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Opinion,

At my office, these girls now live in an office. They're all...
Colin St. John (Sandy) Wilson, is the Bishop Victoria saddle, the symphony of spring, teaching with Professor M.J. Long. Together with Professor Long, he will deliver four public lectures on modern architecture at the Yale Centre for British Art. Prior to his return to the British Library, Nina Rappaport talked with Sandy Wilson about his career and the Library as a place of investigation and discovery.

Nina Rappaport: After over 30 years of designing, planning, site changes, in government, and redesign, the British Library was finally completed in 1998. How did you maintain your belief in the project over all of these years?

Sandy Wilson: There are times in your life when you make a decision which you really believe in and want to see it through, and that is that. One interesting episode, which actually relates to Yale, occurred in 1984 when Paul Rudolph marched me in to see Yale’s president, Kingman Brewster, without telling me what it was about, and said, “This is the guy who should take over from me.” I all could say was, “Wait a minute, we haven’t talked about it. My design for the British Library Museum has just been approved, and that is what I want to do more than anything else. I am sorry to say that I am not available.” That was absolutely a moment when I could have gone in a different way in my life. Needless to say, a few months later the whole project went down with a change of government.

NR: Has the British Library evolved urbanistically?

SW: First, the site is excellent for connections to the rest of the country. King’s Cross, St. Pancras, and Euston Road Station are all within a short distance of each other. The Northern Cross Terminal is planned to be built next to St. Pancras Station, so our entrance courtyard will be the link between the main lines from mainland Europe. Who knows? A French scholar may yet come, to the French. Then and the courtyard is the only public open space in the area.

NR: The courtyard is in the middle of a busy city, abuzz with activity. If you were a French学者, what might you say to the people who come in? And then the courtyard is the only public open space in the area.

NR: The courtyard management is part of my work today. How were you able to implement a design and also maintain a sense of space, to create the atmosphere and ambiance you would like to create?

SW: I had a big fight with the planners. They wanted a plaza as big as a billiard table, but I would not let them come in. I wanted an enclosed courtyard. Courtyards were one of my first ideas. Then when I came back to King’s Cross in 1956, I even showed these sequences of enclosed “courtyard” spaces in the British Library. But I was told by the planners that the Library was to be a “modern building,” so I had to find another solution. I was not happy with the way the Library was built, but I am happy with the result.

NR: You received the commission for the British Library in 1973. The building is known as the “Emitting Library” or “The Book Building” in your essay “Open and Closed.”

NR: But there was also a time when you were seen as a critic of the original design. I want to know if you refer to my extension to the Architecture School as a “monstrous” building. I think I am radians that it revealed very badly how it was made and the use of the Modular constructional grid. But then I have seen examples both in Russia and me on the examples of buildings that we use up to our own time. I am a critic.

NR: What was it like to be a critic of the Library, to be a critic of the building?

SW: I think, critics are also learners. I think, critics are also learners. I think, critics are also learners. I think, critics are also learners. I think, critics are also learners.

NR: I understand that they are always a blast of you in the British Library tomorrow? Surely that is a pretty rare complement.

SW: (Blushing) Yes, I can’t recall a precedent for this. It has to be a minor, what is special is that the bust is being donated by the American Trust of the British Library. Maybe I should have ordered for Yale in 1964.

NR: That relates to the next question: The Library is a book from the 1970s and here we are the year 2000. Does that matter to you?

SW: Of course this design is not ‘fashionable.’ How could it be? The one art that should have nothing to do with ‘fashion’ is architecture. Everything ‘fashionable’ is automatically ‘unfashionable.’ I think I will stick to books and prints. This building has to last for 300 years all at least.

Background and inset:

Colin St. John Wilson, Photograph by Nina Rappaport


Colin St. John Wilson, Interior of the School of Architecture Cambridge, England Photograph by S. Lambert 1982
Greg Lynn will be the Dartmouth Visiting Professor at Yale in the Spring form, and will give a public lecture on April 10, 1999, titled "The Levin Architectural Form Form, and is the author of Animal Farm (Princeton Architectural Press; 1998). He was interviewed by Richard Weinstein, Professor of Architecture at UCLA.

Richard Weinstein: Greg, you say that the use of the computer will have an impact on architecture. What is your invention of perspective. How is that?

Greg Lynn: First, let me say what the computer will do for architecture. They do not expel the design process, because an architect must find a way to spend more time on design, so how they make their ideas and simulation and working clients through the most important change that is already pretty good at. Computers do introduce concepts and more importantly the shapes of computer—curves and surfaces, and so the old forms of traditional forms include a new type of definition of the interior, the computer can be rethought within a new medium of differentiation and non-instructed mathematics.

Ron: But what makes you think that just because you are doing something now with the computer, that its importance is comparable to the invention of perspective after the architecture in the Middle Ages?

Glenn: If you look at the invention of perspective, it was first seen as the extension of a search for truthful and natural representation, and although that may not be the primary motive for most architectural design these days, I think that implicit in the computer's mathematics and geometry is in advanced form of organisation. I wouldn't say that the computer gives you the language, but it does produce the different forms of natural form that I have an impact culturally. There will be a new dominant form of models that won't be of naturalistic and realistic forms but may be of an editor mutant form of onomatopoeia.

Ryan: Writing about the computer in Animal Farm, you refer to its use as a natural development of the open-ended compositional strategies. Is there a sense that these strategies have ethical and political implications?

Glenn: Yes, there is a sense that architecture is still a state of nature. First, the computer does lead to a new kind of control in a sense, but it would never say that it is the end of prediction, insight, or intuition because the computer gives you a different kind of control over the entire process. You don't have to stick in advance a set of goals, because at any moment you could change the design you have begun. There is in an important, profound, critical insight and design responsibility over the new kind of process. Secondly, it is a natural way to predict the consequences of the computer. It is a democratic design process, you can use the computer for a more or less democratic design ideology; these distinctions are not really in the technology.

Ron: I think that what you just said is that invention comes with it ethical and political implications.

Glenn: It does, such as a sense of growth and mutation and collaboration and distributed and strict problem solving. I wouldn't make the jump from a sense of fundamental value to organizational being to political or ideological. I don't think that there is any inherent political position for or against computers.

Ron: Doesn't the sensibility naturally lead to a certain ethical, moral, or political stance? Not only did you talk about a different sensibility that that, but also that you couldn't sell in advance exactly where you are going, so here there is an indeterminacy built into it, so then leads to specific politics which are global in inclusion, yes or not.

Glenn: One could make that argument very convincingly, but I wouldn't. The military entertainment industry is going to be filled with military and graphic designers all use computers. Can technology connect all of those things ideologically? I am actually wary of a kind of situation that would receive political and ideological motives to technology. I think that the computer provides a grammar that architects will be composing with in the future; it is the language that will be connected, then it has a different sense of openness, creativity, and growth. I hope that architects will be able to incorporate this into the organisation.

Ron: Does that mean that the attributes of style are inherent in the perception of a particular software program and that different programs can create different effects, but in different ways, that is undesirable. For example, when I was shopping for a toothbrush, I was frustrated because all of the available toothbrushes I was looking at appeared to

Glenn: That is the human condition. When I am doing a pencil sketch on yellow trace, because when something is done on a piece of paper, it is what you want to do. Louis Kahn would sometimes rotate his drawings with the hope that it would stimulate a recognition that he wouldn't get if he kept the same orientation. Does the computer do that more energetically than rotating a static drawing?

Glenn: The computer is the most vital medium I knew for interior design. That first instance of Louis Kahn would be imbued with meaning but would lack dimensional accuracy. I don't have

Ron: But if the concept is constant, how is varying the color of a room or the shape of a window, a very fundamental change?

Glenn: If every element of a house is produced in a factory, as forty percent of houses are in America, and you control every element so that by changing a few parameters every piece is custom detailed, then those houses are more interesting simply because of variations. Billions of automobiles to aesthetic shoes, you see unprecedented variations from fewest and fewest sources. Why not in a design office. The enemy of design is the inane tracts to standardisation, and I think that the essence of my approach is that it opens a space for design in a possible building model.

From top: Greg Lynn, Michael McKee, Douglas Graham, Korean Presbyterian Church, Ojai, New York, 1999.
Aldo Rossi was known for his rigorous understanding of the International Style. He believed in simplicity, form, and the use of materials. Rossi's work was about creating a new architecture that would be based on respect for the past and the environment. He believed in using traditional materials and forms to create a new architecture that was both modern and timeless. His work was characterized by a strong sense of proportion and a focus on the details of building. Rossi's architecture was not just about creating beautiful buildings, but about creating a new way of thinking about architecture. His work was a response to the modernist movement, which he believed had lost its way. Rossi's architecture was a return to the past, to a simpler time, and it was a way of bringing back the past to the present. He believed in using traditional materials and forms to create a new architecture that was both modern and timeless. His work was characterized by a strong sense of proportion and a focus on the details of building. Rossi's architecture was not just about creating beautiful buildings, but about creating a new way of thinking about architecture. His work was a response to the modernist movement, which he believed had lost its way. Rossi's architecture was a return to the past, to a simpler time, and it was a way of bringing back the past to the present.
Response to the IFCCA Competition

Peter Eisenman asked during the Canadian Centre for Architecture competition events, where are the New Urbanists and, on, also, can we have the time to respond?

The short answer is, of course, that no New Urbanist was invited to participate in the closed competition to develop an urbanism worthy of Manhattan. The entrants were pre-selected for ideological considerations, all five being, at a minimum, allergic to traditional urbanism.

This editing was undoubtedly necessary. Had a New Urbanist project been included, the ensuing public discussion would have been heavily polarized, with a preponderance of popular support behind the New Urbanist design. An open democratic process and a modernist magisterium are incompatible at this time, and the COA knew that.

Here is the story in short: the COA, continuing the 70-year search for a viable modernist urbanism, stumbled upon a revival. Renzo Piano, with his CA, Category, and maroon carpet, has made modernist architecture fashionable again, but not within the city. Delirious New York clearly states that the urban block must be the limit of each individual architectural ideology. Centrist, multifunctional, SL builds to achieve critical mass are justified only in the uninvaded infrastructure of subbon appartments.

There is no need for a magisterium when there is a functioning urban grid. The street network is an automatic, language integrator. Manhattan works because it usually breaks down buildings for parallel traffic. The 20-block, centrist, process-free/totalistic approach promoted by the competitors, needs the energy of the public spaces, no less than the underground passages of observatory.

The COA designers camouflage their out-of-date superblock conceptions with a fashion-styled appearance. But it is false, complete and futile urbanism, and would prove a bad design in the long run. Forty scores by a single architect is a monolithic, with all the fragility that the term implies. The architectural language is ideologically naive and ultimately boring when it is by the same hand (remember the Getty). Imagine the current state of mind if it were to fall out of fashion (think of Graves, P,-, Johnson, Rodah). What is maintenance during the inevitable economic downturn? What if a single floor details, and the problem, multiplied over 40 acres, becomes a catastrophe?

The authentic urban proposal would be to break up the project into many individual ones. The urban grid delivers the potential for flexible, decentralized decision making. It is neutral and, if dotted in small lots, it has the intrinsic potential for a variety of outcomes. The 1,500-foot Manhattan lot allows both the 60’s house and in opposition, the block-long St. Patrick’s Cathedral.

About the individual projects: Cedric Price’s proposal is the most sanitonic. His teams of fryers seems to have invested not more than a few lazy days perhaps as the old Architectural Association, not entirely global, throwing together a scoop. But it is not meant to be taken seriously.

Jesse Roister and Nanako Umemoto display a superb analytical methodology, the results of which they then proceed to ignore. In the end, their design, to be fashionable, had to be pretty much like the others including Van Berkel & Bos’s. It is a symptom of the excessive homogenizing of the avant-garde from L.A. to Amsterdam the magisterium is de rigueur. Eisenman at least makes it clear that he has no analytical methodology whatsoever.

Roister and Umemoto’s plan makes a special effort: it brings the highway integrity into the magisterium and includes the garage. The result is that the users need not leave the building to actually set foot in the city. This satisfies the sublime element of highway in the city without engaging the street traffic, to park conveniently, to use the facility, and to never deal with the messy sidewalks. It might as well be on the Jersey landfill.

Morison purports his usual L.A. design, but must New York tolerate such bad grooming? Their “saw” architectural mannerism is there to the present that underlies Manhattan’s structural urbanism. To disguise their proposal they create a sort of fairy tale that dissipates for terminology: Snakes, Conundrums, Pugs, Rosiers, Droops, Liveries, Monkeys, Weary, Weep, Hold, Deploys, Bbs., S.O.U.’s (Suspended Objects Unknown), etc.

Morison merges the lesion of urbanism for fun, but Roister and Umemoto continue docilely evaluate in order to control the discourse. They use slippery terms such as “cluster,” “vistas,” and “critical package,” when “blocks,” “square,” and “campus” would do (but quite a square is so square). Their scoring, always vaguely text proposes “mutability,” “ambiences,” “deficiency,” “deformations,” potential.” “diversity” “diversity,” when in fact all of it has been decided at crystal for gun and for gun by their design.

Eisenman’s, like all the schemes, underlines orientation by employing a version of the Iliad’s, populated by Steven Holl at Helsinki: a sort of crossover warp that, just for starters, destabilizes the ground plans. Eisenman’s entry begins the takeover but doesn’t actually complete the immelman turn. Perhaps that is for the best, as his winning proposal is conventional enough to work.

His mature work seems to be reconciled with a suave ugliness that, at this scale, results in a form so monocron that they would have troubled Sper. His building ends up being functional, not just in truth in form, in syntax, its construction is his personal testament secret: it cannot be divorced to other architects.

These magisterial projects will require a permanent management authority, withdrawing from public discussion a large sector of Manhattan. Even after it was built, its government would be administrative, which is to say, hermatically bureaucratic—never democratic.

The people of New York so ostentatiously invited to the viewing at Grand Central have been presented with merely the illusion of a choice. Piper’s entry is so phallic that only a childlike like Herbert Muschamp would kick it, and the four others are conceptually interchangeable.

A New Urbanist proposal would present a third position, one between the absolute control of the magisteria and the seduction of Price. It would begin with the restoration of the superfluous Manhattan block pattern. This is a radical proposal compared to the presidential promise of a single big building for the single big site. The streets created would not be conventional; they would jump over the oblige of the tracks, in memory of them. Only a few of the 20 blocks thus created would be permitted to contain, and then only in the event of a genuine large user, perhaps at the scale of a Rockefeller Center or a Yankee Stadium. But not any longer, because it is essential for the viability of the city to avoid institutionalizing about activity.

The New Urbanist proposal would make each block available for many separate buildings. The architectural work would then be decentralized to dozens of architects, the free market to this competition is redundant.

The sequential incursions of decision would assure a self-correcting variety in programming, investment strategy, and architectural design. The result would be resilient, although it would admittedly lack the block-plan quality of a single creator.

The IFCCA competition is not about urbanism. It promises about a conceptual, decentralized, and public design process. These are very large architectural projects. In the end, the only thing that is urban about them is an audacity worthy of Burnham. Their contribution is to send the honor of the innumerable of the nightmare of the irrational. As Osa-gawara, the sleep of reason creates monsters.
This is a great feast of a book, a compendium of a wealth of detail, at least as far as the text is concerned. But there is more. It is possible to appreciate the whole by studying the parts. In a book that devotes over 700 pages to building types alone—everything from office buildings to opera houses—the city's variety and scale are made abundantly clear. There's something of interest for everyone. I found the extensive section on the John D. Rockefeller apartment competition as well as the development in New York of the Victorian apartment building particularly fascinating.

The St. John's competition—in which the only entries were considered between 1888 and 1899—and an astonishing case study of the development of an anachronistic style are the highlights of the book. The book is a tour de force, a masterful piece of architectural history that is not only informative but also engrossing.

For those familiar with the city, the book is a useful resource for further, in-depth research. But for those who are new to the city, or who have only a superficial knowledge of it, the book is an excellent introduction to the world of architecture. It is a must-read for anyone interested in the history of New York City, and it is also a valuable resource for anyone interested in the history of architecture in general.
Successful memoirs can convey wisdom across great distances of time and space. Through them, the unique experience of one generation can become a living part of our shared culture. This has been the case with obvious masterworks like Marcus Aurelius’s Meditations, St. Augustine’s Confessions, and Montaigne’s Essays. These are not mere autobiographical stories, but distillations of lessons learned through a lifetime of experience. Strangely, these works speak in a paradoxical manner: both humble and profound, intimate and universal. Such seeming contradictions, however, are precisely what lends the personal to the political and the temporal to the transcendent. Architects are not only known for their memoirs, but rather their buildings. This may be because they are not literary artists but authors of a wholly different kind. However, architecture does not easily grant its most advanced practitioners the freedom to remove themselves from commissions of ever greater importance. When a written work does appear, rarely is it celebrated, and never described as a series of confessions or meditations. The classic architect authors we do recall, Vitruvius and Alberti, or in our own time Frank Lloyd Wright, appear to have been motivated less by a love of art than by personal recognition. Writing late in life, Vitruvius had not distinguished himself as an architect and was not particularly fond of the work of his contemporaries. Alberti used his treatise to generate commissions, as no great built works of his are known prior to the circulation of De Re Aedificatoria.

It is within this context that we welcome Cesar Pelli’s Observations for Young Architects. A series of concise essays, it is both a meditation on the vocation of architecture as well as an confession of a well-traveled architect. Each observation is followed by a personal anecdote that connects this knowledge to an intimate recollection. In this way, a discussion of the culture of architecture abounds as we are drawn into the inner world of a master garden designer, a man whose ability to see new spaces and forms has formed the recollection of Pelli’s personal experiences. While memoirs may be similar in form, each is distinguished by specific knowledge unique to a particular time. Indeed, this collection affords a singular view of the golden period of American modernism.

Observations clearly reveals that we still have much to learn from our mid-century modernists. Through its simple style and sincere tone we learn from Pelli, not from him. And this is perhaps the greatest observation: we come to learn that our mentors are not only our guides but also our fellow students. As Montaigne reflectively observed in his own memoir, “Here you have not my teaching but my study: the lesson is not for others. It is for me.”

—John Well

John Well (M.Arch. '93) is an architect in the office of Steven Holl and Associates in New York.

Amid the flood of unremarkable hagiographies of celebrity designers, self-serving surveys of trendy practices, and abstruse theoretical musings, the arrival of an architecture book that illuminates a pressing issue is cause for celebration. Even Blau has succeeded in forging a spellbinding narrative from the important subject of public housing. That, while focusing on the interwar period in Vienna, encompasses the urbanistic history of the Austrian capital from the Biedermeier period of the early nineteenth century to the Anschluss with Nazi Germany. Long awaited, extensively researched, and definitive, Blau’s masterful achievement is distinguished not only by its thoroughness and clarity but also by a sophisticated methodology that grounds theoretical speculation in the palpable and animates it with humanity and meaning.

Blau’s brilliant synthesis of information and his incisive insights into the dialectical interplay between politics, economics, aesthetics, class struggle, housing typology, and sociospatial structures create a richly nuanced portrait of the complex culture of Red Vienna, so dubbed because of the socialist majority that governed the city between 1919 and 1934. Each chapter, although integral to the larger schema of the book, may be read as an essay complete in and of itself. First, Blau introduces us to the principles of Austrian Marxism, which, emphasizing reform over revolution, would determine the housing policy of the Social Democrats when they came to power in the municipal government. The second chapter surveys the transformation of Vienna from imperial Realenstadt to the densely built capital of a modernizing and capitalist nation-state. The seven subsequent chapters explore the intricate and contradictory history of the Gemeindebauten themselves. Veterans of Vincent Scully’s “History of Twentieth-Century Architecture,” who will recall his meticulous description of the façades’ sharing of Karl Ehn’s Karl Marx-Hof in 1934, will appreciate Blau’s detailed analysis of the design and execution of this miniature city and all of the other superblocks constructed by the municipality, which all told provided 64,000 attractive row houses for 200,000 working-class families, together with communal facilities such as libraries, bathhouses, laundries, day-care centers, markets, and public gardens as well as public spaces for work and leisure.

The majority of private architects who designed Vienna’s public dwellings were members of the so-called Wagner School, among the most active being Ehn, Hubert Greiner, and Heinrich Schmied and Hermann Aschinger. Largely unremarked outside Austria, they brought important formal and urbanistic innovations to the design of large-scale housing ensembles.

Like these architects, Vienna’s courtyard communities, the Höfe, have been overshadowed in the literature by the undomesticated open row housing found in Germany and the USSR during this same era. Even in their own time, the Höfe were criticized by foreign visitors and home-grown modernists for their individualistic fenestration patterns, handicrafted ornament, and historical allusion. When rediscovered by a new generation of historians in the 1970s and 1980s, they were frequently condemned on ideological grounds as bourgeois solutions punitively imposed on an unwitting proletariat.

Evel Blau has forthly summarized and convincingly countered the negative judgments on the Höfe. Her subtle characterizations of these perimeter blocks, which accommodated not just one garden but encompassed a series of large courts and often straddled several city streets and squares, demonstrate their ambiguous semi-public, semi-private nature, and uncover their origins in planning practices rooted in the historic city. Thence to her sympathetic interpretations, we can again appreciate these majestic ensembles, many of which have been lovingly restored.

—Helen Searns

Helen Searns is Professor of Art History at Smith College.
The Work of Daniel Libeskind—Two Museums and a Garden

Until recently, the relatively new museum at the School of Architecture in the University of Illinois at Chicago was not open to the public. The building, designed by Daniel Libeskind, was constructed on the site of the former Illinois Institute of Technology, which was razed to make way for the new building. The museum opened to the public in 1998.

The museum is a large, rectangular structure with a glass facade that provides a view of the city. The interior is divided into several exhibition spaces, each with a different theme. The first floor is dedicated to the history of architecture, while the second floor features contemporary works of art. The museum also has a sculpture garden and a cafe.

Background:
The work of Daniel Libeskind—Two Museums and a Garden

Text:

The Work of Daniel Libeskind—Two Museums and a Garden

- Title of the exhibition
- Brief description of the exhibition
- Key features and highlights

The exhibition explores the work of Daniel Libeskind, a renowned architect known for his innovative designs and unique concepts. The exhibition includes a variety of works, ranging from architectural models to paintings and sculptures. The exhibition is divided into two main sections: the first focuses on Libeskind's early work, while the second features his more recent projects.

In the first section, visitors can see models of Libeskind's early projects, including the Berlin Jewish Museum and the Anne Frank House in Amsterdam. The models provide a glimpse into Libeskind's design process and allow visitors to understand the evolution of his work.

The second section features Libeskind's more recent projects, including the Museum of Jewish Heritage in New York, the United Jewish Appeal in Israel, and the National September 11 Memorial Museum in New York. These projects showcase Libeskind's ability to create buildings that are both functional and symbolic, and that pay homage to the history and culture of the communities they serve.

The exhibition also includes a video presentation that provides an overview of Libeskind's career and his approach to architecture. Visitors can watch as Libeskind discusses his设计理念, showing how his work is shaped by his philosophical and cultural interests.

Overall, the exhibition offers a comprehensive look at the work of Daniel Libeskind, highlighting his unique approach to design and the ways in which his buildings reflect the values and traditions of the communities they serve.
Re-Connections: The Work of the Eames Office

With the exhibition "Re-Connections: The Work of the Eames Office," the Yale School of Architecture celebrated the recent reissue of classic Eames furniture by Herman Miller. Curated and designed by Dean Sakanoto, director of exhibitions at the School of Architecture, the show ran from September 1 to October 10, 1989 and will travel to Columbia University School of Architecture later this year. On view were the new Eames reissues and a selection of Eames furniture from the Zeeland, Michigan firm's ongoing production, as well as more than 50 panels created by John and Marilyn Neuhart of the Eames Office for the 1976 exhibition "Connections: The Work of Charles and Ray Eames," at the University of California, Los Angeles.

The show provided a broad survey of the Eameses' working practices and career, and juxtaposed vintage works and reissued pieces. The stark white-painted center floor within the cruciform gallery focused fine paper's attention on some 13 reissued designs, which visitors could sit in or otherwise try out. Vintage designs were placed on pedestals, with some positioned separately on higher levels framing the central floor. Visitors were mingled with the reissued work, a subtle suggestion perhaps that the vintage and the new are near equivalents, although to this viewer the stalewood lacked the attractive patina that comes with respectful use. The reissued works include the DCW and LOW chairs (1946), the LOM chair (1946), the soft pad chair (1960), the folding screen, and the low wood tables. Works continuously in production include the DOM chair (1946) the 670/671 lounge chair and ottoman (1965), and the turned stack-laminated stool. Airport seating, a storage unit, a turned stack-laminated stool, a fiberglass chair, a surfboard-shaped coffee table, and a chaise were among the vintage Eames designs featured. The panels from 1969 deceptively framed the whole in a sweeping three chronicling Eames office projects, ranging from furniture, films, and exhibits to architecture. Films, including an early version of The Flowers and 901: After 45 years of working, which documents the closing of the Eames office, complemented the video images of the panels, providing a narrative of the Eameses' design mentality and methods. In light of the fact that the revival of old design is a perennial part of the history of design, American or otherwise, Herman Miller's revival of the Eames work is not surprising. In the last decade, vintage Eames designs have appeared with regularity in the secondary market, and the prices for old pieces in good condition have crept steadily upward. Competition for the old also fostered a demand for the new. Clearly, the firm would not have launched a release of designs that are more than 40 or 50 years old unless it sensed this market. But what drives that market? Why this demand now for the culture of the past? War II era?

These reissues exude today's interest in the culture of the 1940s and 1950s, a phenomenon that scholars have dubbed into, such as Thomas Hine in Reception (1986). Curators are drawn to it, as the exhibition "Mechanical Brooks" (National Design Museum, New York City, 1990) demonstrated; and Hollywood continues to revisit it, reframing it with films like Pleasantville (1998). Looking back at this era from our vantage point at the end of the century, we are filled with nostalgia for its property and its fast-paced introduction of consumer products; and seeing American suburbia, we revere the heyday of railbuses, when television sets projected images of perfect nuclear families.

The catalogue that accompanied the show emphasized the importance of Charles and Ray Eames placed on connections as a design issue in their work—hence the title of the 1976 show "Connections" and the recent show "Re-Connections." Examples abound of the problems they puzzled over—how to mount the seat and back panels of their molded plywood chairs to the levers and how to fasten the road made slantable to the plastic-laminated plywood sheathes of their storage units. But, as the title of the show implies, today there is yet another kind of connection, and that is the reissued furniture's power to re-connect us with the past.

The Eameses' work documents themselves in the acts of creation and production. Photographs of the young Charles and Ray enamel the panels and convey their earnestness, playfulness, sense of joy, and confidence. The panels showed the broad scope of the project from the Eames offices, but the lack of explanatory captions was frustrating, and in one instance was misleading. The panel illustrating the floor plan of the milestone 1949 exhibition "For Modern Living," at the Detroit Institute of Arts seemed to imply that the Eameses designated the exhibition, in fact, in their close friend Alexander Girard both curated and designed the overall scheme within which the Eameses and others presented displays of their work.

The quintessential nostalgic element of
How to create buildings instead with meaning, whether they be of referential or abstract forms, is the subject of constant discussion and speculation. This debate continues in the studios at Yale and in the design of cities and projects in other countries. From Berlin and Bilbao to New York and Los Angeles, Nina Rapaport, the editor of Constructions, organized visiting faculty Frank Gehry, Daniel Libeskind, and Demetri Porphyrios for a forum with Mimesida Balmori, Karsten Harries, and Dean Robert Stern in a roundtable last fall.

Frank Gehry: The site I gave the kids in the studio was for a new cathedral in Los Angeles. It was a place where I lived when I first moved there in 1947. It has a lot of personal memory for me. When I go near it, it moves to me; it was a difficult time in my life. The Latino population has now grown up so much around it, but they are not represented in the buildings. The new cathedral is not in an area where they live, but that was circumstance. I asked the students to take ideas to these sites, to represent themselves in a culture that is growing up there, and come forward with designs that relate to them.

Karsten Harries: There is always a question of memories and memories. There are personal memories of a site, and architects must also consider the history of what was there. Daniel Libeskind's Israeli Museum is latently with memories in very specific ways.

Frank Gehry: When I go to the Jewish Museum, when I don't have a personal memory of that site, I cry there, too. The message of the museum is that Daniel brings to the building is very clear, and the memories are there.

Diana Balmori: For me, the issue is that meaning has to do with the issue of trying to get back to origins. The next step is that if one can get back to origins, one has the only chance of being original. Most of the time, memory is being used for simply historic preservation, as a literal story of what happened here.

Frank Gehry: It takes a certain sophistication on the part of students to understand. I met my kids that they have to become aware of every cliché, understand them, and separate them from their life, guiding them so that things don't creep into their work.

Karsten Harries: What we need to do is distinguish between a Bilbao Museum, an insertion that sits like a figure on a ground, and an apartment house. In both, you have to attend to questions of memory, but you need to attack them differently. If every building was like the Jewish Museum, it wouldn't work as it does now.

Daniel Libeskind: Thinking about it, the relationship of site to everyday life, and people's memories and the city itself. That is what the students were looking for when they came to Berlin—braces of the Wall and images from the Berlin Wall, but they were discovering a completely different city, literally developing as they were walking the streets. The studio project is a multi-project, but the site, Tacheles, is difficult because it has a run up open space. The names, which means "Barbary Lion" in Yiddish, designates a new path through the different transformations of Berlin.

Some people suggested leaving it empty, but most people want to return it to life without a sentimental view to the past. I agree with you, Karsten, there should be different responses, but there is the same essential concern for a new memory.

But it goes both ways. Frank, your building at Bilbao is also part of memory of the place. It is the result of many of the factors that I associated with Bilbao before the building was built. The building does not represent a look backward, or the memory of the inrevatable past; it is something that balances over time. And great architecture like Frank's building does not need memory. It creates memory because it is not a picturesque and not a representation of a story, where the story is a good ending of the works. I wished for a better ending. It is an insight into the workings of the city and the mind of the modern mind.

Frank Gehry: It is a boat on the river; it tucks into a funny bridge; it relates to the city and the building, and it is sort of a gift. It is a heavy screw in the light bulb, as it were. A reminder of the building is the students. It is, if you put it on another site, it wouldn't work.

Daniel Libeskind: Memory is not an accumulation of facts, as Proust makes very clear. It is a radical breakdown of all that we know. As Onora O'Neill, the tradition of obscurig origins and cutting through tradition.

Robert Stern: Memory can also be the desire to carry forward from the past what you want to remember. Gehry built temples in Italy as their way of extending memory of their homeland. Americans built what they knew from England and then transformed it to new conditions. Modernism is not about erasing; people need memory in different ways. It is ironic that we are talking together with people who endorse a modern view and talk about memory, too.

Daniel Libeskind: But you are right, the whole twentieth century has been plagued by ideologies of annihilation. What else is there but memory? As the Talmud often points out by пользуыы, the world was created in order for it to be remembered and passed on, which is even better than what Hume said: "The world was created in order to write in a book."

Diana Balmori: But you have to erase at the same time. You can't just do an accurate copy, because there is just too much pile up and it doesn't mean anything anymore.

Daniel Libeskind: But you can't really erase—Berlin is an example of physical erasure, of literally getting rid of a city.

Diana Balmori: That is different. Rather, you have to transform the memories, not purge erasure.

Robert Stern: Even the modernists, such as Le Corbusier, weren't totally erasing, but reinventing the past. Frank Gehry: That transformation is important for all of our work. But if it is the degree of transformation, Demetri's transformations are of a different nature, but they are transformations. In L.A., where I am now building Disney Hall, there is no need to erase there. There is nothing to connect to, so I connected it to curve of the Chandler. The acoustic interior started to remeber of falling sails, so I took that to the outside. But there are no memories there, and it is hard to relate to that kind of environment when the memory there was the beautiful Victorian buildings of Bunker Hill.

Karsten Harries: Let me throw a slight provocation. I was quite enthusiastic about enviornments latent with memory to a student in Frank's studio, and said, "I don't really care about memory; I like a building like Bilbao, as opposed to the historical as the city in itself. You know, we are Americans forward looking, and we think we have it together. We should not forget that a lot of students find it hard to get enthusiastic about memory.

Daniel Libeskind: Then let's think about it again: Memory doesn't mean a sentimental image of the past, presented in a nostalgic form, nor is it coded meaning. The Jewish Museum has nothing to do with obvious reference, to anything particularly Jewish; people don't see it as a sign of that. Yet the overwhelming feeling is that it has an attachment to a present that is compelling in its relationship to the Baroque building and to the program of the Museum. I think that modern architecture must mean something, but that has to be necessarily figurative.

Karsten Harries: But you have to remember that every building operates in a human context. And Berliners remember an awful lot. Accepting everything that you said, it now seems into a situation that forces them to remember.

Frank Gehry: Also, memory is different now.

Robert Stern: There is much in this conversation that is nostalgic. Americans are obsessed with the past because we are so diverse. We need common things from the past to help bind us together culturally. These can be from the Colonial past or the recent past. Often our nostalgia is monumental, but that doesn't make it less valid. We are nostalgic for an innocence that we imagine people had before World War II, of the new experimental forms. But the 1950s were terrible times. Nostalgia in a wonderful human quality: I am saddened to think that Derril and Frank are both down on it.

Karsten Harries: We should not use "nostalgia" so easily as a term of rebuke; it could be that human beings should always dream of a home that they never arrive at. That is what nostalgia means, dreaming of home. It could be that the important thing is not to go to that place, but it is important for everyone to have such dreams.

Demetri Porphyrios: It is not about dreaming. It is about the pain we feel when we are savored from the place and the people we call home (allego and nostos). Odyssyan to his perceptions to be the classic example of nostalgia. We remember Odysseus for his journey, but we would not have no journey without nostalgia. Nostalgia surfaces when the condition of absence returns here with Robert that what one experiences in Leo Corbusier is a similar nostalgia for recapitulating an innocence which had never been. In a discussion I had with Charles Jencks he said that I had to see Bilbao. So I did go and away and indeed Frank's building is a brilliant expressionist statement. It also confirmed my general feeling that expressionist buildings are one-off statements. Bilbao works universality because of the nineteenth-century urban fabric. But you cannot make classic out of such buildings.

Frank Gehry: You mean, if I were to do a building next door, that would destroy it? (Laughter)

Demetri Porphyrios: There are normative qualities in your work. A Frank Gehry School can never build a city or even a neighborhood.

Frank Gehry: God forbid. The issue is interesting; I don't even believe in it. When I get my project of any size in bring in other peer-recognized colleagues because I have a wild sat about having different vectors work together.

Robert Stern: What is implied is that certain buildings are special, and it is enough to have one. But that is also changing as the idea of context, as the gray background for the figure of the monument. It is not about the type of building, but about the power of the architecture to realize the power of architecture. I don't think that the idea of a special building against the background of the nineteenth-century city is relevant.

Demetri Porphyrios: It is not for you to proclaim whether it holds or does not hold any longer. I am not discussing the ideological. I am referring to urban problems.

Daniel Libeskind: No, I am discussing how the city develops.

Robert Stern: It is not just a matter of putting buildings next to each other. It is about the urban fabric that makes up the city. Cities are made by different competing technologies through private and public sponsorship. Expressionist buildings such as Frank's are interesting, but only when viewed against an urban organizing framework.

Robert Stern: It is a formal issue. But I can assure you and Bilbao and itstoneveness
Daniel Libeskind: It is extreme, as is the abstract art position.

Robert Stern: Even so, there was another problem in Daniel’s study, there were two interesting projects. One was a big block and filled it in, the other introduced numerous features between two buildings. The study of the urban block is an admirable urban project. But why does the urban block, street, and square have to suffer such a painful dilapidation when we know that the existing urban model works very well?

Libeskind: The idea of a panoptic system of organization of a city—where half of it has been destroyed, as in Berlin—really is applicable here, and that is what I take exception to what Karsten said about the generalization of notions of cities. Cities can’t be interchanged. The specificity of light, the green, the light, the green makes each one unique. I am not arguing for regional differentiation, but it is one way to get in touch with a particular site, and a particular city.

Robert Stern: It is easier to work on existing buildings and imagine new areas of cities, such as Sibton, which Cesar is coordinating. But to make a whole new town, as we have done and Libeskind has made new quarters of cities, without literal memory and patterns based on uses that grew up over time and without familiar forms, is very difficult. I am willing to see if there is another way, but I have no evidence of it so far.

Libeskind: The design of a town has to do with the knowable, the readable, the familiar. Conceptual memory is always necessary but we must know a specific place to go so that we can find our way.

Daniel Libeskind: But don’t make it banal. It is familiarly in a context of the one hand, the earth and the angles and the spheres of intelligibility of the other. Familiarity is not just the final stop on the train; the train keeps going beyond dual directions, and the interesting architecture doesn’t make the human position banal. It is profound and eternal.
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Demetri Porphyrios: Architecture has to do with recognition.

Robert Stern: That is what I am beginning to think. How do we do it? You guys, Bob and Demetri, have an answer.

Demetri Porphyrios: Direct and informal architecture emerges only when there is openness. Consciousness is not about a formal system but of ethical and civil values. The history of architecture has shown this to be the case.

Frank Gehry: It doesn’t exist today. We live in a democracy at a time when individual expression is given very high mark, and
Architectural Lectures brings many diverse voices into the school.

Pleasure in Architecture

While the architects who spoke in the fall series and in the landscape series (see below) touched on a variety of lessons in art and landscape design, their voices resonated with the architects’ personal sense of pleasure in architecture as the art of building beautifully.

Frank Gehry

In his lecture on November 4, Frank Gehry discussed "the beauty of the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao," whose success led a delega of cats to his office, which he ran sternly and asked engagingly, "How do buildings have a sense of light?" He echoed and observed, "The building is organic and that the shape can sustain itself."

Cesar Pelli

To Cesar Pelli, the Seagull Visiting Professor and former dean of the school, "Buildings are expressions of ideas; we have to have an idea or a theory about what we do. In our buildings we need to be continuously rethinking—is this the most appropriate and suitable way to build?"

In his lecture on October 4, Pelli confessed to an abiding interest in tall buildings, whether they be skyscrapers in Iran, Lagos in Nigeria, or Western Europe. He explained, "As the city expands, and we need to change the city, we must build higher buildings to accommodate the increase in population." Pelli also discussed the "symbolic" aspect of buildings, how they can represent the history and culture of a city. He noted that tall buildings can represent a city's economic and political power, and are often used to signify prestige and status.

Jorge Silvetti

Jorge Silvetti, a well-known architect and professor at the University of Arizona, delivered a lecture on the role of architecture in the future of the city. He discussed the importance of designing buildings that are not only aesthetically pleasing, but also functional and sustainable. He emphasized the need for architects to consider the social and environmental impacts of their designs, and to work with communities to ensure that buildings meet the needs of all residents.

Peregrine L. Glass

Peregrine L. Glass, an architectural historian and writer, delivered a lecture on the historical significance of buildings and their role in shaping the city. He discussed the impact of architecture on the social and cultural fabric of a community, and the ways in which buildings can reveal the values and beliefs of their creators. Glass also discussed the importance of preserving historical buildings and sites, and the benefits of doing so for future generations.
play layering coated in the place, in which the building had been about their own construction, to one that relates more particularly to the human scale and material nature of the structures.

In earlier projects, Paikus explained how he took a closer look at the materials and processes used in the construction of a building, including its relationship to the larger environment in which it is located. She explained that she has always been interested in the way that materials and processes are used in architecture, and how they affect the overall aesthetic of a building.

In her most recent project, the "Continuing Dilemma," which was constructed in a forest near a small village, Paikus explained how she used natural materials such as wood and stone to create a building that was in harmony with its surroundings. She also explained how she used the natural landscape as a source of inspiration for her design, and how she incorporated the natural landscape into the building itself.

For more information on this topic, please see the website of the Architectural Association, which offers a range of resources and information on contemporary architecture and design.

---

Daniel Libeskind

"I am a lot of things, but I am not a one-dimensional person," Libeskind explained. "I am a person who is constantly in flux, who is constantly exploring new ideas and new ways of thinking."

Libeskind's latest project is the "National Museum of World War II," which is currently under construction in Washington, D.C. He explained how this project is particularly important to him, as he has a deep personal connection to the history of World War II.

In his speech, Libeskind also discussed his work on the "Potsdamer Platz" in Berlin, which is a large-scale urban development project. He explained how he used the site's history as a starting point for his design, and how he incorporated elements of the past into the new buildings.

For more information on this topic, please see the website of the Architectural Association, which offers a range of resources and information on contemporary architecture and design.

---

Laurinda Spear

"I am a person who is constantly in flux, who is constantly exploring new ideas and new ways of thinking," Spear explained. "I am a person who is always looking for new challenges, and I am always striving to push the boundaries of what is possible in architecture."
Term-Time Travel

The China Studio, a new architectural education program in Shanghai, has received a significant gift from the Rockefeller Foundation to enhance its program by making it more accessible to students. This gift is part of a broader initiative to support the China Studio, which is dedicated to advancing architectural education in China.

The China Studio

Although the site visit is not an unusual component of a design studio at Yale, the site visit to Shanghai takes on special meaning. The focus of this fall’s China Studio, a semester-long collaboration and exchange between students from Hong Kong University, Tung Chi University in Shanghai, and Yale University, was to explore the development of a former industrial area along the Suzhou Creek in Shanghai, for which the government had proposed a master plan.

The site visit is a rapid reflection of China’s new emphasis towards the global economy, as we discussed with Deborah Davis, Yale’s Acting Director of East Asian Studies, and Paul Katz, principal in charge of East Asian projects for Reis Berdahl. For the local backdrop of a diverse and dynamic site, design investigations centered on studies of other waterfronts and issues of the creek, including reactivating it as an inner-city area with recreational activities. The development of open space and cultural, sport, and tourist facilities; providing access to the waterfront; developing housing for the new wealthy; and promoting commercial and retail space.

At mid-morning the preliminary design proposals, which included a site model and conceptual development focusing the city as a whole—from the generic condition of river front development, down to the conditions of the actual site—were reviewed by Sheila de Bretteville, Fred Koster, Robert Stern, Alan Plosker, and Zhang Shiling, the Vice-Chancellor of Tongji University. Then, armed with incitements, precedent studies, and preliminary design proposals and compared by our professor and studio coordinator, Alan Plosker (who had visited the site in May) and Dean Stern, we embarked on the path to Hong Kong. It was only when we were immersed in the diverse texture, scale, and pace of Hong Kong that we recognized the limitations of our preconceived notions and began to engage with the design issues directly.

At Robert Black College at Hong Kong University, the Yale contingent was formally received by the College’s deputy president of Helm, the American and Chinese students presented their schematic design proposals for Suzhou Creek to Patrick Lau, head of Hong Kong University’s Department of Architecture, and professor Leslie Lu, graduate of Yale, and head of the Huawei Shanghai Studio. Instead of working independently, which we had done, the Hong Kong students had worked in groups of five developed collective ideas and analyzed the site.

After the presentation at Hong Kong University, we visited sites such as the Pu- Lin monastery with its 45-meter-tall bronze Buddha and the Tai O fishing village, with its jagged metal sheds perched over the water on repairable stilts. To us, this indigenous architecture evoked a modern design sensibility like that of Lubetski. However, we also noted that a more detailed and unified development, in sharp contrast to the high-rise density of Hong Kong Island, could have been achieved with Westerners’ architects. We then proceeded to Shanghai with the Hong Kong students. There, the wild range in the city—from the colonial long-tang houses of the early twentieth century, to the traditional gardens of the imperial era, to the modernization of the post-Maoist new development areas at Pudong—underscored what it means to be building in China at this fast-paced point in history. In fact, it is common for projects to have three to five shifts, so a job can run 24 hours continuously.

After an overview tour of the city, the Yale and Hong Kong contingent met up with the students from Tongji and together they studied the area, only to be shocked to see that in the short time since Professor Davis’s visit in May, our site, the home of a former cotton mill, had already been cleaned and six new residential towers and a high-rise were under construction. The site borders a melding of gated dwan factory complexes that remain from May’s industrial programs, new and old housing developments, transport corridors, and new commercial towers, and the 50-meter-wide creek, all of which we viewed from the ground as well as from atop the new 40-story residential developments. Disappointed with the preliminary development of the site, we were more impressed with the informal details of life in the surrounding neighborhoods.

The challenge upon our return to New Haven was to synthesize our newfound appreciation of the fragility of the context with our earlier planning analyses from the beginning of the term. At midmorning most of our projects had proposed swearing planning changes for the site; by finals we were more concerned with reawakening the urban fabric.

In December, Patrick Lau, Leslie Lu, and their students traveled from Hong Kong to Yale for a joint final review and to spend some time visiting and observing other reviews at Yale. The jury—who de Bretteville, Michael Havardian, Deborah Gana, and Andreas Krem—reviewed presentations from both schools. There were notable differences in our approaches. The Yale students were more focused on housing for all income groups that sustained a degree of continuity with the existing population. Jafakia and, for example, documented traditional housing types and attempted to adapt them to the area, reconnecting the construction to the low-rise surrounding neighborhood and making improvements to the infrastructure. The Hong Kong students, however, were more focused on the development of a new cultural and entertainment center along the river. And while the Yale projects completed a cohesive whole, the Hong Kong students developed individual projects within their overall scheme.

—Thomas Mertens (’00) and Irene Shum (’00)

with Nina Rapaport

Visitors’ Studios

This semester’s highly individual visiting professors, Daniel Lubetski, Frank Gehry, and Peter Zumthor, were all united in a common search for expressive yet contextually responsible form. Their animated architectural discourse continued between and around the studios.

Cesar Pelli

Cesar Pelli’s studio was subtitled “Cosmic Farmers.” Together with William Butler, Pelli assigned a complex project: a 1.9 million-square-foot office tower that would serve as communications headquarters for Olympics 2012, for the same site addressed by live architects for the PCDA competition (see page 7). The jurors at the final review—David Childs, Paul Goldberg, Stanley Tigerman, Alexander Garn, and Andrew Agnino—were treated to a feast of classification, the detail of that building. The treat the entire - for the building—this building, this is essentially stone. Pelli addressed, “Do you think abstraction is a modern idea?” Goh responded, “I feel it as a transformation, it is an ancient idea.” Pelli agreed, noting that “it is anything Egyptian.” In another project, Timothy Hickernell chose to site the school in the interior of a city block in Boston. Having eliminated the street face, the layout is in a linear manner and all of the buildings were now to be enclosed, from the top of the walls to the bottom level. His consideration of the project at every scale, from architectural detail to urban scheme, impressed the jurors.

Daniel Lubetski

Daniel Lubetski’s studio site was in Berlin Mitte, in former East Berlin, and contains the ruins of the Jewish department store, Tchibo, on a block that is a development
tell buildings, and their discussion, which was exceptionally lively and analytical, rang from the skyscraper's unified form to issues of base, entry, and crown. In evaluating the way the building meets the sky, a David Drennan project, Tigerman noted that "although you begin as a triangle, you then jumped into a convex rather than a concave form at the top. You say it reflects the sun. But convex is actually a reflecting form, it turns its back on the corner." Goldberg, however, had it as the overall generator of form, remarking "The illusion is a pinwheel twist in a profile silhouette." Diane Agrest said she takes "convex as addressing different points of the city. It is really an arrow pointing in three directions. The way the top and base are manipulated is an interesting approach; it is like peeling away, and yet they are talking to each other." But citing I.M. Pei's Hong Kong skyline, where the sprint also operates in section, she asked, "Why not make the entire building inflated and turning around?"

The issue of how to enter the buildings was a concern, because breaking into the overall form while maintaining the whole presented a problem. Thomas Skura made the entire skin of his project a woven structure wrapped around the building frame in a celebratory gesture towards the proposed stadium site. David Childs found that "the form evokes a home and solves all of the problems. You have taken a skin and evolved a form; it is like a fractured Lucid skin, and it is structural too." Garvin commented, "You don't see it in the same way from any spot: the surface modulates; it is oddly contextual." To which Robert Stern responded, "It is not contextual, it is sculpture in the round; it creates the contextual."

**Frank Gehry**

Frank Gehry's work, given by Gordon Kopp, with Hugh Grant's advice from Father Jaime Larras of the Divine Fruits, assigned the Roman Catholic Cathedral of Los Angeles. While pursuing the same order on the project, he collaborated on a different site, facing McEwane Park just west of downtown. The students were asked to "create an image of Christ's Mystical body as well as design a civic sculpture." At the final jury, art dealer Douglas Christine, filmmaker Paul Schrader, Jaime Larras, and the late James Mort Morton, Dean of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, joined architects Philip Johnson, Jeffrey Kipnis, Bruce Hennes, and Stanley Tigerman.

The square site influenced the plan of stairs and steps to permit the plaza to be a central place rather than cruciform. While Paul Schrader didn't see Armand Davulci's project as a cathedral, he noticed that everyone on the jury was focused only on the tallest project. The students noted that "Hevia Sophia with its circular space was originally an early Christian church." Lichtenstein sculpture inspired some of the projects, as did Frank Gehry's own work. Chaplin won the order of the Casa elevated, for a view of the City of Angels. Kipnis commented that it had a wonderful diagram, but that "you need to increasingly abstract a figure to find the place where it forces, and how it can evolve its logic, and at the same time move into a formal abstraction..." The building had to be more ambiguous. To which Tigerman responded, "the power of the body is awesome, but not incredible. John Hejduk said that the closer the final product is to an original idea, the more powerful it is. I would hope that the future work is further developed." He recommended that "the building is a good part of architecture is not verbalizing it, but internalizing it.

Philip Johnson said he was enchanted by the students' connection to the "spiritual and emotional in the physical to create a sense of awe," and Father Jaime Larras noted that the students were "straining them selves to see what is the place of religion and spirituality in modern society and how to express their feelings." Then Douglas Christmas invited all of the student to participate in an exhibition of their work in his Ace Gallery in Los Angeles later this year.

**Dimitri Porphyrios**

Dimitri Porphyrios asked his students to transform the building fragments, courtyard surrounding positions, and templates of the ruins of Alcatacium at Persnes into a business school at an uncharted site of their choosing. With a goal toward "reverse building," students developed projects using different architectural language and search for origins. Some used a classical language, while others used a more reducible abstract form. The jury—Dist. Bailey, Richard Cameron, Vicente Dauis, Allen Pettus, Alex Porphyrius, James Robertson, and Vincent Scuoly—discussed formal issues and context in the final presentation of drawings and models.

Since the issue of where the business school was to be located was for the most part not addressed, Donald Johnson's sitting at the edge of a plaza in Verona, Italy, was recommended for the classroom. By making the plaza of the city the center instead of the school's own courtyard, Johnson, according to Porphyrios, "assumed the Western tradition and contraposed the Mosque: there are no windows or doors out." While it is internalized, it nevertheless relates to the city.

Influenced by Kahn and Lewenstein, Grace Ong saw her abstracted project as a transformation from the fragment to the school, with offices around the perimeter in a monastic setting. The most striking feature was her use of the existing petal-shaped building as an interior space enclosed in a church shape, prompting Beaudry to mention Kahin's relationship to classical forms and details and the way he transformed them, creating a link between the classical and the modern, inside the petal shape. Ong proposed a library with niches for books and a central reading area. Purvis declared that it was an "astonishing competition. Using the developers' brief, the students struggled to reconfigure the interior of the large city block for housing and commercial use, all while seeking to avoid the overly corporate look of the projects of Potemkin Platz. The jurors—Frank Gehry, Karsten Harries, Jeffrey Kipnis, Kent Kleinman, Enrique Horton, Eva-Iesa Polkonien, and Jesse Reise—raised philosophical issues as they responded to the projects, which incorporated the intellectual history of Berlin, evoking traces of the past with "Usbeinstein" shapes. Brian Pappa contrasted the Potemkin style development by depicting the celebratory approach, creating smaller spaces within the central block. Passages went between and through the buildings, which have a thick base modeled on a turbiniform. Kipnis was critical of the approach, seeing it as a cartoon of a medieval courtyard. But Usbeinstein defended the project, saying that "it has a very strong theoretical idea, how the cartoon can be exploded, in a sense, and go back to the city. It is attractive to the city and it maximums density. Its interest is to create a system of volumes and provide it with the right atmosphere and jenesis of the city."
Keller Easterling's spring seminar on new materials and fabrication techniques will, as she explains, "prompted by a current renewed interest in fabrication, especially the digitally directed manufacturing techniques."

According to Easterling, these techniques are altering "not only the process of making, but the nature of the building components themselves, their assembly, and their relationship to each other. These, together with new plastics and composite materials, are making their way into the minds of building techniques and changing the way in which we think about prefabricated or standardized construction components."

Although the recent focus of fabrication techniques has been primarily on digital modeling as a means of realizing material form, this seminar will explore a broad range of technologies and materials throughout history, looking for successful but for the most part less visible examples. "Most of the best architects in the century have pursued fabrication experiments and have been naturally attracted to various means of spatial and material production that do not necessarily originate within architectural conventions," says Easterling. The class will analyze the material experiments of architects and designers such as Mies van der Rohe, Frederick Kiesler, Adolf Loos, AA Asplund, and Prouvé, Konrad Wachsmann, Andrea Branzi, and Charles and Ray Eames, but will also examine the way in which these experiments have prompted an inventive and improvisational approach to practice. "Moreover," she says, "in many cases, the fabrication process is transformed into architectural thesis that influence one's design or organization and lead to one's architecture being formed and part of the cultural context of a distinct position in itself, in our culture. The seminar will pay particular attention to the intelligence embedded in these processes."

The seminar is a group of discussions that accompany the Monday night lecture series. Some of the speakers will be lecturers — James Glyn, the Glyn Smith Lecture in Practice and History; Laura Hawkinson and Henry Smith-Miller, "Building Spaces"; and Marco Zanini, "Milan Modern". May 20, Hugh Hardy, Eames Award Lecture — "Old Things, New Life: A Remarkable Professional Journey," May 27, Laurie Hawkinson and Henry Smith-Miller, "Building Spaces." 3 April, Mario Seling, "Innovation: The Eames Award Lecture — "Almost Space." 6 April, Zaha Hadid, "Almost Space." 10 April, "Almost Space." 14 April, "Almost Space."
Victoria Casasco, newly appointed assistant professor (adjunct) at Yale, completed her M.Arch. at Columbia University in 1983, and has built projects in Barcelona, Spain, and Seaside, Florida. She is a member of the town planner prior to setting up her firm, Casasco Studio, in Los Angeles. She has also taught at SCI-Arc, CalPoly Pomona, and UCLA.

For Victoria Casasco, "architecture is an environmental art, an incredibly complex and intricate constructed landscape. It is about economic, political, social, and environmental systems. The architect is the mediator between client and society, creating an ethical and environmental response."

After beginning her career as a sculptor, Casasco switched to architecture because she was "attracted to the idea of how architecture is and how it operates at so many levels, including scales in scale."

It was the "overwhelming open natural landscape west of the Mississippi" that intrigued her in the differences between natural landscape and constructed landscapes, in the juxtaposition of extreme abstraction with hyper-organic systems.

But when she moved from California to New Haven last summer, she discovered that the density of the aging infrastructure on the Northeast corridor and the rate at which these cities have grown into each other, combined with natural landscapes are for the most part erased and superimposed by infrastructure systems, which rarely have anything to do with the cultural or topological antecedents of sites. The open landscape of the West also influenced her thoughts concerning environmental systems and the need for architects to be responsible environmentally and globally. "Desert building in a cooler place should work intentionally, and with basic environmental conditions such as drainage patterns, sun, rain, wind," says Casasco. "I would consider it utopian not to do so.

The idea of interior landscape and exterior architecture informs Casasco’s thinking, leading her to intentionally superimpose abstract and organic systems. She begins with a site strategy, an abstract landscape, which in turn generates the building. For the Bahk Residences, an unbuilt house for a flat, one-acre site in Lake Forest, Illinois, she explored how Frank Lloyd Wright related site and site. In response to the site’s natural grassland and 100-foot tall oak trees, she eroded an abstract geometry over the site that would exaggerate the trees, placing particular stone terraces over the full site in linear layers, which also served to shield the flat site from the headlighting of passing cars.

Casasco’s relationship between landscape and site is evident in the 1999 Asner house in Barcelon, Spain. Using local materials and honing in to the culture, Casasco superimposes three distinct landscapes on three vertical levels. The first level is and desert landscape, and it is built-like in its concrete sheathing from the building; the second level relies on water and has palm trees; and the lowest level is a vertical landscape with a eucalyptus tree providing shade. Responsible to the climate, the house is full of bright and dark areas.

For the Los Angeles competition “101 Hollywood Freeway Bridge,” Casasco worked with partner Elisabeth Ledgerwood, artist Dennis Oppenheim, and landscape architect Linda Polak on the design of a pedestrian bridge, bringing together art, architecture, and landscape architecture. Since the freeway cuts through a red light district in Chinatown, which she calls “another kind of ‘natural system,’” the team seized on the connection suggested by a Versace dress they had stumbled upon whose structural yellow threads were evocative of the pedestrian traffic on the site, and decided to use it for the project’s site plan. "The female body became an open space system to the freeway below and her contours created edge conditions of hard and soft landscapes.

Casasco says that using the computer has made her more aware that we are artificially constructing environments. She feels that “the computer’s liquid light generates a kind of fluid movement and play that is an experience on a freeway. The computer is a tool skewed aligned to the way I think.”

In her fall studio project for a commuter terminal in Jersey City on the Morris Canal, she explores that “we are experiencing the differences between pure abstraction and organic systems. We are looking at the antithesis of site, the natural grassland and meadows and site in place that makes Jersey City unique.” It is important that her students be aware of a site’s natural history. After reviewing the Duany/Picker Zetkin master plan for the site, which was designed to create a mixed-use neighborhood like Manhattan’s Greenwich Village, she felt disturbed that “what was missing was the inclusion of complex natural and cultural systems within the site strategy. The site is across from Liberty State Park’s open grasslands and yet it is on an artificial construct, an infra, and it houses a service metal yard. I did not want the students to just play down a building on an open field. Building is connected to a larger and much more complex condition.”

Victor Bodily-Lawson is a newly appoint- ed assistant professor (adjunct) at Yale. Originally from Togo, he completed his M.Arch. at Columbia University in 1994 and soon set up a firm that primarily designed houses in New Jersey. After working for a few years with Bond Ryder and then with Davis Bodily Bond, he founded Bodily-Lawson Architects in Harvard in 1996, just as the area was beginning to rebuild.

Bodily-Lawson’s essential strategy in architecture is to involve the client in the design early on in the process. He calls it an “action plan approach,” and has informed everything he has done, from the design guidelines he developed for the 1,200 unit Baekmeier housing project built in the 1970s in the South Bronx to the 32 historic Harlem brownstones for the Homeworks Project. For Baekmeier, Bodily-Lawson worked closely with tenants United for Better Living to develop market para- meters for public areas. In the Homeworks project, he is incorporating each owner’s needs into individual stable plans. Tenants are involved, he says, a greater sense of pride in the community.

One of Bodily-Lawson’s interests is church design in African-American communities. “For African-Americans, sources of worship need to be connected because the entire congregation moves to the alter for prayers and to participate in Communion,” he says for a number of churches in New York. Body-Lawson says, “we created stairs that also function as bleachers in order to smoothly connect the main floor and mezzanine levels.

While sensitive to tradition, Body-Lawson is also mindful of new technology. “Video, sound, cameras, and the Internet all must be incorporated into a church,” continues Body-Lawson. "The physical nature of a church is more symbolic; the wider audience the site for television, and the Internet. For example, the services at New York’s landmark cathedral-styled Riverside Church (where Body-Lawson recently completed a lighting design project) are televised. At the beginning of each project, Body-Lawson makes an art piece, which he says, "could be a piece that ends up as a major influence on the outcome of the project. The artwork is used as an investigative element to search for the essence of the project. It is also used to coordinate the site, program, context, budget and client desires. Sometimes the artwork doesn’t resemble the project at all, but it use the way to get rid of pressures associated with developing buildings..." In the studios I teach, I also use art, especially because it is one of the best ways for students to express their individuality while sorting out the pedagogical issues associated with their project.

Body-Lawson has been teaching since 1995, primarily at City College in New York, and he taught a seminar at Yale in 1995. His primary teaching topic is, he stresses, “to empower the students to look at and manipulate thought with a kind of literal focus that will enable them to move their thoughts into buildings. Everything we do and think becomes material, because we focus specifically on things that don’t exist and try to turn them into the material world. I try to impart this to the students: that they are thought engineers using their eyes, hands, and minds to create buildings. If we can get a good grasp on how to convert all of these things, it enables us make a beautiful environment, I also want to continue the tactile relationship between pen, paper, and mind, and at the same time recognise that we have to use technology in which a computer that go beyond the tactile mode.”

Body-Lawson’s interest in the way technology and synthesis extends to more universal realms. “I am very concerned about not only the physical environment but the cultural and psychological environment,” he says. “We need to become sensitive to ideas from the entire world. We can’t just look at work from one set of values; it has to be more global. We have to be able to design in China, Ghana, Afghanistan, or New York. But before we do that we have to understand the specific cultures and contexts.”

One way Body-Lawson cultivates such sensitivity is by having his students rework a previous study’s project for a tropical climate, as he did in his final seminar semester at Yale. One student created an edition for a house in the Bahamas, another designed a prototype for a college campus, and another designed an office building using green technology in Malaysia, which, he says, “is where the rest of the world is.”

Body-Lawson explains that “we are studying all varieties of work in terms of looking at the materials and the culture of the place and asking ourselves, as American architects designing anywhere: What am I going to do that is culturally, economically, and technologically significant for that place? What technology from the United States might be helpful? There is a need for Western architects to work in developing nations in a sensitive way without trans- planting one set of cultural issues to other, even though the developing countries often desire a Western image.”
Lord Richard Rogers
Richard Rogers, who received his master’s degree in Yale in 1963, will discuss the Millennium Dome and rejuvenating England with Nina Rappaport at the House of Lords in London last fall. Richard Rogers: Complete Works, by Kenneth Powell, was published by Phaidon Press in November 1999.
Nina Rappaport: How did you first get interested in urban revitalization and the role of the waterfront in London?
Richard Rogers: When I set up practice with Norman Foster after Yale, we designed a housing block very much based upon our Yale studio community and public domain with Serge Chermayeff. In the 1980s we designed an unrealised scheme for a derelict area, Colin Street, along the South Bank of the Thames and worked on large-scaled regeneration ideas for the river. In our 1986 exhibition at the Royal Academy, “New Architecture: Foster, Rogers, Stirling,” we showed an impractical scheme for the riverfront Tidligging Square and London Bridge City. Piccadilly Circus, Whitehall, and Westminster Square, key spaces in London that have lost their sense of place due to the onslaught of traffic, spaces that if pedestrianised would enhance the city.
NR: Much of your current work addresses sustainable development, such as the town in Malaga and a new community outside of Florence; then in your 1996 Rath Lefrak—now a book, Cities for a Small Planet (Faber and Faber, 1997)—you address issues of planning and sustainable cities on a global scale, but I understand you have also just completed a major study for the renewal of that scheme? 
RR: As part of the Urban Task Force we have completed a report called “Towards an Urban Renaissance,” based on a request by the Prime Minister, who wants to reverse urban decline and the flow of people leaving the cities. In the next 20 years England will have four million new houses. Where can we build it if we don’t build on the Green Belt? England doesn’t have the land that America has per person, so we have very little space to grow. In our 150 recommendations we propose that 80 percent of the four million dwellings should be on brownfields, or recycled land. We look towards building within the cities, recommend compact development from the center define successful urban regeneration schemes: promote mixed uses, social wellbeing, environmental responsibility, and good design. It will be published in a new more popular form, with the working title “The State of Our Cities.”
NR: How is England different from the rest of Europe?
RR: England has a specific problem because we were the first to have industrial revolution, which left a massive scar. We have a serious problem especially outside of London. If you compare the smaller European cities such as Lyon, Marseille, Hamburg, and Frankfurt with those in England—Manchester, Birmingham, and Liverpool—they are not in the same league and are very badly damaged, socially and architecturally. We make the point that you can’t separate social poverty from physical deprivation: it is no good putting money into building schools if it is in the middle of a slum.
NR: What urban success stories are you looking at?
RR: I think that there is an interesting story to be told in comparing the Barcelona Olimpicas to the Los Angeles Olympics. Los Angeles was the first to balance their books, but they had riots and not a penny of their revenue going to the communities. Barcelona, on the other hand, used their money to make new towns and public spaces, and they seriously dropped their crime rates because of civic pride.
NR: In London, how is the Thames taking on a new role as part of an urban Renaissance? 
RR: The Thames is where London starts, it is the heart. The Thames is typical of every industrial waterfront. This silver pleth has in the last 10 years, but our plan says that rather than try to encourage things like tennine-mouthex, we first need a series of dense stopping points with public transport interchanges. This is the peals on a string concept, and one of the peers is the Greenwich Dome.
NR: So the Dome isn’t just for the Millennium year but it is part of the city’s revitalization? 
RR: The Dome will be permanent, but we don’t know what its function will be after this year. The idea started about three years ago as a business enterprise under the Conservative government; the Labor Party then changed it. They didn’t want business, they wanted community, sustainability. So it became a concept of 15 businesses run by Imagination Corporation, then we were brought in.
NR: How were you selected? 
RR: We were asked by the Dome to build a neighborhood of 10,000 houses on the Greenwich Peninsula. We won that competition and the Dome was to be on our land, so we designed that, too. The Dome is basically a big umbilical, a face structure. It is 365 meters in diameter, one kilometer in circumference, about the biggest type of structure this size. Oh, there are all sorts of statistics about it, like you can put the Eiffel Tower in it kiteghed.
James Stewart Polshek

James Stewart Polshek, who graduated from Yale in 1959, founded the New York firm the Polshek Partnership, and was Dean of the Columbia School of Architecture. The firm’s Rose Center for Earth and Space will open in February and a book on their work will be published later this year.

Nina Rapoport: How did the Rose Center for Earth and Space and the new Hayden Planetarium evolve to such an expansive project?

James Polshek: It started five years ago when a Boston exhibition designer asked us to work with him on an RFP to redesign the planetarium exhibits. Our presentation book included a sketch of a sphere floating in a concrete container. A New York firm asked, “What would you do if you could do whatever you wanted?” I said I would demolish the planetarium and reconstitute it for the 21st century. A discussion ensued about needed museum amenities—parking, restaurant, gift shops, and interactive media stations. And it appeared to me that the project could serve multiple purposes for the museum. I saw it as an opportunity to heal the whole north side of the museum, which had never been completed. After both Schindler and I showed Ellen V. Futter, the museum’s president, a plan of the first and second floors, she asked us what we might do with the planetarium as the nucleus of a new North Side.

Nina Rapoport: How did the idea of the sphere in the universe develop?

James Polshek: In studying images of Two Bridges and Livingston’s planetarium, I realized my compass was the hemisphere center of radius and noted that it didn’t interest the casual look. In our final group of photos showed that the concrete hemisphere was supported on its own supports and the rest of the building was an independent steel skeleton. It became apparent that we could expose the hemisphere. In 1935, Buck Rogers was a character of the air, the future. In the 1970s, Buck Rogers was an element of the future. This was the sphere that was the atomic bomb, and with the future of space, the universe. It’s a time of looking at the planet from the inside, a planetarium that is a spectacular and the beauty of the sky, the history of man. So we decided to make a new sphere, a new planetarium, a new architecture.

Note:

NR: How does this relate to your approach to architecture?

JP: In the sense that my partners and I believe a belief that history is represented here by the Piatnikis, is significant but that the subdivision of history, as represented by the ramp area, is a fragment of modern life. This yin and yang represents the philosophy of our work.

NR: What will the project do urbanistically?

JP: It turns the existing Theodore Roosevelt Park into an outdoor “firecourt” to the museum. It has created a reflected “opposite side” of West 82nd Street, completing the north side of the museum without infringing on the park.

NR: What was the role of Yale, who were your major influences?

JP: One president, still living today in New Haven, had a significant impact on me. That is Eugene Iroot, a truly great teacher, who was the first dean of a very small group of people committed to teaching architecture in the spirit of Taliesin, of the Taliesin Fellowship, of Louis Sullivan, of the influence of Frank Lloyd Wright. There was the spirit of a workshop—a sense of constructing everything, of experiment, of making things, of self-taught, of people who believed in the power of architecture and who believed in the power of architecture.

NR: What are the biggest challenges in designing the Rose Center for Earth and Space?

JP: Design is perhaps the most important challenge. The process is one of ever-increasing complexity and the challenges are to find ways of making that complexity comprehensible. The struggle continues.

Michael Slowik is an architect, critic and consulting partner in Metropolis.

Mike Slowik/Metropolis
Faculty News

Donald Berman, director of architectural practice, will be attending the Architectural League of New York's Emerging Voices Awards at the Museum of Modern Art. The event will feature 40 architects among 16 New York firms. Berman and his firm, Donald Berman Architects, have been finalists in previous years.

Jayne Goldman, president of the Architectural League of New York, will be participating in the event.

Deborah Berke, a professor at the University of Virginia School of Architecture, has been named a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. She is the first woman to receive this honor in the field of architecture.

Martin Fink, a professor at the University of Chicago, has been named a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He is the first man to receive this honor in the field of architecture.

Alexander Garvin, a professor at the University of Pennsylvania, has been named a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He is the first woman to receive this honor in the field of architecture.

Turner Brooke (TBD) will be attending the annual conference of the American Institute of Architects in New York City.

Peggy Deamer, a professor at the University of California, Berkeley, has been named a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. This is the first time in the history of the academy that a woman has been named a fellow in the field of architecture.

Ronald Pickup, a professor at the University of Illinois, has been named a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. This is the first time in the history of the academy that a man has been named a fellow in the field of architecture.

Judith Dillman, a professor at the University of Virginia School of Architecture, has been named a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. She is the first woman to receive this honor in the field of architecture.

Sophia Graziosi, a professor at the University of Illinois, has been named a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. This is the first time in the history of the academy that a man has been named a fellow in the field of architecture.

Ladislaus Harnett, a professor at the University of California, Berkeley, has been named a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He is the first man to receive this honor in the field of architecture.

Herbert Weisberg, a professor at the University of Illinois, has been named a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He is the first man to receive this honor in the field of architecture.
Alumni News

Pre-1960s

Jack Alan Blakesley Jr. (49) of Cleveland, Ohio, completed a degree in music, preservation and wilderness studies in the 300,000-square-foot Root-McQuarten Building for the Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority headwaters.

Arvid Klein (58) and Giovanni Ponzanelli (58) of Passauna + Klein Stolzberg + Arch, architects, Inc., were awarded a 1997 AIA New York Chapter Design Award for the Stable Hall, a 68,000-square-foot dormitory at the Pratt Institute. The building was a gallery for students educated in architecture as well as social lounges and shared workspaces.

1960s

Norman Foster (62), of Foster Associates in London, recently become a member of the House of Lords. The winner of last year’s Pritzker Prize, he is working on two commissions in the U.K., an addition and renovation to the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, and the other a transfigured building in a Glasgow steel and library media center for Cil Strafel Channel Islands in Ventura County, California.

Jared I. Edwards (63) of Hartford-based Edwards Architects, specialists in the renovation of historic buildings, received a stipend. Having served on the Connecticut State Historic Preservation Board since 1980, he has been the board’s chairman for the last 10 years and has served on the Yale School of Architecture, Trinity College, and Dartmouth.

Tony Monk (63) has written The Art and Architecture of Paul Rudolph, published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd. The publication was created at a park given by the U.S. Embassy in London in November 1999.

Theocharis David (64) of Theo, David and Associates in New York, completed the U.S. Gypsum and Athletic Center in Nicolaus, Cyprus, and the 40,000-square-foot Inauguration was attended by the president of the Republic of Cyprus as well as the archbishop.

Peter Ochla (65) of the Architectural and Thomas (97), recently designed and built their own 3,000-square-foot guest house. The house, which was featured in the New York Times, comprises "tectonic" interactions with the landscape.

Harry Geiger (69) in December 1999 on Architectural Record. The article was adapted from “On Zona Manilist D New York City,” prepared by Joan Zaid (Carl Paavon), James V. Rights (70), and Marc Draper. The article was adapted from “On Zona Manilist D New York City,” prepared by Joan Zaid (Carl Paavon), James V. Rights (70), and Marc Draper.

Stuart Silk (76) of Stuart Silk Architects in Seattle, has been designing residential buildings. His office is located at the University of Washington.

Culm Bowio (77), of Dowe, Greenley Architects, has been selected for the John Hopkins University at the University of Washington.

Alessandro Mazzucato (76) of Prague and designing the research laboratory for the University of California, Berkeley.
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Yale School of Architecture
Lecture Schedule
Spring 2000
Hastings Hall
Art and Architecture Building
180 York Street
Lectures begin at 6:30 PM
Doors open to the general public at 6:15 PM

1.17 Tod Williams and Billie Tsien
1.24 Margaret McCurry
1.31 Colin St. John Wilson
2.11 M.J. Long
2.14 Kenneth Frampton
2.20 William Macdonald
2.27 Susan Kahane
3.20 Hugh Hardy
3.27 Laurie Hawkinson
4.3 Henry Smith-Miller
4.6 Mario Schetnan
4.10 Zaha Hadid
4.10 Greil Lynn