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Kurt Forster, architectural historian and curator of the architecture exhibition at the 2004 Venice Architecture Biennale, will be the inaugural Vincent Scully Professor of Architectural History for the next five consecutive fall semesters at Yale. He met with Defel Martina, architectural historian and chair of the architecture department at the University of Pennsylvania School of Design, to discuss for Constructs topics in the history of modernity, visual perception, and critical thinking about architecture today.

Defel Martina: Your work encompasses five centuries of architectural history—really the history of modernity—from the Renaissance through Schinkel all the way to the contemporary. What are the themes of consequence to you within that long history of modernity?

Kurt Forster: What attracts me is the definition of the "new" and of "new" theorems in architecture. The periodic manifestation of the "new" challenges the popular notion of architecture as something firm and durable. Seen from inside architecture, its bases are always called into question, while from the outside architecture seems to be the very image of permanence. What is the real basis of architecture as an intellectual subject? It may be its language or, more specifically, its literature. How is language being used? What does literature tell us about language? At times, the vernacular crops up, but time and again architects have shaken their language and codified its use. Periodically they have even stripped their language of everything fluid, reducing it to its bare essentials. At extreme moments, the idea of a mathematical order replaces the constant change in form and
scope. Architecture participates as a reclining Glasgower—a secret science of arcane subjects—and a straightforward statement of purpose. Either way, architecture tells us something about the world—how it has been put together and how it acquires meaning.

Architecture revisits the nature of its origins, and its future, extends beyond all aspects of history, even into fields like geography and zoology. This is a field that since the Enlightenment, architecture has been hard pressed to find its own base within over-scientific concepts of the universe. If at first a simple fact may make the story—architecture as a biologically artifactual nature—soon the expanding history of life on Earth and the “creation” of the universe added new dimensions. In the long term we see architecture slipping from firm ground and probing deeper into its uncertain origins. A Renaisssance palace may suggest that we can build from nature and achieve a refined and calibrated result—easily carved and elegantly proportioned columns and ornaments—but a contemporary building, say by Herzog & de Meuron, mixes photomorphographic imagery with a technologically motivated assembly of panels, challenging the “progress” we expect and inviting the order from the raw via the refined to the artificial.

DM: In some ways this accounts for why the basins, foundations, or authorities for architecture have multiplied and proliferated. As you say, architects have looked for a long time to other areas of knowledge and practice—to the sciences and mathematics, literature, and the arts. Not only has architecture looked to many disciplines, it has grown and changed over time, proliferating models to choose from. Architecture is ridged with this dilemma of having multiple bases that aren’t coordinated or necessarily related. I don’t know if it’s specific to architecture or not, but I can sort out how things happened and how they fit together. But there are a lot of different people, each with a different view of its origins, and that’s fine. But it doesn’t seem to give the sense of an overall understanding. I think what I’m trying to say is, architects should be looking to other areas of knowledge and practice to see how they build their own sense of identity.

DM: In my understanding of the development of architecture, one could look to the Renaissance, for example, and see how the study of classical literature and art influenced the Renaissance architects. Similarly, one could look to the Industrial Revolution and see how that influenced the development of modern architecture. I think that by looking at these historical examples, architects can gain insights into how they can develop their own identity.

DM: Architecture is so tied up with the history of science and technology that it’s difficult to disentangle them. However, I think it’s important to recognize the influence that science and technology have had on architecture, and how architecture has influenced science and technology in return.

DM: I think it’s important to recognize the impact that science and technology have had on architecture, and how architecture has influenced science and technology in return. For example, the development of concrete and steel allowed for the construction of taller buildings, which in turn influenced the design of buildings and the way they were perceived. Similarly, the development of new materials and techniques has allowed architects to create more complex and innovative designs.

DM: Architecture must also take into account the cultural and social context in which it is produced. It is not enough to simply focus on the technical aspects of construction; architects must also consider the social and political implications of their work. For example, in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks, there was a push to create buildings that were more secure and resilient, which led to the development of new materials and techniques.

DM: It’s true that science and technology have had a significant impact on architecture, but I think it’s also important to recognize the role that the arts and humanities have played in the development of architecture. For example, the study of history, literature, and art has provided architects with a rich source of inspiration and ideas.

DM: In my opinion, the study of history, literature, and art has provided architects with a rich source of inspiration and ideas. By looking at the work of past architects and artists, architects can gain insights into the ways in which architecture has developed over time, and how it can be used to express different cultural and social values.

DM: I think it’s important to recognize the role of the arts and humanities in the development of architecture, but I also think that science and technology have had a significant impact. For example, the development of new materials and techniques has allowed architects to create more complex and innovative designs.

DM: In my opinion, the development of concrete and steel allowed for the construction of taller buildings, which in turn influenced the design of buildings and the way they were perceived. Similarly, the development of new materials and techniques has allowed architects to create more complex and innovative designs.

DM: Architecture must also take into account the cultural and social context in which it is produced. It is not enough to simply focus on the technical aspects of construction; architects must also consider the social and political implications of their work. For example, in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks, there was a push to create buildings that were more secure and resilient, which led to the development of new materials and techniques.
Jeanne Gang of Studio Gang, in Chicago, is the fall Louis I. Kahn Visiting Assistant Professor at Yale, where I advanced studio. Nina Rapaport interviewed her about her approach to architecture. She will present her work in a lecture, "Through Material," on Monday, September 12, 2005.

Nina Rapaport: How did you establish your independent practice after working for OMA in the Netherlands, and why did you choose Chicago as the place to start your practice?

Jeanne Gang: It was a conscious decision for me to go to Chicago, a place where I felt I would have the opportunity to design buildings that would be built. I had started on my own in 1997, then joined forsoa in 1999 with Mark Schenkel, with whom I had worked at OMA, and with Kathy O'Donnell from Chicago. At OMA I was able to work on two real projects—the Life Grand Palace and the Bordeaux House—not just competitions. My first project in Chicago, the Starlight Theater at Rock Valley College, was an outdoor theater, a civic project that opened the door to getting other public projects. The theater was near the town where I grew up, which helped me see that there was a great client who was very ambitious, and we were able to elevate his design goals. One of the first things I showed to the college was a model with an operable roof to make the theater functional year-round. Knowing the contractor’s capabilities to build large-scale projects, we argued that the idea was achievable, but as it turned out the dean of the college was a hydraulic engineer and had no problem with the concept.

NR: This project involved collaborations with engineers and contractors from the outset. How does your built work contribute to an innovative way of working?

JG: What I really like about working on real buildings, and at OMA, is the collaboration with team members, especially the engi- neers. I brought this to our practice, where we involve consultants at the start of each project. When there is good collaboration, there is a chance for discovery during the process. I-I in Chicago, I worked with a studio with engineer Tim MacFarlane, and then he was the one who engineered the Starlight Theater.

NR: How do you see the impact of architecture in your design process? Does it determine the form? Do you see it as integrated with your design process or an after-effect?

JG: Structure has a lot to do with form, but it is one of a number of things that you consider. It is a driving component that is critical to how the building is ultimately interpreted. It is important for structure and services to be consid- ered early on because it reinforces the work throughout the project, realizing and revealing how something is made.

Structure is a component; it can solidify your idea or liberate it. In the Masonry Variations exhibition installation last year, for example, the idea was about the thin- ness of structure. We explored what stone could do in tension. We had to find a bal- ance between materials, the process of making, and the form, in order to hang a marble curtain in tension from the mus- eum ceiling. It hadn’t been done before. Considering the shape, we had to figure out how lateral loads would be accommodo- rated. We suggested the wheel brace is a complete integration of structure, form, and ornament. The idea of this being done by the architect alone.

NR: Speaking of craft, what role does it play in your work? Are you focused on craft within the different aspects of materials in the making or as a formal way of understanding building?

JG: Our interest is in wanting to take mate- rial further, which is why we can’t ignore how it is put together in the field, the scale of the material, and the way it gets con- nected. One project includes a lightweight, lazy brick screen. Before talking to the engineer about it, I needed to find the right builder to build it. So I worked first with masons, who know the intricacies of mortar joints and ways of customizing lateral brick and tile on the whole piece together. When you are working with a contractor, you need to align with the engineer. To achieve lightness and delicacy as we are designing, we really need to know about craft—and that is a differentiation from the work of OMA. I am interested in the appearance of lightness and fragility with materials that are very strong.

NR: Are you trying to create an effect in conjunction with the significance of struc- ture to give meaning or justification to the materials of a project?

JG: With the screen I was conceptually trying to expose something ordinary, such as the cavity wall between the brick and backup material, and I was trying to bring a presence to an absence that never is—never to reveal something new about something we take for granted.

NR: You have also brought this craft and concern for tactonics into your work for the Ohio State American Community Center in Chicago, as a cultural and design issue with meaning beyond the material surface. How did you integrate the cultural issues into the center’s design for the urban set- tling without making it kitsch or tonnism?

What specific design and historic considerations were involved in the cultural aspects of the design?

JG: The Chinese American Service League wanted their building to be a part of Chinatown and be a symbol of aspira- tions but a modern approach. They also wanted it to make a familiar place for recent Chinese immigrants. What I find interesting in traditional Chinese architecture is how the environment is modified. I created a latticework sunshade to protect a major room on the corner from excessive heat gain. We designed many patterns based on refer- ences to Chinese designs. The first ones were not Chinese enough for the client, so the process was a combination of finding a pattern that worked for the sunshade and for the client’s perception of what is Chinese. They had to interpret their culture for us.

NR: Do the organizational sys- tem of a nonprofit agency so different from working with a privately funded institution? JG: It is indeed a top appointment. We also worked with a Feng shui master, who questioned that we change the building’s entrance. But for us it all made sense because our work is criteria-driven. We try to do as much fact-finding as we can, so that the base of knowledge enables our imagination to make a leap. So instead of starting with a form, we begin with research. And sometimes we find things we didn’t expect that influence the design, as opposed to applying a formal idea to a project a priori.

NR: So your research is based on multiple aspects of a project: site, context, pro- gram, environment, materials? Does that overwhelm your project or get in the way?

JG: It is so easy now to complete loads of information, but one thing usually rises to the top in terms of importance. For exam- ple, for the project we are working on for the Ford Calumet Environmental Center, near Chicago, we completed research on climate and habitat and learned the envi- ronmental and cultural history of the former industrial area. Then one intern, who had studied biology, added her finding that 97 million birds die a year in glass collision. It struck me that this was the significant issue that could inform the design, especially for a nature center. So we focused on creat- ing a physical manifestation of that issue. A professor at Northwestern College, Daniel Kien, had experimented with preventing birds from hitting glass and found that exterior screens worked. Birds were able to see lines that were four inches apart, so that gave us some criteria to create a screened porch with discarded materials from the site. It is like a basket- woven metal mesh that envelops the build- ing, making a blind for people to look at the birds while preventing the birds from flying into the glass.

NR: And what happens to your research- oriented firm as you take on projects of larger scale and higher risks?

JG: We are interested in the complexity of a project, no matter the scale. We have just begun a high-rise on Columbus Drive, in Chicago, that has both complexity and scale. The development was a patchwork of buildings on a block north of Millennium Park. It is adjacent to three levels of infrastruc- ture, an electrical substation that has air rights, and right-of-ways that have to be preserved in Burnham Park. I designed an entirely new structure ground planes. We are designing a 70-story residential tower with about 350,000 square feet of retail. It is exciting to be working at that scale.

NR: How are you able to move your research beyond a specific project toward civic issues and urbanism that involve the politics of a building, such as the "Beauxarts in the City" project for the Vaux Bijouterie?

JG: We explore projects that are about the city that could have a real impact. Before the Biennale, we had been looking at urban areas around baseball stadiums for a num- ber of years, because Chicago has two very different stadiums: one that encourag- es urbanity and the other that rejects it. We had thought about the urban condition and the building type but had never compiled the stadium design until we were selected by Architectural Record to reconsider the design of the Biennale last year. Our hyper-urban baseball stadium was very convincing because we located it above the city’s infrastructure of existing parking and transportation, rather than isolating it in a vacant parking lot. This new stadium could fold away and disappear when not in use.

NR: It seems that you are provoking urban design issues in a very pragmatic way. What other urban dilemmas have sparked your interest? Do you ever push an idea beyond the boundaries of what architects are allowed to design?

JG: Recently we have been looking at cas- sins as a type, because there is a plan to build one in Chicago. In the Midwest, cass- nes are normally placed on riverbanks in the suburbs. We were interested in exploring what a land-bounded casino could be, and we have designed what we call the "Eco- Casino" for a Chicago exhibition. Again, we located it within the downtown infra- structure. We wanted to show the potential of this building type and that it could offer something new: a combination of ecology and cash flow for the city. We distributed our idea in the form of postcards to all of the politicians in Illinois, and it influenced their current discussions for a downtown, land-bounded casino.

NR: In what other projects away from your home base have you been able to investi- gate issues of urban significance?

JG: We are in the midst of final design for the Hoboken 9/11 Memorial, in New York City, with architect of record Jeanne-Catherine Echelman. We will also have the chance to work further afield on the design of the Ananias Alabama Courthouse, which we were just commissioned to do through the GSA’s Design Excellence program.
The two-part exhibition Jean Prouvé: A Tropical House, curated by Robert Rubin, was held at the School of Architecture Galleries from April 6 through May 25, 2005.

Architecture exhibitions are by nature problematic. The complexity of displaying a representation of a building or its parts, removed from the viewer via layers of photographs, drawings, and textual interpretations, is not the same as experiencing the architectural things. Thus, a building amassed inside a gallery is uncommon. But the work of Jean Prouvé (1901–1984) is important but uncommon. Jean Prouvé, A Tropical House, curated by Robert Rubin (Yale College ‘74), was an ambitious exhibition on the great twentieth-century constructivist, focusing, particularly on his iconic prefabricated Tropical House, designed in 1951. Retrieved from Brazzaville, Congo, and installed in Paris, France, by Atelier Bannew, the house acted as a travel icon against the backdrop of historical evidence, illustrating the designer’s dedication to the techniques of prefabrication.

Complementing the Tropical House, the exhibition design by Dean Sakamoto, director of exhibitions, included large-format photography documenting the restoration effort and a trove of Prouvé artifacts, including architectural drawings and furniture.

Adequate and minute details were provided by Randy Bell and Robert Rubin, called Prouvé a naturalist, but the exhibit was a testament to the restoration in France the previous year.

For Rubin, a retired commodities broker, and a Ph.D. candidate at Columbia University, Prouvé’s work is an important link between the Modernist rational architecture as a cultural artifact and as an industrial object. Prouvé managed this correspondence by utilizing large-scale industrial practices with a set of skills associated with handwork. Although that interest began in earnest with the work of the German architect Peter Behrens (1868–1949) and in the pedagogy of the Bauhaus, Prouvé was one of the few to explicitly enact such a practice by creating a sort of studio in the factory.

What makes Prouvé interesting is that for all of his involvement in building with steel, he was not trained as an architect or engineer but as an iron craftsmen in Nancy, France. Perhaps because of this, he saw early on the importance of experimenting with material and the new production and material processing that grew quickly in the building industry. A combination of cutting-edge machine manufacturing and the techniques of shop practices led to a body of work that reflected a fully integrated understanding of materials and processes, and to an assertion of its materiality primarily as bent steel.

Although Prouvé’s furniture business indicates his ability as a designer, the discrete, singular displays of his technique in metal and wood in the Tropical House demonstrate his most comprehensive application of his methods at the large-scale—from singular components of a single unit to massive structural frameworks of material limits of steel. Even when a common structural steel pipe would have sufficed, Prouvé designed a lighter, folded sheet of steel to perform the same structural function. Unlike his much lauded and now highly valued furniture, Prouvé’s attempt at prefabricated architecture met with little popular success. This shift from the furniture to an architecture introduced a more complex set of impediments in terms of the economics of houses and the peculiarities of public taste. It could be that Prouvé was ahead of his time. It could also be that the people of Modemien had by that time begun to turn away from concerns for the efficiency of material form to experimentation with a more indigent and plastic expression. Certainly traditional housing was still more popular than even the most heroic of Modernist architecture.

But that was a half a century ago, and the timing of this exhibition couldn’t be better. It manages to capitalize on the happy intersection of the current revival of Prouvé’s work in the design community with an equally enthusiastic interest in prefabricated architecture. The restoration and display of the Tropical House helps to reproduce a series of important issues carried forward by an early Modernist dictum: that architecture can still be a model of efficiency, lightness, and beauty. The work also reintroduces a challenge for architects to consider the traditional housing established in the separation of the practice and production of architecture. It is a question that is confronts us again today, with a new host of technological advancements such as digitally assisted fabrication, exciting new material compositions, new abilities for mass-customization (for example, 3D printing), and a far more sophisticated building industry that has challenged the profession to once again consider how they design and produce.

Built by Prouvé in 1951, the Tropical House was a prototypical prefabricated dwelling designed for the tropical central African environment of Congo. The project was initiated by a request from French architects Paul Herbie and Jean Le Courrier, who lived in the capital, Brazzaville, and approached Prouvé to help find an architecture that would perform better in the hot climate than the existing contemporary concrete structures, which were intolerably warm at night. Prouvé saw this as an ideal challenge not only to produce a lightweight and efficient structure but also one that could perform well. At the building elements work to create a passive thermal chimney while also maintaining a low thermal entry through lightweight material, critical to the inhabitant’s comfort. Due to a lack of popular interest and all of Prouvé’s preconceived housing endeavors, the Tropical House never went into full production. However, the structure remains one of the most cohesive representations of Prouvé’s ability as a constructor. Prouvé implemented an ambitious exercise in material and structural efficiency, all the while maintaining his design and prefabrication technique of bent steel profiles. Every aspect of the structure exhibits Prouvé’s signature, particularly the enigmatic, small overt windows and vents, louvers, columns, and panels, all of which exploit the workshop’s machinery and innovative techniques.

The first installment of the exhibition inside the gallery began with the display of a structural bay of the Tropical House, along with several large photographs and speciﬁcs from the restoration process. Utilizing the double-height portion of the gallery, the exhibition offered a striking view both from the main floor as well as from the interior balcony. When the Tropical House was retrieved from Brazzaville, numerous segments of the structure were found in various states of deterioration and were no longer suitable for their original purposes. By displaying only a section of the house without access, the exhibition team allowed visitors to see the original structural elements in place.

The second installment was the Tropical House, unpacked from its two blue shipping containers and artistically arranged on the site adjacent to the AIA Building. Amid the austere masonry surroundings, the steel structure, paneled alpí fourteen concrete pier, created a small sit on campus and was protected by a fence of steel-reinforcing bars and Plexiglas, designed by Dean Sakamoto. With space freed up in the gallery, Rubin brought in another set of furniture, a 1956 Citroën Devin Cheveux, and building elements for display.

About the Restoration Process

The exhibition was in many ways about a particularly unique restoration project. Too often, historically important pieces of architecture become victims of historical conflict, and this house was no exception. Its advantage, however, was that it was designed as a set of assembled pieces. Although it was never intended to travel after being installed, its components were well suited to deconstruction.

However, it was no easy task because of the lack of existing drawings. Often Prouvé’s drawings were by-products of a prototyping process. Without them, the building pieces were seen as a complex dimensional and structural puzzle. Since the house was a prototype, many of the pieces were nonrepetitive, making it even more complex. The end of the lengthy restoration process resulted in a packet of drawings that were shown in the exhibition space, furnishing each piece of the house as though they were artifacts from an archaeological dig. This brought to light how each component worked in concert with the others. From the distinct structural panels that were pressure-fit into place to the aluminum roof panels that stiffen the structural diaphragm, each piece could easily be lifted and bolted into place. The house became a choreographed exercise in both the capacity of the structure to its absolute limit and an ease of assembly.

The heroic reassembly of the building in New Haven proceeded at a fast pace, with a crew of three and an army of two-man teams (transplanted from France) assembling the building on top of new concrete piers.

The two shipping containers had been customized to accommodate each piece, allowing easy transport. Not many schools are prepared for such a large-scale exhibit, but with the help and experience of School of Architecture professor Paul Broida (‘91), honed from 30 years of erecting the annual Building Projects of the architecture studio, the assembly of the Tropical House went quickly and smoothly. The structure came together in a matter of days.

The Tropical House exhibition raises the question as to whether Prouvé succeeded in bringing architects closer to the practice of manufacturing. The presence of the Tropical House on Yale’s campus poses a provocative juxtaposition between the modern AIA Building and the gothic-style campus. In any case, an all too relevant question in the context of a school of architecture gallery becomes: How can the practice of architecture be more influenced by the integration of prefabrication techniques and material experimentation in the academy?

Rubin’s Yale lecture underscored the importance of the cultural politics and Modernist ethos that surrounds the Prouvé legacy by reflecting upon both his newfound popularity and the difficulty of trying to categorize Prouvé in the context of Modernist architecture. As a designer and a fabricator, Prouvé was neither a practicing architect nor a professional engineer; he was in between an artisan and an industrialist, but always autonomous. At times that autonomy came at a certain price. Although his career was tremendously influential, Prouvé was still vulnerable to an unforgiving manufacturing economy, as we can see in the loss of his Meudon venture. He was no less vulnerable to the public taste, which leads us to consider the additional innovations that might have occurred had Prouvé been more engaged in the practice of architecture.

― Michael Tower (‘00) Tower is a visiting assistant professor at Pratt Institute and has an architectural practice in New York.

"Eero Saarinen: Form-Giver of the 'American Century,'" was held Friday-Saturday, April 1-2, 2005 as part of the Saarinen Project at Yale and the Finnish Cultural Institute.

In the conclusion to his 1962 professional pseudo-obiituary, Reyner Banham summed up his feelings about Eero Saarinen (34): "He was never a really great architect, and I have some reservations about his Tuberculosis building in the city. But only some, and those not enough to detract from the fact that he was a great designer with a stamp of stunning professional expertise on everything he did. Perhaps the detractors who now compete in praise were just jealous?" If it seems strange that it was the year before he died, he must have been critically reviewed of Saarinen's work who was coming to his defense, well, it is. Banham's reading of Saarinen was fraught with the disappointment of a child that realizes that even in the days of his youth, his hero was, be. As the architect of the General Motors Technical Center (1949-56), Saarinen was a god, at least a demigod of the Mid-century style; as the architect of the United States Embassy in London (1950-60), he was all too mortal, a blasphemer of the great project of Modernist architecture, the embodiments of all that was bad about America (architecture and elsewhere), and, if not the most, certainly on the leading edge of a regression into eclecticism, Historicism, neo-classicism, and other sins against Modernism.

As Banham's remark suggests, in the year following his death the job of the critic was to deal with his legacy. In 1961 Saarinen must have looked too much of the heat for what was wrong about postwar architecture - what had been seen as innovation and experimentation came to represent itself as pretentious and inappropriate. Given how profoundly disturbing Banham and other critics of the period found Saarinen's heterogeneity, it is perhaps all the more surprising how little has been written about him despite its centrality to the self-styled, so-called "second generation" of Modernist architecture. In the relative silence of the almost forty-five years since his death, the architect, a slow speaker and hardly a prolific writer, has largely been left to speak for himself, who has done through the pages of Aline Saarinen's edited volume of his writings, first published by the Yale University Press in 1962.

In 2002, Kevin Roche donated his collection of Saarinen materials to Yale. The archive, consisting of over 600 boxes of drawings, letters, and other forms of related materials, was added to the archives previously donated by Yost and Aline Saarinen. With the support of a major research grant from the Getty Foundation, Yale is again returning to the subject of one of its most illustrious and controversial graduates in a traveling exhibition and publication, co-organized with the Finnish Institute in Architecture and the National Building Museum. One of the goals of the project, led by Eva-Lisa Pelkonen (MED '97 and director of the curatorial research team), is to uncover for the first time just how much knowledge on our part to say "redefines" - and interpret the great number of Saarinen's buildings and projects. Another goal is to complicate the ideas we have about Saarinen, discovering that the ever-present danger in a project on a controversial figure like Saarinen is redemption through rehabilitation, Pelkonen and Donald Albrecht — curators of the exhibition and co-editor of the book — have wisely conceived the exhibition as a whole without the use of separate entities. The two-day symposium "Eero Saarinen: Form-Giver of the American Century," represents the first step toward the publication and was conceived as a working meeting where the researchers an opportunity to open their projects up to one another, fellow scholars in the field, former Saarinen office colleagues, and young practitioners.

Rethinking Saarinen

In many respects, Vincent Scully's keynote adds to the confusion: "Rethinking Saarinen," was emblematic of the complex project of reconfiguring Saarinen and his contributions to architecture. Often a rigorous critic of the architect during his lifetime, Scully has, in his less than complimentary remarks and his uncomfortable position in having to face him as the keynote speaker of the symposium. Indeed, as he stated, it is the late Alan Temko, author of the "best and more balanced work on Saarinen," who "should be here instead of me." Scully first reflected upon his "derisive and even hostile" criticism of Saarinen, placing it within the context of the 1950s and 1960s and his own preference for the "more reasonable" forms of Kahn and Tafur. Speaking about Saarinen today, he confessed to feeling a "twinge of guilt," recalling a note he wrote in the 1950s criticizing the "more rigid" forms of Saarinen's work. 'I said toward rather arbitrary architectural experiment,' he wrote, "chose to do instead was focus on Saarinen's work within architecture in the 1950s, a decade in which the central questions about what it meant to be American and what constituted an American art in the context of the Cold War, were reenvisioned.

Valerie Steele's focus on Saarinen's emphasis on simplicity was implicitly tied to what Scully called the "impoverished generation," that at their "most transcendental" but at their weakest "invoked his work." He then charted Saarinen's course through what Scully has described as the "provincialist strain" (no better illustrated than in the 5/6-inch thickness of the spandrel at BM Rockefeller) and through Saarinen's exploration of architectural forms in the Krone Auditorium and Chrysler Saarinen's careful study of context, or "total environment," was revealed in the Ezra Stiles and Morse Colleges—Scully was especially appreciative of Saarinen's opening up of Yale to the community of New Haven (the gates were only later installed)—but saw Saarinen holding back from his "making-place".

Before moving on to discuss the individual papers and panels, the title of the symposium — "Eero Saarinen: Form-Giver of the 'American Century'"— suggests that the event would address the cultural and historical significance of Saarinen's work. Indeed, in the opening address, Kevin Roche gave as much关注 to the opportunity to open their projects up to one another, fellow scholars in the field, former Saarinen office colleagues, and young practitioners.
to complexity the relationship between furniture and architecture is an extremely important one.

Taking up three of the most well-known buildings—Yale, Ezra Stiles and Samuel F. B. Morse Colleges, and the General Motors Technical Center—Randall Isenstadt of Yale's department of art history explored what he termed the "perfor- mative" in Saarinen's work. By examining the self-consciously dramatic, theatrical, and performatory qualities of the buildings that engage rather than distance the user (as in the specimens), Isenstadt asserted that we might come closer to understanding the experiential, or "liveness," in Saarinen. Seen from this point of view, TWA is "unpredictably compelling" not because its form suggests flight but "because it scripts visual movement, psychologically preparing the traveler for the next step in his/her journey. Life-Albrecht, Isenstadt sees Saarinen as an independent "actor," arguing that theatrically was the conscious intention rather than simply an unexpected outcome of his work, Isenstadt concluded with a provocative reading of the powerful dualities encoded in the General Motors complex: a masterful choreography of "cerebral restraint" and "somatic release." ILT, as he noted, has nothing to equal the mise-en-scène set up by Saarinen: the cool, sustained control of the Miesian system broken by hot colors, stage lighting, and curved forms.

Moving up another degree of scale to that of planning, Alan Plattus's talk on Saarinen's work for college and university campuses unfolded as so many revelations. The first was the sheer number of projects for institutions of higher education: No less than one-third of the office's work was devoted to campus master plans and buildings. Plattus, professor of architecture at Yale, was quick to discuss the audience of any notion that the main story lies in the individual buildings, thereby pulling the perspective back to expose Saarinen's careful study of context, the "next big thing." A remarkable series of sketches and drawings, recently pulled from the archives, followed for such projects as the master plan at Brandeis University (begun with Eliel Saarinen, 1949-52), the early 1950s master plan for the North Campus of the University of Michigan (the Music School was realized), and of course plans and buildings for Yale (1953-61). Projects like the cluster of religious buildings at Brandeis were not conceived as compositional groupings but as "fabric" and were thus intended to dissolve into, rather than dominate, the landscape. Studies for Stiles and Morse show Saarinen carefully drawing the tower of the Payne Whitney Gymnasium into dialogue and engaging "an almost irrefutable dialectic of symmetry/asymmetry, closed/open"—convincing archival evidence for Plattus's assertion that Camillo Sitte's three-dimensional planning was as important to Eero as it had been to Eliel for the Crenshy plan. The "smoking gun" of formal historical precedent—sketches of Piazza San Marco and the Sienna Campos—were found among the rolls of drawings for Drake University (1947-55) and for the Yale Colleges, respectively. Plattus revealed the tip of the Saarinen iceberg and demonstrated the potential of the archive to bring new understanding of his design sources, methodology, and motivations.

In her challenging response to the session, Sarah Goldhagen identified symbolic forms as the red thread uniting the three scales of Saarinen's practice. Underlying each scale, she said, is "the search for a physical embodiment of communally resonant symbols." Goldhagen offered Suzanne Langer's popular work on symbolic expres- sion in art as a possible source. By reading the "style for the job" approach through Langer, Goldhagen proposed that it might show itself to be a "much more profound, deep, and resonant endeavor to re-anchor a juggernaut society, over threatening to spin-out of human control."

1. Eero Saarinen in the Womb Chair. Courtesy of Yale Archives and Manuscripts.
2. Eero Saarinen, drawing of an adminis- trative building concept. Courtesy of Yale Archives and Manuscripts.
3. Eero Saarinen, competition entry first place for A Police Station, 1934. Courtesy of Yale Archives and Manuscripts.
Collaborations

Led by Dean Robert A. M. Stern, the first of two panel discussions of the day brought four architects who had worked for Saarinen—Robert Venturi (Hon. Degree Yale 1979), Helene Roy (’80), Cesare Pelli (former dean of Yale’s School of Architecture), and Kevin Roche—more fully into the conversation. In light of the plurality in both Saarinen’s work and the critical approaches so far explored toward its interpretation, it is perhaps not surprising that a unified vision did not emerge from the recollections offered by the participants. Venturi spoke first and added nuance to the issue of Saarinen’s eclecticism. While through its Baroque drama Saarinen’s work expresses Venturi’s definition of “complexity,” it lacks the “contradiction” required to make the work Modernist, an approach that Venturi would have preferred. Pelli, Pelli, and Roche each focused on the intensity of the office practice, the almost clichéd phrase “getting it right” used in connection with the rigorous exploration and experimentation involved in every project. It was in the question period that the differences in opinion came to the fore, especially with regard to the issue of Saarinen’s “style for the job,” which elicited a series of sharp exchanges between Roche and Venturi about Saarinen’s motivations. Interestingly, it was Venturi who came across as the Modernist in his critique of Saarinen’s “stylistic, costumelle approach.”

Symbol, Form, and Materiality

Moderated by Lawless, the final session focused on three singular themes, each of which again underscored the problematic heterogeneity of Saarinen’s work. For many critics, Saarinen’s pluralism was equated with inconsistency. Almost every architectural triumph was matched by a less successful building. But as Pellekien suggested at the end of the second paper of the session, it may be these projects that reveal the most about Saarinen. Of these “failures,” no other building received as scathing a review as the United States Embassy in London (1955-61), the focus of Tuomi’s paper on Saarinen’s three embassy projects. Not even Tecton could muster up much positive to say about this building, and Saarinen himself owned up to some doubt, writing, “In my own mind the building is much better than the English think—but not quite as good as I wished it to be.” Taking up the criticism leveled by J. M. Richards, Peter Smithson, and, of course, Banham, Tuomi focused his discussion on the most egregious of the embassy’s architectural sins, that of “false monumentalism.” Pellekien’s talk on “The Search for Form” also entered into the verboten territory of Saarinen’s “stylistic pluralism,” specifically his formalism, which, as she aptly pointed out, was a source of the rising anxiety within the profession that architecture had entered into a period of chaos and confusion. Perhaps in response to the growing criticism of his work, around 1960 Saarinen formulated a position on what contemporary architecture should try to express, including his “Six Pillars of Architecture” concern for the perceptual and experiential aspects of architecture. Indeed, it is in Saarinen’s privileging of the “participatory nature of architectural experience” that a consistency can be located in his otherwise heterogeneous formal vocabulary. In a statement prepared for Perspectives shortly before his death, Saarinen rather poignantly wrote, “Once one embarks on a concept for a building, this concept has to be exaggerated and overstated and repeated in every part of its interior, so that wherever you are, inside or outside, the building sings with the same message.” Pellekien also took the important step to place Saarinen in the “form-giver” within a larger intellectual framework, connecting his ideas about the representational and appropriation of forms to his father, Eliel Saarinen, (articulated in his 1949 book The Search for Form in Art and Architecture) and to George Kubler at Yale. Although not mentioned in the talk, Kubler’s mentor, Henri Focillon, is the unnamed presence in this discussion of form. There is more to be said about the ideas that were in the air at Yale in relation to Saarinen’s work starting from about 1953 (the year he was appointed chair to A. Whitney Griswold, Yale university’s president), Ernst Cassirer, the father of symbolic form, taught at Yale briefly in the 1940s, and his disciple Suzanne Langer, who Goldhagen brought into view, drew his ideas into aesthetics and made them accessible to a lay audience, architects chief among them. If there was a zeitgeist of architecture in the mid-1950’s, Langer’s nuanced concept of “significant form” played no small role in it. It fell to the final paper, given by Reinhold Martin of Columbia University, to address the inherent dualities in Saarinen’s work. Martin want far toward formalizing a more satisfying framework within which to see Saarinen. Rather than being a “late Modern” or a “proto-Post-Modern,” Saarinen might best be seen as a hybrid of these two movements, which is not a smooth blending of two entities but the very embodiment of ambivalence, in the same way as Horst K. Bubka has argued about culture. Posing the seemingly simple question “What is a material?” Martin shifted his focus away from Saarinen’s glass-and-steel curtain walls for IBM to explore the very different materialities of the John Deere and Company Headquarters (1957-60) and the CBS Headquarters (1960-64). Martin showed that the traditional oppositions of natural/artificial and material/image cease to be meaningful in projects that are as sophisticated as the oxidizing surface of the Corten steel structure of John Deere or the “liquid-honed” granite slabs affixed to the concrete structure of the CBS tower. While Saarinen’s “style for the job” approach may remain problematic for historians and critics, Martin artfully concluded that “deep inside architecture...lies something that we might dare to call the truth about architecture: The moment that, deep inside, at architecture’s inductively material core, virtually—that is, image and style and but cultural meaning—reappear.”

In his response to the session, Detlef Martinis, of the University of Pennsylvania, noted how the three papers arrived at the “irreducibility of architecture,” symbol, form, and materiality. He elaborated on the discussion of form, placing it in yet another context, suggesting that a more romantic conception of form as that which speaks to the senses, but also expresses the subconscious and intuitive, might be relevant in considering Saarinen’s search for symbolic expression. He also saw a theory of the symbol replacing that of character—a potentially critical evolution given Saarinen’s Beaux-Arts education (an issue left untouched in the presentations).

Legacy

The symposium came to its formal conclusion in a panel on Saarinen’s legacy, moderated by Kurt Forster of the Bauhaus-Universität Weimar and inaugural Vincent Scully Visiting Professor of Architecture at Yale. The three speakers—Sarah Whiting of Harvard and Greg Lynn and Keith Krumwiede (both of Yale)—confirmed the continued relevance of expression, form, and plurality for contemporary architects. Of the members of the panel, only Lynn confessed to a long-standing fascination with Saarinen, one that first took him on a cross-country trip to see the buildings. He proposed a new bodily/technical-normative-culture-space-blended-tecnology, gr-ident extravagism, office architecture, com-ponent fusion—for seeing how Saarinen’s work might be translated into the present. Whiting focused her comments on Saarinen’s emphasis on expression, distin- guishing it from symbolism and connecting it to experience and hence communication. She concluded her comments by reiterating the paradigm of an architecture parable that relies upon “metaphor, symbol, or illustrations of process,” calling instead for an architecture that resonates by “deploy- ing figures, shape, and form.” By contrast, Krumwiede found an interesting middle ground in Saarinen between pragmatism (function and luxury (pleasure). Aiming himself with Banham and his critique of American commercial culture, Krumwiede proposed a final provocative reading of Saarinen as a Pop architect.

Saarinen emerged on the other side of two days of papers and discussions not just as a problematic figure in the history of twentieth-century architecture but also as a very complex architect working through a very complex—even contradictory—set of principles in a very complex time. Perhaps one of the greatest realizations to come out of the ten papers was that any project to reconcile Saarinen’s plurality and corre-sponding inconsistency would be both mis-guided and futile. For the present moment, the danger of redeeming Saarinen as a misunderstood genius has been averted. In an an age suspicious of heroes, we may be prepared to accept Saarinen’s too human architecture.

—Carmen McAtee

McAtee is a Ph.D candidate in the history of art and architecture at Harvard University.

1. Symposium participants, from left to right, top to bottom: Robert A. M. Stern, Timo Tuomi, Mark Cut, Will Miller, Donald Albrecht, Barry Bagdol, Vincent Scully, Elvia-Lise Pellekien, Plekka Konnersveen, Sandy Banstock, Alain Planul, Sarah Goldhagen, Cesar Pelli, Kevin Roche, Helene Roy, Robert Venturi, Reinhold Martin, Detlef Martinis, Keith Krumwiede, Sarah Whiting, Greg Lynn, and Kurt Forster.
3. Eero Saarinen, Plan for the expansion of Cross Campus, Yale University. Courtesy of Yale University Manuscripts and Archives.
The Museum of Modern Art's landscape architecture exhibition, Groundswell: Constructing the Contemporary Landscape, displayed from February 25 to May 16, 2005, was curated by Peter Reed, deputy director for Curatorial Affairs, and assistant curator Irene Shen (920), and will travel to the Zacha Zoltovein as part of "Entry 2006" in Canada (Germany from August 20th - December 3, 2006).

Groundswell accomplishes two important objectives. First, it reintroduces MoMA to landscape architecture, long neglected by the Department of Architecture and Design, as an important design medium. As Glenn Lowry states in the forward to the Groundswell catalog, the museum's official interest in landscape architecture has been minimal, with a few notable exceptions: its iconic, outdoor sculpture garden, its publication in 1946 of Elizabeth H. Howes's Modern Gardens and the Landscape, and the exhibition, Robert Burns Men: The Unrealized Art of the Garden. In 1991, Groundswell appropriately addresses this hitherto ignored imbalance. Second, it presents an international survey of twenty-three contemporary landscape projects whose shared focus during the past two decades has been public space, ranging from town squares, memorial gardens, and public parks to reclaimed brownfields, disused military and industrial sites, and the world's largest sandy dunes. The disparate works are organized around the Reptilian device of describing and, in some cases, showing each site's intransigent conditions before being transformed by the landscape architects' interventions. The approach is a good one since the spirit of the majority of works exhibited is regenerative.

At a time when some architects seem fixated on technological innovation and design their buildings as autonomous, sculptural objects, seemingly without regard for context, whether physical or social, contemporary landscape architects have been transforming the public realm into spaces that have reclaimed unused or environmentally unsafe sections of our cities as habitable spaces for the urban dweller. Although affirming the time-honored principle that public landscapes should provide health, recreation, and beauty for those who use them, these landscape professionals have adopted radical new forms of design that no longer rely on old-fashioned greenwashed parks, John Nolen's classic, or chichi-themed parks. Aware we are of our social responsibility as environmentalists, they have begun to question the role architects have traditionally played in urban place-making and have formed a new alliance with urban planning. James Corner and Charles Waldheim (two of this merger landscape urbanism, "a term used, according to Reed, "to describe the shift from architecture as the traditional proprietor of city form to landscape as a new pars pro toto."

This is the central lesson that comes through in Groundswell. Reed groups the designs that the landscape architects adopt into three categories. The first, "Designing the Urban Stage", explores a boxed range of newly designed or proposed urban squares. At the large scale are three English projects: EDAN's inorder plan for Manhattan's City Center (1995-present), bonded by the IRA, including its Arg and its Design's proposal for Piccadilly Gardens (1998-2002) and Martha Schwartz's Exchange Square (1999-2002). These are intertwined into a pedestrian plaza, andWill Alsop's proposal for the Bradford City Gardens (2003-2003), which transforms the city's abandoned center into a series of large and small interconnected parks, brimming with brightly colored Pop imagery in which landscape serves as a matrix to re-create the city's divided neighborhoods.

Less ambitious in scale are Peter Walker's (in collaboration with Yul Sassak) and Adrian Guaia's (Waist 8 Urban Design and Landscape Architecture) rooftop projects in downtown Saltama City, Japan, and Rotterdam respectively. For Keyes Plaza (1994-2003), Walker employs his minimal- ist approach to landscape by planting on a grid several hundred zelkova trees, specifically selected for their symbolic association to a nearby temple complex, and interspersing them with stones and grass into tight geometries. The forested plaza, located atop a commercial building, is conceived as a space of reposée, a sacred grove, within the congested city. Corner's Guiaza designed Theatre Square (Schwoburg, 1991-98) as a synthetic urban oasis, slightly tilted above street level on an underground garage. The pavement consists of wood, rubber, precast metal, and epoxy, embedded with silver maple leaves. In lieu of trees, Guiaza creates vertically through a row of patios, waterfalls, and rows of monumental light- mast, landscape metaphors for Rotterdam's maritime industry, in this case the steel cranes that operate in its port. For both projects, visual symbols, natural and man-made, work well each city's historical past.

The second section, "Simulation of Nature and New Topographies," explores the fine line between disguised artefact and simulated nature in several parks of diverse scale, none of which resort to retardataire greenwashed solutions. Kathya Gualitano, for example, uses only native plantings to create a Midwestern prairie for the Lurie Garden (2000-05), in Chicago's Millenium Park. Catherine McVosh, on the other hand, uses a radically different approach to plants for her Botanical Garden in Bordeaux (2000-03). Here, she replicates the environmental characteristics of the surrounding Aquitaine Basin through three connecting gardens: one of water, another of field crops, and one focusing on multiple environmental issues.

This shift in ecological strategy parallels the work of Foreign Office Architects (FOA) and Weisz/Mandrell Architects (WMA), both of which fabricate topographies to construct parkland for parks having forty-foot trees. At Barcelona's Sorolla Park, 1999-2002, WMA constructs a high-tech system of sand dunes on a landfill for an open site between a parking garage above and the sea below. Similarly, Willi connects Seattle Museum's Olympic Sculpture Park (2001- 06) to Puget Sound with a 2,200-foot, zigzag path that begins on the museum grounds, bridges a four-lane highway and railroad tracks that bisect the museum from the coastline, and terminates at a proposed new park along the shoreline.

The third section, "The Bad and the Beautiful," presents the most challenging propositions landscape architects face today: what to do with disused industrial and military space, toxic polluted ground, and sanitary landfill. The solutions vary considerably. At Duisburg-Nord, Germany (1999-2002), Peter Letz chose to leave the industrial structures of the Thyssen Steelworks in place. He creates a partially remediated park that recycles some of the industrial structures for recreational purposes and uses others as visual stimulation to evoke Germany's industrial past, turning the iron-and-steel ocean into being yet majestic objects.

Perhaps the best known project in Groundswell, Fresh Kills Lifescapes (2001- 05), in Staten Island, is also the most controversial and Hartmut-like; whether to hide or not to hide fifty years of New York City garbage lying underneath 200-foot high gross mounds. James Corner and Field Operations' proposal, with an anticipated start-up in 2007, appears to be the Reptilian one of hiding the "before" under a naturally regenerating "after" that will regenerate Moore's garbage dump into an environmentally safe, ecologically regenerating paradise of bike paths, ball fields, and bird-watching areas. Field Operations' solution is a biological one, the vision is as optimistic as an uncovered Reptilian picture.

Historical connections, touched on briefly in the catalog, are rarely mentioned in the exhibition. For example, has cited Oran's sixteenth-century Italian Renaissance garden at Bomarzo as an inspiration, but his project also recalls the eighteenth-century cult of ruins in the landscape park. Until Pickard has written on Lucca's connection to the Burkin sublime as well as J. C. Alphand's Parc des Buttes-Chaumont, Alpina's plan for interconnecting parks brings to mind the string of royal hunting parks in London that until Kensington to Westminster, Eton Memorials and Garina Pirro's Enghausen Chapel (1680-85) can be placed in a large history of geologically oriented landscape design. Walker's use of tree symbols looks back to the typology of the sacro-skylo groves of ancient Rome. The exhibition would have been well-served by bringing historical comparisons, which not only contextualize contemporary work but enrich our understanding of just how new these projects and designs are.

The range and quality of presentations in Groundswell are wide yet uneven. The compellingly large-scale models of Altop, Weisz/Mandrell, and Field Operations, for example, visually overpower most of the other work. Similarly, Altop's fast-paced animated video outshines every other video in this exhibition. This disparity highlights the conundrum landscape architects face: how to convey a sense of the outside, inside. The descriptive wall mount models, models, and videos in Groundswell underscore how rare for landscape architecture has mowed its garden-club connotations, but they also evidence the difficulties in giving museum-goers a true feeling of outdoor space. This remains an elusive goal for the profession, as this important exhibition demonstrates.

- Bryan Fuernau
Fuernau is a lecturer in the History of Landscape Architecture, at
“Nonstandard Structures: An Organic Order of Irregular Geometries, Hybrid Members, and Chaotic Assemblies” was held on Friday, February 11-12, 2000, and exhibited a diverse group of practitioners, the event exhausted innovation. Building on the success of last year’s “Numbers Count” symposium, professor James Axley coordinated an apt and illuminating sequel titled “Nonstandard Structures: An Organic Order of Irregular Geometries, Hybrid Members, and Chaotic Assemblies.” Featuring presentations of current thinking and work by leading innovators and engineers, the symposium was as useful as its seemingly paradoxical billing, with ongoing discussion of the standards for a determination of “nonstandard,” the nature of nature, and the role of the computer in this evolution. Though the collaborating architects were left at home, design certainty was not, with presenters focusing not only on the technical resolution of their work but also on the underlying systems, ideas, and aesthetic interventions involved in creating the projects. Lately, both the blurring of disciplinary boundaries between engineering and architecture and the cross-pollination between architecture and engineering have become hot topics of renewed interest. The symposium added to these discussions not only the everyday presentations of design ideas—but also work in which architects were not involved but that still involved architects as responders in architectural design. In addition, the two-day symposium was the most forward-looking ever at the week when Hastings Hall held a talk to Stephen Wolfram, the creator of the computer program Mathematica and author of A New Kind of Science. Wolfram focused his Monday night lecture on his efforts to trace and explain complex phenomena in nature. In support of his premise that “it takes only very simple rules to produce highly complex behavior,” Wolfram’s mathematical methodology for reaching this conclusion with the aid of ample black and white graphics depicting the results generated by various cellular automata. These exhaustive studies show the effects of even a minor variation in the basic instructions for simple cell-based repeating systems were used to support the assertion that complexity is not only the result of simple rules but also the result of complex processes that can be studied and reproduced. In this context, repeating systems can be defined as being able to reproduce seemingly random and unpredictable behavior while remaining both highly regulated and infinitely reproducible. The performance of a natural world calculated by simple recursive processes and the possibilities these understandings make available for design were ideas echoed and materialized throughout the “Nonstandard” symposium.

While introducing engineer Chris Wise, the symposium’s keynote and Gordon H. S. Smith, chairman of James Axley’s University of Illinois, expressed the common conception of structural engineers as occupying all aspects of “oblivious gravities;” possessed by an “inexperienced population with numbers, formulae, and building codes that can paralyzed inspiration with a deadening numbness.” He projected that the most successful theorists would suggest instead that the model engineer, “intoxicated by form and set free by computational power,” could wield his knowledge base and expertise to “bring a certain bubbliness and joy into the design table.” It was a role for which Wilas, of Expedition Engineering and first professor of creative design at Imperial College London, was certainly well suited. His lecture, “Engineering Unbound,” focused not only on the work—he’s the “worldly” Millennium Bridge down to Arup, the mobile Antarctic Research Station, and historic reconstructions for the BBC—but also how through a delicate balance of the norm and goes from “beef” to “good.” Wise proposed that technology has fundamentally changed disciplinary boundaries, allowing “engineering to become more of an art, architecture more of a science, and all design more intuitive.” Providing examples of parametrically designed “natural” systems, Wise also contended that if the purpose of science is to make ideas come to life in the world, then in its efforts to make the world conform to ideas “engineering is the opposite of science.”

On the day’s events and clarifies his choice of the word “unbound” as the defining characteristic of the projects and ideas around which the symposium was crafted. Through the term “unbound” Wise not only conveys an idea of ongoing movement and contention during the day, Axley suggested “architecture is evolutionary,” built on a design process that has an affinity for nature. Identifying tiny antenna designs by NASA’s Evolutionary Systems Group, for which researchers used genetic algorithms to identify the most effective forms, he proposed that a suitable architectural analogy might resem- ble the “E Father Repton’s observed a prefabricated house.”

The following series of morning lectures were the most telling set of the day, with Henry Bardsey examining the line between unpredictability and standard methods, Chuck Hobeman dexterously jumping scales, Craig Schiffer proposing a wider knowledge of the scope for engineers and Neil Thomas presenting a startling variety of built work. Bardsey, a founder of RFR Structural Engineers in Paris, expressed concern that computer simulation, while an important tool, could become an excuse for not understanding the integrated design process expected to far outweigh the buildings’ underlying architectural merits, blurring the line between formal design and technical consultation. Of his experience working with architects,Thomas said it is a “lot less than anything. I find working with architects at times quite difficult because they are not very efficient.” His work showed that his principal interests were in the technical resolution and the question of challenging projects, as opposed to their specific aesthetic or formal directives. In the case of the Empire State, Thomas attributed its strong visual identity to the criteria required for its all-glass construction. “Highly organic, because it is responding to natural parameters. It was a point emphasized by Bardsey during the brief discussion that followed. Proposal that designing
lies in identifying the parameters worth responding to, his assertion that “simple components put through simple rules or steps or in response to specific parameters yield complex results” was apt a description for Wolfram’s Rule 30 results as it was for much of the work shown that day.

With the exception of Michael Meadowlark’s presentation, most of the projects and ideas presented on the second day of the symposium were based on the premise that the material challenge was followed by Structural Design Group Tokyo’s Kinji Watanabe’s disclosure of the strategies used in the engineering of Foreign Office Architecture’s first building in the Far East, Paul Wasiutz, of Buro Happold London, rounded out the afternoon, arguing that “good design is optimized” rather than standardized.

In a fitting conclusion to the day’s events, Wasiutz, codirector of the Architectural Association’s Emergent Technologies and Design Group, in London, focused on “emergency” as a field at the intersections of evolutionary biology, computation, and architecture. Drawing on D’Arcy Thompson’s studies of geometric relationships and Alfred North Whitehead’s writings, Wasiutz argued “structure and material is a realization in the reality of a natural world in which ‘organisms are bundles of relationships,’ he concluded: “And then, by means of his presentation to the symposium’s potential challenge of both the virtual versus nonstandard was tell- ing: ‘In nature you don’t have either. You have forms that are topologically different and have nothing the same kind of geometry, but any single tree is different from any other of the same, and within the tree there has been a static form. . . . We don’t think of form as so much as it is a natural thing, but as a pattern, an arrangement of material in space and time over space.’ Returning to many of the day’s previous themes, including parameter-driven design, as a finding, the methodology, current tools and methods of production, and a debt of gratitude to Fred Otto, Wasiutz concluded that “the big engineering lesson of the day was that the components are always very simple. . . . Nature doesn’t do efficiency; nature does redundancy.”

While nature, endlessly reinvented, is hardly a newly or easily exhausted source of inspiration for architects and engineers, it seems that engineers have developed a greater tradition of building on the knowledge gathered through observation and research. What the projects and talks presented—“Standart” not only the nature of nature as dynamic but systematic and design as an activity whose fundamental parameters are to be found in those systems. In its apparent freedom from the complexity of science, technology, and aesthetic baggage that architecturally fits and would not equal, nature is engagingly simple. . . . Fjeldh Hugo Hugo (1970) works at Cesar Pelli & Associates and was co-editor of Perspectives 34: “Building Codes,” with Stephanie Tyner.
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Ant Farm 1968–1978

The exhibition Ant Farm 1968–1978, co-curated by Constance Lewallen, senior curator of exhibitions for the University of California Berkeley Art Museum, and Steve Seid, assistant curator for video at the Pacific Film Archive, will be exhibited at Yale from August 29 to November 4, 2005. The collection of more than 300 objects was previously shown at the University of California Berkeley Art Museum, University of Pennsylvania, University of Houston, and the Zentrum für Kunst und Medientechnologie in Karlsruhe, Germany.

A collection of radical architects who were also video, performances, and installation artists but, above all, visionaries and cultural commentators—offers an intriguing look into the conceptual activity of the late 1960s and 70s, a time that has proved to be seminal for succeeding generations of avant-garde artists. Founded as an architecture-and-design group in 1968 by recent architecture graduates Doug Michels (Yale School of Architecture) and Chip Lord (School of Architecture, Tulane University), Ant Farm expressed the idealistic spirit of the times outside of traditional architecture. Joined by Curtis Schreier (Rhode Island School of Design), Hudson Marquez (Newcomb Art Department, Tulane University), Doug Chadwick (Architecture School, North Carolina State University), and others, they also shared a sense of being between San Francisco and Houston and solidified it with the three principals: Michels, Lord, and Schreier. Compared by a friend to a toy ant farm (bulbous in 1968), the experimental activity took place below the surface and collectivity is a way of life, the name suggests.

As Lewallen notes, “Ant Farm worked against a backdrop of tremendous cultural ferment, in places such as San Francisco. It partook of the youth culture’s embrace of communal living, sexual liberation, mind-altering drugs, and revolution.” From the mundane do-it-yourself ethos of the White Earth Catalog to the grandiose belief that they could change the world. Each team member contributed various and parallel experiences to the mix. Lord attended Anna and Lawrence Halprin’s workshop for dancers and architects. “Experiments in space were our passion: space was a condition for collaboration, audience participation, and ritual was emphasized.”

Michels had been working at Charles Moore’s office after graduating from Yale in 1968 and was trained in a method called “supergraphics.” In the interview Lewallen conducted with Michels, Lord, and Schreier in 2002, Michels explained supergraphics as “large bold shapes, images, or words applied to interior or exterior walls that tend to extend onto the floor or ceiling. I was working in Charles Moore’s New Haven office in 1965 when C. Ray Smith of Progressive Architecture visited.” Lord’s background in theatre also affected the design aesthetics of the ant farm, in the same issue of the magazine, and they met when Michels lectured at Tulane.

In the early years, Ant Farm set out to create an alternative architectural utopia called a zoological park. Michels noted, “We carried out a poster announcing a summit design workshop for architects called ‘Creek City.’ And that’s where a lot of people, including Doug Hur, came together.”

Inspired by such visionaries as Buckminster Fuller and Paolo Soleri, as well as Archigram, they developed giant inflatable structures, easy and cheap to build and transport and symbolic of their opposition to the mainstream. Care were also favored as cultural commentary, and in their 1970 Media Van, a modified Chevrolet van, they set out on the “Truckstop Network,” a rolling tour of colleges and universities, unveiling and inflating their “ICE-9” inflatable demonstrative the sounswerner-era trainer, which a kitchen and an inflatable shower unit with solar-heated hot water. “Truckstop” came to Yale, where they did a piece called “Johnny Romeo.” Michels said, “We decided that we would get the Media Van washed before we drove up to the building at Yale, and at the car wash there was a guy working whom heself fashioned as a singer. And we thought, ‘Hey, let’s take this guy along, and we can give the lecture with him.’ And Johnny Romeo was hired and thrilled to be able to sing at Yale. We put up ICE-9 in the exhibition hall at Yale and announced Johnny Romeo.”

Michels also observed that, “In a way, the Ant Farm bees were born at Yale when I was a student there. In 1965 the Art Department and Architecture Building had just opened. Within that building was architecture, city planning, urban design, the art school—painting, sculpture, printmaking, and photography. It was very unusual for all these fields to be represented in one building. All the students came together in the rooftop coffee shop in an interactive and interdisciplinary atmosphere. At that same time, team design, with no leader, was emphasized in the architecture school. And that’s very much like Ant Farm—mixing disciplines and not having a leader or having every person lead at times and follow at others. But that was subliminal, deeply subliminal. When I got out to San Francisco and we started talking about what to do next, we thought, ‘Well, let’s start a group.’”

Ant Farm thus became a way of working, a fluid mix in which, Michels noted, “Whoever was the coolest tend inspired other people, and then they got on board. It was always organic—no one person always did one thing. One of us might design it once; build another; manage or things. It was never fully competently.”

Ant Farm also made architecture, including the Newman Media Studio and the Poole House Remodel, in San Francisco (1971 and 1974, respectively); the Ant Farm Art Building, in Yellow Springs, Ohio (1971); the award-winning House of the Century, in Angleton, Texas; and Dolphin Embassy, a sea station where man and dolphin could communicate (1974–78). The group documented their architectural happenings on early video technologies with a Sony Portapak camera, using it to explore the potential of video and performances. “Megaburn,” a 1975 video-tape (shown 1991 exhibition) was a literal collision of two American icons: the car and the television set. They also worked with T. Ullrich—San Francisco artists Doug Hall, Diane Andrews Hall, and Jody Proctor—to create “Eternal Frame,” a remakement of John F. Kennedy’s assassination. It is a quintessential comment on the replace- ment of real experience and memory with a mass media.

But perhaps it is Caltech Ranch, their installation project along Route 66 (now Interstate 40) in Amarillo, Texas, that has received the highest acclaim. Commissioned by Stanley Mars 3, Ant Farm members Lord, Marquez, and Michels partially buried ten Calitrops nose- down in a wheat field on Marson’s ranch. As Lewallen has written, “It is both a celebration of the evolution of the tail fin, which adorns Calitrops from 1948 to 1964, and a critique of Detroit’s practice of planned obsolescence. It was as American as apple pie yet highly critical of the establishment.”

With ten years of innovative and revolu- tionary projects, Ant Farm disbanded in 1978 after a fire in their San Francisco studio destroyed some of their work, but fortunately not the studio. Among the destruction was videotape, and videotapes, which along with materials lent by friends, supporters, and collectors, are included in the show. Yale is (appropriately) the exhibit’s last venue, the place Doug Michels, who died in 2003, nurtured his creativity.


Transcending Type

Yale will host the exhibition Transcending Type from November 14, 2005, to February 3, 2006, organized by Architectural Record for the U.S. Pavilion at the ninth International Architecture Biennale Venice in, 2004.

With Kurt Fostert’s comprehensive show Mutations as the main exhibition at the Biennale, Architectural Record’s curatorial team, led by Christopher Mecklenburg, brought together six young innovative architects who had been researching particular programmatic expressions to exhibit their work on the theme of transcending types. Over the past five years the selected architects had their work included in Architecture Record’s “Architecture Vignette” issues. To further direct the theme, the curators matched the archi- tects with ordinary iconic building types where their research could inform current design: The shopping center went to George Yu Architects; the parking garage to Lewis Tsutsumi Lewis; the highway interchange to Roser + Umemoto; the resi- dential skyscraper to Kolman/MacDonald Studio; the sports stadium to Studio/Gang; and the spiritual/contemplative space to Pre福德. The teams were asked to design their spaces as large-scale installa- tions rather than as sampling of their work so that visitors could “be inside the architecture.” The unexpected solutions each had connections to the social tissue and to the landscape, bringing them into a broader context and scale.

In the U.S. pavilion that the State Department leaves from the Peggy Guggenheim Collection in Venice (one of thirty-three such pavilions in the Giardini di Castello), the architects had ample space to install their creations. The exhibit was Architectural Record editor Robert Hy’s second collaboration with the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. Department of State. In 2002, he had been the U.S. commissioner for the two-part exhibition The World Trade Center Past, Present, and Future, one organized by Max Pottier and the other by José Mejía’s architects.

Architectural Record’s editorial team—curators Sarah Amell (3R), William Weatherson Jr., Sam Lubell, Jef F. Kohlen, Rita F. Catiol, Andrew Beaton, and Nick Olsen worked with the six architectural firms on the conceptual development of their schemes and with the Architectural League of New York to raise funds for the projects. Architect Christian Bruun was the curatorial consultant, advis- ing both the curators and the architects while coordinating the details with Chiara Barbieri, special projects manager for the Peggy Guggenheim Collection.

As Hy emphasized, “The show illustrates architecture’s transformative power, whether through design, biotechnical, sci- entific exploration, or sheer imagination. Despite numerous precautionary studies in a wide range of disciplines, society continues to contaminate the environment. Transcending Type frequently guided only by imperatives of economic return and simplicity of execu- tion. Too often they fail to respond to the complexities and nuances of the real world. This exhibition, Transcending Type suggests an alternative.”

Based on articles in Architectural Record, November 2004.

A Tribute to William H. Jordy

On the occasion of the publication of "Symbolic Essence" and Other Writings on Architecture and American Culture, edited by the Buhl Center (Yale University Press, 2000), a symposium sponsored by Columbia University’s Buhl Center was held on April 14, 2000.

On a sunny afternoon in April a large group of architects, art historians, and architectural enthusiasts gathered together at the Union Theological Seminary in New York for a symposium on the work of scholar and critic William H. Jordy (1917–1987).

First a student of painting at Bard College, then of art history at New York University (in the time of the German emigre Karl Lohanm, Erwin Panofsky, and Richard Krautheimer, and American Studies at Yale under Ralph Gabriel, one of the first to earn the Ph.D. in Yale’s American Studies program; and later a professor of art history at Yale (1949–54) and then at Brown University until his death, Jordy influenced several generations of architects and historians with his wide erudition and rigorous approach to the history of art and architecture.

In her opening remarks, Joan Ockman (director of the Buhl Center for the Study of American Architecture at Columbia University) set the tone for the afternoon’s discussion—"The Contribution of the Historian"—by emphasizing both Jordy’s broad intellectual scope and his affable personality. She had come to know him through his role on the board of the Buhl Center, and they had some time discussed the possibility of publishing his influential essays on architectural history. The lectures to follow, she announced, were in celebration of the long-awaited appearance of just such a collection—fifteen essays, some previously published, some not—began just before Jordy’s death. Edited by the Buhl Center and published by Yale University Press, it is titled "Symbolic Essence" and Other Writings on Architecture and American Culture. A surprisingly stout volume featuring essays written over nearly fifty years, the collection is a worthy tribute to Jordy's quest for an authentically American cultural understanding of America in terms of art, architecture, literature, and politics.

Following Ockman’s introduction, the book’s editor, Marjorie Bazon (Northwestern University), offered a brief overview of Jordy’s long and varied career (a condensation of her exhaustively researched introduction to the book), placing special emphasis on his efforts to reconcile inconsistencies in the historiography of architectural Modernism. According to Bazon, Jordy’s project was to "deprofessionализировать" Modernism’s heterogeneity, to render it “less ideological” than its forerunners, Hitchcock, Johnson, and Peever had made it. To do this, Jordy rejected outdated critical frameworks with a new search for a “symbolic objectivity” underlying all Modernist cultural production. In his "signature essay," "The Symbolic Essence of Modern European Architecture of the Twenties and Its Continuing Influence" (1963), Jordy took up the themes of his contemporary, Reyner Banham, that "the new technology" that had served as such an inspiration to the avant-gardes, “was an idea rather than a fact.” Henceforth, he wrote, clarifying the record of Modernism should be a problem of uncovering the "symbolic core" of architecture and of describing its relationship to "facts.”

However, Jordy’s essentialist position ended up taking him far from Barthes’s fascination with “real” technology into a rigorous but limited formism.

Despite the historiographical emphasis of Bazon’s summary, the limine of the remainder of the afternoon was conversational and at times even emotional. James O’Gorman (Whitney College) remarked that it would be difficult, if not impossible, for those who knew Jordy to separate out the scholar from the man, and for endorsing unequivocally Jordy’s “iconographic” formalist method, O’Gorman appeared to choke back tears as he recalled his former teacher’s kindliness. Merle Gutman (City College of New York) and David Brownlie, chair of the Art History department at the University of Pennsylvania, both discussed his social and inclusive engagement with an emphasis on his respect for women in academe and the way he put Philadelphia architecture on the map of pre- and post-WWII Modernism.

The tone shifted to the more critical with Ed Dimondring (University of California, Irvine) treatment of Jordy’s ambiguous stance toward Post-Modernism and the question of his purported “inclusionism” raised regarding his politics. For example, how is it that a man who had written so compellingly of the need for unionized workers’ housing in 1943 could by 1985 be discussing Robert Venturi in the pages of the neoconservative organ the New Criterion with such deep sympathy? In a neat twist, Dimondring—as sympathetic as the others to Jordy’s work—found in Jordy’s insistence on the continuity of formalist tendencies exemplified best in the work of Venturi, Mies, and Kahn) between so-called Modernist and Post-Modernist a critique of both the left and right. Jordy distanced himself from both the heady late-Maoist theory of capitalist spectacle (Debord, Tafur) and the conservative phenomenological backlash (Moore, Stucky) he precipitated. Both of these approaches, it seems, threatened to take him into a “contorted position,” an “ironic detachment” that constituted the basis of his occasion- ally conflicting politics.

Architect and critic Alan Colquhoun, given the floor, offered a no-nonsense array of incisive and skeptical questions centered on periodization, which Jordy’s work inevitably raises for the contemporary historian. Should 1985 really mark a de- pressive break in the historiography of archi- tecture? What assumptions does presenting such a break entail? Colquhoun left these matters open for reflection—after all, he stressed, the day’s discussion was but a ceremonial beginning to the work of reass- sessment lying ahead.

At the evening session, “The Effect of the Historian,” four of Jordy’s students demonstrated, in whatever form they saw fit, how Jordy influenced their own scholarship or architectural practice. Dietrich Neumann, to Jordy’s chair at Brown University, discussed Jordy’s work on Lescaze as containing a refreshing willingness to take on difficult, confused, and even banal architecture as a topic of real interest. Ed Michtal, of the Yale School of Architecture, spoke on Marcel Breuer’s Ferry Cooperative House at Vassar College. He emphasized Jordy’s ability to and role of wandering between the real and with seemingly reckless abandon, his play- fully free and functionalist interest in a manner familiar to Jordy readers, juxtaposing drawings of stiar details with science fiction. Stan K., dean of the Princeton Architecture School, and Deborah Faust, of the University of Illinois at Chicago, concluded with reflections on how Jordy’s understanding of architecture had influ- enced their own work.

While the event was commemora- tive, as a whole the “tribute” to Jordy was face-focused. The short talks opened much larger questions than they answered. While Jordy’s interest in “the real” and in “resence” was acknowledged, the word phenomenology was never uttered. And as Merle Gutman pointedly stated near the end of the question-and-answer session, there never is “a satisfying answer” to what there is to dislike about Jordy, the man and/or the historian.

While the far reaching influence of Jordy’s work on contemporary architects and historians was clear, there is still much to be learned from the specifics of that influence. The republication of his essays, as well as this conference, have thus admirably served as a provocation to further generations of scholars to continue reconsidering the work of that theoretician of “iconic splendor,” William H. Jordy.

—John Herwood
Herwood is a Ph.D. candidate in Art History at Columbia University.

ARCHITECTURE IS MOTION
The Charged Void: Urbanism

Not so long ago it was nearly impossible to find a book, outside a lecture, on the work of Alison and Peter Smithson. Everything they say is prefaced—and they preside over a great deal during their careers—was out of print. Occasionally, a copy of The Shift, the 1982 Academy Editions monograph, would turn up in the discount bin at a used book store. But otherwise, nothing.
The Shift was a curious document; a sampler more than a monograph, it defied conventional form. Instead of project following project chronologically, it charted what the Smithsons described as a shift in their architectural aesthetic by intervening in projects at a variety of scales and in various media. More a depiction of life as lived by architects than a description of a body of architectural work, it presented what they termed the "epheferas" of their lives alongside their architecture and without hierarchy. Thus, one spread includes a sampling of their holiday wrapping papers, a detail photograph of the Garden Building, and diagrams of urban real estate projects for the Berlin Hauptstadt competition. On other pages you are as likely to see a photograph of their Christmas tree as you were to see one of their buildings. And if you did catch a glimpse of a building it would most likely be just that—a glimpse—since most of the architectural photos were like family snapshots, with the architecture taking a background role to a flowing tree, a friend's sculpture, or, yes, shirts drying on a line.

To come across this book during one's education in architecture was both liberating and slightly daunting. Liberating in that it presented an idea of practice that drew no boundaries around what constituted proper architectural work; nothing was off limits. It was also daunting in its insistence upon a commitment to architecture as a way of life. Ultimately, the trouble with The Shift was that it let you want more. And for too many years nothing else was available.

But lately, since both Alison and Peter Smithson have died, their book business is booming. In the last ten years, nine new books either by or on the Smithsons have been published, and two more are due for publication later this year. The latest, The Charged Void: Architecture, is the second of a two-volume series that was initiated with The Charged Void: Void urbanism, is the second of a two-volume series that was initiated with

As if the simultaneous presence of each manages a kind (involving Neutra, his practices, and their disciplinarily specific) isn't enough to make for an engaging story, Lavin argues that, starting in the 1950s, Neutra began favoring design practices more "contemporary" than merely constructing the sort of abstract space central to earlier canonical Modernism and its historiography. By "contemporary," he refers to both the 1950s Googie saucer of the land and the quality of being eternally restless and perpetually mobile, i.e., the domain of a cool hunter. Neutra is thus doing a pioneering figure. Not just the first to link architecture to psychotherapy, he further melded that onto another insight, which envisioned a way out of architectural Modernism's postwar dilemma, of innovation congealing into frozen style. In effect, for Lavin, Neutra instigated "environmental design," defined by the designer as the fashioning of effective environments. Inventing common understanding of that term as demarcating the new sort of space-psychotherapist, behaviorist cataloging of design solutions that during the 1940s all but killed off earlier compositional strategies. From this perspective, this particularity makes Neutra contemporary once again, producing the polemic of a reconsidered Neutra is thus the man of the hour for design today, where mood and ambiance pin affect and environment as catchwords for future frontiers. Yet the vitality of this situation, pregnant with the unconscious pathological patterns inherent in the lack of identity between a producer's disavowed interest and the scope generated by a work or research project based on that interest, makes for an interesting read but an uncannily cold and frustrating enterprise.

Lavin is both in awe of the interminable three between the positions on her love triangles (man, profession, discipline) and in love with the system that produces such movement—namely, architectural history practice within a newly expanded theoretical field. By citing Gilles Deleuze's particular brand of history of philosophy as the production of new concepts, Lavin makes explicit her ambition to go beyond critical architectural theory and design with her study of Neutra. By referring in the first chapter to Rayner Banham's early 1960s phrase "design by choice" (his argument for the curating of designed objects as the prime drive and ideal poetic for our second, postwar machine age), the author alludes to a certain conflation of today's scene—and his chosen instrumentalization of late poststructuralist thought toward a supposedly seamless projectivity of the design of objects at all scales—is clearly voiced.

Labeled a "designed history," the book characterizes the generative sensibilities of the designer, the scholarly concerns of the historian, and the aesthetic judgments of the critic, asserting that the historian should be viewed simultaneously as a creative artist, a conscious storyteller, and a disinterested curator. In the book, Lavin is a (theoretical or is it anti-theory?) manifesto, suggesting that as "an author"—alternately Neutra or Lavin—but ideally both, valiantly reconstituted from an earlier relegation to a construct that sits within a "theory"—is a primary a savant theorist. Compellingly, Lavin seems to be proposing that in this latter guise (as theorico-Historico-critico-designer?) emerges perhaps the most
advant-garde variety of hybrid thinker/ doer yet to emerge within the field of architecture, he had stood his ground. It was as if his career was being driven by forces of his own creating. His work is a testament to the power of imagination and creativity, and it is evident in his designs, which are a departure from the traditional architectural norms. His work reflects a desire to challenge the status quo and to push the boundaries of what is considered possible in the field of architecture. The impact of his work is evident in the way it continues to influence and inspire contemporary architects. His legacy lives on, and his work will continue to be studied and admired for generations to come.
The spring lecture series presented projects and ideas in architecture and development; highlights are excerpted here for Constructs.

1. Gerald Hines
Edward P. Bass Distinguished Visiting Architect, University of Texas at Austin, Global: Urban Development for the Twenty-First Century* January 10

I will more or less tell the story of the how the Hines firm evolved into what it is today through the photographs of some of our buildings. We believe that there is one architect that will be better for that particular piece. And you have to feel how the people respond to a particular type of architecture and you have to do a lot of market research as you can with the major tenants. In Paris we have a mini competition between four architects, and we showed the different outcomes around to the different prospective users to get feedback. And our French team, which is very integrated into that society, builds a local team of that nationality, so it is not Americans going in and saying we did in New York we are going to do in Paris, we don’t do that. You have to be sensitive to that, but we took Norman Foster to Warsaw and that was a success.

It is fun to be in a business that you are passionate about, and I think if you are not passionate, get out of business. I think you have a chance to improve the built environment, you do have to work in the context of an economic sense of what the owner wants, but really it is tough because you can draw something and if they just exclaim it is too difficult and that just small lows everything that is not a very good client. A client that challenges you, that creates the challenge, that is where you can make something better together and think those are the things that you can build better cities, better environment then we will leave this planet better than we found it.

2. Hal Foster
Brendan Gill Lecture
“A Little Dictionary of Design Ideas” January 20

The inspiration of course, comes from five or so years ago when I first heard the term “postmodernism”... As for architecture, what else? Clearly architecture has a new importance in the culture at large, although this prominence stems from the initial debates about Post- Modernism in the 1970s, which centered on architecture; it is clenched by more recent developments such as the great inflation of design and display and so many aspects of consumer capitalism today—art fashion retail corporate relations, political campaigns, even inaugural balls. Yet the significance granted architecture today also has the compensatory dimension. In many ways the celebratory architect is the late, great Philip Johnson, who was endowed with a magisterial vision in a worldly aristocracy that the rest of us cannot—do not possess. Despite the great gap between vernacular architecture and the work of a Philip Johnson, the street is likely to come up with names of a few architects, but not of a few artists, writers, or directors. This is not a bad thing. I hasten to add. Architecture has great cultural capital today; the question is what can be done with it. The often-paired structure of the discipline today, the manner in which all kinds of status-visions of grandeur-alter with feelings of impotence also points to the compensatory dimension of contemporary architecture. These days architects can do everything, but at the same time nothing—Mertin Clouse, a Dutch architect, states. Architecture nowadays is an amorphous, evasive concept that just hangs like a scent in the air or the latest fad.

3. Jörg Schlaich
“The Joy of Structural Engineering” January 24

As we know from the dinosaurs, it is much easier to design an animal, at some point it will break down by its own died load. it does not get linearly, it goes exponentially. Therefore we must reduce the size and must strive for small sizes. You can improve your relation to be more efficient over the length of a beam by using high-strength material. Concrete is worse than steel, and steel is worse than wood. So we should build small and use material of high strength and low density. The two different bridges have the same material structural vibrations, but in the case of the bridge, there are many of people who cross it which the vibrations were disturbing, but in the case of the roadway, forty percent of people said that the vibrations were disturbing. And the only explanation you can find is that people expect that since this bridge is so light, it vibrates, whereas the other bridge is so strong and heavy and therefore it should not vibrate. So vibration is not something for analysis, it is only something for psychology.

But in the Nimetz Stadium, there is a membrane structure covering the grandstand, and I think that is an example which shows that membrane structures are light and beautiful and that they complement the architecture. What we tried to do is use the seams not to join arbitrarily but to show the flow of forces.

4. Tod Williams and Billie Tsien
Louis I. Kahn Visiting Professors
January 31

Billie Tsien: When we drew our construction drawings on paper or Mylar, certain areas of the building looked smudged and as to how warm over time as we drew and erased, drew and erased. Looking at the drawings it was clear where thought, indecision, correction, obsession, desire or fear had focused. Tod Williams: We still work with pen, with the advent of the computer the results of a days work are often printed on paper. When we review the sheet we add with pen or with colored pencil, but when we want to erase we use an eraser not a pen. White- out erases lines, but it leaves a trace that is physically present. Instead of wiping away the paper, as on tracings, we build up a residue of attention, small numbers of white, like the white lines that we draw over white and white out again and again,... a white scar tissue, tinged with color, is left behind. These are the new markers, and they are reminders of what has been done and then redone.

Billie Tsien: There is the..., prevailing image of the architect that we are a much more benign, we’ve all felt very, very much more to that archetype. Rather, we’ve felt much more comfortable with the image of this person from a child’s book called Paper, John, who is slowly making his entire world by folding it from small pieces of paper. So this idea of a practice with attention to the understanding of making things and an attention to detail is a place where we feel most comfortable.

5. Morgan Dick Wheelock
Timothy Egan Lenahan Memorial Lecture
“Dancing With Nature” February 7

My work is not based on rigorous scholarship. I concern myself with our consciousness—a consciousness that leads too easily to the destruction of our planet. My approach to creative expression is totally intuitive. There is no theory to express my design process. I believe that design transcends the mind, the intellect, dialogue, and description. I believe design, like music, is best understood experientially and not through words. Design is to be lived; design is evolving, not static. Above all, design far outruns the limitations of the designer’s imagination. I believe that the mind is a vase from which design must spring free. I do not subscribe to the notion that enlightened dialogue and theory produce good design. My intuitive method is careful and quiet observation, intent listening, surrendering of the ego—stepping outside of my internal dialogue so that I can feel the land and hear that muffled cry deep within my client—and that cry is his creative energy. My role is not as composer, musician, or dancer. I am more the conductor who facilitates the dance between client and nature.

Collaboration is forming a single whole from separate energies, from diverse talents, perspectives, and ages. All great designs in both architecture and landscape architecture depends on successful collaboration, and that is based on offering respect to our colleagues in sister professions, opening up to their ideas and not just exposing our own and defend them to the death. The exercise of humility before your colleagues and your clients is the key to deeper understanding. The exercise of humility before the greater powers of nature and the universe will begin our journey toward enlightenment. Landscape architecture is about that.

6. Setha Low
David W. Roth and Robert H. Symonds Memorial Lecture
“The Architecture of Fear: Gated Communities in Urban Suburban America” February 10

Across America, lower-middle, middle and upper-middle-class gated communities are targeting much broader market, including families with children. This trend to secure enclosures with walls, gates, and guards, materially and symbolically contradicts aspects of an idealized American ethos and undermines democratic spatial practices such as public access to open space, and creates yet another threat to social integration and the building of social networks, as well as tolerance of diverse cultural, racial, and social groups in a period marked by Homeland Security.

These issues are not new, but it is the American dream with a twist because residents’ security is gained by architecturally excluding others and providing for services privately, not publicly. Further, an intensified politics of fear is emerging that justifies gating as well as private governance, increased social our kind, and surveillance to reinforce these socio-spatial and class-based elitization processes. This architecture and its accompanying politics threatens the viability of public spaces through increasing enclosure and separation of people in a rapidly globalizing world.

Living behind gates reinforces the perception that people who live outside are dangerous or bad. I refer to this as “social splitting”—the good people inside and the bad people outside. Of course this has always existed, but the walls and gates make that was social distinctions more concrete.

7. Stephen Wolfram
Emeritus Lecture
“A New Kind of Science” February 14

In the late 1970s... I got interested in the question of how simple rules could come from the universe, from galaxies on down. I quickly realized that it was an instance of a quite general question: How does anything complexly produced get produced in nature? When we look at the natural world, it’s full of complex forms and complex behaviors—it’s not just circles and squares and repetitive motion, what does all of this complexity come from, and what is its fundamental origin? If one wants to ask a fundamental question like that about nature, it’s been a defining feature of the exact sciences for the past three hundred years, and one should use mathematics and mathematical equations to address it because, as I use Gail’s phrase, “we have already witnessed the language of mathematics.”

That’s an idea that really transformed science three hundred years ago... but somehow for the more complex things one sees in nature, it has never worked out very well. What I think is that one really needs a new paradigm, a new kind of science to address those kinds of questions. When I first was thinking about this... so happen to have a personal interest in a system that in some way was a forerunner of mathematics, but the cause of that system that was a computer language.

And to design that computer language, in the one thing, I thought was to think about all the computations people might want to do and to try and identify primitives that could be...
and try to identify primitives that could be stitched together to build up those compositions. That gave me the idea that perhaps just as I had been able to find primitives for computations people want to do, I might somehow also be able to find primitives for what nature does.

8. Sara Czepies and Everodo Jefferson
“New Mix” February 17
For the past fifteen years—especially the last ten—we’ve been giving a series of explorations of what have emerged from our founding principles, and we wanted to share these series of explorations that move in and out of the projects that we are short of the mark. I could be talking about a talk a bit in our office is... intensionality. A lot of what we experience is at a remove. We look at movies acted by people that are long dead; we listen to music that was recorded when we were small. So much of what we experience is remote from us. But architecture is present. Architecture has this great ability of bringing you into the present. The idea of intensionalism is to intensify that sense of being in the present, of being in a specific place or experiencing a specific quality of light.

The second idea emerges from the social contract that we have. We've been developing projects in neighborhoods that are often very difficult for people to live in, yet we've found by using certain planning methods... we can use architecture not just as a shelter but as a way of helping people negotiate the social contract with one another in a more constructive way.

For our work, our work has been entering a larger public realm, more and more projects that we've been working on have engaged people from multiple cultures... We find that more and more we're designing buildings that are crossroads for people from different cultural conditions, and that one of the missions we've been charged with... is to engage and enrich the language of Modernism, to extend it to embrace different cultural understandings.

9. Maria Gooden Louis L. Kahn Visiting Assistant Professor
“Unspoken [SPACES]” March 21
Our work seeks to engage the production of critical architecture while simultaneously empowering revolutionary drives and evolutionary movement. Crucial to this production is the understanding of the particular cultural context. Architecture as a cultural practice must interpret and translate the historical, social, and political contexts of a place and how one comes to terms with that place to reveal new situations, and conditions (both apparent and sublimi- nal) that allow for individual human partici- pation, action, affirmation, affirmation of self and the whole of living, and recognition of existential meaning and knowledge. Simultaneously, architecture should be an instrument for spatially inter- pretating and translating relationships of his- tory.

Architecture must not be equated with the mere act of building or simply dwelling. The necessity for architecture must be coupled with the dosis for understanding that seeks to recognize the inner, consciousness, status, and identity, which are all lacking in the work and thus provide no stable ground for architecture. Hence, the archi- tect, as the poet, must construct through the exploitation of uncertainties... through what occasionally appears illogical, and sometimes through ambiguity.

For our exhibition “Unspoken [SPACES]: Inside and Outside the Boundaries of Class, Race, and Sex,” we proposed (not being art historians or real curators) to make a selection of eight pairs of works based upon architectural notions of boundaries and spatial conditions, such as postmodernism, openness/closeness, shallow/deep, and to see how these terms might not only apply to architecture but also to cultural tissues of race and class.

We proposed that the exhibition space, the Met Gala, could be approached as a multidimensional landscape in which sequenced works from one conclusion are recontextualized and the boundaries of the space transmogrified, and the cultural conditions of these terms would be inves- tigated.

10. Peter Gluck
“Buildings and Buildings” March 24
This is what I think and always have thought about architecture. These are the elements that are existing with: functional, construction, and setting. The subset of construction are structure, cost, detail, and setting. Setting can be looked at as setting the context, landscape, surroundings, or fit. And a subset of setting is color. This attribute of Modernism has gone away, and we are try- ing to bring it back. It was paramount in the conception of the movement, and now you could also include “green” architecture in it. These attributes need to be searched. If you make this simple-minded diagram and take the larger space in the middle where they all overlap, you would get the perfect diagram or the best possible diagram of the building where it is most successful. The fact that this is a real, ideal, per- fect diagram. I think it is what I call the Modern project is all about. It’s heroic; it’s ambitious—it’s arrogant—and I think failure is implicit in it, because it is basically unachievable.

On the other hand, I think that’s life. That’s what the project of living in these times is all about. When this diagram doesn’t work, we get situations where con- struction is not the only thing at issue. We get structural expres- sionism or we get a kind of trinket, which we see in a lot of modern idioms. Where function is the only thing at question, we get banal, superficial buildings—we all know how many responsible buildings there are. We’ve all been told so many times to be responsible. And when setting is the focus, we get a kind of nostalgic, sentimental, romantic situation. So that’s my theory. And without even thinking about it, I’m always trying to come up with a dia- gram that is as overlapping and complex as it can be.

11. Alexander Garlin
“Hard Work” March 28
As opposed to the latest fads of black and blues, global flows of capital, or the latest computer program necessary to deter- mine architecture, I choose not to follow the proceedings of the World Bank to see what shape my buildings will take. Only last week, at a symposium on the legacy of Derrida and architecture, Eisenman, Kere, and Kipnis made it clear that it was all a hoax. Evan Derrida had said that you don’t need to be a good philosopher to be a good architect. Mark Wigley said he would never again have his students read Derrida. So I believe that now is the time to reassert the primacy of architecture which it does best.

So I choose to make an architecture that accepts the reality of gravity, that is in dialogue with the site, that creates space with light, and that is concerned with how people walk through space. In addition, I agree with [Dean] Stern that the architect has a social obligation to give back to society.

12. Robert M. Rubin
“Jean Prouvé: Legend and Legacy” April 4
The main question I always try to keep in mind is: What is the interest and importance of Jean Prouvé’s work for the practice of architecture today?

The historical record shows that Prouvé’s buildings as discrete built objects, not as examples the building system, for which they were merely at hors d’oeuvre. But as you can see, the elements were designed for all kinds of uses. In this particular case, the government offices in Ouagadougou look like the Tropical House, which is very similar to the Institut du Monde Arabe.

Once Prouvé was summarily removed from the means of production he had creat- ed, he was involved as aired gun in some projects of questionable social significance... two or three things... that Jean-Jacques would rather not... I don’t want to fall into a Frantocist rant against the internal com- petition engine since, like Prouvé, I’m kind of a car guy myself.

Genius architects were turning out mass-produced monumental structures on the one hand, and the building business was turn- ing out anonymous but saleable maga- structures and industrialized accessory elements on the other. These are the poles between which these new constructions are seeking a third way today. ... Prouvé’s career is not just an exercise in curiosity but something one whose work inspires and helps point the way.

13. Stefan Behrens
“Eero Saarinen Visiting Professor
“Concepts and Approaches” April 7
Today’s working environment is most amazing. I never understand the cubic culture, and it changes rapidly. We think we are a part of a paradigm, but we are also in a knowledge-based age. We think we control all means of communication with the cell phone. How many senses do we have? The phone only applies to two, so the range of potential misunderstanding is huge. The smilling sense is actually the most communicative. But you can’t smell through phone line and videoconferences.

Our working environment should be flexible, and it should be designed for the future and throw it away every ten years. Our way of building is wrong. Why don’t we build office spaces that people can live in? There is always a discussion about open offices versus privacy. But really, the good offices are not good as work spaces, because then you could just work at home. It is more about communication.

The Genzyme Building’s design came from the fact that it can’t deal with the cubicle, so we divided up standard cubic volumes. We tried to break up the basic cube, as seen in view of the dense city of Boston, and we gaved it height. It will be so dense that you will always be seen in perspective. The building is sustainable for its function. They have operable windows, and it is like a huge loft with an open atrium, so we made window shutters with hula Sigts, which follow the sun. It is a good net and reflects daylight. The quality of daylight is what determines the change in the quality of the vertical views. ... There is a chang- ing sense of light in the building that is very discrete, and you have a feeling that there is light out there. It is always great when reality meets theory.

14. Elizabeth Dilber
“Work in Progress” April 11
Today I am showing projects that I am not supposed to show at this presentation. With the Highline Project we ask how we can inflect the space, how to make it a huge loft with an open sight, so we make window shutters with hula Sigts, which follow the sun. It is a good net and reflects daylight. The quality of daylight is what determines the change in the quality of the vertical views. ... There is a chang- ing sense of light in the building that is very discrete, and you have a feeling that there is light out there. It is always great when reality meets theory.
Gerald Hines and Stefan Bahnsen

Gerald Hines, the inaugural Edward Bass Visiting Fellow, with Stefan Bahnsen, Eero Saarinen Visiting Professor assisted by Markus Doinciancachi, was a first-time studio collaboration between an architect and a real-estate developer at Yale. The program, for a semester in research and culture in Milan at Garibaldi Republica, provided a forum for research into an architecture that combined formal and programmatic experimentation with the bottom line and functional. The students and the artists developed new techniques to find new aesthetic solutions and, inversely, to find the economic potential of formal solutions.

The students were asked to design a $50 million building for the design and technology school at an unnamed university, which would house the architecture school and the museum and school that they presented to the final review jury of Joanne Aitchison, Hans Hollein, Maria Connelly, George Knight (’60), Cesar Pelli, Dean Robert Stern, ’65, Brigitte Shim, Mark Zimsky, ’69, Stephen Thomas, Todd Williams, and Jay Wyper from the Hines organization.

Using experiments with weaving and knitting as the basis for an architectural strategy, Brett Speeraman and Genevie Fu made the MODAM building a central tight-felt knot for a fully reimaged Garibaldi Republica development. Vitra Weir weaving as a stimulant to generate the larger idea, but asked, “How do you actually achieve it in a building, not just as a metafor?” Dean Stern wanted them to turn off the computer and make the model. “The models of the weaving in the corner are fashious,” Jennifer Nonowski used a series of programmatic “pods” yet within a strongly articulated interstitial space. Simon approached a work of the visceral. Gino Balonian used the site as a uniform grid, a plotted surface, and then ascribed different programs to each unit, deriving architectural organization through manipulation of the grid. Fiona Raghby’s project used architecture as a weave to add spectacles and connectivity to the Hines project through a series of ramps and complicated changes in grade.

The students found the immense open public space the most intriguing to design. For example, Dedicated to the design of long structural systems capable of integrating transportation, circulation, public and retail spaces, theaters, and urban places, which they presented to the jury of Aaron Betsky (’80), Hernandez Diaz, Joanne Gang, Jeffrey Kipnis, Brigett Shim, and Bille Tien.

Many students employed new concepts of continuous surface as structure. David Hecht, who chose the manifest form or turino—similar to a coal-iron radiator—placed two spaces, one inside and one outside between tubes, creating a solid box within a translucent box. The manifold made vertical connections, linking the theater spaces and an exterior sunken garden and thus facilitating connections with all included in their building as a landscape element, raising from the ground with large light wells that opened onto internal courtyards. There was much debate about the building form. Simon Kipnis thought “it’s a very modern, big, Pritzker.” It was “seductive but at the same time it’s a bit off putting. This looks like a piece of machinery, not like a real building.”

Forty Bagley and Jon Gamblin, after working out an intense economic planning analysis of the project and site, used the idea of proximity—“the constructive interference that arises when unlike elements are brought near”—as a planning strategy and a primary architectural diagram, which Williams thought was a successful approach to the project. They addressed the development’s six-meter-high plaza by cutting the connection to the park and extending the plaza’s perimeter. The plants transmuted MODAM from the park onto the plaza in an attempt to maximize the density of the area in the Hines project. The resulting high-rise flint-on-flint-shaped massive sites, single-story low school were like a billboard for the football-field-size plaza with a vibrant polka-dot façade, behind which the memorials of visitors provided constant visual activity. Wyper emphasized the actual issues that the client and the architect are having with the scale of the plaza, and Hines said that he thought that, “the computer program analysis was very ingenius.”

Gerd Lynn

Gerd Lynn, Davenport Visiting Professor, with Mark Gage (’10), Mike van der Raadt, Kevin Fong, and Robert Peterson, proposed a grid of 30-meter-long modules, each including a variety of functional and social spaces, from individual workspaces to large scale conference rooms and seminar rooms, all integrated into a single, continuous structure. The building was envisioned as a place where people could come together, collaborate, and be productive.

With a 16-FAR, the potential of diverse programs, programmatic adjacencies, new circulation configurations, and desires for sun-filled public plazas influenced the various environmental and structural issues. For a full-semester project focused many projects. For example, Vicki Koppes designed three linked towers, with the highest building making connections through a circulation ramp on the perimeter block. Chris Fien used a nine-story tower, surrounding it on an undecorated, circulation via elevators with a double skin, and a car-rodinated elevation. The project by Matthew Ford was designed as a series of towers linked together with complex corners and increased sun-filled plazas.

Other focuses included the interior space and outdoor space. Jason Van Nest created a performance-based building, with the assumption that sunlight is still valuable and was the site for a series of interactions between interior and exterior. Kevin Cornman sought a great public space, but Goettler suggested that he could make it more interesting. Michael Day’s design encompassed the scale of the site, where the surrounding context drove the strategy for developing a tall tower into a courtyard block building. The generic form of the project centered on the interest in the building’s aesthetics.

Vory Teperman’s investigations of vertical adjacencies and consideration of the urban context led to re-earthed perspectives on the project. This included the development of a composite floor plate with residential units facing the inner court and offices along the exterior envelope, enabling a non-hybridized live-work opportunity. Each program was given its own structural frame, which resulted in
sectional opposition of programmatic adven-
tures with the building’s western side as a 31-story-high vertical retail mall. Levi appropriated the building as a site where it was acceptable to talk about the institution that lacked an obligation to the street. Maya Mehta, also interested in addressing the institution’s context within the city: the joint activity and living together in a multiplicity of spaces that are critical to the understanding of relationships within the contemporary city and social contexts using the political issues addressed by the United Nations’ peacekeeping mission to Sierra Leone, which was led by the UN secretary-general.

Historians studied with titillated interest how such critical architecture can be developed as an instrument to construct a discourse appropriate for the space between universalism and globalism: a network of information and the commodity exchange, technology, political reorga-
nization, instability, tourism, and culture. In many ways, the project was set up to capture the views. They were presented to the public in the New York Times (1935). Lyg, Lynn Patricia Phathu (1978), Britte Shree, Scott Simmons, Elias Tetteh, and Peter Wisselink were very much interest in the social and political implications of a building.

Formal explorations of the distinctive museum site led students to manipulate topographic dies. Andrel Harlow cre-
ated a fluid circulation, rather than separate and opposed forms, that were organized in formal lines of Titling art into the museum’s courtyard from the hilltop to the city. The glazed总裁 said that this entrance was another fluidity form and was supported by a network of existing outdoor public art, including a throne, a ball-and-socket chair, and a sculpture, which sought to maintain a fluid relationship between the vertical and the physical, which could actually become tactically strategic.

Amat Shahana and Christopher Yoat ai designed their building that would facilitate both outreach and security for the UN and took cues from the spatial strategies for performance and for a system for the cultivation and regulation of urban life. Andrel Harlow’s idea was to develop the notion of scattering, exposure, and spatial stretching/distance, becoming either a fluid, continuous, and urban architectural entity. Bello noted the power of the building to recognize the existing and new develop-
ments in the city, and thereby to create an armory between the vertical and the horizontal, which could physically and symbolically become tactic strategies.

Martin Shaw and Rachel Tenenbaum pe-
ning the library collection in the museum as an apparatus for framing views of the city and the world, a place that could be seen in close-to-nature conditions. Because window placement was a chal-
lenge in a building of contemporary interest, the window was a virtual Cruz, Morton, using a latex sheet patterned with a par-
ton on the exterior, an interesting juxtaposition of complex spaces within a meandering roof. Michael Cohen created a singular group of a bar-shape volume that was divided into three separate and distinct complexes: an atrium, an auditorium/community room, and galleries. Lynn thought the cocking of the Jucar core, which was to be set in the middle, would minimize the articulation of the form.
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South by North, measures almost two miles, from the Medical School through the Central Campus and past Science Hill to the Divinity School. Projects under way or recently completed punctuate the stretch. Leaning aside the major building renovations—about which much should be written—they fall into two camps: large new buildings on tricky or campus-edge sites and smaller adaptive-reuse projects, often with clever additions. The former tend to project a sense of the campus as one of maximum use; the latter, the latter testify that the campus is a valued patri- mony to be renewed and improved on for the future.

The Medical School’s 2003 Antony C. D’Alessandro Center for Education, designed by Venturi, Scott Brown & Associates (VSA) with Payetto Associates, is a 440,000-square-foot build- ing at the edge of the convoluted core of the campus, which is so compact with Vitra’s work, the structure is very different when encountered from various directions, which helps work to the advantage of breaking it down into what feels like a traditional campus-like urban block. Stepping down in scale to an entrance on the corner of Cedar and Congress streets, the building is sur-prisingly compatible with Frank Gehry and Alan Dehne’s 1980 Yale Psychiatric Center, directly opposite.

the College of Arts and Sciences’ Office of the Arts, which Charles Swartz’s AABA Building addition is complete, and Yale’s art historians decamp to it, Street Hall will regain the exhibition and classroom spaces it had when it was built almost a century and a half ago. Beinecke Library, which had its forti-eth birthday in 1985, has had its facade cleaned, individual piers cleaned at a time or holes made in the New Haven city fabric; they were for the most part suitable but singular objects. Yale’s recent ambitious building and rebuilding activity is not either because it is neither a fundamental transformation nor a disconnected set of gutting performances. The recent process has been a filling-out and retrofitting of the Rogers campus’s basic public fabric, best described as a maturing, it has added both clarification and specificity.

Yale Builds Anew

With astonishing ruthlessness and skill, Yale physically remade itself in the James Gamble Rogers years of the 1950s and ’60s. It had done so once before, on a smaller scale, with the demolition of the Old Brick Row after the Civil War. By con- trast, the pioneering Modernist buildings of the 1950s and ’60s were bold, indi- vidual pieces dropped at a time into holes made in the New Haven city fabric; they were for the most part suitable but singular objects. Yale’s recent ambitious building and rebuilding activity is not either because it is neither a fundamental transformation nor a disconnected set of gutting performances. The recent process has been a filling-out and retrofitting of the Rogers campus’s basic public fabric, best described as a maturing, it has added both clarification and specificity.
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What Is “Environmental Design”?  
When Yale’s M.E.P. program was established in 1968 on Chalisa Moore’s initiative, it was not alone. Many universities initiated similar programs, most notably Berkeley where Moore had taught prior to coming to Yale. “The term ‘environmental design’” as opposed to “architectural studies” was based on the progressive ideals of the 1960s; design was seen as a vehicle for social change rather than an aesthetic ideals. The notion of the environment referred both to the physical, nature, and man-made fabric as well as to the underlying socioeconomic forces that shape it. It goes without saying that this expanded notion of the architect’s task was in sharp contrast to the formalistic prac-
tice which reigned in most schools, par-
ticularly on the East Coast. The field called for the architect to learn from various disci-
plines, from human to natural sciences, in the pursuit of a better understanding of the dynamic forces that constitute the environ-
ment and man’s relationship to it. Thus, research became an important aspect of architecture.

Forty years later, the notion of environ-
mental studies seems more relevant than ever. Half of the students at Yale are from fields other than architecture (the 2005/6 application included a registrar’s lawyer and a consultant for the telecommunications industry). This pays tribute to the fact that architectural and urban studies are becoming an increasingly interdisci-
plinary field and that issues concerning the environment—buildings, cities, and land-
scapes—are of great interest to the popula-
tion at large. Or put it bluntly, the world might have come to realize that fate of the built environment cannot be left to architects alone.

This year’s M.E.P. graduates represent a sampling of the variety of backgrounds, interests, and future pursuits that charac-
terize the program. Francesca Ammon was a civil engineering student at Princeton and had worked for the aviation industry prior to enrolling in the program, focusing on historic preservation, her thesis, “Little City, Big Plains: Stories of Aubry Park, New Jersey,” dealt with attempts to restore and revitalize the area. It featured various players, from corrupt developers to those Springfield fans who were part of the team that told, often with humor, of the rise and death of America’s cities, where good intentions clash with economic and social failings.

Daniel Barber studied intellectual his-
tory at Washington University and received an MFA from Mills College. His work with Barbara Littinberg and Steven Peterson on the urban plan for Ground Zero prior to coming to Yale introduced him directly to the most contested build-
ing site in the world where symbolic and economic interest often clash. Barber’s thesis, “People’s Park and the Crisis in Humanistic Architectural Environmentalism 1960–1969,” dealt with the debates of late 1960s and its surrounding the Berkeley, College of Environmental Design and its focus on the question of how architecture can trigger social change.

Rowanwood Fletcher, a graduate of Rhode Island School Design who most recently taught at Georgia Tech, came to the program with a keen interest in build-
ing technology and fabrication. Her thesis, “Negotiating the Interface: Communication and Collaboration in Building Technology,” from Graphic Menus to Softwares,” sum-
plored two transitional moments within the development of building technology: the first wave of standardization in the 1930s and 1940s, and the introduction of digital technology in the field in the late 1990s and the early twenty-first century. Rather than focusing on this physical object per se, Fletcher emphasized the increased com-
munication and collaboration behind these technological paradigm shifts.

Barber and Ammon have chosen to continue their academic interests by enroll-
ing in Ph.D. programs in architectural histo-
ry at Columbia University and urban history at Yale, respectively. Fletcher will teach at RIDST.

—Envia-Lisa Felkson (M.E.P. ’04)

First Year Explorations

In the first-year core studio organized by associate professor Kather Eastering (with faculty John Blood ’87, Mark Gage ’01, Minu Huong, Gevin Hogben, and Ben Pell), a series of projects, lectures, and readings focus on the acquisition of design skills within contemporary archi-
tectural discourses. Nina Reppart has dis-
cussed the successes of the program, now in its third year, with Eastering.

Nina Reppart: Since Yale is small to medium-sized relative to some other schools, and because it has a long tradition of close interaction between faculty and students, the students have no architecture experience, how does your revised curriculum draw on this diverse intellectual strengths in the class?

Keller Eastering: We use the presence of postgraduate students as a reason to make the course more rigorous than less advanced. We go in with the premise that the students have already started a career, and they are already responsible for a dis-
course—for making an argument in today’s culture. Although it is fundamental, it is not elementary.

NRF: Does it then serve as an equalizer, bringing out different strengths in the students and helping to build their confi-
dence?

KE: We are trying to empower them, The English majors, for example, can lead-
era in special ways, and their appetite is whether to transplant that knowledge to architecture. They can take positions about the impact of what they are designing in the broader social and cultural realm. We con-
tinues to have a series of projects where we change tools, try out different muscles, and provide a chance to fail and start again.

NRF: Can you describe one of these proj-
etes?

KE: The second project, which is about field and landscapes, develops planes, topographic, and modeling skills, but at the same time it is translated through art prac-
tices and ideas about landscape urbanism. These skills are lasting the discipline, find-
ing out what urbanism is currently learning from landscape and vie versa.

NRF: So are they becoming strong critical thinkers?

KE: Yes, they are taking topics such as the index, the field, form/force, the spec-
tacle, and the diagram from texts by Stan Allen, Gay Debord, Gilles Deleuze, George Balzaki, Deleuze, Rosalind Kraus, Cedric Price, and Bernard Tschumi.

NRF: Do you think the various exercises relate to the rest of their course work in the first year?

KE: There are crossovers with 2-D/3-D, with structures, and with history/theory.

The warm-up project calls for the design of 200,000 cubic feet of space. While formally simple, it reawakens architectural drawing conventions such as section, elevation, and physical models. We expect each student to know these conventions cold so that they can use them in very specifically authored documents designed for their particular skills. The second project investigates the idea of field as a matrix within which several spatial orders, complimentary or resistant, can coexist. The project calls for a transportation-Landeschaft near the New Haven train station. The third project focuses on the importance of geometry, as well as the status of geometry in contemporary discourse. Kent Bloomer lends his expertise here. It investigates form and informa with two versions of the same project. The first uses formal and geometrical scaffolding to determine form. The second uses another set of specific, political, aesthetic criteria for determining form and shape.

In the final project we incorporate what the students are learning in their structures course, investigating program and urban spectacle in relation to contemporary disci-
course about order, under construction.

The project calls for a large urban arena for the training and performing of animals. In addition to designing an entire building and its surrounding site, the studio inve-
igates structures that is, the computer to assemble repetitive parts. The computer is a tool that solves the logistics of this particular type of building. Jim Avelx comes to talk about them long-

Deborah Berke, adjunct professor and principal of Deborah Berke Partners in New York, was awarded the 2005 Tiempo Magazine Prize, a recognition for her work, in philanthropy for the city it was praised for its private street facade, use of materials, and walkability to the site.

Phil Berstein (83), lecturer, gave a pre- 
sentation at the National Building Museum, in Washington, D.C., “Moving to Building Information Modeling: Challenges, Vision, and Reality,” in April. At the AIA Convention in May 2005, he moderated the panel discussion “Tall Architectures.” Berstein was quoted extensively in a December 5, 2005, New York Times article, “This Row and the Green Building,” and was a commen- 
tator on sustainable design on National Public Radio affiliate WHKJ. Fairfield County Public Radio, on Earth Day. Design Intelligence magazine asked him to con- tribute his thoughts on “the future of the architecture industry” for the publication’s tenth anniversary issue in May 2005. Berstein has contributed articles to a number of other publications, includ- ing Architects Newspaper the week of March 25, Urban Land in June/July 2005, Convention magazine, in June, and Structural Engineer, August 2005.

Kent Bloomer, professor, with his firm, Kent Bloomer & Associates, completed an entrance portal at New Haven’s Truman School, a contributing building in the historic district. Bloomer lectured on various topics of the New Haven Yale School of Architecture, the “In STEE” symposium, at the University of California, San Diego, and the “Locophobes” symposium, at East Carolina University. In May, Kent Bloomer’s article “Juxtapositions: Nighttime,” in the AIA Journal, was published.

Alexandria Grauman, student, exhibited her work at the Annual Student Show at the New York State College of Architecture and Design at the New York State College of Architecture and Design in May 2005.

Alexander Garvin (87), adjunct profes- sor at the Yale School of Architecture, a graduate of the Yale School of Architecture, in May 2005, was named as a recipient of the 2005 Emerging Voices Award. He was professed as one of the new generation of architects in the New York Times article “The Fort Greene project on May 5, 2005. Christoff Finio Archıtects is designing the beginning of a new house for a Manhattan, New York, and finishing construction of the new headquar- ters for the Headstart Foundation for Children, in New York. Martin Finio and Brian Healy, critics in architecture, were both featured in the “Style” section of the New York Times (July 2005) along with five other male architects.

Alexandria Grauman, student, exhibited her work at the Annual Student Show at the New York State College of Architecture and Design at the New York State College of Architecture and Design in May 2005.

Alexandria Grauman, student, exhibited her work at the Annual Student Show at the New York State College of Architecture and Design at the New York State College of Architecture and Design in May 2005.

Deborah Berke, adjunct professor and principal of Deborah Berke Partners in New York, was awarded the 2005 Tiempo Magazine Prize, a recognition for her work, in philanthropy for the city it was praised for its private street facade, use of materials, and walkability to the site.
Hilary Sample and Brigitte Shim in Conversation

Hilary Sample, recently appointed assistant professor and previously the Royall W. and Gwendolyn B. Williams Professor of Architecture at SUNY Buffalo, is assisting Brigitte Shim, Saarinen Visiting Professor, in her advanced studio at Yale in the fall.

Brigitte Shim: Since we will be teaching a studio together this fall, how would you define the similarities and the differences in our design philosophies?

Hilary Sample: In terms of our interests in practice and teaching, there are probably more similarities than differences. We both think about the ways in which architecture, a non-natural material, integrates design with technology and its environment. We are concerned about creating a site for design from the use of new fabrication techniques, to testing a design with a full-scale mock-up, to sustainability, and so on.

Brigitte Shim: Also engaging social and cultural contexts. Ultimately, creating a physical site, cultural site, and political site for architecture.

Hilary Sample: And considering architecture’s relationship to technology and its environment, where one does not operate independently of the other.

Brigitte Shim: This relationship creates a context integral to design ideas. Shim-Sutcliffe’s building project for a house in the Thousand Islands does this by using landscape to create a site. By creating an unusual proportion with a clever mix that a local farmer calls three things. This creates new ways of addressing the cultural transformation from agricultural land to leisure space. The green roof is part of the conceptual idea of the project and simultaneously addresses issues of sustainability.

Hilary Sample: Yes, I think of this as meaning to create new possibilities for architecture today. In my work for OMA on the design of the Pritzak San Francisco Headquarter building, we considered the changing social demands of the environment surrounding the finish of the facade. More recently, the Bainbridge Vellon at SUNY Buffalo, I constructed a full-scale mock-up proposal for a new type of building that is both material and cultural. The design involved using post-industrial materials and the environment with a mix of new technologies, particularly in the Weathering Steel House, in Toronto. On another topic, in terms of teaching, how do you think will we bring ideas into our design classroom and to our studio and sustainability at the studio at Yale?

Brigitte Shim: Our studio will address leadership through the creation of design explorations that use technology to assist in fabrication and in the ability to refine a building in an urban context.

Hilary Sample: The students will do this by testing a building’s visual performance, scale, and assembly process. They will continually address creative and material ideas and the construction ideas through built mock-ups of the building envelope that can be brought into a design and allowed to be affected by its elements.

Brigitte Shim: The studio plans to engage in new fabrication methods through mock-ups, models, photos, and renderings to simulate conditions. Initially, in lieu of a full-size model, our experiments focus on the effects across twenty-four hours on a variety of materials with astonishing results. The process includes a series of slides, photos and renderings to simulate the process, developing a smaller scale building that simulates issues of sustainability and simultaneously making beautiful buildings.

Hilary Sample: Initially, we spoke about a studio that would not be off the grid. I think this is such an interesting problem, particularly in cities. But we decided to have the studio site the University of Toronto campus, where the buildings we are building are more urban than we want to think about with studies and monitoring environmental issues of large metropolitan sites.

Brigitte Shim: This studio will enable students to work at the large scale of the city, the scale of a small building, and the scale of the detail in an integrated and sympathetic manner. While incorporating issues of sustainability in an urban context, one of the most pressing concerns of our time.

Three Assistant Professors Appointed

Along with the new assistant professor Hilary Sample, Mark Foster Gage (‘97) and Emmanuel J. Pett, former lecturers at the school, have been appointed as assistant professors. Mark Foster Gage, a graduate of the Yale School of Architecture, is an architect with a six-person firm, Gage/Clemency-Bells Architects in New York City, which is currently designing the 500-room Grand Hyatt in Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, for developer Marvin Kriz. His other recent projects include the Spotted Mall project in Venice, Florida, and a collaborative interactive installation project. His office is also currently competing for the Seoul Metropolitan Architectural and the Guangxi ACC Complex, both located in China, and the Studio of architectural critique of the city of Chicago. Gage’s work has been published in the New York Times, Archdaily, Architecure, GQ, and Architectural Record. Gage has taught at Columbia University and the Institute for Classical Architecture, in New York. Gage’s seminars at Yale have included “Architect and Effect: “Surfaces,” “Form, Shape, and the Emergence of Exotica.” His research and work focus on the possible architectural outcome engendered by the manipulation of classical material properties of digital, interactive, and technical innovation.

Emmanuel J. Pett graduated from the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH) in Zurich, and is Ph.D. candidate in history and theory of architecture at Princeton University, where he received his master’s degree in architecture in 2001. His work focuses on architecture’s diverse epistemological models since the mid-1960s and more specifically on the interaction of architectural theory with philosophy, literary theory, and poetry. His essays on formalism, criticism, virtuality, and architectural body metaphors have appeared in Log, Thesis (Bauhaus Press), Trans (ETh Publications), and Threshold (MIT). From 1999 to 2004, he assisted Peter Eisenman in teaching advanced studios at Princeton University and at Yale. Last winter he co-curated Eisenman’s exhibition Barabino at Whitehorse Wells at the Museum of Applied Art, in Vienna. At Yale, he teaches seminars on architecture’s obsession with “measuring” in the 1990s and 70s, as also in the evolution of formal theories in the second half of the twentieth century.

Advanced Studio Visiting Professors

Leon Krier is returning as the Davenport Visiting Professor. He completed the design of the Jorge M. Perez Architecture Center at the University of Miami, School of Architecture, which opened this summer. The 5,800-square-foot building includes an exhibition gallery, a state-of-the-art lecture hall, and a classroom. Krier was the designer with Merrill Potter and Colonists of Miami as architects. Krier also gave a keynote talk in 2011 at the Frontiers in Planning & Design, conference of the Canadian Institute of Planners and the Alberta Association, Canadian Institute of Planners.

Brigitte Shim, the Saarinen Visiting Professor, is a partner of Shim-Sutcliffe Architects in Toronto, Canada. The firm of six, including Shim and Sutcliffe, has remained small in order to focus on projects of their own choosing. The building work has been honored with five Governor General’s Medals and Awards for Architecture. With her firm, Shim recently completed the Corazon Shopping Mall in Toronto. She is currently a member of the editorial board for Architecture Research Quarterly and Phaidon Writing and Writing. Shim is also a member of the board of Canadian Studies at the Yale Center for International and Area Studies.

Peter Eisenman, the Kahn Visiting Professor, with Richard Renn, has completed work on the memorial to the mur- dered Jews of Europe on May 10, 2005. The design fills a four-foot-tall, six-foot-square slab of land in the midsection of Berlin with more than 2,700 concave slabs, or steles, near the ministries and parliament (Reichstag). Eisenman Architects is currently working on the city of culture in Galicia in Santiago de Compostela, Spain, as well as the TWA/Cardinals Multipurpose Stadium, in Glendale Arizona.


Three Yale College Seniors are Finalists

Three Yale College students class of 2005, Wade (Chi-Li) Weh Fuh, Ashley Hoener, and Lauren Lewis, received awards for their work in the Seventh Concurso Internacional Arquitectura Frontera/Border competition in spring 2005. The senior studio, led by professor Steven Harris, was organized around the competition and included a visit to the site in Mexico. The proposal includes a pedestrian crossing from Anapra (Ciudad Juarez) to El Paso, New Mexico, at the intersection of the international line and the main international highway of Anapra, as well as immigration control stations on either side. The project is necessary because of the growth of the eighteen mile legally visible United States-Mexico border, along with increased migration of Mexicans to the northern border zone. The project will be published in Arquitectura’s quarterly publication and will be exhibited in the third-floor gallery of the Yale School of Architecture in the fall.

Booknotes

Raymond Ryan (’84), Curator of Architecture at the Hetz Architectural Center in Pittsburgh, has recently compiled a catalog for the exhibition Michael Mattz: Alternate Ground, on display at the Carnegie Museum of Art from February 12 to June 12, 2005. The catalog, published by the Carnegie Museum of Art, contains Mattz’s work through photographs, renderings and renderings and is accompanied by Ryan’s comprehensive introductory essay and interview with Mattz. Two short essays on Los Angeles, where Mattz is based, and China, where he is working, provide further context for the work in the exhibition.


2. Susan DiGennaro, "What Time is It?" Bluiee Village Community Center, Ohio State, University, Spring 2005.
5. Mary Sampol, Ambiente Facade, 14th and No. 2, a full-scale mock-up of a new design that works with new sealing glass and pre-printed RFP techniques, to balance the heat exchange of the facade regulated by fluctuating transparencies of glass.
Squaw, Gwathney's former Greensville, Connecticut, residence was featured in Architectural Digest (May 2005).

Craig Hodgkins (78), of Hodgkins + Fong Design Architects, was background of Yamato Tower, a 28-story mixed-use high-rise in Tokyo, in December 2004. Slated to be completed in 2008, the tower will be home to its namesake, the famous Yamano

Beauty School, along with residential, retail, and public spaces. The design has a contextual approach that reflects traditional Japanese culture and Tokyo's urban espotherny in three softly folded catenary lines of varying heights. The firm developed a consciously "tennis" structure that is oriented and configured in response to the cityscape and Japan's stricter seismic codes.

Caswell Cook (67) opened his own architectural practice, Caswell Cook Architecture, in 1971. The firm features a long and diverse career with Washington DC firm Hopkins by Way of work on more than ten small residential projects. In spring 2005, Cook's completed the Rosalio House, a split-level ranch house in Montgomery, New Jersey.

Don Watson (72), former chair of the MED program (1970-1973), was awarded the 2004 James H. Declercq Distinguished Leadership Award for Architectural Research, offered annually by the Architectural Research Consortium (ARC) to recognize an individual who has made outstanding contributions to the growth of research culture in architecture and related fields. Watson also edited the 2005 edition of Time-Saver Standards for Architectural Design and co-authored, with professor Alan Platter, "Time Saver Standards for Urban Design".

In 1970s

Daniel V. Scully (70) and his firm, Daniel V. Scully Architects, won an AIA/New Mexico Design Honor Award for the Daper Lake House (2003). The firm received a citation in the AIA/New England Design Excellence Awards for its work on the Bellows Falls Waypoint Interpretive Center, in Vermont (2004). The project located the amenities of the town plan and was noted by the jury for taking risks while evoking the history of the Bellows Falls community. The project also won the first award ever given by the Preservation Trust of Vermont for a new building on May 21, 2004. His article, "Monument to a City's Past Could Save the City's Future," appeared in the Providence Journal (August 8, 2003).

Ron Gonzaile (71) retired from the faculty at City College of San Francisco in 2001 and now designs projects in the greater Bay Area. The first exhibition of his painting—"The Print and Paint"—was held at Palo Alto Downtown Library, February through March 2005.

Mark Bilson (72) was the partner-in-charge of Centerbrook's recently completed Green Street Arts Center (1004C), in the North End of Middletown, Connecticut. The GSAC is the result of a partnership between Wesleyan University, the City of Middletown, and the North End Action Team (NETA), a resident-led advocacy group, to create an anchor for the revitalization efforts currently under way in the neighborhood. Shortly after, he was a juror of the Wood Design Awards with Patricia Patilha (7B) in November 2004.

Ted Landsmark (MED '73) was elected president-elect/vice president of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA). He is also president of the Boston Architectural Center since 1997. Landsmark is a trustee of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, and the New England Foundation for the Arts. He is a regular contributor to architectural journals and has lectured on architectural education, community organizing, youth violence, and African-American material culture.

Patricia Patilha (7B), with her firm, Patilha Architects, was selected in January 2005 as a finalist for the University of British Columbia (UBC) University Boulevard architectural competition for the design of a new campus entry for the Vancouver campus. The firm received two American Institute of Architects National Honor Awards for the Shaw House, in Vancouver, British Columbia, and the Agota House, in St. John Island, Wisconsin. In December 2004 Patilha's Architects were awarded two Canadian Architect Awards of Excellence on work on the University of British Columbia's New College House and Winnipeg Centennial Library. Patilha is currently professor at the School of Architecture at the UBC.

In the 1980s

Turan Duda (90), with Duda/Plante Architects, was awarded the 2004 IMPACT Award for Design Excellence by the Downtown Austin Alliance for work on the Frost Bank Tower, in Austin, Texas (December 2003). The 33-story glass office tower is the tallest building in downtown Austin.

Peyton Hall (MED '86) elevated to the College of Fellows by the American Institute of Architects and was inducted in ceremonies at the 2005 convention. Hall is a principal of Historic Resources Group, LLC, Los Angeles, where he has recently completed the exterior conservation of the Gamble House and rehabilitation of Gamble's Chinese Temple. Hall is president-elect of the California Preservation Foundation and a founding faculty member of the Master of Historic Preservation degree program at the School of Architecture of the University of Southern California.

June D. Komisar (90) completed her PhD. in architecture at the University of Michigan in 2004. In March 2005 she presented a paper on Colonial architecture in Ouro Preto, Minas Gerais, Brazil, at the annual meeting of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture in Chicago. She is currently assistant professor of architec-

In 1990s

Anita Markovska (98), a principal at Pickard Chilton, is currently designing a sixty-story office tower in Chicago on the Chicago River being developed by the Helix company. The tower will be called Six Thirty and Ellis. Also in design is a new Basketball Practice Center for the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign adjacent to Cameron Indoor Stadium. Scheduled to complete construction this fall is the U.S. Census Bureau Building for the California Public Employee's Retirement System in Berkeley and the City of San Diego Silver building in the Capital Mall area of Sacramento.

Alvaro de la Rosa (86) and Ana Mendez (87) designed the HuskerLink Wireless Systems Campus Cooperative Center at the University of Nebraska at the Omaha campus. The building's innovative design includes a large atrium space that serves as a campus commons and meeting space. The project won the 2008 American Institute of Architects Honor Award for Architecture in the category of education architecture.

Michael Winstanley (83) established his office, Michael Winstanley Architects Planing and Design. He is currently a member of the Architectural Institute of America, of the Washington office of Leo A. Daly for the last seven years as the design director and vice president. Winstanley's projects included the South Sector Master Plan and a one million-square-foot research facility at George Mason University; the Yin Tchin Technology building; Shanghai's new Jin Mao Relocation Study; Museums, and Monumental Plan, in Washington, D.C.; and numerous academic master plans for institutions including Catholic University of America and the University of Arizona. His office is focusing on architecture and planning services for cultural, educational, and commercial clients.

Ted Porter (94), with his New York-based firm Porter Architects, entered an AIA-sponsored competition for a prefabricated single-family home, which is currently in the design stage. The prototype will be constructed in a New England location and will be exhibitoned at the 2006 Architectural Design and Building Show in New York City.

Tim Culhane (98), MED, editor of ArcGo, the journal of the AIA California Council, and a Public Architecture (PA) adviser, was quoted in the article "A Fifth Avenue Outfit" (Metropolis, April 2004). When asked what it takes to be a successful architectural project in the private realm without paying clients, he responded, "We want to do it for free. It gets our name out, it gets our firm noticed, to wait for people to ask you to take on a project." Culhane emphasized the charge of communications for Culhane Consulting Group, dedicated to clarifying, articulating, and advocating the value of design.

John Tittmann (96), Jacob Albert (83), and James Righetti (70), of Albert, Righter & Tittmann, disclosed their Architectural Business (May/June 2005), for their success in creating a discipline for revitizing Scolay Square, Boston City Hall plaza's, Tittmann's work on a new Greek Revival house in Newton, Massachusetts. Megan G. Clifford was awarded a PAiloido Award and was featured in the summer 2005 issue of Architectural Record. In addition, his work on a North Shore Greek Revival house received an Honorable Mention in the Architectural Record New Home/ Magazine (April 2005) and was featured in Period houses (March 2005).


Anthony Markovska (98), a principal at Pickard Chilton, is currently designing a sixty-story office tower in Chicago on the Chicago River being developed by the Helix company. The tower will be called Six Thirty and Ellis. Also in design is a new Basketball Practice Center for the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign adjacent to Cameron Indoor Stadium. Scheduled to complete construction this fall is the U.S. Census Bureau Building for the California Public Employee's Retirement System in Berkeley and the City of San Diego Silver building in the Capital Mall area of Sacramento.

Alvaro de la Rosa (86) and Ana Mendez (87) designed the HuskerLink Wireless Systems Campus Cooperative Center at the University of Nebraska at the Omaha campus. The building's innovative design includes a large atrium space that serves as a campus commons and meeting space. The project won the 2008 American Institute of Architects Honor Award for Architecture in the category of education architecture.