamentally disrupt the extra capacities that Latour’s theories hope to make available. While neither theory nor construct disrupts the other, the disposition to eliminate rather than expand powers may nevertheless be comforting within the discipline of architecture.

But then, “What is there to say that they don’t know?”

—Keller Easterling

Easterling is a professor at Yale and author of Extrastatecraft: the Power of Infrastructure Space forthcoming this fall from Verso Books.
emerging from the womb, as it were, kicking in invention. Yet it also shows computation broad section of work is profound; it is full history launched. reinvented and from which it’s continuous first discovery, it is yet more significant for fascinations of certain Modernists. Yet, to may ar to the moment of the digital, to reflect on its adolescence of the digital, to reflect on its materialism.

The double meaning of the Italian word ‘digital’ — which signifies both atmosphere and new anxieties has taken hold. Time and vision unfold to the fever-pitch materialism.

Yet it ascends to its elemental best when the suggestion of the ephemeral, even ghostly, vertebrates are very much process documents, even transcription. It is no longer the Rorschach test that animates the most compelling reinvention of the computer. It is the first of a planned series mounted by the Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA) and curated by Yale’s David Porter, which brings together four new assemblies projects of four designers—Frank Gehry’s Lewis House, Peter Eisenman’s Biozentrum, Chuck Hoberman’s Expand
ing Sphere and Iris Dome, and Shohei Yokozawa’s Kanagawa Sports Complex and Toyama High School. Vitality often elides into a new vital force of design, and, for example, in the context of Archaeology, the computer reveals itself as a machine for multiplying both language and media. Of course, it is not just about the digital transformation, a tool not so much of original inception but of projective distor-
tion, materialization, the computer is funda-
mentally, of processing and transcription. It is this theme that implicitly bound together the two transformations of projective form, syntax, and structure played out in innum-
erable ways across the projects.

Among the transformations of these transcriptions are the projective and choreographed choreographies of the digital. Both sets of drawings and numerical matrices that sequentially reproduce and assemble computer- 
ized architectural transcriptions. Codes—operational scripts, indexed correspondences, and recombinant sequences—are suggested as the exhibition that was less visual and textual. It is this theme that implicitly bound together the two transformations of projective form, syntax, and structure played out in innumerable ways across the projects. More generally, transcription is a constant theme—particularly that between myriad forms of digital and visual, physical, narrative, and haptic manifesta-
tions. Naturally, drawings and models were shown to great effect; but the colla-
eteral and almost incidental means of represen-
tation fundamental to the digital process became, in the show, more pivotal to the transfor-
mal and narrow obsessions but of extended transformations ar imputed to computation.

In Gehry’s drawings, there is also the suggestion of the ephemeral, even ghostly, effect of motion and virtuality. In this he is not alone: Hoberman, Eisenman, and Yoh each graphically evoked their own local chronologies of project logic. For Hoberman, it is the timed unfolding of intricate linkage structures; for Yoh, it is frozen moments of digital structural fluctuation. In each case, the drawings are merely a chronological moment within a more extensive sequence of transformation.

Archaeology imparts to computation a new vital force of design, and, for example, in the context of Archaeology, the computer reveals itself as a machine for multiplying both language and media. Of course, it is not just about the digital transformation, a tool not so much of original inception but of projective distortion, materialization, the computer is fundamentally, of processing and transcription. It is this theme that implicitly bound together the two transformations of projective form, syntax, and structure played out in innumerable ways across the projects. More generally, transcription is a constant theme—particularly that between myriad forms of digital and visual, physical, narrative, and haptic manifestations. Naturally, drawings and models were shown to great effect; but the collateral and almost incidental means of representation fundamental to the digital process became, in the show, more pivotal to the transitional character of these projects.

The evolution of the density of informa-
tion—from points to curves to volumes and kinematics—becomes the kernel of ideas for the projective private syntaxes of graphic transcription.

Th e taut and fraught transcriptions of advice: Could do, at least, in keeping with the suggestion of the ephemeral, even ghostly, effect of motion and virtuality. In this he is not alone: Hoberman, Eisenman, and
Although the death of the author was announced with much fanfare about a half-century ago, this news seems to have been slow to reach architecture. The field has long relied on a strong sense of individual authorship—the "architect" is the only latest iteration of this trend—and the cult of the discipline and the architect's role within it.

It is perhaps not surprising, then, that authorship actually emerged as the underlying theme of Yale's symposium "Digital Post-Modernities: From Calculus to Computation," organized by Mario Carpo, Vincent Scully Professor of Architectural History. It set out to examine the effects of evolving digital technologies on architecture over the past several decades and to ask whether the field has been able to "design" its own future.

The following session, on Friday afternoon, presented a joint presentation. Frank admissions of reliance on digital tools were accompanied by a far more fine-grained discussion of their implications for the design process. Princeton's Alejandro Zaera-Polo's talk was potentially explicit in this regard. Cycling through slides of his student work at Harvard's GSD, he declared, "These drawings were only possible because I had learned the AutoCAD menu." He recalled rigorously structuring entire projects around the execution of a single AutoCAD command, for example, the one used to create ruled surfaces. While his implementation of design software inevitably expanded in his early built projects, such as the Yokohama Ferry Terminal (1995–2000), and while he was by no means implying that he had ceded his agency to the computer, he was unequivocal in his argument that these projects resulted from an intensive feedback between software and design intent.

In the same session, Charles Jencks and Sanford Kwinter presented an idea that the idea of a give-and-take—not only architectural designs but any form of knowledge—are essentially inseparable from the technology with which they have been articulated or produced. Jencks took a broad historical perspective, returning to the seminal projects of the 1960s and 1970s to identify an essential divide between modern thinking, which is fundamentally about simplicity, and postmodern thinking, which is fundamentally about complexity. The history of science, he pointed out, provides many examples of this transition. Classical physics, for example, was bent on giving order to the world by distilling the tumult of the universe into fundamental natural laws; contemporary particle physics embraces the riotous chaos comprising all matter. This was not, as Jencks put it, a pains to emphasize, an arbitrary shift; it was inexorably intertwined with the development of technology. If the modern scientific revolution was catalyzed by certain tools that enabled new ways of looking at, and thus understanding, our world—most famously, the telescope and the microscope, then the computer could be called the "postmodern microscope," its raw analytical power allowing complexity to be examined as never before.

Out of new technologies, in other words, emerge new regimes of knowledge. Kwinter made a similar point in a discussion of new media and the digital. He asked whether the possibilities offered by digitally enhanced environments—the kind of increasing interrelation between reality and computational output suggested by, say, Google Glass—he pointed to ways in which the effects of technology drive a new kind of software that is nothing more than an endless stream of ideas to the creation of new modes of perception and experience.

Mario Carpo summed up this contradiction in a discussion of a new 3-D modeling techniques based on the voxel, a kind of three-dimensional pixel. These voxels have the potential to provide far more resolution than more established paradigms based on lines or curves, because with enough processing power, a designer can use a voxel-based curve—essentially a fundamental contradiction, addressed during the evening roundtable, in which Lynn and curators Paola Antonelli (Museum of Modern Art) and Frédéric Migayrou (Centre Pompidou) sat on a conversation moderated by Yale's Peggy Deamer. On the one hand, digital tools unquestionably expand the architect's control by giving a vast range of new formal and procedural possibilities. On the other hand, these possibilities are enabled by the computer's ability to process a quantity of information so vast that it inevitably escapes the architect's understanding.

"What constitutes each voxel?" Tracking and manipulating the position of every component within even a relatively simple model would be impossible for the human mind.
so a designer must outsource this activity to the computer. At best, this may simply be an evolution toward a new form of mediated authorship, positioning the architect as a code crafter who sets computational param- eters, rather than micromanaging formal outputs. At worst, however, Carpo’s question conjures an architect alienated from the design process by the brute force required to carry it out, cut off from his or her own work by an algorithmic black box. Indeed, Yale’s Phil Benveniste (“93), of AutoDesk, offered a dismal counterpoint to Zaera-Polo’s story about exploring AutoCAD, remarking that, when he drives around most U.S. cities, he can easily identify which version of his company’s product was used to make most buildings, illustrating how tightly architects are constrained by the software they use.

Antonelli pointed out, however, that a loosening of authorial control is not necessarily a bad thing from the perspective of a building’s or product’s eventual user, turning the discussion to what she calls the potential for “democratization of design.” One effect of the unprecedented flexibility of digital design (and, increasingly, digital fabrication) may be to create a multiplication of consumer choice: the promise of mass-customization. In this case, one answer to Eisenman’s question would be that the architect doesn’t need to choose the “best” Embryological House; instead, thirty-thousand different homeowner could each choose the right one based on their individual needs. At its most quixotic, this diverging trajectories of digital technology in architecture over the past decade. The ant, all business and hard work, represents the backers of BIM technology who used developing software to remake the building industry. The grasshopper, a carefree artist, represents the digital designers who carried out ever-more complex formal experiments (often using the eponymous scripting plug-in) with few practical applications. When the recession came—just as when winter arrived

Such questions are, of course, likely to remain purely in the realm of speculation for the foreseeable future, growing urgent only as the application of these technologies becomes more advanced. Appropriately, then, various forms of implementation were the main topic of the symposium’s final day, although the foundations for this discussion had already been laid by Pratt’s Dagmar Richter’s incisive presentation the previous morning. Richter used the well-known fable of the ant and the grasshopper to outline two diverging trajectories of digital technology in architecture over the past decade. The ant, all business and hard work, represents the backers of BIM technology who used developing software to remake the building industry. The grasshopper, a carefree artist, represents the digital designers who carried out ever-more complex formal experiments (often using the eponymous scripting plug-in) with few practical applications. When the recession came—just as when winter arrived
One way to ease such anxieties is to remember that, in practice, paradigm shifts are rarely clear-cut and that the evolution of technology is often marked by unexpected historical continuity. Indeed, Mayou opened the final session of the symposium with a kind of prehistory of computational design, examining a rich and impressively broad range of material, from Norbert Weiner’s mid-century invention of cybernetics to Constantin Doxidis’s turn to early computer programming to aid his town planning efforts. In the following presentation, Philippe Morel (Malagais Architecture School) quipped that Sigfried Giedion’s classic examination of industrial-age design, Mechanization Takes Command, should have been called Information Takes Command, given that, even in that period, technology was becoming dependent on flows of information.

In the same session, Alisa Andrasek (The Bartlett), Michael Hansmeyer (ETH Zürich), and Yale’s Mark Foster Gage collapsed into the same process. Following Bernstein’s presentation, Matthias Kohler (ETH Zürich), offered a glimpse of this possibility at a small scale in his experiments with robots fabricating masonry structures; here, the project’s design exists not as a geometric representation of form but as a set of coded instructions for construction. In a discussion of her machine-woven structures, Cornell’s Jenny Sabin described a similar process of bypassing traditional representation to directly materialize data.

In his 2011 book The Alphabet and the Algorithm, which examined many of the themes underpinning the conference, Carpo referred to the fact that all architectural ideas traditionally had to be translated into drawings before they could be constructed as a "notational bottleneck." For centuries, if a structure couldn’t be drawn, it couldn’t be built. While new software may come as a "notational bottleneck." For centuries, if a structure couldn’t be drawn, it couldn’t be built. While new software may come...

The Institute: A Spring of Architecture Made of We’s

The architecture schools were basically schools of sociology or political ‘prepossession.’ The discourse of architecture had completely evaporated, so the institute filled many voids. The institute was right on time. It was a traumatic time, and out of the ashes of that moment the institute really took off. Its last moment of golden days, in my opinion, was when Ada Louise (Huxtable) wrote about it in The New York Times. Once that happened, it was over—it was public territory.

Diana Agrest added, “I think, at that moment, the functionalist ideology was bankrupt. We didn’t want to do architecture as form-function. That’s where language came in; we wanted to look at things differently. That’s why linguistics and semiotics came in. The IAUS had this impact on architectural education since it presented a different way to look at it. The institute made a difference because we were not just disseminating: we were presenting, cooking, producing, doing everything. We ourselves were teaching there; we were doing our projects; we were writing; we were doing the roundtable; we did workshops—public and publishing a magazine. We were totally invested in the place, and that is what made it unique.”

Diana Agrest, one of the first interns at IAUS, described how she discovered it: “I was there between January and September 1973, before there was a formal internship program. I got there because I went to Oberlin College and the Great Lakes Collegial Association helped place students in arts internships in New York City. That’s how I got to Peter Eisenman and said, ‘I have a philosophy background, I know nothing about architecture, but I want my future to be as an architect. Would you take me?’” I was just so delighted that there was a place to take somebody like me who knew nothing about architecture. The amazing thing was that having studied philosophy and linguistics, I arrived at a place where those areas were actually being studied in relationship to architecture. That, for me, was very profound.”

Alan Plattus, who was at the Institute from fall 1973 through the following spring, recalled, “One of the many things I did when I was here was the working drawings for House VI, which Randall [Korman] was producing for Peter. This speaks to the extent to which the Institute was always a work in progress. Whatever there was to do, whoever was around was drafted to do it. I roomed with Ken Koolhaas for a whole year and lived to tell about it. He was at Cornell working with Matthias Unger and fighting with Colin Rowe, so he came to the institute. There was an empty office looking out onto the Empire State Building, and we moved in there when he was writing Delirious New York. The world of theory was already heating up in comparative literature, linguistics, and philosophy departments, and the great discovery was to find this place where the interest in architecture intersected at a high level with such disciplines that seemed to be out in front of us. Architecture, thanks to the IAUS, seemed to catch up very fast to the extent that intellectuals such as Princeton Professor Carl Schorske and French literature professor Peter Brooks, then at Yale, started coming to the institute to find out what was going on in architecture. It was an exhilarating experience.”

Deborah Berke gave her talk on a longer tenure at the institute, saying, “I was at the institute from 1978 to 1982. I started going to Open Plan [the IAUS evening lecture series]. I already had the internship and undergraduates program. Diana was starting the advanced design workshop at that time, and I, along with Larry Kutnicki, went to the board of fellows and told them we would like to start a program for high school students. The response was along the lines of, ‘If it meets our standards and if you get your poster design to look like the rest of our posters and if we don’t have to pay you anything, it’s totally fine with us.’ So that’s what we did. There I met Mario Gandelsonas, who was running the educational program at the time. He asked me to work with him, and from there I moved into teaching a studio in the undergraduate program, along with Steven Harris. The lecture series, exhibitions, catalogs, the Oppositions, Oppositions, Skyline, and Oppositions publications, four different educational programs, constant debate—every single thing was imbued with an idea, and there was so much of it.”

The evening’s discussion also touched on the institute’s connections with places such as Cooper Union, Columbia University, and Princeton as well as the Architectural Association and its director at the time, Alvin Boyarsky. There was talk about other figures, such as Bernard Tschumi, the relationship between the Grays and the Whites (New York Five), as well as the so-called West Coast—Craig Hodgetts (BA ’66, Coy Howard, Eugene Kupper (MArch ’67), Anthony Lumensd, former Yale dean Cesar Pelli, and Tim Van Reeland (BA ’46, MArch ’54). Stern commented Julia Bloomfield for her high-level editorial work on IAUS publications and remarked that the founding of the institute was driven by Eisenman’s nostalgia for a public forum like CIAM and Team 10. Eisenman emphasized, “There was an immense degree of cohesion, a sense of pride in the mission of whatever it was we were doing. At the same time, there was an extraordinary anxiety and antagonism in the world out there to what the institute was doing. One always felt a little embattled. There were certain people who were very much against not so much what we were doing but how we were doing it. That antago- nism around Anne Tuck was a strain that was there the last fifty years in this country. The clichéd reference to the IAUS as elitist has to do with our relationship with Philip Johnson. He ran a show in New York City, a group of architects who used to hang out in the Century Club. He was obviously a very rich guy.”

Agrest argued that Johnson “came into the institution when we were struggling and everyone was sticking their necks out.” Stern contradicted this by claiming that Johnson’s interest in the IAUS actually preceded its high times and added the anecdote that Johnson always referred to it as the Eisenman Institute. According to Sven Pfaller, what to some seemed like elitism and obscurantism had to do with the difficult situation of the publication of the IAUS, which “scared a lot of people when cigar-smoking, bearded, bomb-throwing people like Manfredi and Tornatore showed up.” Stern then confirmed the suspicion that the IAUS was smuggling dangerous ideas into the country.”

A point not adequately clarified by Agrest’s documentation is the profound historic reasons for the IAUS’s end. However, the three simultaneous public and private answers, one of them Agrest’s point of view that institutions of that kind have a certain life span might in a very short time, within a lot into it, we got a lot, and then it couldn’t go on. You know, the Beatles lasted fewer years, and they were three members. Isn’t it in a strong people; it’s a miracle it lasted so long.”

To this, Deamer added that the institute’s demise was not irrelevant to the fact that “the mission had been accomplished.”

Thanking Agrest for her contribution, Pfaller said: “If you think of the battles that were had during the CIAM meetings what Diana did for the IAUS. What an incredible resource and provocation that would be and how much more vivid all of this is because the way it has been presented.” Everyone seemed to agree. Earlier in the discussion, Stern had remarked that, although the timing of the closure of the institute was a similar institution today “because the need doesn’t exist.”

At that last point, I couldn’t agree less. Comparing the debates produced by the IAUS and its journal Oppositions to current discussions about architectural discourse, Deamer said: “There are still the same sorts of struggle we are all faced with: ‘I don’t think we read those in the same way we read Oppos; it’s different because you have to get a sense of what’s in the air, but not to get positions. I think we really read Oppositions to understand architecture because we wanted to take a stand.’” The idea of “taking a stand” exactly what contemporary discourse of architecture needs? The timing is perfect.

—Gregorio Carboni Maestr

Maestri is an architect, visiting research professor at Columbia University, and a PhD fellow at the Università degli Studi di Palermo. His dissertation is focused on Oppositions.
Fred Koetter received his BArch from the University of Oregon in 1962, followed by his MArch from Cornell in 1966. That same year, the Museum of Modern Art published Robert Venturi’s Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture and Aldo Rossi’s L’architettura della città, both of which, according to many, had an effect on a whole generation of architects that would go onto become influential. Fred, having completed his MArch, decided to move to New York City in 1966 to pursue graduate study in the area of architectural history and theory. As a student in the master’s program at the Institute of Architecture and Urban Studies at Columbia, Fred was exposed to the largely macho world of architectural design and theory. That was my first experience of Fred, in the mid-Seventies as a student at Princeton, which was already well underway in its architectural theory and pedagogy and would soon make itself felt in the realm of practice. Graduating in the mid-Sixties, Fred was teaching architecture at a time when the Modern Movement was beginning to give way to the slightly more nuanced approaches of Post-Modernism. And as an occasional contributor to the academic and popular journals of the time, Fred’s impact on the GSD was equally significant, indeed, the public and the private.” Not only is this Collage City in a nutshell, it is a convenient half-truth that may apply to the more mannered and academic manifestations of the school but misses the subtlety and critical acuity with which Fred has observed, and operated in, those settings. Fred has, in fact, never had much use for the conventional titles of Post-Modernism. Indeed, that does not do justice to a career that has been explored by many great minds, including Jim Stirling, who ran Fred’s thesis for his MArch from Cornell in 1966. This first Yale sojourn is often forgotten, but Fred has always acknowledged the important role that Michael Wilford and Bob Krier played in his architectural education.

At that time, Fred had just made the move from Ithaca to Boston, where, in 1977, he established the practice that would become, in 1983, Koetter Kim & Associates. After a decade at Cornell and an interim year at the University of Kentucky, Fred taught at Yale under dean Cesar Pelli and alongside Jim Stirling, among others, from 1975 to 1978. This first Yale sojourn is often forgotten, but I know from my contemporaries who were studying at Yale at the time that Fred had a huge impact and was a respected and beloved figure. Toward the end of that period Collage City was finally published, and a version of the central chapter, “The Crisis of the Object: The Predicament of Texture,” was included in a curious blank-versus-format in Perspecta 16, so that the entire issue bore the unmistakable stamp of Fred’s influence. By the time the issue appeared in 1980, Fred had already moved on to the Graduate School of Design at Harvard, where he taught until he returned to Yale as dean in 1993.

Fred’s impact on the GSD was equally significant—for witness, for example, the contemporary transformation in his colleague Michael McKelvey’s work from Brutalism to contextual Post-Modernism. And as an occasional visitor, I remember his sane and constructive voice in the midst of an increasingly shrill and unconstructive ideological environment. Two of his best essays appeared in The Harvard Architectural Review: in the early 1980s: the one mentioned above, “Notes on the In-Between,” and, in the fourth issue, in 1984, a brilliant account of “Monumentality and the American City,” which presents Fred and Susan’s Boston Plan of 1982 in the context of one of the most pernicious arguments I know about the role of architectural monuments and monumental urban design in American urbanism.

This is just one more reminder that the accusation so often leveled against the Cornell approach to urban design—that it is more grounded in the two-dimensional figure-ground representation of seventeenth-century Rome or eighteenth-century Paris than in the reality of the American landscape or the contemporary global city—is a convenient half-truth that may apply to the more mannered and academic manifestations of the school but misses the subtlety and critical acuity with which Fred has observed, and operated in, those settings. Indeed, the public and the private.” Not only is this Collage City in a nutshell, it is a far more accurate and sophisticated reading of the American and the contemporary city than those polemics that simply celebrate the heroic and the mundane, the planned and the accidental, the public and the private. Not only is this Collage City in a nutshell, it is a far more accurate and sophisticated reading of the American and the contemporary city than those polemics that simply celebrate the total—and totalizing—disruptive liberation of architecture and the city, apparently from each other.

It is also the analytic and intellectual framework for the series of brilliant projects in the early 1980s with which Koetter Kim introduced and established its ongoing role in American architecture and urbanism: the Boston Plan, followed by the built and unbuilt projects for leftist cities such as University Park and Allston Landing and, finally, the Codex World Headquarters of 1983, which became, along with Jim Stirling and Michael Wilford’s Stuttgart Staatsgalerie, the first major manifestation of the Collage City approach to monumental architecture. The late 1980s found Koetter Kim working on major campus plans and projects around the United States as well as going increasingly global, with an office in London initiated with an ambitious series of urban-design proposals that have opened up unexplored territory and possibilities in another historic city.

What is remarkable in all of this is, that, as the practice and its field of operations have expanded, the intellectual commitment has remained robust and unavoidable and the range of issues, techniques, and interests has expanded to include new sites, new technologies, and important emergent concerns such as sustainability and climate. Rather than hunkering down and taking professional and intellectual shelter behind established positions—or, as has been more and more commonly the case, behind no position whatsoever—Fred continues to pursue the same apparently casual, cheerful, and nonconfrontational—but always deeply serious—openness, curiosity, and spirit of exploration as an architect that has always informed his teaching. Indeed, I doubt he has ever drawn any of his many elegant and seemingly effortless lines without an idea behind it. I think it was Fred—although it may have been Mike Dennis—who said that, as an architect, one needs to be able to sing and dance at the same time (evoking another performer named Fred). However, that does not do justice to a career that has been exemplary for doing so many things and engaging so many people and issues, very well indeed.

—Alain Platts

Platts is professor of architecture and urbanism and director of the Yale Urban Design Workshop.

Fred Koetter: Teacher

This spring, Fred Koetter announced his retirement after six decades of teaching, including stretches as a visiting professor at Yale, as the dean of the School of Architecture from 1994 to 1998, and more than fifteen years as a member of our faculty. It has been my privilege to work alongside Fred since the fall of 1999, when we were paired as co-instructors in the
post-professional studio. I knew Fred’s architectural work and writing fairly well since I had recently graduated from Princeton, where he had taught. He was an influential mentor, and my architectural journey was greatly impacted by his teachings. Fred’s work was characterized by a deep understanding of the historical and cultural context of the places he designed. His designs were not only aesthetically pleasing, but also functional and responsive to the specific needs of the people who would use them.

Fred was a master of his craft, and his students were always challenged to think deeply about the problems they were trying to solve. He was a great teacher, and his influence on me and my peers cannot be overstated. He taught us that architecture is not just about creating beautiful buildings, but also about solving real-world problems and addressing the needs of the people who will inhabit them.

In conclusion, Fred Koetter was a brilliant architectural designer and teacher. His contributions to the field of architecture will be remembered for many years to come.

**To Draw Is to See: Drawings of Rome**

To Draw Is to See: Drawings of Rome, a collection of freehand drawings by Yale students, is an exhibition of, and about, an examination of the city of Rome. The exhibition was organized by Fred Koetter, and opened on April 8 at the Hearst Tower, in Manhattan.

The exhibition is a testament to the power of drawing as a tool for architectural education. It features a collection of drawings by students from the Yale School of Architecture, who were invited to create freehand drawings of Rome during their visit to the city. The drawings were then selected for inclusion in the exhibition, which is on display until May 31.

The drawings in the exhibition range in scale and technique, from small, detailed sketches to larger, more abstract renderings. They capture the essence of Rome’s architecture and its historical context, and provide a unique perspective on the city.

The exhibition is not just a display of drawings, but also an opportunity to reflect on the importance of hand-drawn images in architectural education. Fred Koetter, the exhibition’s curator and a former Dean of the Yale School of Architecture, has been a strong advocate for the use of drawing in architectural education.

Fred Koetter, who passed away in 2014, was a prominent architect and teacher. He was a key figure in the development of the post-professional studio, and his influence on architectural education is still felt today. The exhibition is a fitting tribute to his legacy, and a celebration of the power of drawings to capture the essence of architecture.
2. Constantinos Dooxiadis (1905–82), courtesy of the Dooxiadis Foundation.

3. Marcel Breuer, Haus am Horn, Weimar, Germany, 1923. Photograph courtesy of the Breuer Archive, Syracuse University.

Gender and Housing

Gender and Housing: Pier Vittorio Aureli

This spring, Equality in Design, a group organized by students in fall 2013 to address issues of gender inequality in architecture, organized a discussion between professors Dolores Hayden and Pier Vittorio Aureli to examine issues related to housing. Professor Hayden is author of Redesigning the American Dream and The Grand Domestic Revolution and visiting professor Pier Vittorio Aureli taught an Advanced Studio on housing asking his students to reimagine domesticity and consider how our society is produced and reproduced by domestic architecture in the spring semester. That the political realm of the home is also the space of agency for the architecture was a position that clearly engaged many students, and the ensuing discussion addressed many of the difficult but important questions in the current discourse.

Pier Vittorio Aureli

I think architecture allows us to understand how these habits and conventions that have always defined domestically have become sedimented in the very construction of space. That it’s not to say that architecture is responsible but, rather, that it allows us to retracing in these very habits and conventions the way we accept a certain manner in which space is scripted physically. In this kind of research we always have to consider the way the material evidence interacts with the policies and social engineering that constructed domesticity.

Dolores Hayden

The British architect was a position that clearly engaged many students, and the ensuing discussion addressed many of the difficult but important questions in the current discourse.

Pier Vittorio Aureli

I think architecture allows us to understand how these habits and conventions that have always defined domestically have become sedimented in the very construction of space. That it’s not to say that architecture is responsible but, rather, that it allows us to retracing in these very habits and conventions the way we accept a certain manner in which space is scripted physically. In this kind of research we always have to consider the way the material evidence interacts with the policies and social engineering that constructed domesticity.

Hayley Hayden

The history of gender is not merely one of exploitation. The concept of domesticity is a form of life but in contributing to the construction of specific subjectivity. DH I agree. It constrains behavior, it supports behavior, and it can be very significant.
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PVA The history of gender is not merely one of exploitation. The concept of domesticity is a form of life but in contributing to the construction of specific subjectivity. DH I agree. It constrains behavior, it supports behavior, and it can be very significant.

Shayat De Silva (16)


2. Dolores Hayden and Pier Vittorio Aureli with Yale students Maya Alexander ('15) (left) and Elisa Nuñez ('15) (right).
On April 21, the School of Architecture celebrated Paul Brouard on the occasion of his retirement after forty years as director of the Jim Vlock Building Project. The following are just a few of the numerous toasts and tributes written in his honor by his colleagues and students.

Paul Brouard Retires

Paul Brouard's long career at Yale began in 1967, when he arrived as one of the first group of Yale students to study under the legendary Rudolph. After graduating, Brouard worked as an associate for the firm of Koolhaus & Associates, in Portland, Oregon, and then joined the firm of Brubaker & Associates in New York City, where he was involved in the design of the Jim Vlock Building Project. The following are just a few of the initiatives in sustainability and green building that Brouard's steadfast leadership has been essential to the unparalleled success of the program. His remarkable combination of building knowledge, technical skills, good humor, and spirit of fun has been a guiding light for Yale students for over forty years.

—Richard W. Hayes ('86)

Paul: carateguer of youthful architectural vision, entertainer of technical fantasy, realist of fixer of failed ambitions, speaker of hard truths, benevolent guide to the arrogantly unbridled, antagonist of excess, detractor of all things ideological, champion of the anti-heroic,_grumpy doubter, enthusiastic advocate; architect, emergency medical technician, carpenter, "hammerswinger," truck driver, lunch companion, electrician, plumber, mechanical consultant, d Right your hammer, make contact with nails as best you can, and get back in the back. Scared of heights? All right, it's roof-rather, so walk carefully over the ceiling joists, stick to the perimeter, and don't look down. Himm, high-heeled tennis shoes are in fashion. That's why we have to tape these here on this solid, flat surface, and please wear something else next time. Each year a new crop of architects, and every year it makes it on, showing an unwarranted confidence in the construction capabilities of a very green group of students.

The Yale Building Project has made the abstract concrete. Real-life clients with real-life concerns: decision-making within the context of group dynamics and politics; balancing a zealosity for socially responsible work with a sensitivity to human and project respect; getting out of the clouds of architect-speak and into the dirt of building mechanics. Full engagement.

After grad school, my first exposure to the working practice of architecture was not so direct. Thinking was clearly disconnected from doing. What was I supposed to do and how to do it and he allowed students are simply trying to keep their heads above water. Paul has been a lifeline to that humanity which architecture, and the Building Project, is supposed to serve. Within the heady realms of Rudolph Hall, and into the swelter of the ground in summer, Paul has been ardent in his belief that there is an education to be had in doing. It seems he has always known when to speak, intervene, assist; and when to remain quiet, stay back, and allow learning to come from within. His restraint is borne not from reticence, but from an intelligence that fosters his students' discovery and growth and compassion. For forty-two years, with over 2,000 students, through six deans, alongside some 150 critics and twenty some students, Paul has been steadfast in his commitment to the pedagogy of design/build. He embodies it.

—Adam Hopfner ('99)

Partial inventory of morphologies of orphaned lands and road surface configurations at highway interchanges. From Infra Eco Logi Urbanism, RVTR.
The exhibition Infra Eco Logi Urbanism will be on display at Yale from August 26 to November 20, 2014. It features work by students, faculty, and alumni who were part of the Center for Architecture’s “OfficeUS” repository, which examines the evolving cultural and spatial discourses that all reflect, as Eversole says, the “OfficeUS” repository, which examines the evolving cultural and spatial discourses that all reflect, as Eversole says, the

infrastructure, logistics, and environmental management, confound traditional questions of economic incentives, political power, and natural and man-made systems. The emergence of megaregions also signals a moment when reconsideration of material and cultural common ground enables new concepts of resources, publics, distribution, and design. With these contested roles and agency of design, and specifically architecture, can be rethought.

The working methodology put forth in the exhibition moves through multiple scales of consideration in both analysis and design, conceptually examining the large-scale urban ecologies, geo-design, assemblage, and actor-network theory as well as utopian paradigms. The work has been developed through three parallel streams of research: 1) an intercontinental analysis undertaken within a methodological framework of system (shed cartographies of interdependent systems), structure (hypothetical physical forms and artifacts), and code (operational practices and rule sets); 2) an assembly of historic disciplinary influences within the topics of fragmented utopias, urban megafarms, and large-scale urban interiors; 3) a speculative design proposal for the megaregion developed through systematic infrastructural interventons and detailed architectural designs. This research is produced through analysis, regional cartographies, network analyses, historical research, photographs, and design proposals for urban infrastructure.

A proposition embedded in the word is that, by investigating what has been considered “back of house” activities of cities and their support systems—infrastructures, logistics, and ecologies—urban design could take a more active role in transforming the future of cities, settlement patterns, and metropolitan life. The project investigates how existing infrastructural systems and proposes to leverage the significant renewable-energy potential in the future of cities, settlement patterns, and metropolitan life.

The project is an investigation of the potential for architecture to engage not only in urban processes but to imagine alternative futures of urban form by structuring spaces for negotiation and public action at the scale of the megaregion.

Infra Eco Logi Urbanism is supported by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), Taubman College of Architecture + Urban Planning, the University of Michigan Office of Research, a grant from the city of Ann Arbor, Michigan, and the social science and humanities research council of Canada (SSHRC), Taubman College of Architecture + Urban Planning, the University of Michigan, and the Mi Group. The exhibit opened in Montreal in February 2013, followed by an installation in Venice Biennale 2014. It will travel to Ann Arbor, Michigan, in winter 2015.
architects turned sculptors

After ten years as a partner in Prentice & Chan Architects, Tim Prentice (BA ’53, MArch ’60) gathered together his colleagues one day in 1975 and announced, “I am leaving architecture. I am going to be a sculptor.” They were shocked and envious. “How dare you go out and say something like that?” they said. For all the architects who believe the profession is humankind’s most desirable, there is always a yearning to channel their interests into artistic expression and plastic material in a more direct way than the typical office job. “There is much more control over the end product,” architect-turned-sculptor Charles Bergen (BA ’85, MArch ’90) admits.

The master’s in architecture is a concertina of ideas, of theory and money, and architecture seems like a safer career path. Focusing the CAD stage for the hammer, anvil, and chisel is a dream for some, a reality for only a few. “How was I going to become an artist and make a living?” Bergen once wondered. Yet the School of Architecture has had a substantial share of graduates become successful, eminent, and influential sculptors. The school’s program is rooted in architecture’s identity as an art, as a philosophy that has permeated architecture through the material and ideological changes. Yale’s architect-sculptors have thrived under the consistent emphasis on hands-on work and actual openness that allows sometimes unfashionable approaches to persist, as long as they are rigorous and relevant.

While other collegiate architect programs were starting in schools of engineering, Yale’s sculptural program began in 1916 within its School of Art, which had opened in 1900 but not formally as an independent school until the 1970s. Kent Bloomer (BFA ’59, MFA ’61) recalls that, under Bauhaus guidelines, “the arts of drama, painting, graphics, and sculpture could all have the same foundation course,” a unity that was memorably described in an iconic circular diagram. “To go toward [one of those] was merely a specialization you made later in your education.” Yet the direction architecture became professionalized...a self-defining entity with a history that was independent of the School of Art.

Charles O. Perry (BArch ’52) seemed to embody that threshold. The Montana native and Korean War veteran studied sculpture, primarily in marble, and, recently, he was in Siena carving into fresh blocks of travertine. “I chose models that were not Brancusi-like forms could find relevance into the sunset, which of course did not occur,” she observes.

Maya Lin’s (BA ’81, MArch ’86, Hon. ’87) conspicuous transformation to international designer took place at the end of her undergraduate career and before her return to graduate school. “Maya was in my three-dimensional design course when she entered the competition,” Hauer says. “I believe I didn’t do too badly by her.” She, too, was a lifelong artist in the architecture programs. “I’ve been making art since I can remember,” she says in a video interview. “As a child, my after-school activity was to spend time in [my father’s] ceramics studio.” She sees her current practice as “a tripod. The art, the architecture, and the memorials inform each other. I love bridging the three different disciplines.”

Meanwhile, Craig Copeland (’89) has stayed in architectural practice, working for Duda-Paine and Pelli Clarke Pelli. Yet he has been a Fulbright Fellow and a visiting artist at the American Academy in Rome to pursue sculpture. In 2006, he started working primarily in marble, and, recently, he was in Siena carving into fresh blocks of travertine. The work, Copeland has written, is “grounded in carefully sustained observations and distillation studies of nature’s formal essence.” Both Copeland’s sentiments and his Brancusi-like forms could find relevance in almost any decade of the past century. His approach is grounded in refined technique and intellectual rigor that embrace timelessness over trends.

Others fit into the architect-turned-sculptor paradigm more loosely. Although Paul Rosenblatt is a principle of Springsteen, which is primarily an architectural practice, he has produced enough Rauschenberg-influenced assemblage sculpture to warrant a solo exhibition at West Virginia University some years ago. Then again, Rosenblatt majored in both art and architecture at Yale (BA ’81) before continuing to study at the school for his master’s in architecture (’84).

Dee Briggs (MArch ’02) rapid transformation took place following an epiphany she had while looking at one of Bloomer’s courses. An investigation into chirality, the capacity of certain shapes to be left- or right-handed, led to a series of formal explorations that still drive much of her work today. Her piece rings together short spirals of metal with an appearance of randomness that is actually guided by rigorous order. Even though she had a studio with Frank Gehry and cots with Richard Serra in 2002, she attributes Bloomer with primary influence on her work in both rings and plate steel. The advantage of learning sculpture in an architecture school, Briggs says, is that “you understand how large structures are made and the materials are formed to collaborate with to make them happen.” Briggs taught architecture for several years at the University School of Architecture in the 1970s while working on her third doctorate. “You don’t have to graduate school to have a studio,” she says. She, too, sees her current practice as “a tripod. The art, the architecture, and the memorials inform each other. I love bridging the three different disciplines.”

In 2012, his son, Spencer (MArch ‘04), has taken over the company. Ray Kaskey (BArch ’69), a Pitts-burgh native, was a more direct disciple of Bloomer’s, first studying with him at Carnegie Tech. “I had him for basic design,” Kaskey recalls of the well-visited course. Kaskey followed Bloomer to Yale in 1967, entering the new MFA program. “I was able to take a lot of sculpture courses, especially with Erwin Hauer,” explains Kaskey, who gained exposure “to the very rigorous kind of mathematical ideas about surfaces to the capacity of certain shapes to be left- or right-handed, led to a series of formal explorations that still drive much of her work today. Her piece rings together short spirals of metal with an appearance of randomness that is actually guided by rigorous order. Even though she had a studio with Frank Gehry and cots with Richard Serra in 2002, she attributes Bloomer with primary influence on her work in both rings and plate steel. The advantage of learning sculpture in an architecture school, Briggs says, is that “you understand how large structures are made and the materials are formed to collaborate with to make them happen.” Briggs taught architecture for several years at the University School of Architecture in the 1970s while working on her third doctorate. “You don’t have to graduate school to have a studio,” she says. She, too, sees her current practice as “a tripod. The art, the architecture, and the memorials inform each other. I love bridging the three different disciplines.”

In 2012, his son, Spencer (MArch ‘04), has taken over the company. Ray Kaskey (BArch ’69), a Pitts-burgh native, was a more direct disciple of Bloomer’s, first studying with him at Carnegie Tech. “I had him for basic design,” Kaskey recalls of the well-visited course. Kaskey followed Bloomer to Yale in 1967, entering the new MFA program. “I was able to take a lot of sculpture courses, especially with Erwin Hauer,” explains Kaskey, who gained exposure “to the very rigorous kind of mathematical ideas about surfaces to
The Architecture of Paul Mies

By Detlef Mertins


No account of Yale's Art & Architecture Building is as funny, or accurate, as Vincent Scully's jaunty appraisal in the Architectural Review (May 1964). "The hysterical bungling," Scully wrote, "of the forty-nine painters who were caged in what can only be regarded as its entablature, and the heavier, troglodytic walls, and bafflement over its labyrinthine inscrutability." Indeed, is beautifully illustrated with images, plans, and sketches. Figures are numbered continuously and woven into the text to maintain the flow like a story board. However, the typesetting has such narrow line spacing that it is difficult to keep track of each sentence, and I wish the overall text layout was more generous.

Although, at times, Mertins emphasizes Mies's approach to the expression of structure, he applies the same "both/and logic" (as opposed to an "either/or structure") that he attributes to Mies in his own writing; for him, Mies's architecturebirds together dualities. As much as the architect seemed to have resolved his contradictory aspects—he once said his work is both progressive and conservative—Mertins, by contrast, is a master of transforming two mutually exclusive interpretations into constellation in which both equally prevail and reinforce each other. Such is the case in the chapter on "860-880 Lake Shore Drive," who introduces Mies's formalistic expression in outer form and as a continuo envelope, achieved by millennials even on the most important questions. Indeed, it would have been more convenient to describe this apartment buildings as either a structurerevolutionary or as a beautifully knit envelope that maintains its own unity, although Mies, in fact, sought to arrive at both ends without compromising his dedicati on altogether. Here, Mertins makes this moment of reconciliation between visual and structural logic accessible to us, an idiom that is deeply embedded in the contemporary theoretical discourse around Mies. The fact that Mies preferred a more conventional apartment building to live in conjures another smile on the reader's face. In the same chapter, a chapagne flute, photographed by Walter Peterhans, is woven into a discussion of neo-Kantian aesthetics that centers on the ambiguity of identity. The two apartment towers suddenly become even more thought provoking as many more possible readings start to gather in the intellectual spaces that Mertins has so generously arranged for us. Mies is pure bliss.

—Tim Attehöff (PhD '17)

The Architecture of Paul Rudolph

By Timothy Rohan


T he last two seminal books seeking to examine Mies’s work were MoMA exhibition catalogs published in the early 2000s: Mies in Berlin and Mies in America. Recalling these tomes, which together amount to nearly one thousand pages, one might well expect that a single monograph as Detlef Mertins’s posthumously published study on Mies’s work would not satisfy the expectations of an informed reader. Mies’s work is as complex as it was his influences. Yet if these two catalogs were The Beatles’s so-called “Red and Blue” albums then Phaidon’s recent publication undoubtedly would be the “White Album.” Indeed, its title is simply Mies, in white capital letters.

Mies is both staggering and smooth, much like a novel, and not easy to put down. The book proceeds in a logical manner, followed by a discussion on Mies’s event spaces. Although Mies is introduced as a philosopher-architect, Mertins never considers his architecture as applied philosophy. Instead, the author lays out the cultural grid within which Mies’s work is critically incorporated. The genius of Mertins’s writing (which is never pretentious) becomes apparent and especially compelling, for instance, in the chapters on the Riehl House and the Barce lonia Pavilion, when his provides a possible reading of the latter in terms of Augustine’s trinity of mind and gives insights into the former by telling us how Riehl’s own philosophical thinking resonates with the country house.

Given that Mies is a compact book of 560 pages, Mertins’s study is surprisingly detailed and inclusive. The tendency toward a complete presentation of the architect’s work becomes clear right from the beginning, and Mertins is equally well informed on manifold aspects, be it a project’s structural system, philosophico-logical, or historical context. All the principal protagonists are introduced and woven into the larger fabric of each project, both those who fueled the theoretical discourse and those who were part of the often invisible dynamics that operate in the background of commissions—an aspect that seems ever more curious for young architects today. Many of these constellations are arranged in a non- anecdotal ways; for instance, when we learn how Phyllis Lambert finally decided to select Mies “out of a long list of lesser talents” to design the Seagram Building, which she had received from Philip Johnson. It is also soothing to hear that even the most thoughtful planning process cannot anticipate everything: the Farnsworth House was flooded several times over the years, even though Mies elevated its floor way above ground. He could not predict subsequent site conditions after the 1940s.

Mies is beautifully illustrated with images, plans, and sketches. Figures are numbered continuously and woven into the text to maintain the flow like a story board. However, the typesetting has such narrow line spacing that it is difficult to keep track of each sentence, and I wish the overall text layout was more generous. Although, at times, Mertins emphasizes Mies’s approach to the expression of structure, he applies the same “both/and logic” (as opposed to an “either/or structure”) that he attributes to Mies in his own writing; for him, Mies’s architecturebirds together dualities. As much as the architect seemed to have resolved his contradictory aspects—he once said his work is both progressive and conservative—Mertins, by contrast, is a master of transforming two mutually exclusive interpretations into

—Michael J. Lewis

Lewis is the Faison-Pierson-Stoddard Professor of Art History, at Williams College.
James Polshek ("55) opens his thoughtful and absorbing memoir with a quotation from Vladimir Nabokov about time being a flying carpet, folded over and over so that events overlap one another, and creating a pattern through one's life. "Let visitors trip," warns the Russian novelist. Polshek is attracted to Nabokov's model of memory, with events juxtaposed next to each other in layers, as if "folds" pass through a stack of tracing paper. The architect also identifies two mentors who helped guide the memoir: Tony Judt and Abraham Flexner. Polshek explains, wrote about the late-nineteenth-century milieu that mixed professional self-confidence with a sense of duty and a contribution to the improvement of the civic realm—a combination that strikes a chord in any architect who came of age as a designer in mid-twentieth-century America. Flexner, a medical educator who helped found the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, wrote extensively on the role of the professional in society. Polshek likens architecture to medicine in its capacity as a "healing art," and mentions one of Flexner's six defining characteristics as particularly apt to architecture: a profession must be "altruistic in motivation."
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January 4
DAVID ADJAYE
Norman F. Foster Visiting Professor['Black']

It is nice to be back in this hall, though I have a very faint memory of it, due to its intensity. Metropolitan Architecture was really trying to engage with the idea of the continent not as one of African slavery and landscape, the migration of people from one place to another, and the life in the cities.

Architects have really become part of the global economy, moving from one project to another. The world is no longer a place where you can build a house in one country and live in another.

Architects today are part of a global network, working on projects all over the world. It is important to think about the impact of architecture on the environment and how it can be used to improve the quality of life for people.

January 16
DAN WOOD
Louis Kahn Visiting Assistant Professor['Black']

When we started the office we were just coming out of OMA and did not really know what kind of architects we were going to be or what our voice would be. We saw two possible paths toward a possible future.

One of them I would call the Archigram or the Ant Farm route—basically, you end up at the same place. The Archigram route is the ivory tower, where you are thinking, drawing, developing your voice and ideas in isolation through academia and competitions. The Ant Farm route is dedicated to the history of the African-American and the African-American lens as a way to understand architecture. It is a thirty-thousand piece puzzle, but it is really about the narrative of the journey from Africa, the migration to the United States, and then the migration into the urban landscape and cities, the explosion of art and music, and so on.

I was really looking for what we would call a make a building not like what you generally find in Washington, but something with a new kind of profile.

The site is very close to the Washington Monument, so I argued that the building had to fall somewhere between an artwork and a building.

January 23
SEAN KELLER
Myriam Belouzoug Memorial Lecture['Automation']

What is needed now is the maturation of architectural practice and criticism beyond isolated positions, so that computational methods can be considered written, rather than simply against, historical and aesthetic contexts.

One could say that what architects must be today, to greater and lesser degrees, are automations of automation. That is, an architect must attempt to wrest one side of the process back, the manipulation of the digital process, or the digital manipulation of the digital process.

I propose that Cavell’s concept of automation suggests what a critical, contemporary architecture could be—critically in a Kantian sense of questioning its own ground—an architecture that encompasses but also moves beyond the automations of computation.

The limitations of applying such a concept to architecture seems to lead to the familiar situation in which "serious architecture"—or simply "architecture"—is only a minor subset of building. I’m not sure that another possibility exists within late Modernism. For his part, Cavell recognized the similar condition of art but was careful to characterize it in a manner that may give us some small comfort: "While the community of serious art is small," he said, "it is not exclusive—not the way an elite is exclusive. It is esoteric, the one secret is open to anyone."
same speed at this time, so it was very easy to
test the two mediums against each other and
cross back and forth. It is very hard to theorize tools that have not been well
documented or understood in a
generализаво way. So, part of this show is to clarify what the roles of
software and hardware were and to make the
documentation accessible to scholars.

In an interview Peter Yessis said, “I am going to have nothing to talk with Peter
Eisenman about in terms of working with a
computer; then, by the end of the project, he
realized Peter was a computer. He described
him as a speaking computer, and I remem-
ber very well Peter’s desire for a procedural
process, something that was reversible
where you could make sequential decisions and then go back and change a decision
in the chain and replay the design process,
which was what he saw in the digital technol-
yogy of the time.

Many people think digital technol-
ogy was cooked up in the attic of Columbia
University and paperless studies by people
of my generation, but the fact is that a bunch
of older dudes who already knew what they
wanted to do were using computers to
digitize things they were already looking at—
it was not only kids.

These five projects describe five trajectories by people (Greg Lynn, Peter
Eisenman, Frank Gehry, Chuck Hoberman, Sno cer, RCR) and
design intelligence that guided the computer and were not “born digital”—this was not something that came
as second nature to them the way it would
to most of the students at Yale right now.

As a postscript, none of these people really thought that the critical part of computers was
important, as we do today.

March 31
JIM EYRE

Deborah Berke, Smith Lecture “Exploring Boundaries”

This lecture has the same title as my 2008 book because I think a lot of what we are
to explore our own boundaries rather than
those of the discipline.

I have four themes. One of them is
manipulation, which is not as sinister as it
sounds. It is really just about confounding
materials and the various electronic elements
to achieve what we are trying to do in terms
of form. The second is collaboration, which is
really out of our relationship with, for example.
Thirdly, regeneration takes many forms, but,
for me, it is about working with existing build-
ings and the aspect of memory and identity;
and the fourth is celebration, which I will
come to a little bit later.

Often, we are blurring the boundaries
between disciplines, but, principally, we work
at the boundary of architecture and engineer-
ing. We really enjoy working with engineers
who have a good understanding of architec-
ture, and they can be structural or civil but
also environmental engineers. Occasionally,
we stray into sculpture, which is considered
by many to be dangerous territory.

Now you would expect architecture to be fertile territory for technical innovation,
but, in the construction industry, innova-
tion is actually agonizingly slow. The reason
is that every building is its own prototype,
but, there is a limit to what you can do each
time. Technology is often transferred from
elsewhere. I have always been interested in
the notion that architecture straddles the line
between science and art: Science, of course, being the tangible, finding out how things
really work or what really exists, and art
being rather more like holding up a mirror to
ourselves. But I think that technology, often
seen as a branch of science, creativity is still
king, and innovation comes from applied inventiveness. It is very different from
twentieth-century science, the scientific method of gathering data and proof.
So, in architecture, creativity can be technological or just an act of imagination.

The twentieth-century construction
industry really got too utilitarian at times. If you have limited resources, you should do
things for the lowest cost to spread benefit
across society; but that did not always
work in the direction you want it to because
ingenuity gets directed to cost instead of
well-being in the widest sense or the efficient
use of materials. This is a really aggressive
approach if it is erosive or applied to the
environment, which deserves our respect
and is far too valuable to ruin. After all,
as architects, we actually believe we are
enhancing people’s lives with what we do.

April 3
Deborah Berke
Bishop Visiting Professor “Out of the Ordinary”

I have long been interested in the everyday
and the ordinary. This is the new ordinary:
as of Monday, there were more than 430 million
of these iPhones in the world. That was
Monday—who knows what it is by today.

I like the regular and the useful, but I want
them to have a more resonant meaning and
connection to everyday life. I believe one
has to believe in something and have those
beliefs manifest in the work. It is a
tactic. If I am going to talk about…

I think architecture should effect
change in a world that is changing very
rapidly. Much has been said about the
dramatic new world created by the Internet
and other forms of electronic communica-
tion and computation, but, finally, with
the exception of my nice little boat, buildings do not move: they sit where they are built, and
a rapidly changing world whizzes around
them. Buildings collapse. An enormous
amount of time, energy, and materials into a
single moment; they collapse the efforts
of many into a single object. Another idea I am
interested in is going back to that seemingly
simple object again and again and finding
something new. I want to embrace a back-to-
basics approach to architecture, maybe with
a little twist of social responsibility, not
growing over community participation but
refin-
ing it in. I think it is important to take pleasure
in designing the working parts of your archi-
technique as much as the narrative. For me, I
like making the architecture of the back of
house, and the key to our philosophy of practice is to
acknowledge the collaborative nature of the endeavor.

Being an architect is more like being
a playwright and less like being a painter
because you are so dependent on the skills
and commitments of others for the realization
of your work. I do not think architecture is
problem-solving, although in the process of
making architecture there are certainly plenty
of problems solved. For me, architecture is
about making something you believe in,
whatever that expresses your beliefs, about
doing many things simultaneously, many
of them burdensome, like the building and
zoning codes, ADA and LEED standards,
mainly ignores the topological and phenom-
ena of the discipline. In Europe, landscape
architecture is undoubtedly the environmental
and aesthetic conditions of open space are
at risk.

The strongest motivating force for
achieving the objectives of landscape archi-
tecture is undoubtedly the environmental
movement as carried out in Europe since
the 1960s. It has generally dictated people
to be the enemy; this movement propagates
without people.

I am also convinced that the landscape architect is the ideal urbanist and
that the landscape architect should be
the educator in the city. I have been
always been interested in the
the creative at the source of many
problems, the invisible and the visible, the unpredictable
but inevitable space, light, form, material,
function, program, environment, community
responsibility and engagement—
and the poetry of everyday life.
Frank Gehry

Frank Gehry, Louis I. Kahn Visiting Professor, led a studio with Travis Davies (BA '94, MA '96), John G. Belush (BA '97), and Robert A. M. Stern (BA '58) that devoted a new concert hall for Yale’s Barciniac Centre, replacing the subterranean 1,449- seat Gary Cuoco Theatre. The students were asked to reimagine the place of the concert hall within the 1982 Grade II-listed historic complex; they were encouraged to explore strategies for accommodating different musical programmes and to minimize the visual impact of the new building to give it a striking profile when viewed from afar.

Beginning with design exercises that explored a range of scales from urban to building to room, the students developed strategies and attitudes about the interface of different users of the site: guests, skaters, schoolchildren, and local residents. Working at the edge of a UNESCO historic district raised distinct questions about the importance of contextual urban design versus iconicity. The diverse results exemplified these challenges, as some students privileged one scale, others recognized that the forces outside of the Barbican raised distinct questions about the visual prominence of a new building versus iconicity. The diverse results exemplified these challenges, as some students privileged one scale, others recognized that the forces outside of the Barbican raised distinct questions about the visual prominence of a new building versus iconicity. The diverse results exemplified these challenges, as some students privileged one scale, others recognized that the forces outside of the Barbican raised distinct questions about the visual prominence of a new building versus iconicity. The diverse results exemplified these challenges, as some students privileged one scale, others recognized that the forces outside of the Barbican raised distinct questions about the visual prominence of a new building versus iconicity. The diverse results exemplified these challenges, as some students privileged one scale, others recognized that the forces outside of the Barbican raised distinct questions about the visual prominence of a new building versus iconicity.

After a study of surfaces in relation to flowing water, the studio traveled to the Tennessee River Valley to tour Dams and Power Plants, sponsored by the Tennessee Valley Authority and accompanied by TVA Engineers. Upon returning to New Haven, each student considered the dam through its form language and evaluated the function and operation of its components (dams, turbine hall, penstock, turbines, draft tube, and spillway). Critical design decisions were made in relation to the physical mass of a Dam.

After the midterm review, the students toured hydroelectric dams in Connecticut, and each selected a local site for a new or existing dam. They then presented their designs with integrating both visitors to the dam site and the intense pressure of water and waterways, as well as the need to design their buildings, accessible to all individuals. Students presented their projects to the final review jury comprising Michael Kimmelman (Guest Critic), David Adjaye, Mark Gage (‘01), Frank Gehry, Chuck Hoberman, Walter Hood, Jeff Kipnis, Nicolai Ouroussoff, and Steinthór Kári Ólafsson. Each student considered the wide array of typologies representing new concepts for how a dam could look, ranging from reaching to the top of a mountain to the opposite, elements to a massive packed-earth bar with a huge rotating lock and turbine hall.

Peggy Deamer

Peggy Deamer based her studio in Reykjavik, Iceland, exploring the design of concert halls and opera houses on a small island nation with unusual natural resources, such as thermal and hydroelectric potential and the need for those of building封daions accessible to all individuals. Students presented their projects to the final review jury comprising Michael Kimmelman, David Adjaye, Mark Gage (‘01), Frank Gehry, Chuck Hoberman, Walter Hood, Jeff Kipnis, Nicolai Ouroussoff, and Steinthór Kári Ólafsson. Each student considered the wide array of typologies representing new concepts for how a dam could look, ranging from reaching to the top of a mountain to the opposite, elements to a massive packed-earth bar with a huge rotating lock and turbine hall.

During the studio trip to Iceland, the students probed new materials and their structural and formal implications, as exemplified in the composite Neal Bridge, in Maine; explored the hotel as a unique building type representing new concepts for how a dam could look, ranging from reaching to the top of a mountain to the opposite, elements to a massive packed-earth bar with a huge rotating lock and turbine hall.

Deborah Berke

Professor (adjunct) Deborah Berke and Noah Biklen (’02) engaged students in the design of a 50,000-square-foot site to be studied, the Icelandic Modern Media Initiative (IMMI), which rethinks the necessary protection of free speech in the Internet era. Iceland is emerging as a global free-speech safe haven following the 2008 banking crisis and the relocation of the island's central bank to New York City. The design of a new airport adjacent to the main hospital, the students were challenged to focus on the design of a curtain wall to address the issues of energy efficiency along with the redeployment of resource assets and deficiencies. Working with Peter Arbow (’04), a curtain-wall consultant at Steeke, they learned about the applicability of digital design and the challenges in relation to the qualities of fabrica- tion and collaboration in the real world. Working with Peter Arbow (’04), a curtain-wall consultant at Steeke, they learned about the applicability of digital design and the challenges in relation to the qualities of fabrica- tion and collaboration in the real world.

The students pr
speech, which became a fertile source for creativity. To design architecture that explicitly expresses these current unresolved issues was a thought-provoking problem that confronted the students more deeply than expected. They presented their projects to a jury comprising Peggy Deamer, Martin Finio, Cathleen McGuigan, Dan Michaelson, Mary McLeod, Emmanuel Petit, and Damon Rich.

Pier Vittorio Aureli, Pier Vittorio Aureli, Davenport Visiting Professor, and Aidan Doyle (’10) led a studio on the theme of housing in America. This semester, the students focused on domestic space as a place of exploitation and gender discrimination, proposing social reform through a critique on the role of production and reproduction in the home. The studio investigated the spatial and social relationships of the home to develop alternative forms of domesticity, ultimately proposing new housing prototypes for the city of Houston.

Inspired by concepts developed by Lars Lerup in his book After the City, Ludwig Hilberseimer’s work in the United States, and Albert Pope’s ideas defined in Ladders, the studio began with a rigorous study of the home as both an economic and a political apparatus within the American city. Houston’s lack of zoning regulations, as well as its emphasis on homeownership and the automobile, has made it the archetypal twentieth-century capitalist city, a form driven by private interest rather than coherent urban policy. Students sought to rethink this condition not through the apparatus of large-scale planning, but through the reform of domestic space.

After returning from the studio trip to Houston, the students, in pairs or individually, developed new prototypes for housing and habitation, investigating alternatives to the single-family house: singles’ dwellings, cooperatives, communes, temporary living, and live-work shared spaces. By testing the basic conditions of residential architecture—walls, spaces, passages, enclosure, separation, and physical comfort—the students proposed domestic interiors for our contemporary conditions. Some students addressed ways to provide flexible, shared work-live space; others investigated common spaces that also incorporated privacy. One focus was to find ways to annex the vacant in-between spaces in Houston, such as parking lots and forgotten gaps in the city, into housing.

Another was how to reconfigure disused big-box stores for working and living. Making linear connections between them resulted in an archetype and the edge condition of suburban “ladder.” One student created a linear spine as a communal space in which immigrant populations could gather.

Projects were debated by a lively jury that included Ioanna Angelidou (PH ’16), Andrew Brenner (’13), Cynthia Davidson, Peter Eisenman, Keith Krumwiede, Lars Lanzi, Gary McLeod, Emmanuel Petit, Alan Platus, Albert Pope, Matt Roman (’19), Surry Schiabs (PH ’17), and Stanislaus Von Moos.

Dan Wood

Dan Wood, Kahn Visiting Assistant Professor, led a studio in Gabon, central Africa, focused on sustainable infrastructure, in terms of its potential to create new public space, and how architecture can represent the aspirations of a country transitioning toward a new post-oil economic base that could encompass eco-tourism, social and cultural institutions, and housing. Gabon’s first wave of development followed its liberation from France in the 1950s and the discovery of oil off its coast in the 1960s. In those decades, eco-urbanist Marcello Di Olivo designed a master plan for Gabon’s capital, Libreville, with many Modernist government buildings, along the Boulevard Triomphe, as a forward-looking image for the country. Students began the semester with research into precedents of transformative infrastructures, from Hausmann’s Paris to Sir Norman Foster’s Masdar and explored contemporary African urban issues. On their visit to Libreville, they critically surveyed the city, locating and documenting the remaining traces of the Modernist master plan.

The Sylvia Bongo Foundation, the National Parks Association (ANP), and the Agence Nationale des Grands Travaux (ANGT), which is planning over seventy large-scale infrastructural and architectural projects throughout the country, informed the students about the country’s demographics and economy. Together, the students developed a new plan for the Boulevard Triomphe, and then, back at Yale, worked on individual building designs.

The students investigated how new sustainable infrastructures could both transform the boulevard and create the opportunity for new representative public architecture with inventive programs, such as a transportation hub combined with a motor-vehicle office and a public market, both offering a reinterpretation of tropical Modernism. One student designed a building for a new entity, the Ministry of Open Space, Easter Celebrations begin within and outside of Gabon’s cities. Sustainability and ecology issues were at the forefront of many of the projects, with one student designing a permaculture research facility merged with water-filtration infrastructure that responded to the richly variegated terrain condition not through the apparatus of large-scale planning, but through the reform of domestic space.

Inspirational projects were presented to a jury including Ben Aranda, Nathan Brownwing, Glenn Cummings, Keller Easterer, Jorge Joaquin, Peter Palios, Brigitte Shim, Mark Thomann, and Neyran Turan.

The colorful tropical projects were presented to a jury including Ben Aranda, Nathan Brownwing, Glenn Cummings, Keller Easterer, Jorge Joaquin, Peter Palios, Brigitte Shim, Mark Thomann, and Neyran Turan.
Michelle Addington, Hines Professor of Sustainable Architecture, discussed keynote lectures for the ninth International Congress on Sustainable Design, held at the University of California, Berkeley, Mexico, in City, and for the Intersections Symposium 2014, held at CUNY. She also addressed the Institute for Renewable Energy, in Temixco. In the spring, Addington participated in a discussion with Sean Lally at the Van Alen Institute and in panel discussions at Harvard GSD, The New York Times Edge and the event, and at “The Energy Issue,” in Culver City, Los Angeles, and is currently designing commercial projects in Miami and Kuwait City.

Tratte Davies (BA ’94, MArch ’04), critic in architecture, and her firm, Davies Towes, recently completed a series of projects for the PARC Foundation, including a new Camp Center housing a welcome center and small residence for the Rangely Lakes Heritage Trust, in Qopossauk, Maine, for which the firm did the master plan; preliminary studies for a small urban infill park in Memphis, Tennessee; and the Hudson Linear Park, a four-block-long green corridor connecting the main downtown thoroughfare to an adjacent residential neighborhood in Hudson, New York. Her recent construction an artist’s studio, a production space, a gallery, a home/guest room in Chester, New Jersey, as well as several residential projects in New York City.

Peggy Deamer, professor, contributed to the catalog of OfficeUS, the American entrance to the 2014 Venice Biennale Architecture Lobby, the activist group that she coordinates, performed a reading of its “10 Demands” for a better paid and humane architectural profession. The piece was also performed at the Chicago AIA National Convention. In July the group held an event at the Ron Feldman Gallery, in New York, in conjunction with the group exhibition titled “The Therapeutic Architect.” In the summer, Deamer was a visiting scholar at Unitec, in Auckland, New Zealand, and gave a lecture at Victoria University, in Wellington.

Peter de Bretteville, (BFA ’83, MArch ’88) critic in architecture, was one of 14 architects selected to provide facilities for four local arts organizations. DeBerke is transforming two buildings into the DeBretteville Museum Hotels, including a 1913 McKee, Mead & White building in Lexington, Kentucky, and a 1917 Ford assembly plant designed by Abell Kahn, in Ohio City.

Kentar Bloomer, professor, director, and fellow at the Institute for Sustainable Urban Design at Columbia University, was appointed to the steering committee for the Institute for the Preservation of Cultural Heritage. Addington also serves as the principal investigator for Yale’s Solar Decathlon project. In June 2014. Her project entitled “NOMA” (North of Massachusetts Avenue) neighborhood and are dramatically constructing projects in Pune, India, and Taipei. Steven Harris Architects, his firm, Steven Harris Architects, recently completed the restoration of the Edward Durell Stone building, Prudential Tower in Knoxville Tennessee. Gage recently designed a three-story glass-and-wood preschool facility in Williamsburg, Brooklyn, and private homes on Shelter Island and in the Berkshires Mountain.

For the Spring 2014 issue of the Stirling Prize list for Architecture in Buenos Aires as part of the Latin American Architecture in October, In January Moore’s Spiral House was shown at the International Biennial of Architecture in Buenos Aires as part of The City and the World exhibition, organized by the Chicago Athenaeum and the European Center of Architecture, Art, Design, and Urban Studies. The project was a recipient of the Athenaeum’s annual American Architecture Award. This spring Moore served as a juror for the AIA New York Design Awards in Interior Architecture and was named to the board of directors at the Cultural Landscape Foundation, in Washington, D.C., whose mission is to support historic landscapes and heritage.

Eeva-Lisa Pelkonen (MEd ’94), associate professor, is a consultant for an Alvar Aalto retrospective that will open at the Vitra Design Museum in September and is contributing two catalog essays. She gave the talks “Alvar Aalto and the Geopolitics of Architect,” at the Vienna School of Applied Arts, and “Postmodern Morphologies,” at the EAHN conference, in Turin. Recent essays
Nina Rappaport, publications director, was invited to display a condensed version of her Vertical Urban Factory project at the Museum of Architecture in London’s King’s Cross Filling Station this summer. In the fall she will open another version of her show in the Falchi Building, in Long Island City, Queens, New York. She was a collaborator with Robert A.M. Stern on his "New York: Now and Then" programs and tours for “Making It Here,” and she was on the exhibition committee for the Brooklyn Navy Yard’s exhibit making it in NYC. Rappaport is on the program committee of the Design Trust for Public Space’s Emergency City project.

Elihu Rubin (BA ’09), assistant professor, worked with students in his graduate seminar “Urban Research and Representation” to create “Interactive Crown Street,” a pop-up urban research field office, set up in May in an unused storefront. Students displayed a variety of projects, from cognitive maps to soundscapes, and all participants contributed to a “Crown Street Collective Memory Palimpsest” on a thirty-five-foot-long image that grew as the semester progressed.

Elihu Rubin (BA ’09), assistant professor, worked with students in his graduate seminar “Urban Research and Representation” to create “Interactive Crown Street,” a pop-up urban research field office, set up in May in an unused storefront. Students displayed a variety of projects, from cognitive maps to soundscapes, and all participants contributed to a “Crown Street Collective Memory Palimpsest” on a thirty-five-foot-long image that grew as the semester progressed.
Architect on the design of a forty-story residential tower in Seattle. Their projects include work in progress for an abandoned skyscraper pedestrian bridge in Minneapolis, a proposal for a video installation in New York City’s subway system, and a 4,000-pound steel sculpture for unused railroad tracks commissioned by Northern Spark, an annual arts festival, in St. Paul, Minnesota.

Brett Stremmel ('05) became an associate at Pickard Chilton. He is currently the team leader for the one-million-square-foot global headquarters for BHP Billiton, currently under construction, and the corporate headquarters expansion for an international energy corporation, both in Houston.

Katherine Gillis ('10) has been made an associate at Robert A. M. Stern Architects, Miriam Peterson ('10) and Nathan Rich ('10) and their New York City-based firm, Peterson Rich Office (PRO), received fellowships from the Institute for Public Architecture to study Mayor Bill DeBlasio’s ten-year plan for affordable housing. Their project, He A, investigates parking issues and affordable housing to find ways to change the building code and parking requirements, especially for underused parking on NYCHA campuses.

Chat Travieso ('10) in July had an opening of his project in Paths to Pier 42, a six-person gathered to “redline” twelve families on new condo-style homes in a day. The book describes the development of nineteen houses built between 1965 and 1976 in a former draft-camp service training area on Governors Island. The author’s method of notation and analysis, published by MIT Press this year, presents the economic implications of building infor

Money plays a paradoxical role in the creation of architecture. Formless itself, money is a fundamental form giver. At all scales and across the ages, architecture is a product of the financial environment in which it is conceived, for better or worse. Yet despite its ubiquity, money is often disregarded as a factor in conceptual design and persistently avoided by architectural academia as a serious field of inquiry. It is time to break these habits. In the contemporary world in which economics are increasingly connected, architects must creatively harness the financial logics behind architecture in order to contribute meaningfully to the development of the built environment.

The book Linkography: Unfolding the Design Process by Gabriela Goldschmidt ('70) was published by MIT Press this year. It presents the author’s method of notation and analysis for the design process, showing how designers develop ideas to make projects work. She uses cognitive psychology to demonstrate the logic of the creative process along with protocol analysis. Her theory is that ideas develop and change in smaller steps and then transform into networks, which she has diagrammed in a particular system. Goldschmidt’s work has been influential in the field of design thinking.
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Recently released is the forty-seventh edition of Perspecta. The journal is edited by James Andraczuk ('12), Christopher C. Bates ('10), and Marcus A. Hooks ('12). Money plays a paradoxical role in the creation of architecture. Formless itself, money is a fundamental form giver. At all scales and across the ages, architecture is a product of the financial environment in which it is conceived, for better or worse. Yet despite its ubiquity, money is often disregarded as a factor in conceptual design and persistently avoided by architectural academia as a serious field of inquiry. It is time to break these habits. In the contemporary world in which economics are increasingly connected, architects must creatively harness the financial logics behind architecture in order to contribute meaningfully to the development of the built environment.

The issue of Perspecta explores the ways in which money interacts with architectural discourse, design practice, and urban planning. The editors encourage the development of productive relationship between money and the discipline. Contributions from a diverse group of scholars, practitioners, and architects create a dialogue about architecture, reflexions on which range from the aesthetics of austerity to the underwriting of large-scale art projects to the economic implications of building information modeling.
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Fall 2014 Events Calendar

Lectures

All 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.

August 28
FAT (Sam Jacobson, Charles Holland, Sean Griffiths)
Eero Saarinen Visiting Professors
"Once more with feeling"

September 4
Isa Ray and Alan Orange Visiting Professor
Louis I. Kahn Visiting Assistant Professors
"Scarce means alternative uses"

September 11
Kay Beajones
Georges Morris Woodruff, Class of 1857, memorial lecture
"Suspending Modernity: The Architecture of Franco Albini"

October 9
Justin McGuirke
Brandan Gill Lecture
"Radical Cities: Across Latin America in Search of a New Architecture"

October 30
Annabel Horton
Vincen Scully Visiting Professor of Architectural History
"Manipulating models"

November 6
Ted Billie Tsien and Davenport Visiting Professors
"A Deliberate Architecture"

November 13
Jerry Brown
Myriam Bellazoug memorial lecture for Perspecta 47: Money Design Risk Design Reward

November 20
John Paskau
Loré Norman Foster
Visiting Professor
"Recent Work"

Exhibitions

The Architecture Gallery is located on the second floor of Paul Rudolph Hall, 180 York Street. Exhibition hours: Mon. – Fri., 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.; Sat., 10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

August 25 to November 20
Infraeco
Infraeco Urbanism was organized by RTVR principals Geoffrey Thun, Kathy Veliko and Colin Ripley. The exhibition is supported by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), Taubman College of Architecture + Urban Planning, the University of Michigan Office of Research, Rackham Graduate School at the University of Michigan, and The MI Group.

December 8, 2014 to May 1, 2015
Archeology of the Digital: Media and Machines
Archaeology of the Digital was organized by the Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montreal, Canada. The CCA gratefully acknowledges the generous support of the ministère de la Culture et des Communications du Québec, the Canada Council for the Arts, the Conseil des arts de Montréal, and The Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts. The presentation at Yale is sponsored in part by Elise Jaffe + Jeffrey Brown.

The Yale School of Architecture’s exhibition program is supported in part by the James W. Wilder Green Dean’s Resource Fund, the Kibel Foundation Fund, the Nitkin Family Dean’s Discretionary Fund in Architecture, the Pickard Chilton Dean’s Resource Fund, the Paul Rudolph Publication Fund, the Robert A. M. Stern Fund, and the Rutherford Trowbridge Memorial Publication Fund.