that dichotomy post-Stud, when I wrote Curtain Wars. I come to it intellectually. Coincidentally in my own work I am doing the thing about how to space a fabric or make a furniture arrangement, so I began to feel like my life was this dichotomy, making it uncomfortable dealing with the sensual in an area of decoration typically seen as woman’s work.

**Peggy Deamer:** I feel trained in abstraction and dedicated to abstraction. There is a difficulty in maintaining something that is abstract as something itself. The more you deal with materiality, the harder it is then to also be abstract. It is about a larger diagram or space, and I feel the tension.

**Joel Sanders:** The material could compartmentalize the space.

**Peggy Deamer:** I don’t feel threatened by the material. I think it is hard to have the thing that can be itself and not call too much attention to itself, so it can play its role as an abstract thing in terms of the space, I assumed that all of us trained at Modernists felt that way, abstraction an issue you are struggling with?

**Joel Sanders:** I was trained to think in an abstract, conceptual way, which privileges the spatial and the cerebral and is beyond Modernism but central to it. I am trying to move beyond that predilection and incorporate more of the tactile, the sensual, and the body.

**Nina Rappaport:** But would you say tactility then becomes decoration and how do you resist?

**Joel Sanders:** Thinking in terms of tactility means to think decoratively. And the people who take care of those things in buildings tend not to be architects, it is that re-look to see the reciprocal relationship between the tactile, the optical, the bodily, and the haptic—which is a discourse that we need to move beyond. And Billie’s work seems to do that.

**Billie Tsien:** I think I am just moved by beautiful things, I want to make beautiful things, that may sound very superficial, but that is a powerful driver. I don’t care what beautiful means, but that is why I do what I do. My training at UCLA was more theoretical or intellectual. It was California in the late 1970s. Charles Moore was my advisor; he never gave us any crits but took us on field trips to amusement parks and Fast Food restaurants and I was left with the feeling that I could look anywhere for inspiration. If things outside architecture could move me, I could in some way bring them into my work. I was left with an easy relationship to fine arts and the freedom to tap many different sources for inspiration. I don’t think about architecture as an intellectual exercise. Recently I noticed red leaf stains on a sidewalk: the leaves were gone and the stain was left. It was an amazing image. Who knows that it will ever come up in my work; but the image is inside my head, so I believe it will somehow.

**Peggy Deamer:** If it is so, different from Cooper. As you describe this all, I think of the nine-square grid, the black platform, the white little pieces that we had to sand so you could see every grain.

**Tod Williams:** Architecture as we see it, as an art, as an elite activity. But its common root is to touch and affect all people. As you, I was taught and still believe that architecture is an intellectual activity, but I want the work to be something enjoyable and not alienating. I constantly ask myself through the process: “What am I going to do to make the space feel vigorous and clear and still be something people will want to be in?” For example, at the Museum of American Folk Art I had to reduce the tread-to-riser ratios to minimize height to get the stair to “float” in the space. Here again I wanted to make sure it was comfortable, so we made the handrail so people would want to touch it as they walked up and down. At the Neurosciences Institute we convinced Dr. Edelman to use concrete despite certain misgivings he brought with him from his years at the Salk Institute, in many ways we had no real interest in adding another material, but Edelman felt it was too cold, so we searched for and found a warm asbestos stone that related to the Salk Institute’s travertine and became the element your eyes touch on before you see the concrete. I look at things that make people feel better and don’t compromise the integrity of experience. I would like to have more people appreciate architecture while holding on to the rigor of the conceptual act.

Why should architecture alienate people? Architecture can be beautiful, but also transmitted visually, but so many architects are eager to detach themselves from the intellectual and make them uncomfortable. It is interesting that you are concerned with this.

**Tod Williams:** We are trying to get emotions back into the architectural experience without playing on cheap sentiment—not that sentiment is bad. Architecture is like writing a good book or piece of popular music; you can have all sorts of good words, but they can be bad. We want music to move me; it must be more than words; they must add up to become a whole work of art.

**Joel Sanders:** What kind of emotions are you interested in?

**Tod Williams:** I would like people to feel their heart, feel that they are alive, sense something, especially those emotions that we so often eliminate in our daily lives. **Peggy Deamer:** It makes me think about the issue of dehumanization as something that makes someone feel alive, causes them to think, and draws their attention by responding to the unusual. In that sheve and escalation of emotion there is a challenge. I think those things come together.

**Nina Rappaport:** And taking something out of the normal context—which is what Charles Moore was doing with students—brings you to a different context, which is this unexpected.

**Billie Tsien:** We are very interested in this issue of the unexpected. We believe you never really expect or have a full experience of architecture until you get inside. So at the Cranbrook Swimming Pool, you walk in at the entry and think the pool is only going to be one story high. It is actually cut into the ground and set a full level below the entry, so suddenly you find yourself in a much bigger space than you had imagined. Although hatchas open to the sky, we didn’t make them clear glass because, when the hatchas are closed, it should be dark. The ceiling is dark blue, and the recesses are darker blue. When the hatchas open the light comes in and you see it as a shaft—the space changes.

**Joel Sanders:** The computer and the media also influence how we perceive and experience space. As we spend more time in virtual space it engenders leaving behind the body. As we embrace that synesthesia there is an aspect of the digital mythology that plays into the most conservative old fashioned culture that would privilege the sphere of the conscious and derigate the flesh, the senses, and the body—and the dream of immortality, which we can lose in a moment. And the moments are captured in places like gym, where you are engaging your body and surfaces such as computer monitors and equipment in an incredible recycling back-and-forth.

**Billie Tsien:** We see computers as fast because we come from a time before the computer and have something to compare it to. My hand is slow, computers are fast. But to young architects computers are not fast, they just are.

**Peggy Deamer:** But although the visual and image-making, by implication, can be seen as the nonbody, now there is also a certain sensuality that comes with the image quality of virtual space. It can be maniacally amusing and corporeal.

**Joel Sanders:** The bodily experience is about the dynamic reciprocal relationship between the virtual and the actual, which the computer enhances. We are in danger of buying into the dematerialized and virtu- al, or redefining those distinctions because they are reciprocal and reactive.

**Tod Williams:** The other day I was thinking about living in dreams. In the past, life in the night was as extraordinary as that in the day. The dream world and the pres- ence of darkness was an extraordinary vir- tual life, deeply intergrated into the overall living experience. The kind of integration that existed 10,000 years ago doesn’t exist now. The dichotomy that you are talking about—that one can experience these two things and calibrate the body and the virtu- al experience in the machine—is the kind shift that we are able to absorb. Maybe an interesting goal would be that 5,000 years in the future we would use the virtual as a way to get back into our dream state. Meanwhile we have architecture.

---

Greg Lynn, Davenport visiting professor at Yale since spring 2000, has new projects under construction, and his exhibition Intricacy opens at the Institute for Contemporary Art in Philadelphia, January 17–April 6, 2003.

Greg Lynn's Intricacy

For the past three years Greg Lynn, member of United Architects—one of six teams of designers chosen to participate in a design study for the World Trade Center site by the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation—has been setting new standards in the development of a computationally driven tacitonic characterization by macroscopic holism and microscopic diversity. His incorporation of design software specific to the modeling and control of surfaces, using complex animation tools and computer-numerically controlled (CNC) manufacturing techniques, into the architectural design process allows for the rigorous proportioning and regulation of shapes, scales, and textures of architectural elements. Technologically induced ambiguities emerge in the materialization of these variations through computational modes of design and fabrication. The affections of structure and ornament, surface and skin, edge and contour, and individual component to whole are motivated by a computationally informed tacitonic that enables the synthesis of heretofore discordant elements into an organic whole.

Intricacy, a term Lynn defines as "the quality of multiple systems living through local intensive connection and mutual modification," characterizes his recent work. In his projects such as the World Museum, Alees Tea & Coffee Plaza 2000, and the 70 million Euro Kielburg Housing Complex Transformation, as well as the exhibition Intricacy at the Philadelphia Institute of Contemporary Art, intricate connectivities and organizational trajectories at a variety of scales—from industrial design to architectural, urban, and contextual concepts—are evident. Lynn's design for Ark of the World Museum (in development for San Jose, Costa Rica) combines the program of a natural history museum, an ecology center, and a contemporary art museum. The architect articulates the institution's ambition to expose the ecological diversity and cultural heritage of Costa Rica, and to encourage global environmental preservation through a formal integration of morphological and spatial methodologies in the indigenous flora and fauna. Lynn rigorously incorporates these features into an architectural system in which the relationship between individual components and manifold assemblies is a calculated balance of diversity and cohesion. The project's cellular organization challenges the structures of modularity, as each element—from the scale of major meandering volumes down to that of individual surface subdivisions—is unique in form yet rigorously related to adjacent elements. A three-dimensional lattice provides the logic of the structural framework and subdivides the building's skin into panels. The individual structural elements and larger volumes develop out of a series of local independencies. The complex tessellation strategy weaves the orientation of a structural skin, as the trajectory of structural members derives directly from the geometry that regulates each undulating pod. Application of color-shift media produces a surface efficacy that transposes the logic of tessellation, reflecting and highlighting undulations in the surface and reintegrating the particulate hue of the surface treatment into discrete regions. A series of buoys, vellum, water-filled voids forms, and the column forms of the World Trade Center courtyard is a large-scale granulation that is reflective and supportive of different organizational elements. Upon closer inspection the column also exhibits a microscale granulation in the complex interface between tessellation, veiling, and texture. Interference at surface scale involves the secondary layer of veiling and a tertiary layer of texture elaborate on the coherent subdivision of the surface into smaller entities. The skin itself becomes dematerialized as an organizational pattern lays upon a tendonary pattern, disjunction evaporating into a sinuous meshwork. The large pods housing the exhibition spaces come into a series of tendrils, five of which, with that edge dissolving as they flatten to form a ring-like membrane on a monolithic surface. In this project the strands of the channelled surface are designed so that the individual building envelopes cohere at points of tangency. At these points of adhesion, a local cohesion occurs through the mutual modification of adjacent structural, ornamental, and panel entities into a tertiary system. A central glass-fiber-reinforced fabric-covered canopy subdivides a lattice of major structural members that in turn spans an integrated network of ornament within its periphery. Even at the scale of a product in Lynn's Alees Tea & Coffee Plaza 2000 project, commissioned for the 200th anniversary of the original Tea & Coffee Plaza series, the intricate relation between shape and pattern, and the articulation of edge and contour produces microscale architectural affects that inform the product's design. Lynn's Cove coffee set is a completely customized mass-produced industrial design object. Thin-illustrated titanium vessels are formed using pressure to shape and ambrosia thermally plasticized laminate. The three-dimensional trajectory of a CNC tool, whose path is the choreographed spatiotemporal manifestation of a digital code translated into a mechanical process, produces the surface articulation. The pattern on the original Cove-surface motifs accentuates the cutting geometry used to produce each of the specific forms, producing an affiliation between surface relief and form. A series of major themes located along the surface's construction lines, or "leapars," modulates regions of space captured through surface manipulation, infiltration, and Inagination. These seams regulate the nonuniform cellular logic of the individual vessels in relation to the complete Cove assembly.

At the urban scale, Lynn's award-winning competition project Kielburg Housing Complex Transformation, for the Amsterdam district of Bijlmermeer, the Netherlands, engages a series of intricate connections. On the city's periphery, the existing 500-unit Kielburg social housing block was slated for renewal in response to more extensive redevelopment and changing demographics in the neighborhood. The design transforms the existing block through a new system of vertical circulation housed in a series of more than 150 uniquely shaped vertical steel trusses clad in a semitransparent stainless-steel fabric. These customized exterior trusses are connected to new ascendants and elevators to be hung on the existing concrete structure, allowing for the radiadistribution and absorption of existing corridor space into the interior of enlarged vertical spaces. At Bijlmermeer, Lynn addresses issues of large-scale patterning and rhythm on a scale that transforms the architectural and social organization of the existing repetitive block structure. The system of trusses constitutes an inhabitable skin that establishes intricate connections between the existing concrete structure and new elements that redirect pedestrian circulation vertically or along a plane to produce a variety of spatial configurations for the local housing unit clusters. The series of true elements that form the skin gradually inflects and transforms according to a logic of interpretation as it migrates across the concrete structure. This incremental variation through the skin provides for an organization in which the adjacency of one element to another produces a field of apertures, which are designed to provide a variety of views and lighting affects.

Lynn proposes what he considers to be an emerging sensibility in the scope of artistic, design, and architectural production as the curator of the forthcoming exhibition Intricacy (January 17–April 6, 2003), at the Philadelphia Institute of Contemporary Art—University of Pennsylvania. Wrightsman also show technical innovations to produce multiple mass-production methods that exhibit diversity and variation on a local scale, which are inspired and informed on a more extensive scale. Lynn examines intricacy through isolated instances in the exhibition, in conjunction with plans of visual and material organization becomes responsive to one another, modifying and registering their respective effects. The work in the exhibition integrates and adapts contemporary mechanical processes, which enable fine granulations and connectivities to be registered across larger monolithic forms. Participants in the Intricacy show include artists (Borri Golla, Chris Cunningham, Tom Friedman, Adam Fusa, Fabian Marcocci, Rony Pales, David Hield, and James Rosenquist); fashion designer Hussein Chalayan; architects Karl Chi (Melay), Peter Eisen (Steven Holl, Arichetel), Farshid Moussavi and Alejandro Zambra Polo (Foreign Office Architecture), Wolf Prix (Coop Himmelb(l)au), Jesse Rehberg, and Nana Omuta (Rehberg + Numa Omuta), Preston Scott Cohen, and Hador Tahviri (Office da).

Lynn's own work speculates on the degree to which intricacy as a principle of subdivision, modification, and cohesion has the capacity to produce a multiplicity of spatial effects specific to issues of scale and materiality.

—Marcelyn Gow

Gow is a partner and co-founder of the design collaborative Servo, and teaches at UCLA in the Department of Architecture and Urban Design.

Will Bruder, of Phoenix, Arizona, will be the Bishop professor at Yale in spring 2003. He was interviewed by Martin Finio, critic in architecture, this past fall.

Martin Finio: You’ve taken a decidedly unconventional route to becoming a profes-
sional architect—a path marked by what advantages or disadvantages you think that brings to teaching in an institution, or academy, like Yale.

Will Bruder: It’s not the academy, or the independence from the academy, that makes you. It’s just a different way of look-
ing at things. To constantly be putting out there and putting down different ways of engaging things with every commission—
with every opportunity to think different-
ly—that’s a good thing.

MF: Do you see things in the formal acad-
emy like architectural education that you’d like to change?

WB: The academic has become a profes-
sional unto itself who is alienated from the prac-
titioner. There was a much closer bond between those two in the 1950s and early 1960s, before Vietnam. There was an optimism among makers after WWII, and among people coming from Europe, where the academicians and the practitioners were the same. They shared similar optimism, ideals, and agendas. And I think during the period of Vietnam it was the unwrin-
ing of Modernism into Post-Modernism, we kind of lost the conversation and mutual respect for one another. So I think if there is something to be changed, it’s to bring that back. There needs to be a real understanding of that need at Yale.

MF: Can you tell me your plans for the spring studio?

WB: It will deal with people and place making. I’m looking at a problem for the town square in Jackson, Wyoming. This square has four antler arches as entry por-
tals. They still have stagecoaches and late afternoon shoot-outs there in the summer. It’s a place that doesn’t know if it’s a stage set or if it’s real. It doesn’t know its mean-
ing. On one of the courses I want to have the students work on a program for a museum of contemporary photography. The building will also include a cafe, a restaurant and affordable housing, which would be required as a real project, because now everyone has to commute over to Idaho to find a place to live. It will have a certain vertical density; I want to make an example of the density that I think needs to be there.

MF: You also have work in Wyoming. Does this program reflect what you’re currently doing there?

WB: Not at all. I have a library, a white-water rafting company, an advertising agency and a financial institution that are all differ-
ent. And they’ve all been attacked totally differently. I want to deal with the question of what is a contemporary museum. I want to deal with issues of the New West and how urbanism has evolved out of it.

MF: Your work and rhetoric have been rooted in this desert—and you’re known as being an architect of the desert—yet now you’re building in places as far away as Maine, Wyoming.

WB: Madison, Botes, California, Nevada—the whole spectrum of the country right now.

MF: So how does what you know about living in the desert inform that work, and what does this new work bring back to the desert?

WB: It gives me an opportunity to prove that my work is not about style but about an attitude, about curiosity and question-
ing. I want to bring an attitude of inquiry and respect to a place. I’m interested in the whole gamut—from geological or bi-
ological forces of a place, to the historic and the material. Along with analyzing prob-
lems in functional ways, I hope I can bring a depth of architecture that is colored by a place. The more opportunities I get like that, the better I can become a desert architect, because when I go back I can ask better questions about things that maybe I had taken for granted there.

MF: Are there thoughts or positions about your practice that you had as a younger architect that you have since abandoned or changed? Do you see yourself as having evolved?

WB: I’m much less interested in object build-
ing. I regret having lived at the edge of the city, in the distant desert. I wish I moved to a city much sooner. You have to live in a city before you can understand the consequences we often take for granted just driving by a city. There aren’t much of a desire for integration into the fabric of the city in my earlier work as there is now. I just really get into the fabric of cities, insert buildings that are about a connec-
tion or a point of movement. I am interested in how facades talk to other facades, how there’s a real richness we are missing in older cities and elsewhere on the planet.

MF: Was it the library, and having suc-
cceeded with it so wildly, that made you come to this conclusion?

WB: No, I think it’s more since the library.
The library is certainly a point of reference, but I think my extended travels over this period of time—the last decade or so—
with a new set of eyes, expanded it. The willingness to accept change and to look deep inside myself. One day we sat around the studio, just having a conversa-
tion, and we realized that it took 1,200 miles a day for my staff to come and go from my studio, an energy-efficient, wonder-
ful little paradise environment out in the desert. When I first moved out there it was about 45 minutes to the city. It was now anywhere from an hour and 15 minutes to an hour and 45 minutes to those same places. I have become a very angry person. I was also chasing large building commis-
sions—becoming more modernist too much—and I had to look at myself and say, “Why am I not getting this job? What is this all about?” I realized that I couldn’t live in the desert and expect to get confidence in the people who wanted to trust me with their urban problems. You know, I just spent two weeks in Europe and saw it as I’ve never seen it before. I realized I was not being doing as an architect; I wasn’t being the opening. I thought I was. MF: As you travel and as your work takes you farther from home, are there are obviously greater demands on your time. How have you had to adjust the way you manage your office?

WB: The move from the desert to the city has been profound. There is a calm and a focus; there is a perspective from those windows that roll over into the work every day. The staff has never been more con-
centrated, and I’ve got great leadership devel-
opment in two of the long-term people. The computer’s also interesting: It’s helped even with my own personal inability to embrace it, which does not compromise my respect for the tool and what it can help me do.

MF: What would you ideally like to be working on right now?

WB: I have all my ideal projects. I have four library projects, an art museum going down, and two really neat housing pro-
jects, one 50 units and one 5 units, both near Phoenix, Arizona. The larger one is mixed-use, so there will be a supermarket, a gourmet grocery, and a gallery.

MF: Is that your first housing project?

WB: Yeah. It’s a developer from Canada, a father and daughter, and so far they are dream clients. We’re going to be working on the Phoenix light-rail stations, including all the way from the art museum to the air-
port. With 13 stations, we can turn it into something really good. I guess my disap-
pointment or frustration right now is that though these wonderful cultural projects possess the ambition behind them to rival, people are wary of bond issues and taxes. So they use our experiments and images for fund-raising. In every case you get a momentum, but then there’s no continuity for the studio. Every one of these libraries is in the same position; we’re hamstrung by the fact that there’s been no commitment from the first phase they’ve paid us for. I would just love for a client to call me and say, “Hey, we’ve got $35 million, we want you to do this great building, go for it.” I’m totally ready; I’ve got this staff to make these things really good, and I want to see the next buildings built.

I’m really excited about teaching at Yale. It’s going to be a chance for me to develop a whole bunch of ideas about working with people to make architec-
ture—how we create architecture that is respectful of place, which gives us all the right clues as to how we experience it. I want to look at the Modernist realm of building with the students and analyze what it means.

MF: Teaching how to value research?

WB: That’s a lost tool. I want us to chal-
lenge one another to ask good questions. It’s going to be great fun.

MF: Where do you want to be in ten years?

WB: That’s a work in progress. I guess it would be interesting to be in a position to work comfortably on one wonderful com-
mise, to be able to immerse myself totally in the pursuit of a perfect thing, at a scale in the community and in the world that would make a difference.

MF: It means still practicing?

WB: It’s probably still practicing, but I can’t say for sure. I think there’s a whole bunch of things I want to discover in myself. I like to be more the artist than the less the artist, but I don’t know that that means in terms of practice. I don’t even know where that place might be.
Dense-Cities: An American Oxymoron?

The symposium on September 22–23, 2002, "Dense-Cities: An American Oxy- moron?" was held under the auspices of the symposium, 21C City: Studies in Density. Recent Work by MVRDV, brought together architects and urbanists on the issues of the American city in a day-long symposium with responses by Winy Maas of MVRDV. The symposium was funded in part by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Consulate General of The Neth- erlands in New York and Susan Hen- niger, Architecture, and the American "visiting professor in spring 2003.

"Dense-Cities: An American Oxy- moron?" used MVRDV's proposals for a more three-dimensional city to examine the ways in which urban density is construed or misconstrued in the American context. Christina Reijs Nara Rapport for the "School of Architecture, the symposium "believes" in the "social project" of MVRDV's O-Winy Maas, who, having worked primarily in Europe, saw the symposium as an opportunity to develop a better understanding of American urban conditions. During the past decade young architects in the United States have been looking longingly toward what they have perceived, in the words of Koetter, "the great successes, to be a renaissance in Dutch archi- tecture. Particularly competing are not only the freedom and bold ambitions Maas and his collaborators, Jacob van Rijs and A. M. Schuitema, but MVRDV have brought to their work but the fact that they have been based on a sense of innova- tive projects. Yet what ostensibly ele- vates MVRDV’s status is the proposition that Maas has established an ongoing pro- gram of applied research engaged with the context of American architecture. Focusing primarily on the firm’s stud- ies, the exhibition and symposium provided a perfect opportunity for me to confirm my suspicion that what MVRDV proffers as urban research is more often than not a highly speculative form of problem-solving (another potential oxymoron). Using MVRDV’s work and the person of Maas as a foil against which to scrutinize the American city raises important questions about the context of urban sensibility, as well as the relationship between design experimentation, empirical research, and practice.

Lively Exchange in the Dense Air of Hastings Hall

Eight distinguished panels representing various American perspectives made pre- sentations, and Maas followed each with runnings questions. The format was refreshingly different from most academic symposia in that Maas was the visiting for- eign interlocutor, and informal discussion was encouraged. After a welcome by Dean Robert Keating, Stepping in the position by Nina Rapport, the four morning pan- elists were Michael Sorkin, James Corner, William Burch, and Brian McGrath—pre- sented an ostensibly academic "big pic- ture" perspective. Fred Koetter, Marilyn Taylor, Philip Aaron, Douglas Kelbaugh, Alexander Garvin presented more practice- based case studies in the afternoon.

A.M.: "The Big Picture"

"Density of encounter is the substrate of sociability and the material basis of democracy."—Michael Sorkin.

In particular fit form, Michael Sorkin began with a meditation on the state of our contemporary dilemma, outlining the dual impulses of “utopian perfection.”

This concept includes the “progressive” and “rationalist” urb emerging from the Enlightenment, and the countering reformist urbanism, which takes the modern city as a manifestation of and means through which to ameliorate social and ecological ills. Although past and present illustrate that misleading issues of urbanization is quite rich, Sorkin pointed out that design practice today is dominated by either moral science etc. the normative system of our Dutch colleagues or mock history etc. the so-called A-Kit (which is defined it will-be-it-like-it-was-of the New Urbanists). Following in the tradition of the Chicago School, Sorkin was physical density and cultural heterogeneity as essential catalysts for social mobility and democrati- c political empowerment. He calls for cities to be understood as sites for dense and random encounter, and for urban cul- ture to be buffered by the optimization of local assets in the context of a global ecology. He drew on a number of recent theo- ries to support his propositions, including William Reiss’s thesis of the “ecological footprint.”

He suggests concluding remarks, “Sprawl is unsustainable. Cities are the cure.”

Sorkin distinguished between cities and regions in terms of the former’s institutional and natural possibilities. Urbanization includes what he sees as the two-pronged, functionally oriented "sprawl." By contrast, the city is an evolv- ing yet somehow limited entity, essentially responsible for its own authenticity and respon- siveness to the homogeneous, wholly con- stituent definition of sprawling.

Leaving aside the meaty issue of Sorkin’s succinct and blunt use of the term, authenticity, Maas tried to engage the city as an organizing principle of innova- tive projects. Yet what ostensibly ele- vates MVRDV’s status is the proposition that Maas has established an ongoing pro- gram of applied research engaged with the context of American architecture. Focusing primarily on the firm’s stud- ies, the exhibition and symposium provided a perfect opportunity for me to confirm my suspicion that what MVRDV proffers as urban research is more often than not a highly speculative form of problem-solving (another potential oxymoron). Using MVRDV’s work and the person of Maas as a foil against which to scrutinize the American city raises important questions about the context of urban sensibility, as well as the relationship between design experimentation, empirical research, and practice.
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A.M.: "The Big Picture"

"Density of encounter is the substrate of sociability and the material basis of democracy."—Michael Sorkin.

In particular fit form, Michael Sorkin began with a meditation on the state of our contemporary dilemma, outlining the dual impulses of “utopian perfection.”

This concept includes the “progressive” and “rationalist” urb emerging from the Enlightenment, and the countering reformist urbanism, which takes the modern city as a manifestation of and means through which to ameliorate social and ecological ills. Although past and present illustrate that misleading issues of urbanization is quite rich, Sorkin pointed out that design practice today is dominated by either moral science etc. the normative system of our Dutch colleagues or mock history etc. the so-called A-Kit (which is defined it will-be-it-like-it-was-of the New Urbanists). Following in the tradition of the Chicago School, Sorkin was physical density and cultural heterogeneity as essential catalysts for social mobility and democrati- c political empowerment. He calls for cities to be understood as sites for dense and random encounter, and for urban cul- ture to be buffered by the optimization of local assets in the context of a global ecology. He drew on a number of recent theo- ries to support his propositions, including William Reiss’s thesis of the “ecological footprint.”

He suggests concluding remarks, “Sprawl is unsustainable. Cities are the cure.”

Sorkin distinguished between cities and regions in terms of the former’s institutional and natural possibilities. Urbanization includes what he sees as the two-pronged, functionally oriented "sprawl." By contrast, the city is an evolv- ing yet somehow limited entity, essentially responsible for its own authenticity and respon- siveness to the homogeneous, wholly con- stituent definition of sprawling.

Leaving aside the meaty issue of Sorkin’s succinct and blunt use of the term, authenticity, Maas tried to engage the city as an organizing principle of innova- tive projects. Yet what ostensibly ele- vates MVRDV’s status is the proposition that Maas has established an ongoing pro- gram of applied research engaged with the context of American architecture. Focusing primarily on the firm’s stud- ies, the exhibition and symposium provided a perfect opportunity for me to confirm my suspicion that what MVRDV proffers as urban research is more often than not a highly speculative form of problem-solving (another potential oxymoron). Using MVRDV’s work and the person of Maas as a foil against which to scrutinize the American city raises important questions about the context of urban sensibility, as well as the relationship between design experimentation, empirical research, and practice.
the physical dimensions, daylight, and are
exchange levels that discipline the deploy-
ment of energy in contemporary cities.
The next presentation, by Marilyn Taylor
Chair of SOM, along with the exchange
with Maas that followed, was the most
engaging and somewhat ironic moment in
the symposium. Neither Maas nor Taylor
shares much of his Dutch colleague as we-
several others of a certain neo-avant-
garde stripe, a serious flattening with the
matchmakers (or aesthetes?) of globalization,
commercial culture, and international bureau-cracies. Here Maas was faced with the
works of SOM, a firm that procures and executes projects in an extra-
large corps, governments, and
institutions.
Taylor led the audience through an array
of SOM's urban projects, including studies for
Vitra and Landover, Sideline
Station in Midtown Manhattan, and
huge development in Singapore, all
dealing with high-density forms of devel-
oment. Taylor acknowledged that
Singapore is a democratically governed
country, and therefore the terms under
which development may happen are
not necessarily applicable to our situa-
tion in the United States. Nevertheless,
she argued that SOM's project demo-
nstrated a sophisticated and timely
approach to questions of how to create
a huge new piece of the city that can sustain
extremely high densities (above 12,000
people per acre or hectare, linking high
density uses and scala mix and a flex-
ibility in the way the project could get
built out over time. The Singapore project
present-
ence included a detailed proposal for a
1.3-kiloton-terawatt-hour nuclear power
building complex replete with huge (very
dark) sunken glass planes of sheer glass
shaped in the body of the building to reveal con-
tinuous open-air lobby.
In his follow-up presentation, Maas pro-
posed to "Theore[Taylor's] presentation." According to Maas, one thing was missing: SOM had one thing more so far,
flexibility, but what about SOM's need for flexibility. SOM have the flexibility to
"reconfigure" the "SOM plan" rather than challenge the intellectual foun-
dations of the
amenities, the formal properties of the work, Maas cooly implied that firms such as SOM are not well suited for the need for procedural flexibility and lack the
motivation and independence to "experiment." Maas proposed the only thing that distinguishes the work of the two firms is the way the two
work. The Maas team is "bigger and more
innovative," while SOM's "strategy is to have already absorbed and mas-
tered the language of fonts, bands, and
symbols, and to fit into the system of the
province of a few, mostly
of Dutch description, the differences between
OM and SOM merely ones of style.
It is a differing idea of vision for the
future. In the Maas project, the city is
angrily at being consumed of SOM's share of the new architecture which is seeking to make it clear that his own particular share of the market depends on his firm retaining the mantle of relevance through pushing the envelope. A symposium inquiring density in the
American city would not be complete with-
out the perspective of a real estate devel-
opper. Philip Avalos of Millennium Partners
mentioned in his presentation the
visual evidence from his numerous large-
size developments, how well-informed,
sophisticated client like himself organizing
projects and financing a project can build the kinds of dense housing projects and
urbanists have been drawing and arguing for far more in the past quarter century. Using an operation out of the OMA lexicon,
Millennium's project facing the
Commons at Lincoln Park, Chicago, is a
part of a larger revitalization project in
the United States, as Burch pointed out, self-
interested and lifestyle choices drive urban-
ization. Simon deiches the suburbs as a false consciousness, and many of us
may agree with him, but it's not that
the United States was founded on the prospect of private land ownership and
that the postwar suburban was perhaps an
effort to deliver that dream to the middle
classes. The American city has never much accepted the idea of the public sphere associated with European
urbanism. Such ideals are surprisingly taken for granted in SOM's 3D City. To make a
better city in the United States, one
must begin by understanding that it's not
a new situation, that what "public" space is concerned, the lights are on but
nobody is home.
One way for the architect-urbanist to
gain agency, even power, in the unwieldy
context of contemporary urbanization is to
gate out ahead of the moneymen interests,
politicians, and bureaucrats in identifying
potentials, programs, and agendas to
pursue. Isn't this what MVRDV offers as a
to the American scene? Perhaps.
But beyond dictating the unrelenting
boredom and inefficiency of office parks as a
motivation for the A232 project in Rotterdam, shown during the keynote lec-
ture, I kept waiting to hear Maas articulate his utopian motives for making a better
City. In what ways do MVRDV's urban sce-
narios portend, not just as a better, a more
beautiful, more liberating, more sensual, or more democratic city?
Do the studies offered allow us to make meaningful distinctions between urban situ-
ations in need of design attention and red
heritings realized for project-making poten-
tial? Too often in this work, to quote Sohri,
"premise becomes conclusion," and urban
proposals are justified as the objective result of functional exteriorizations of
available capital investments and数据 borrowing from some omnipotent informa-
tion flows, all rendered visual by (refreshing
ly crude) computer software. The critical
question about MVRDV's work becomes,
by what means are the "data" from those
"scapes" supposed constructed, designed,
delivered, and evaluated as analogs of
social, economic, and geographic reality,
lat alone as visions of utopian potential?
Or am I taking it too literally? Perhaps
MVRDV's FunctionMixer 16.0 and Region-
ator software, which Sohri has shown was
keynote, are as farcical as they sound—
idealism functional with a wink and a nod: materialist functional. If so, who is on
the joke? As the Dutch Pavilion at the
Hanover Expo showed, MVRDV is quite
skilled at making urban-themed buildings. A virtual demonstration farm of Dutch Urban Ecology, the work, however,
standing among a number of the firm's projects that
totally float a provisional architecture—
but there is something quite different than
conducting serious empirical re-
sources leading to broad or critical
powers of urbanization. And I thought
we had come so far from the nostalgic
rehash of a phantom city in Aldo Rossi's Teatro
di Mondello.

—Richard Somner
Somner is an adjunct professor at
Harvard GSD.

Opposite: World's largest population and gaso-line consumption graph. Courtesy Douglas Koubega
The exhibition 3D City: Studies in Density, Recent Work by MVRDV is the first exhibition of the Dutch architecture firm in the United States. Initiated at Yale (September 8–October 25, 2002), the show traveled to the Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning in Ann Arbor, Michigan, (November 4–December 12, 2002).

Through the small line drawing in the back of the catalog to the exhibition it is possible to get an enhanced view of the position occupied by a power broker—that is, if one subscribes to the adage that information is power. It is a great privilege of just how dense the projects and models of city concepts were projected to be and, in that light, might be carefully reviewed before entering the black box of the gallery. The conceptual backdrop of the 3D City is the first U.S. show devoted to the firm and features current work related to issues of density. The video presentations, combined with model installations, were designed and organized at Yale with exhibitions director Dean Sakamoto. The exhibition, which is traveling to universities across the United States, is information-heavy in the best sense.

A popular search engine takes 19 seconds to discover 5,300 sites connected to information about MVRDV. Although the Rotterdam-based firm is only 35 years old, it has managed to command authority beyond its borders. And to that has been called to attention often by its country's political leaders, agribusiness executives, and a vociferous group in the Netherlands that is indeed dense. Approximately the same size as New York City, it has a population and that amount of arable land. This condition of population density coupled with the scarcity of space is the central cause of the particular interest of the urban and rural planner. The firm is as diverse as the primary cause of the international and risk-taking nature of Dutch society. Their perspective, as directly reflected in Dutch design, has seen at least a decade of stunning expression by Droog Design, Koohaa/OMA, Adrian Geuss, UN Studio, and Wel Arets, to name only a handful of the most sought after.

But the work of MVRDV is not only about the conditions of its country; it is a distinctively new methodology of dealing with urbanity, habitation, and its permutations. This is distinguished in particular by its distance from the mainstream design firm. The firm has stopped referring to urban form as the "city." Although data related to living in cities exists—including Cityline and Metropolis/Downtown—in perusing videos on exhibit I noted with particular pleasure a distinct difference of reference to the "city" as an abstracted or visual entity separate from its information. Specific conditions create the opportunity for form and that opportunity is seized by these architects for their larger social, cultural, and economic value. Information is part of the broader approach that sets their work apart from a clever manipulation of form. The concern is about the increase of population density, settlement, construction mode, and building environment. The firm has always seen the challenge—the blurring of the boundaries between the subject and the object. As shown and as practiced, the projects exhibited a superb set of new experiments whose intention seems to promote societal transition.

MVRDV's deliberate blurring of the distinction between information and form makes havoc on the way rules are normally set for describing urbanity. By using their research to open up the possibility that "the Netherlands is a city" or that the impossible odds of population growth and limited space lead to "an urbanism that generates space instead of consuming it," they create the cognitive conditions for change.

Reflecting on this lack of "city conscious" unnecessarily reminds me of the advantage my daughter has over me. There is nothing special about her except that she is two. Any good book on child development will tell you, she is unable to distinguish between what something looks like to her and what it is. As Piaget's experiments demonstrated, when two identical objects are filled with the same amount of water and placed in front of a child, the child agrees readily that they are the same. However, when the child of one of the glasses is poured into a taller, thinner glass, resulting in a higher water level, usually the child answers that the taller glass has more water. When the water is poured back to demonstrate that it is still the same amount irrevocably the child will say something like, "Yes, it's now back to being the same." This simple but striking experiment shows that a child's perceptions alone do not change; rather, the world itself as a consequence changes. I know from watching my daughter that this is a long way from where she started. As a newborn, she saw the world as an extension of herself and anything out of her sight ceased to be. This perception of "the permanence of the object" lays out the essential truth that the constituting of any "object" is relative to itself and is a world independent of one's experience of it.

In the same way, MVRDV's work in housing and urban design can be seen as a developing body of work that describes the world of the city independent of the specific experience of it. In defining a method that doesn't pretend invisible issues don't exist, the firm is able to orchestrate information rather than perform an analysis that excludes data that can't be understood as design information. The method reflects at the very least an attempt not to knowing what something looks like may have little to do with what it is. Often are not singular, and in each of the information it defines is a distinct separate reality, with a logic, consistence, and integrity all its own.

The opportunity to think differently is crucial. Urban design is about understanding the potential for change in urban environments and describing it in as many ways as possible. Historically there have been groups—for example, the Situationists—who have relied on the methodology of pure personal experience. There have also been periods during which concentration has been focused on finding larger form-driven ordering principles. Urban design has always been on the tension between the abstracted and the empirical—between the blurring of the boundaries between the subject and the object. As shown and as practiced, the projects exhibited a superb set of new experiments whose intention seems to promote societal transition.

Opportunity. The constellation of programmatic and economic concerns that imbue the entire exhibition is referred to as "density." This attitudinal position of making more with less—of dealing with scarcity of open space by investing in the infrastructure required to build higher, create more complex public spaces, and take advantage of all building surfaces—is clearly a rational approach. However, it is one that requires the political and economic resources not often seen in American development except in competitive urban centers. Furthermore, as currently posted by MVRDV would need self-generating developments. In this theoretical autonomous world, fragments are so dense that they have to solve their problems within their own boundaries. What is unclear is whether MVRDV is implying that these "autarkic" experiments will result in equally dense political and decision-making structures or whether they are a correct response to the natural clustering of industry and the unconstrained nomadism of urban cycles of resurgence and decay.

We are part of the experiment. That is to say, in the field that MVRDV inhabits, we are part all of its experience. The blackout chamber at Yale allowed us, the visitors, to experience a transition between information and unification from a designer's solution and the representation of information mediated to create a new subjectivity.

—Claire Weiss (’96)

Weiss is a partner with Mark Yoes (’98) in a New York architecture/urban design firm. MVRDV received the first FNL prize for the HagueWagen Housing Project, Ypenburg, as the best project in the Netherlands by a young architecture firm. Why Meas will be the Saarinen professor at Yale this spring and his studio focuses on New York City. 3D City: Studies in Density addresses issues of development as an advocate for an exponential increase of opportunity. The constellation of programmatic and economic concerns that imbue the entire exhibition is referred to as "density." This attitudinal position of making more with less—of dealing with scarcity of open space by investing in the infrastructure required to build higher, create more complex public spaces, and take advantage of all building surfaces—is clearly a rational approach. However, it is one that requires the political and economic resources not often seen in American development except in competitive urban centers. Furthermore, as currently posted by MVRDV would need self-generating developments. In this theoretical autonomous world, fragments are so dense that they have to solve their problems within their own boundaries. What is unclear is whether MVRDV is implying that these "autarkic" experiments will result in equally dense political and decision-making structures or whether they are a correct response to the natural clustering of industry and the unconstrained nomadism of urban cycles of resurgence and decay.

3D City: Studies in Density

Photograph by Yale Media Services, 2002
The exhibition Eisenman/Krier: Two Ideologies featuring House IV organized with the Canadian Centre for Architecture and the Atlanta Project designed by Leon Krier, is on view through February 9, 2003, both simultaneously intriguing and confusing, two of which appear here.

Juxtapositions

Many who attended the symposium on Leon Krier and Peter Eisenman may have left wondering what constitutes the Two Ideologies. The exhibition makes an intri- cately argued kilter. Krier and Eisenman were at one time "against architecture" or, more explicitly, against the consumption of architecture by anything other than a very small and finite elite of cultural progress. If the show allegedly is about ideas and not objects, then it would seem to demonstrate how these two architects inhabit and determine how their ideas are to be understood in con- text, in this case, Paul Rudolph's architecture.

Details of the exhibit seem to obscure Krier's and Eisenman's intellectual pro- jects. House IV, described by Eisenman as "cardboard architecture," is built like a piece of Japanese wood joinery; whereas Krier's Atlanta Project—the construction of which awaits the arrival of a "genuine" culture that supposedly already exists—is built like a stage set. The two projects were conceived 15 years apart. A principled difference between them is that neither of those two architects ever evolved or touched a nail. Some—like the hopelessly unformed keynote speaker of the symposium—will cynically agree with these points, while the latter condition would refuse to engage the architects' challenge to the conventions of history by refusing to look at their architecture.

Eisenman and Krier measure themselves against the legacy of architect educators like Rudolph. The Art & Architecture Building is one large labyrinth of a stair- case that dismembers the conventional spaces of the classroom and the gallery. Krier and Eisenman have good reasons to do this, but they are both great educators and students of architecture. Rudolph's architecture, in its way, is the school they play. The hand Rudolph has dealt them. There are thus not two but at least three ideologies at work. But perhaps there really is only one. Krier reinterprets Rudolph's architecture of style as the "School of Athens," and Eisenman reinterprets it as the central "in-between" space of conceptual investigation.

Eisenman, however, accomplishes this task with complexity and ambiguity. The architectural model of House IV—made specifically for this show by the Canadian Centre for Architecture—is in the middle of the mock scaffold that sits directly in with the formal logic of the space: it is static as at the point of a mere arch or as functional as a myth. Then, again, this is the ambiguous aspiration of most archi- tecture. Two ideologies, three ideologies, or more. Yet the idea stands at the A&A, none at all?

Who's Afraid of Leon Krier?

This year the provocative award of the Fehrenbouch International was present- ed to, among others, Robert A. M. Stern. Two weeks later, as usual, he introduced the symposium "Eisenman/Krier: Two Ideologies" and, as usual, to a provo- cateur, looked aside to watch the carnage unfold. While the symposium itself dramatically the topic is the essay, the exhibition may give us a better peek at the "ideologies" promised in the title.

Accidental Urban Ideologies

Yale's Architecture Gallery is far from a neutral space; Paul Rudolph's shifting floor planes, bush-hammered walls, and window walls require a reaction both physical (how the hell to hang the work) and critical (what does the work do the hang?). Though the oppositional construction of the archi- tects' works is an endlessly interesting topic, the sympho- nium as the dean's signature theatricality, the way the exhibits inhabit the gallery does set up a dialogue between opposing points of view about content. Eisenman's House IV show sits dead center in the pit on its own irregular carpet of white-painted plywood. It separates itself physically and emotionally from the gallery; a pristine jewel alighted among the ragged cliffs of concrete. The exhibition contains a copy of a prefabricated...
Eisenman/Krier: Two Ideologies in Review

The symposium, "Eisenman/Krier: Two Ideologies," took place at the School of Architecture November 8 and 9, 2002. Funded by Ernst Stromeyer, it was held in the auditorium of the Yale Art Gallery in conjunction with the exhibitions at the Architecture Gallery. It is in the nature of comparisons to exaggerate difference, and as a starting point of architectural comparison it is difficult to imagine a pair of figures more conventionally diametrically opposed to Peter Eisenman and Leon Krier. On November 8 and 9, in an event intended to elucidate both the significant distinctions and meaningful overlaps between these two architects, the Yale School of Architecture mounted the symposium "Eisenman/Krier: Two Ideologies." It was an impressive undertaking, as introduced by Dean Robert A. M. Stern, with more than 17 speakers organized along the topics of history, language, urbanism, and politics. The speaking event was a mere centipede, however, to a series of activities, events, and publications exploring and celebrating the dialogue between these two architects. Also on view at the school were both teaching studios this term, organized to be simultaneously collaborative and competitive—each attends the other's reviews—are exhibitions of each architect's work and an attendant catalog featuring reprints of essays from the 1970s by Maurice Cukier and Mario Gandelsonas, with an essay by Joann Oulman providing historical context. This pairing of Eisenman and Krier represents the present as the most significant event, and in fact, this construction has already gone through a number of repetitions; these two thinkers have been on the same days countless times, as pale for their relative positions in a series of events held specifically to highlight difference. Add to the historic elaboration and context of the symposium the preconference description by Alan Philips in the last issue of Constructs, this review and others in this issue, and the amount of attention and effort placed in the service of "Eisenman/Krier: Two Ideologies" (a combination that should be a trademark) becomes significant indeed. Within this constellation, it is a thorough examination of each of the symposium's 17 speakers (a positional review) that a new order of the event emerges: the two architects and their ideologies in fact give way to the 17 ideologies of the speakers—perhaps even more so separate each presenter's axioms.

Two Ideologies
Friday evening's opening presentation, "Is There Architecture After Modernism? (Re)Positioning Architecture (Postmodernism, (Re)Presentation, and the Discourses of Display)," by Roger Kimball, managing editor of the New Criterion—alternately described by others as "spunky" and "uncharitable"—was an invaluable contribution if for nothing more than its polarization of the event within its opening minutes. The talk, dedicated to Brendan Gill and described by Kimball as having had an "appetite for incorrigibility," established that the potential was to expose inequalities within architectural production, specifically what it means for an architech to espouse an ideology. Following a brief etymology of the term ideology (a French variant modified by German obstination), Kimball dismissed it as "mind-numbing but-er ok-ochick ... a fancy way of exposing a worldview." This seemingly offhand, rapid-fire dismissal was clearly "problematic." The ideology of ideology par excellence, Louis Althusser, might assert that the will to naturalize is itself an ideology, nothing more ideological than the proclamation of its absence. Thus Kimball's refutations labored under the weight of a certain disengagement.

In Kimball's consideration of the two architects, Krier—with his hitching images reconstructing a world that never existed—"fared slightly better than Eisenman, who was chastised for his linguistic proclivities in the 1970s; though in the end Krier was also taken to task for "selling out" with Poundbury and Seaside. In his evaluations Kimball, gripping the axe of Post-Modernism yet again, defined each of these architects by his relation to the rejection of the Modern and asserted that each is simply an anti-Modernist. The hero of Kimball's talk was, of all people, Louis Kahn, a fact noteworthy even beyond the symposium's location literally in his shadow on Chapel Street. The assumption is that although talking to bricks might be eccentric, it is certainly not ideological. With a series of admonitions, Kimball critiqued novelty architecture and the silliness of the Post-Modern and set as a corrective to the architectural profession a reconsideration of Geoffrey Scott's Architecture of Humanism (1914). The entire presentation was a critique of architecture from the outside end, in a way, the two ideologies of the title represented not Eisenman and Krier but Kimball and the rest of the conference.

History
Given the conference's overt stake in ideology (or anti-ideology), it made sense that the symposium opened the following morning with the topic of history, thus raising the assertions of the previous evening. On the history panel, Sarah Whiting opened with a closing. In her talk, "In," Whiting illustrated the Tautarian notion in a trajectory of thought that begins with the 1989 Italian publication of "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology" and ends with the 1987 publication of The Sphere and the Labyrinth. The limited options for architectural production under capitalism are elitist instrumentality (at the expense of architecture) or silence (at the expense of effectivity), with the moral of this position finding an equivalent for the historian in the prohibition against "operative criticism" (the loss of historic objectivity in favor of partisan support). However, in a closer reading, Whiting finds the negation of Taut's well-known position written beneath by his own appeal to an active, almost Nietzschean affirmation. In an impressive display of out-the-fly erudition Anthony Vidler addressed Krier's talk of the night before, systematically debunking Kimball's argument, specifically Scott's purported "humanism." Fortunately or unfortunately, Kimball did not arrive until after Vidler was finished, which seemed appropriate given the little space for debate in the proceedings: questions were posed and eventually forgone in promise of exchange during the postevent reception. Vidler, in his "Manentst Modern: Colin Rowe and the Historians," examined first Rowe's late-career positions on Eisenman and Krier—both slippery subjects for him—with each as exemplars of their given positions. Vidler then changed the moment from the late 1970s to the late 1980s and, using Rowe's well-known "Mathematics of the Ideal Villa," "Manentst and Modern Architecture," and even his early thesis on the nonrational thread of Hugo Jonas, exhibited the already present recurrent duality in Rowe's work (from Post-Modern Classicism and Deconstructivism to Neo-Postmodernism and New Brutalism). As respondent, Michalangelo Sabatini plotted his own historian's revenge in calling for a more attentive reading of the particularities of vernacular forms and their potential to generate an enhanced tradition with architecture, setting forth Robert A. M. Stern's "The Doubles of Post-Modernism" as an example. Woven into the fabric of the conference was another doubling, with the assignment of a topic or subject to each speaker through which to approach Eisenman and Krier. The
architects' later work, even to Tarragona's later stage. Organized spatially around sports stadia, clearly influential even in Eisenman's mature work.

Moreover, as editor and publisher of Krier's Albert Speer: Architecture 1850–1900—introduced the polemic of the book—namely that Speer's and the "false" use of Classicism does not necessarily necessarily. With "On Albert Speer, Architect," however, the initial forms recomposed themselves, because once publication of the book in 1985 Speer has become more implicated in the workings of the Nazi machinery than they have previously admitted. According to Coulis, that Speer was "more Nazi" in the way invalidates the possibility of its original assertion. In fact Speer's architecture could be read as "more valid" (i.e., given the complete picture of Speer's machinations, unveiled by politics), allowing for an understanding of the difference between the aesthetic and the logistical. In response, Sanford Kwinter, hoping to reintroduce the former topic of political, diplomatically cautioned against Coulis's sacierently quick and easy separation between form and politics. The case of Tarragona seems less problematic for Krier, as his comments showed an appreciation of the work of Terragona, Eisenman, and Forlur. The implied sympathies of Krier's response, were brought into high relief as he continued his intense discussion in this next section, exaggerating the division of the room by his comments from the floor.

Language
Demetri Porphyrios "I'm a Nikis Krier" addressed what he referred to as "eternal values" through Matthew Arnold's "com- mensurate" and "harmonious" principles of the concept, and the expression of its architectural character to everyone. Pater and Nietzsche, dividual part to Eisenman and Krier; thus, the idea of the architect's office was applied to the general architectural conditions. Deconstructivists and Classicism, where Classicism is seen as an architect's convention as the previous, in the era of its existence. In the construction, the defense and opposition of the de- ned-conditions in either Post- Modernism and Deconstructivism as if it were also a possibility of or even potential concern—braid the more obvious implications of Porphyrios's declarations.

Powers
The doubling strategy continued with investigations of the seemingly problematic processes, exposed first and only to fac- ulty influences. With "How Eisenman”, the Jordanian Composer; Looking into the Mirror, the image of David Ander. Kriti, Kurt Forster offered a model of "Terragone’s leisure" by way of the Krier, that beginning with Eisenman’s trip to Italy with Rome, left aside Terragona’s position in the Italian context and our influ-

matchless, of course, newer, and instead of dandyfication, a hay field of trajectories emerged, where the text itself would easily satisfy the system of flippin to its opposite figure (such as dandyfication; the system of bizar- erie of binaries). The relation of each of these trajectories to the subject of the text was a mere manifest—whether the connection was performed cultural, or simply a categori- cal necessity to complete the text of the conference.

Urbanism
On the topic of urbanism, the doubling was explicit in reference to the work of the studios given by Eisenman and Krier this summer. Since the Eisenman studio consists of an extended analysis and compo- nent of the Poli and Piranesi maps of Rome, the alternates—led by Robert Somol and Pancea to Stan Allan—were quickly deciphered because the process of re- working to figure. From his talks with "Fields, Figures, and Fragments," Forster related the "invasion" (the subject at hand, formed as a student during these debates, and then set off the additional ventures of Piranesi: on one hand, the formal poten- tials entailed within his own interpretation in the 1980s; on the other, the fictive interpretation to be found in the work of Raffaella Moro (for whom Allen worked)." On the implications for current practice: for Krier, the identification between the separability of the two exhibitions and the polarities of Eisenman’s topological project, but beyond that, for the fact that the prospects for architecture for urbanism today, for Allen, considered the unlikely figure of Jane Jacobs and a scientif- ic inquiry into the concept of the street, a landmark that can be found in the processes rather than the buildings.

In "A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum," Somol proposed that the Eisenman studio “demonstrates a critical project of the last 20 years, in reference to the Italian spettacolo dialectic of 250 years ago, Somol’s assemblage of subject is even further to the founding of Rome itself, with its eternal recurrence as a Trọng to the contemporary. However, the figure of Pietro Roma gave way to Rome itself, as a city that is the point of origin for the investigation but of exploration. After an analysis of Krier’s Somol presented a tragi- comedia of Rome, from his own work with the 18th century, "from the City for whom she is acting as Rome’s in the reflective transition" to Las Vegas (the Rome of Caesar’s Palace) and finally to an analysis of the movie A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum.

For Eisenman, the correspondence of each of the presentations is that objects are indeed fields that they extend and construct their surroundings, of Krier’s how the Lyons disappears. Not to say that the positions to the work of the modernity of its many manifestations, Somol’s work is from Wombam competition—between Krier’s contribution to the presentation of the project, and its consequences, the image of the sheer blatant of Superstudio in its various presentations representing the phrase Krier’s link to the architecture and context—was complemented by Piranesi’s use of an image of Terragona to parallel a similar strategy between Krier and Piranesi.

Politics
A doubling strategy continued with investigations of the seemingly problematic processes, exposed first and only to faculty influences. With "How Eisenman", the Jordanian Composer; Looking into the Mirror, the image of David Ander. Kriti, Kurt Forster offered a model of "Terragone’s leisure" by way of the Krier, that beginning with Eisenman’s trip to Italy with Rome, left aside Terragona’s position in the Italian context and our influencing. Beyond these clear affinities in Eisenman’s early work, Forster also illus- trated continuing parallels between both-
Loli Wu

My father was born in 1918 in a farming and landowning family in Quanspodun Province, in southern China. Because he was the youngest of three children by more than ten years—and I am sure that it didn’t hurt that he was a boy—he quickly became my grandparents’, and in particular my grandfather’s, favorite. His childhood was spent moving between the family town house in urban Canton and the country house and gardens a few hours outside of the city. His childhood seemed defined by acts of great leisure as well as great mischief, for which he was rarely disciplined. When my sisters and I were growing up, my father would spend hours regaling us with tales of his youth, from riding horses to lounging in the family garden, climbing trees, and sipping tea, to seawanting who among his friends could pick blackberries with the smallest gilt and competitive dinner cook-offs with his own rice and vegetables. Although he never used to leave his parents’ house at all the great love and admiration for what he would later refer to as the “art of living.” I am quite certain that as a result of this profound meaning, but to his essence was embedded simply in his lifelong love for eating, daily dreaming, making mischief, and strolling in gardens.

Although my father grew up in a setting of relative privilege, my grandmother never failed to point out to him the failings of Chinese society, manifested in the class discrimination, income disparity, and great poverty that defined China in the early 1920s and 30s. This left a deep impression on him, and there was nary a Thanksgiving in our household that would not start with a lecture on the agricultural or urban plight of one person or another and why we should never complain about our circumstances.

My father arrived in the United States in 1937 and, after a brief stint at the University of Michigan where a well-meaning American family transferred his Chinese name into “King Louis,” he arrived at Yale. He was soon kicked out of school for inattention, lack of conviction, and poor grades (was found the following year in our basement for a few months) and was sent packing to that madrassah school in Cambridge, Harvard.

There my father thrived under the tuition of Walker Gropius, who reinforced his conviction to pursue architectural design as a discipline and profession. He was there too because he was one of a wider range of intellectual and academic possibilists who loved affair with Western philosophy and literature as well as the objectives and aims of the school.

After Harvard my father soon returned to Yale, where he was instrumentally given a teaching job despite his earlier transgressions. As his academic and professional life were beginning to take root and sprout, he was preparing from afar to the early days of the political and cultural revolution in his beloved China. As the situation there worsened, his family counseled him to delay his planned return, and it slowly, became apparent to him that he would never see his parents again.

This experience led my father to a period of deep introspection of which he chose to speak infrequently and shared very little. But there was no escape from his family and loved ones, it also emboldened him to pursue his passions with a stronger conviction. And although my father always appeared to be a model of grace and coolness, under his old-fashioned boots and horn-rimmed glasses, there was a fiery passion burning within to speak his mind and make his thoughts known. And of course he encouraged us, and all of his students, to do the same. Furthermore, it was also in this time of relative isolation that he developed his strong belief in the virtues of independence and self-reliance, which he shared with us through our upbringing. Alongside my mother he urged us always to rely first on our own instincts, convictions and abilities, and never to be too dependent on anyone or be too easily swayed by the stylish or fash-

ious. He taught us to be the masters of our own destiny,” he would always say. When you find your passion in life, stick to it and if you work hard enough, we would tell us assuredly. I want to believe this is true, and I thank my father for being so strong in his convictions.

His time at Yale was the defining period of his life, in which he observed the ever-changing dynamic environment of the campus, as well as the lasting friendships he made with his students and colleagues inside and outside that department. He was a great believer in the virtues of liberal education and pursued this on his own throughout his life, always trying to better his understanding of philosophy, economics, and literature. He was deeply influ-

enced by the philosopher Alfred North Whitehead and by an old friend and Whitehead disciple, Paul Wildes. Like the great psychologists, he believed that personal- ity was not a static state but a constant process of learning and diversification. So he embraced students and colleagues alike from all fields and disciplines, inviting any and everyone to share his joy, more commonly, to dine at home. And so my siblings and I became accustomed to a steady stream of visitors enjoying my mother’s cooking, watching slide shows, and chitchat in the living room into the wee hours.

Although my parents, who met at Yale, shared many of the same interests and characteristics, Mom was also his great foil. Next to his voracious reading was my mother’s pragmatic; next to his stoicism under pain was my mother’s tears-eyed emotion; and next to his meticulous approach to tasks was my mother’s love and tenderness. One of my favorites continued their playful banter. My mother kept Dad laughing and smiling and he always remembered her: the anticon, full of happiness and optimism.

George Yu

In my life, King-lui inspired me immensely with a few of his magic acts. As an eager young architect about 25 years ago, I asked King-lui to recommend yet another one of his five projects for me to experi-

ence. “Show me one of your larger garages,” I asked. He took me to his workshop, then suggested I should visit the Huo Residence, in Breezway, New York, a coun-

try house he had designed for his lifelong friend T.C. Hsu.

As I approached the house, the first image I saw was a large stone inscription with two Chinese characters, Ban Jan, which means ‘Hall Room’. I wondered, Why a name a house Hall Room? Why not Hua Hui? Instead of the large house I had expected, in front of me appeared a quaint entrance nestled in a bucolic landscape. The living room was intimate yet spacious, and as usual I was impressed to see the unique ‘King-lui’ style. The floor was gracefully integrated with the interior space as if they were one. Finally I realized that, within a unified whole, half of the room was made by King-lui and the other by nature.

Making small and large intimates is not a trick; nor more magic—it is the real essence of King-lui’s architecture. At this point another image came into my eye: hang-

ing from the far wall was a beautifully written poem in calligraphy with the title “Ban Jan.” In homage to King-lui, I would like to reflect on this poem with you today. I think King-lui would chuckle over my broken translation:

On the peak of a pine-covered mountain
There perched a small pavilion
So small!
Half occupied by a Taoist monk
Half by a cloud
When the water clock struck three
At midnight
The cloud began to dissolve into
Mountain dew
It drifted and lingered in any of the moon’s leisure.

—Anonymous

Dean Robert A. M. Stern

For about 50 years King-lui Wu taught architecture at Yale. During that time, amid the unprecedented turn of events changing architectural fashion that our school—or for that matter any school that is serious to its times—experienced, he was a calm island, a safe port for students who went-

ten to dig beneath trends to find that bedrock of architectural art. King-lui men-

tioned generations of students with his wise counsel and the example of his impec-

cious sense of craft. He taught us to respect the set of building and to take pleasure in carefully joining materials, fitting rooms to functions, and bringing space to life with natural light. But he also taught us much, much more: to appreciate the simple ritual of daily life, eating, drinking, or arranging a few pieces of furniture in a room. King-lui opened our eyes to the beauty of the gardens and showed us that there was a possibility for art in every-

thing we do. He persisted in his belief in architecture as the art of building responsi-

bility and beautifully. And King-lui stayed the course at Yale—even as those swirling seas of architectural fashion threatened to swamp the architecture and the school he loved.

Many of us share a sense of King-lui’s great presence at Yale. And we all share a deep respect for his meticulous work as an architect and as the teacher who leaned over the drawing board, pointing out ways to make our work better. King-lui was a great gift as a teacher; his great gift as a per-

son; he talked with you, not at you; he didn’t advocate, he elicited. I often think of King-lui as he introduced me to room planning—suggesting that a door should swing this way, not that; suggest-

ing the placement of a window for light or view. He opened up the doors of percep-

tion as he showed the seeds of an architec-

tural grammar that remains with us to this day—a grammar that most necessarily be at the core of the Yale School.

King-lui’s inspiring wisdom is a lasting legacy for generations of Yale’s architects. Yale would not be half the architecture school it is today had not King-lui joined its faculty in 1953 and made a life’s commitment to its community. As we cele-

brate his great gift to us we wonder who will take his place for future generations of architects? A position of such promise is reserved for you. King-lui’s simplicities, limitations, and more are the essence of our school. Without King-lui, who will show the way to the essence of our art? Can we really say that the seeds of Yale School of Architecture when I say how much we already have? With the many great stu-

dents who could not be here today, we share with Vivien, Loli, Ying, and Mai their great legacy and the memory of a lifetime of love and gratitude that is ours for having known King-lui Wu.

Vincent Scully

I first came to know King-lui in the summer of 1947, when I took an accelerated term of first-year design in the architecture school. He had just joined the Yale faculty after studying with Walter Gropius and Marcel Breuer at Harvard. King-lui and Eugene Nulty were our critics; I appreciated them both, but there could hardly have been two more dissimilar human beings. They were of course fervent Modernists, full of the evangelical zeal for Modern architecture that so many of us shared in those years. However, Nulty was a true primitive of the movement, a dedicated teacher who believed that everything had to be done as if for the first time—with perhaps a few grass huts as models. Scully had no talent for it at all. He tried to keep us away from the boots, and I used to think he would have burned them all if he could have. Such an attitude was impossible for King-lui to assume, whatever he might have suggested. Our relationship was more like that of a two-horse race, with King-lui leading and Scully never close enough to do almost anything at all. I never think that he would talk with you, not at you; he didn’t advocate, he elicited. I often think of King-lui as he introduced me to room planning—suggesting that a door should swing this way, not that; suggesting the placement of a window for light or view. He opened up the doors of perception as he showed the seeds of an architectural grammar that remains with us to this day—a grammar that most necessarily be at the core of the Yale School.

King-lui’s inspiring wisdom is a lasting legacy for generations of Yale’s architects. Yale would not be half the architecture school it is today had not King-lui joined its faculty in 1953 and made a life’s commitment to its community. As we celebrate his great gift to us we wonder who will take his place for future generations of architects? A position of such promise is reserved for you. King-lui’s simplicities, limitations, and more are the essence of our school. Without King-lui, who will show the way to the essence of our art? Can we really say that the seeds of Yale School of Architecture when I say how much we already have? With the many great students who could not be here today, we share with Vivien, Loli, Ying, and Mai their great legacy and the memory of a lifetime of love and gratitude that is ours for having known King-lui Wu.
gentle in scale—which surely had a formative influence on him. Like them, his architecture always remained inscribed in scale, delicately contained, and full of natural light—characteristics that he emphasized as he went on. The campus King-Kiu drew up for Yale-in-China in 1944, unfortunately never built—albeit those qualities. It came across as a number of casually grouped pavilions set in nature, like those intended to house scholar-artists in so many of the great Chinese landscape paintings: light structures too tellus to insist on their own importance; minimal shelter intended to allow human beings to sit quietly and appreciate the grandeur of all other things.

King-Kiu was always there at the architecture school, a central figure of our continual and a point of balance around which we still, often and with no professional enthusiasm, vacillate, waver, and wander. We missed him badly when he retired. We realized that we had always been fortunate to have had King-Kiu with us, so quietly and clearly different from ourselves, so much more finished than we were. He was a gentleman of the colonial era, and he treated us behandlers with the unfailing tolerance that was natural to him—and which we hardly deserved. King-Kiu endowed us with his friendship and steadied our common enterprise with the perfection of his manners and the goodness of his soul.

Charles Gwathmey

King-Kiu Wu was an elegant man: impeccable, honest, loyal, and totally committed to his family, his art, his teaching, and Yale. His design passion for the inclusion and manipulation of natural light became a primary enrichment and evolution to his architectural form.

I remember King-Kiu as the lighthouse of the Yale School of Architecture: always here, always available, always guiding and nurturing, in spite of the fervor of changes in weather at the school. He was the anchor and stabilizing nurea for hundreds of graduates. King-Kiu was also a dear and beloved friend. An Anni and Eliii Giliroin an appointed sentiment: if we cultivate a respect for truth while accepting the imperfection of the day, perhaps we can cultivate a loving loyalty to goodness, which is the spirit of empathy and compassion, then mayi take cares of itself.

Art King-Kiu Wu was a beautiful man. We will all miss him.

Michael Coc

It seems as an old friend of King-Kiu and his family, my life with the Wu families have been close friends for four decades. Our children and there grew up together and are friends too.

In April 1970, when things were really heating up, the revolution was upon us, my wife and I brought this little house way up in the Berkshires, on a hill on a right on the Vermont border—a Decapit little bouse, and 200 years old. It was a wreck, there was no doubt about that; it needed work, so we say. We took the Wu’s on a wonderful trip on one day we’d had enough of New Haven at that point. When we arrived, we went up through the runty old house. When you saw the inside, you could see that it was worth fixing. King-Kiu walked through it and looked at all the rooms with (melum peeling off the walls), outside and inside, upstairs and downstairs.

The next day King-Kiu handed me a plan of the entire house. He did not have a tape measure in his pocket or anything like that—he did it all by ear. During the next few months I took a tape measure—I am an architectural surveyor—and measured the entire house. King-Kiu’s plan of that house, both floors, was accurate to about a half-inch. But he apologized for it, saying that there was something missing: "There’s some space I can’t get."

When we actually began the restoration, we found a sealed-off room, it was a time capsule. It had been sealed off around the Civil War and had on its walls tattered old Civil War posters and prints. It was a delightful hook for the childhoods of people who had lived there in the early nineteenth century. Even though King-Kiu couldn’t get it into our plan, we visited it, we had an amazing visual sense, and I knew of no archaeologist who could have predicted the room’s existence by eye alone.

King-Kiu was also a gentleman in the Chinese sense. And I don’t think there’s any more perfect gentleman than a Chinese gentleman—what Confucius described as a chih-lu, a man of learned and moral excellence. King-Kiu was all of those things, and he raised his children the same way. I think all of us will never forget that.

King-Kiu is gone, but what I remember best about him is not how he looked or the things he did, but his voice. He would start off with a statement with a high-pitched "well," and then follow it with his wonderful, humorous, ironic observation. I can still hear that voice in my head.

I miss King-Kiu. We all will. So, King-Kiu, liao jin-yu, tsai-chien!”

Alexander Purves

All of you knew King-Kiu as a teacher, a colleague, and a friend. He was all of these to me, but he was also my employer. I worked for him when I was in graduate school.

King-Kiu was an unconstructed Modernist. And he remained on the ideas of Post-Modernism in the few or no interest for him. After all, he studied with Walter Gropius at Harvard. But he was not simply a functionalist. King-Kiu cared deeply about the emotional and content of architecture—how space and light affect our lives—and though he believed in putting things down he was not at all a minimalist in the con-temporary sense of the word—the masking of real complexity with a tainting through.

King-Kiu was happiest working at a small scale. He did, however, produce a number of large institutional buildings. One thinks immediately of the Baptist church in Division Street, which King-Kiu collaborated with Joseph Albers, and of the medical offices on Howard Avenue—a small gem where he used a device similar to that of Le Corbusier’s Venice hospital but with a gentler hand. But he most accomplished work—and first love—certainly was the church. Although he designed a number of schemes for multi-family housing, to my knowledge none was built, which is our loss, because the subtle manipulation of section, the differences between living spaces and sleeping spaces, was truly remarkable.

King-Kiu was a stickler for efficient and thoughtful planning. He and I art a housing studio together, and I remember coming in on a Monday with the real estate section of the Sunday Times and opening to a page that illustrated supposedly desirable apartment plans. He derided them as inept, only to turn around and transform them with the simple relocation of a few doors. But for King-Kiu planning was not just a matter of efficiency—it included the thoughtful arrangement of space, the chronology of balance, contrast, surprise.

He was also intensely visual. King-Kiu believed on what he saw or what he would experience—never upon abstract theory. He used perspective and believed in the authority of the eye. I remember once when I was agonizing over drawing the subdivision of a cabinet—carefully measuring it with my scale, drawing it, erasing it, trying again—he just said, "Do it by eye. Your eye will get it right." King-Kiu’s eye would get it right!

Watching King-Kiu sketch a plan was a treat. He had extraordinary hands over his hand. (And he was an exceptionally fine calligrapher.) He’d pick up a pen and the line would flow gently across the page, becoming gossmar him but never broken and punctuated by points at the beginning or end. You realized that he was not just making lines, but making thinking lines—probably as much as an artist—and was depicting what was already clear in his mind. He was deploying elements he knew well: wood frame, adhair, mosaic, plaster and the loss of walnut. He was more interested in a perfecting of a language of form than he was in inventing a new one.

King-Kiu had great love and respect for the traditional parents of architecture—sur-face, structure, rhythm, and, of course, that element for which he had the most passionate affection, daylight and its use in architecture to illuminate not only a task but the spirit. Not surprisingly his favorite building was the Pantheon. One of his favorite gaimas was to ask his students (who had probably just shown him their designs for huge skyscrapers) what they figured was the identical size of the original to the Pantheon dome; when asked if he guessed 10, 15, or 20 percent, with give he’d told them it was less than 4 percent. The point of this is both that a little goes a long way and that it is the quality rather than the quantity of the light that makes the difference.

This points to another primary commit-ment of King-Kiu’s: detail. Less might be more, but the "less" had to be of the highest. Everything, from an arbor to a head, had to be first-rate. It’s not always easy to work for a perfectionist, but you learn a lot. King-Kiu’s houses were detailed thoroughly as they were cabinets. Probably the most important learning experience of my entire architectural career was making the working drawings for one of his houses. All the plans were drawn at a scale of 1/5 to a foot, and every intersection was accounted for. If you drew a 3/8" reveal in a detail, you followed that reveal in your imagination all the way around the space until it returned to its starting point! But King-Kiu was not without his blind spots. Even though he was a superb cook, the kitchen in the house he built for his family on Prospect Street remained in a "state of becoming" for a very long time. And although his passion was daylight, he could sometimes be oblivious to the heat gain that a sunny window could produce.

But in the end it was not only his com-mitment to precision and accuracy that King-Kiu shared with us more than the truly holistic sense of what it meant to be an architect. He didn’t see architecture as a social critique or political statement, as structural formalism. He believed in architecture as culture, and his love of buildings was inseparable from his of philosophy, literature, gardens, painting, food—or a great piece of wood finished like satin.

Above all King-Kiu taught me that the appreciation of all things of beauty is to be cultivated. This was his rudder, and when the extreme winds of architectural fashion now rise now, another way, never, he never lost his way. I think of him often. Even this morning as I reviewed the sketchbooks from my undergraduate class, in which many tried to capture the fall of natural light on the surface of a wall, there was: I was able to see that as long as we can pass on what is important to him to those that are interested, King-Kiu will go on living right.
A Conversation with
Manuel DeLanda and Cécil Balamond

Engines of Culture, chair of the Europe and Building Division of Arup, and second-time Euro Saxenian professor at Yale in fall 2002, and philosopher Manuel DeLanda, Columbia University intellectual associate professor in the School of Architecture, show similarities in their thinking about new paradigms in the different disciplines of structure and science. They met with Nina Rappaport in New York on the occasion of the publication of each of their new books, DeLanda’s *Innovative Science & Virtual Philosophy* (Continuum, 2000), sharing their ideas for the first time for publication.

Nina Rappaport: Manuel, what is it about your approach to science and history that is similar to the way Cecil looks at geometry and engineering?

Manuel DeLanda: We are similar in the distinction we make between the formal and the informal. I happen to use a different terminology, referring to metric and nonmetric spaces instead. The reason is that nonmetric spaces (topological, differential, pedagogical) are not informal, they just have a different formal structure than Cartesian spaces and Euclidean grids.

Cécil Balamond: I think there is a tradition that concentrated on the simplest formal systems, for example, dynamical systems with a unique optimal solution. As a soap bubble, which minimizes surface tension. There is a lot of shapes in nature that are like that, but there are other things that have multiple equilibriums, for example, a three-dimensional surface. The idea that people like to talk about is that there are many equilibriums, and that the search space that evolution explores has a single best design for every species. But today we know that these searches have multiple equilibriums and that species may get caught in one of several local optima without ever being the “best.” The second point of contact is that, historically, the observation of unique optima went together with the study of systems that are in thermodynamic equilibrium—systems closed to flows of matter and energy from the outside. Today we know that it is only by opening a system to external flows that we can get other types of dynamical stability. In a laboratory one can literally see new types of dynamical stability appear one by one as the intensity of the flows is increased and the original symmetry of the system is broken. When Cecil takes a set of symmetric columns, for example, and displaces one row relative to the other, he is literally breaking the symmetry of the original design and in a sense pushing it away from equilibrium. A similar point applies to the Bouchard-Villa, where the original symmetry is broken twice, changing the whole aesthetic of the building, which is now precariously poised at the edge of chaos, so to speak.

CB: So the other side of what Manuel is saying is, if you take a fixed point in an analysis of a traditional structure frame and take one section cut, from that section you can compute the whole answer. You can figure out what it would be if you take one mile away or another. It is equivalent to a straight-line mathematical calculation. The projects I describe in my book cannot be understood in terms of equilibrium in one cut and then solved; it is impossible. You have to take many cuts.

Manuel DeLanda: It is a large concept. The universality that I was brought up with as an engineer, and absoluteness, change when you realize that you can have several geometries that depend on your starting point. The moment you accept locality, almost next comes hybridity and just the observation of a system. In the book *Inform* I draw a necklace and then it turns into a grid. At a certain moment it is a grid, but it could be pulled out back into a straight line. The typological connectivity moves the same, whether it is a grid of points or straight lines.

MD: Many of the things we are talking about are related to a set of ideas discussed by Delueze and Guattari in a chapter of *A Thousand Plateaus*, where they discuss the nomads of the steppe, who we tend to think of as more barbarians (Steve the Hun, Genghis Khan). These peoples were been in a sense, Militarily, for example, their informal battlefields constantly defended the formal phalanx armies of sedentary peoples. The nomads refused to build cities and settle down, because instead of domesticating plants—a process that automatically settles you, or makes you take root—they domesticated horses. They had to follow the mobile flow of migratory horses through the greedlands, and therefore had to build "noble cities," lent structures. Many of their technologies—if you compare them to sedentary ones—fit your formal varisual informal description, especially as it relates to the idea of fixed borders you are just talking about. Take textiles, for example, instead of weaving with a loom—a process that imposes a fixed length in at least one
part bears on the other part. People say, Where is the section? And there is none. This is a fundamental difference in the anatomy of the configurations I work with, I don’t plan it that way. But by doing what I do, as a designer, structure has moved into a complex independency and is not slaved as dumb skeleton.

MD: The problem is that in the past the words equilibrium and stability became synonymous, but that is not necessarily the case. You can push a system away from equilibrium and still enjoy stability with multiple-point or chaotic attractors.

You don’t get any of those at equilibrium; only nonlinearity is allowed by equilibrium itself. The moment you inject energy or a perturbed system, precariously poised at the edge of chaos, then you have a dynamic equilibrium that is very different from the static equilibrium of the past. So stability and equilibrium should be kept separate. You can be away from equilibrium, which means you have a system that has more stability than if it were rigidly guided by an idea of a stable state that we are all in the time. We can move around stable states.

NR: What about your work in terms of nonlinearity in your idea of history and destiny, and how that nonlinearity relates to Cecil’s engineering work?

MD: One point of connection involves Cecil’s three design principles: locality, irreversibility, and hybridity. In a sense, the notion of “meshwork” that I use in my historical discussions is very close to this. In contrast to a hierarchy, a meshwork is a hybrid created via local connections. In a meshwork, you take heterogeneities and they are forced to try and find functional complementarities among them, like a lock and a key, so that you can mash them together and make them work. An ecosystem is perhaps the best example of a meshwork because there are thousands of plants, insects, mammals—not to mention microorganisms—that are functionally interwoven together in a food web without any homogenization, i.e. their differences are respected and articulated via local connections.

CB: It is that linear-straight-line connection of cause and effect: a is to b, b is to c, c to d. But in the world that we are entering in is a to b, but b is already part of a, so you get feedback, and off you go into the unpredictable unfolding of event. There is no causal connection in the brain: there are impulses, and somehow with the simultaneity of these ideas, coherence comes out and a form or thought emerges. This is a way of order, as Marcel points out, everywhere is already known; and the stability and equilibrium coincide in a hierarchically, knees, dialectical system. When you break from sym- metry, you are allowing heterogeneity to function in a different way with tectonic. Instability is thrashing all the time, but it gives its own sense of order—and

want. There is a real conflict, which I think is what keeps one hectorial or interesting. When those constraints are gone, you can write anything you want to—and it doesn’t matter. I am educating myself as much as I can to broaden the possibilities ahead of the certainty of past assumptions, and that is the philosophical basis of my work. And the conversion, as the motto at Yale has shown: each student’s work is unique. I think it is an indication of vigor to allow organization to emerge at different levels. The students says they have never been taught to think like this. MD: Moreover, questions of linearity versus nonlinearity go beyond the architecture of bridges or houses to the architecture or command systems to the architecture of organizations, where the decision between the former is integral and becomes that between centralized and decentralized decision-making. Linear goes with equilibrium, which goes with centralization; instead of a unique equilibrium, you have a field playing the commands. This is opposed to a mar- ket or a barrier, in which the overall order emerges spontaneously as thousands of decisions are made independently. We have a much harder time understanding emergent order in a decentralized decision- making system because it is nonlinear and far from equilibrium. We have a much harder time understanding the emergence of medieval Venice, for example, where there was no central planning, than the planned creation of Versailles, which resulted from Louis XIV and Colbert’s conception imposed via centralized decision-making.

CB: Marcel, do you think architecture needs to embrace these values and ideas we are talking about, or are you going on doing what you do without it?

MD: I think they need to, because the old search space is completely exhausted. In a very physical space you have introduced to breaking the symmetry of the designs. Your book shows that there is a thrust for drama—and a hindrance of boredom—and that to me is an symptom that the old search space has been fully explored. There is also a realist hunger for non- metric spaces, such as those of differential geometry, where the points that make up a space are not defined by their coordinates relative to a grid but by a local property: the speed or rate at which curvature is changing at that point. Space becomes a field of speeds rather than a fixed grid. That must have consequences for a philosophy of design.

NR: Are you saying the search space is there to be discovered, or must it be invented?

MD: I think the attitude is both—the search spaces can be created and discovered because the architectural forms three in nature also come from search spaces. We can learn from these search spaces to design our own to hold that combinational productivity, as opposed to being very linear.

CB: When you start to read differential geometries, as Raman’s rather than
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Ghost Story: Louis Kahn’s Son in Search of His Father

My Architect, a deeply moving documentary about Louis I. Kahn that is just being finished, was produced by the organization called Crazy Boat Pictures. The name is drawn from the title of a hand-drawn booklet Kahn made for his son, Nathaniel. Kahn actually designed a “crazy boat,” a fantastical floating auditorium that motors from port to port and opens up like a blooming flower to provide concerts for the local populace, and it sails to this day. But it remains unknown to just about everybody who knows anything about the architect. Equally unknown until recently was Nathaniel Kahn himself. His search for his father is one that animates what is a first-rate film on architecture.

Nathaniel was only 11 when Louis died in 1974, at the age of 72. At the time, he didn’t fully appreciate that his father was one of the greatest architects of his time, in a class with Le Corbusier, Mies van der Rohe, and Frank Lloyd Wright. At Yale, where the architect taught for ten years, Kahn designed his first major building, the Yale Art Gallery (1953), and his best, the British Art Center, which was finished shortly after his death. But while his buildings became known around the world, Kahn’s family remained closely knit. Even from Jewish immigrants from Estonia, his face seemed at a young age by fire. Kahn grew up poor in Philadelphia and went on to study at the University of Pennsylvania. He married his wife and divorced his daughter, Sue Ann. Some years later, Kahn had a relationship with a collaborator, Ann-Tyng, and there was a protégé room with a family connection. Architecture is a complicated subject for a historian to pursue. No wonder that the man he was seeking. But for all of us, Nathaniel included, the film makes clear that the art of Louis Kahn remains thrillingly elusive.

—Carter Wiseman
Wiseman, a lecturer at the School of Architecture, is a former architecture critic at The New York Times and the author of a monograph about the architect.

The One and Future Yale Art Gallery: Renewing Yale’s Oldest Museum

January 21–May 18, 2003

The 50th anniversary of the opening of the Louis I. Kahn building and the launch of its complete refurbishing by Polikoff. Partnership is an occasion of an exhibition that looks backward and forward at the structures that have housed this teaching museum’s ever-growing collections since it opened in 1953. The exhibition includes historic and contemporary architectural drawings and photographs, as well as a design and model of the renovation project.

The exhibition was organized by Susanna Boosch, curator of prints, drawings, and photographs and Susan B. Matheson, Molly & Walter Barlow Curator of Ancient Art. A special issue of the Yale University Art Gallery Bulletin with an introduction by Vincent Scully and essays by Eric Vogt (‘99), Susan B. Matheson, Patricia E. Kane, Ellen K. Kennedy, and Alexander Purves (’96) accompanies the exhibition.

Related Programs

Gallery Talk Tuesday, January 28, at 2 p.m. and Thursday, January 30, at 12 p.m. "The One and Future Art Gallery: Renewing Yale’s Oldest Museum," Susan B. Matheson, Molly & Walter Barlow Curator of Ancient Art, and Susanne Boosch, curator of prints, drawings, and photographs.

Gallery Talk Thursday, January 30, 5:30 p.m. "A Bold Decision: Renewing Yale University Art Gallery and Design Laboratory," Patricia Cummings Loyd, curator of architecture, Kimball Hall, and Allen W. Wente, Western World, Texas. Reception at 6:30 p.m.

Lecture Thursday, February 20, 5:30 p.m. "Origins," Richard Serra, BFA ’72, M.F.A. ’74, sculptor. Reservations required. E-mail Kathleen Dentinger@yale.edu. McKean Lecture Hall

Lecture Friday, February 21, 5:30 p.m. "Louis Kahn and Yale. The History of the Yale Art Gallery’s Landmark Building and Polikoff Partnership: Renovation Design," James Polakov (’55). Reservations required. E-mail Kathleen Dentinger@yale.edu. McManus Auditorium

Gallery Talk Wednesday, April 16, 12:20 p.m. "Form vs. Spirit: Louis I. Kahn’s Yale University Art Gallery," Deen Saitome (MED ’96), critic in architecture, director of exhibitions, Yale School of Architecture.

Lecture Thursday, May 1, 5:30 p.m. "Material Presence: The Yale University Art Gallery and the Architecture of Louis I. Kahn," Alexander Peruvas (’65), professor of architecture, Yale School of Architecture. Gala event:

Gallery Hours: Tuesday–Saturday 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., Sunday 1 to 6 p.m., Thursdays until 8 p.m. during academic year. Closed Mondays and major holidays.

Web site: www.yale.edu/artgallery Addresses: 1111 Chapel Street, New Haven Phone: 203-432-0600

Le Corbusier Before Le Corbusier

The exhibition Le Corbusier Before Le Corbusier: Applied Arts, Architecture, Painting, and Photography, 1907–1922 is on display until February 23, 2003, at the Bard Graduate Center, 18 West 80th Street, New York. Bard is also hosting a series of Le Corbusier-related events in conjunction with the exhibition.

All architects and designers should see the exhibition Le Corbusier Before Le Corbusier, which offers fascinating revelations about the complex formative years of Charles-Edouard Jeanneret, who, in light of his ambitious project to transform himself into Le Corbusier, the architect, was described by his close friend Albert Phalus as "a phenomenon."

Curated by Stanislaus von Moos and Arthur Russek, the show was organized as a collaboration between Bard and the Langham Foundation, in Baden, Switzerland, where it originated. The Bard exhibit adds a few pieces, as well as specially commissioned graphics by Venturi, Scott Brown & Associates (VSBA). The author of two enthusiastic books on VSBA, von Moos had the Philadelphia architects design "fussfreie," comparable to their better known "zebra"-inspired electronic zippers. Quoting significant Le Corbusier writings, they remind us how important vertical poeticism was in the career of this visually brilliant figure. Sometimes the passages are in ironic orange on a black background. (The black on display, suggesting how the architect was "the last of his breed" as he retromemories his own history.

The exhibition’s seven sections are like chapters in a dissertation. A ground floor presentation provides an overview of Le Corbusier’s work, with the first chapter on the floor above the dotter known of his largely unknown architectural projects in La Chaux-de-Fonds. The next chapter is his "Esprit Nouveau" period, on the second floor of the gallery, where a visually arresting group of wooden and mass-produced chairs stand at the venter of multifaceted exhibits. The invention of Purists; the beginnings of the architect’s conception of furniture as inte- rior design: essential and consistent with "the spirit"; and a reproduction of a traditional jouvene wallpaper used by Jeanneret, who had yet to adopt the pseudonym Le Corbusier. We are introduced to his mindsets, the workings of the mind, a man who has in objects the architect collected, such as mass-produced, com- merically ubiquitous objects-lyres and the vernacular wooden chairs he purchased for his clients.

An "Institutional Education" is the title of the exhibition’s most compelling chapter. The curators place Le Corbusier’s well-known Voyage d’Orient of 1911 in the context of an ambitious enterprise of self-education and study trips to Italy, Germany, and France during the years 1907–11, after which he journeyed to the East. Here the last four weeks-—best exemplifying VSBA’s principle of "overdose" for exhibition design of this quality—involve a look at period photographs, and mural-size blow-ups—to form a corollary to Le Corbusier’s definition of architecture as
Architecture Toward Painting

A symposium, "Architecture Toward Painting," was held in the Arthur A. Houghton Jr. Library at Cooper Union on October 1, 2002 on the occasion of the opening of the exhibition, Slutzky, Recent Work.

The evening, introduced by Dean Anthony Vidler and moderated by Mark Lender (MED '88) of Syracuse University, was divided into three parts: a slide show that chromatically documented Slutzky's oeuvre, presentations by Luda Svinnov and Robert Morgan on his significance as a painter; and discussions by Tony Vidler, Kenneth Frampton, Richard Meier, and Peter Eisenman on his as an architectural thinker.

The running images in the slide show made evident both the consistency of Slutzky's paintings in form and color and the surprising range of his investigation of surface and depth: from his figure drawings for Richard Geist's drawing class to his discovery of Piet Mondrian; to his diamond paintings in the early 1960s (shown with John Hajdau's contemporary Diamond House); to his move to acrylics and drip paintings; to his revelation of Mondrian through the use of pastels; to the more recent bold and often dark paintings. The viewing of this work alone would have made the evening worthwhile.

Slutzky, a painter and contemporary of Slutzky's, discussed his essential Modernism—the fact that, although it was not a style but a call. This implied for Slutzky a consistent investigation of two things: the search for the structural color, in which one is guided by a pursuit of the flat silhouette but not the flat; and the transformation of surface into space. Art critic Morgan showed how in an age in which critical theory led to the liquidation of a position, an artist like Slutzky—a painter, not an image-maker—regained and reinvigorated its value. Morgan also illuminated the spatial aspect of Slutzky's work, illustrating its value for architecture.

Vidler discussed Slutzky as a writer, participating in a highly influential two-part collaboration with Colin Row and first published in Parsons' 1969 Who's Who. He said that one traced Row's projects to and his collaboration with Slutzky, one would see that the latter implied an interest in the play of depth in surface, or façade, in Row, whose attention prior to this had been limited to the flat. In discussing the spatiality of Slutzky's paintings, Vidler pointed out that the artist had moved beyond a traditional Western approach, in which color is always grounded in space, to one in which it is metaphorically spatial because it dissolves the canvas and forms into things. It was, he said, "a modernity that may never come to an end."

Meier and Eizenman were more personal in their approaches. Meier discussed how Slutzky's formal reality is an influence on all architects; and how his descriptions of how a fine becomes a plane, or a plane a volume, or how shallow space brings forth deep space, were an essential aspect of his generation's definition of abstraction. Eisenman said what was most poignant was his teacher, it was Slutzky whom Rowe invited to enrich his formal studies. The evening ended with a discussion between Linder and Vidler regarding whether or not it is ironic that this occasion, so dominated by a discussion of painting rather than architecture, took place in a school of architecture. Vidler emphasized that with Slutzky painting is a metaphor. This did indeed seem to underscore what nearly all speakers had alluded to and what we realize from Slutzky's "Literal and Phenomenal Transparency" essays: that, space, like the other arts itself, is most provocative when presented in its most complex and contradictory form. Slutzky's observation that painting wanks illusion to be real, whereas architecture wants real space to be illusory, points directly to his value as a painter, a theorist, and an architectural educator. Space, he says, isn't given, it is made.

The Great Hall was full, and the evening was clearly important to the vast number of people whom Slutzky has touched, taught, and influenced. The power of the frail artist's recent work is firm evidence of his untailing passion for exploring the relationship between color, surface, and space. The tribute to Slutzky, which this symposium proved to be, was moving not just because of the breadth of his career but because his work shows so smartly, without recourse to analyzability, the affective dimension of art, be it painting or architecture.

-Peggy Deanor, Deane is Associate Dean of the Yale School of Architecture

Digital Gehry: Material Resistance, Digital Construction

By Bruce Lindsay, Birnhauser, 2001, Softcover, 66 pp.

For five years the IT revolution in Archi-
tecture have been highly specific yet easily digestible glimpses into the increasingly gnostic and technical terri-
tories of contemporary architectural practice. Each book—profusely illustrated and usually less than 100 pages in length—fits neatly into one's back pocket, unashamedly pro-
claiming its primary function as the Cliff notes of technical and theoretical develop-
ments for the profession and academia. In a similar tone as its books and yellow-
ly literacy, the series more generally for-
goes its often indispensable bibliographic pur-
pose of the profession for text that moves along at a merrily—and perhaps wider-reaching—viewer's pace.

The 14th installment in this series, Digital Gehry: Material Resistance, Digital Construction, by Bruce Lindsay (MIT, 1987), pre-
sents the process by which Frank Gehry and his collaborators design, develop, and build using a variety of newly minted tech-
nologies. Lindsay presents us with the architectural equivalent of a "how the
scissors" Fox TV special, complete with special access to the intricacies of the design process, as well as information on the software and hardware used to achieve results. Staged text and photography have undertaken to write, or rather codify, the work process of Gehry's office is important to note. The architecture is quoted as saying, "I think it is my basic skill as an architect. I am able to transfer a sketch into a model and build it." Gehry is unique in that his noted genius for sculptural form is coupled inseparably with an innovative and techno-
logically intensive process—a messy one involving collaboration, compromise, and experimentation. And the focus on this process drastically separates Lindsay's book from the phone-book-size Frank O. Gehry: The Complete Works (MCA/Architectural Press, 1997). If there is one fault with this book, it is that it presents this process as too formulaic and succinct when actually changes dramatically from project to project and involves a constantly rotating cast of languages, digital formats, code materia-
als, and fabricators. The book collapses Gehry's highly complex design and construction system into neatly casted technologies. Like the software releases on which the work relies, the book tracks the history of sever-
al projects, ranging from the Barcelona Fish to the Experience Music Project. It distills the processes in Chapter 4, "Building a Pavillion," through Chapters 4.8, "Rationalization/Logilization." Lindsay charts the stages of work from the simple sketching of programmatic wood blocks rebuilding to the mathematically intensive rebuilding of surfaces using the software program CATIA, it is this program more like any other tool that has provided Gehry and his more technically inclined partners, James Goll, with the ability to realize the design.

Lindsay provides the reader not only with the formidable technical resumes of the program but also with the strange trajectories, via Risk Smith and IBM, into Gehry's office. This book is at least partly self-exploratory, this discussion outlines the role of soft-
ware as a part of the postdesign process. Lindsay's book makes the case for Gehry as a pioneer in the use of the computer as a tool for the design process, with the use of CAD as a tool to visualize the design and to make a design tool. Gehry as a tool for Gehry to make Gehry.

Lindsay's book is essential reading for any architect or anyone interested in the technological revolution in architecture.
Local Sites of Global Practice

Arjun Appadurai, the recently appointed William R. Lanman, Jr., Professor of International Studies and director of the Initiative on Cities and Globalization at Yale, will join architects and historians in the symposium “Local Sites of Global Practice,” April 4–5, 2003, at the Yale School of Architecture.

“Local Sites of Global Practice” addresses one of the most pressing issues facing architecture today—how to engage the increasingly global nature of economic and cultural relations and a sharpening sense of local identity. Around the globe architects are being asked to respond to regional concerns with building types, materials, and methods of construction that are now familiar in nearly any major city on Earth. With global media disseminating symbols of indigenous character and national sovereignty, architecture has become a common icon for the display of local, national, and global identities.

Many architects find themselves acting either as exponents of regional specificity or proponents of international modernism. Such tensions are familiar, recalling fault lines evident in many architectural debates throughout the twentieth century.

“Local Sites of Global Practice” highlights the complex dialogues architects are playing today by placing them in the context of nationalism, regionalism, and globalization.

The symposium aims to ask the very questions that underpin these current debates. When architects cross borders as practitioners or tourists, students, and as teachers, or members of international organizations, the dictionary of local-global cannot hold. The symposium focuses on the Middle East as a rich and complex setting in which to study the issues of influence, dissemination, and appropriation because it has been—and remains—the site both of deep traditions and rapid modernization.

“Local Sites of Global Practice” brings together architects and scholars from a range of disciplinary backgrounds to present papers and debate issues in three panel sessions. The symposium will begin with a keynote talk by Nezar AlSayyad, professor of architecture at the University of California, Berkeley, and chair of that school’s Center for Middle East Studies. AlSayyad has written extensively on urban issues, especially where they embody relations of power, and most recently on globalization and transnationalism in Europe and the Middle East. His talk, titled “Manufacturing Heritage, Consuming Traditions,” will be an introduction to the symposium’s intellectual mission.

Concentrating on developments in the early to mid-twentieth century, the first panel will focus on articulations of national identities that emerge on the threshold of changing political formations. Brian McLaren, architectural historian at the University of Washington, will discuss the absorption of Italian colonial architecture in the organization and independence of North African nations. Gulsum Halabian, an assistant professor of architecture at Bilkent University, in Ankara, will present the unique history of Modernism in republican Turkey. Magnus Bernardino, from Hofstra University, will present “1901 Vannoni.”

A second panel will look at developments in the postwar era, framing this moment in the context of the expanding reach of corporate capitalism. Presentations focusing on how institutions spread Modernist architecture include that of Dewdney Wright, professor of architecture at Columbia University, on the role of OMA in setting an agenda for urbanism in developing nations; Amabel Wharton, an historian from Duke University, will examine American corporations as they began after World War II to expand their markets and exploit international differences in labor; and Masanori, who is completing his doctoral degree at M.I.T., will explore Modernist international exhibitions of the United Nations, in terms of its policies of modernization and its impact on local cultures.

Later in the day a historian and several architects practicing today in the Middle East will form a panel: Hassan Uddin Khan, an architect and coauthor of two books on mosques and Modernism, and past editor of Minbar, a distinguished journal on Islamic architecture, will speak on issues of architecture and globalization in the Gulf States, particularly Saudi Arabia; architectural historian Sibel Boyd琢磨z will discuss the early Modernist movement in Iran and Turkey, the nation with one of the longest traditions of architectural Modernism outside of Europe; and Laura Riesner, the best known for her design of the Israeli Supreme Court in Jerusalem, and Hashim Sarkis, who practices in Beirut as well as Cambridge, Massachusetts, will present their work and address the issues that have absorbed their attention. Each session will have a respondent as well as ample time for discussion and questions.

For the closing address Arjun Appadurai, who joined the Yale faculty as the William K. Lanman, Jr., Professor of International Studies and director of the Initiative on Cities and Globalization, will give the school’s third annual Rith-Rymond Lecture. The author of seminal essays on globalization, he will present his current research on global race and megacity, and grassroots globalization in his lecture, “The Circulation of Forms.”

“Iron Sites of Global Practice” is sponsored by Yale University’s Center for International and Area Studies and the Yale School of Architecture, which will host the event. Kishwar Rizvi and Sandy Isett, both from the Department of the History of Art, have joined Ewa-Lisa Pelkonen, from the School of Architecture, to organize the symposium.

—Sandy Isettad, Ewa-Lisa Pelkonen, and Kishwar Rizvi

The Building Project, One Nail at a Time

It’s the last Wednesday barbecue of the summer and Paul Brouard, director of the Building Project Foundation, has provided the summer crew with a lunch delicious enough to be deemed acceptable for a Robert Stiem dinner party. We’re sitting on the backyard deck of Cedar Creek, at 83 Parramatta Avenue. It’s hot outside—about 95 degrees—and we’re tired, dirty, and sunburned. But there’s nowhere else we’d rather be, because this is the baby-of-the-class of 2003’s idea and efforts molded into a house we couldn’t be prouder of. And although the ten of us who have remained throughout the summer have a difficult time taking ourselves seriously, we see that our often exhausting efforts have come to life—along with our long memories. There were 54 of us at the beginning; we started with the big picture—the larger elements—and now we are finishing the tiniest details. We’ve completed the Building Project challenge that was the focus of our second semester at Yale, and our story is as exciting as the moment we will hand over the keys to the new owners of our summer home.

From the first day of laying the foundation it was clear that our class was determined to get the house built on time and on budget. The following four months would be a successful venture, if weather permitted. And it did. Framing was a display of machismo—crazily swinging sledgehammers, confidently driving in galvanized nails, and raising two-story walls with ease. We cooked roast panels as they flew like magic carpets through the air suspended from a crane, and put them into place. We learned how to build windows and doors—three 300-pound pieces of glass didn’t come crashing down when the crane operator swung them into the adjacent streets. We worked as workers sprayed wet shingled newspaper into the frame.

Apparently we did it well; 83 Parramatta Avenue remains an official New Haven address today. We signed our names on the shingling before it was buried by the lid on the building box, in that manner of innocent defacement of property, that we knew we’d never leave that house, even after we graduated. Our community solved to every problem and provided emotional support when we realized we weren’t perfect builders. Endless hours of cutting and nailing sides made us wonder if we’d ever get to paint the project barn red. But finally, after the first wall was completely clad, we stripped our brushes tightly and painted straight through a 105-degree heat wave. We had to ignore the neighbors’ curiosity and relentless praise to get the job done. We played it cool, like it was no big accomplishment. But there was no use in trying to hide our inflated ego—the house looked good. It’s the details that really make it: an exterior railing, brick shoulders, a shingled side. We washed it and left it unwaxed—without its built-in garbage/recycling bin closets. Everything was accounted for.“Everything was perfect—that is, until we realized our story was coming to an end. It’s the last Wednesday barbecue, the greatest tradition of our summer besides Happy Hour at C.O. Jones—and we’re realizing that it’s over. Soon the house won’t be ours to enter as we please. Neighborhood Housing of New Haven will take the keys and, in three months, hand them over to new homeowners. The kids, Melissa and Beavis, our neighbors for the past summer, will get to play with new friends. Maybe the new owners will collect cans for the nice lady across the street, like we did. Perhaps Route 34 won’t get down and the strange 300-pound loft we’re in the tradition of the Building Project 2002 crew. Cedar Creek will witness countless more barbecues and endless fits of laughter as long as our house remains standing. But most importantly, we’ve had an amazing summer and an experience we’ll never forget. We can thank one another for the time shared on the site and for the lack of seriousness that became a source of energy during one of the hottest heat waves we’ve ever seen. And there’s a handsome house in the West River neighborhood that we will never forget. Thank you, class of 2004.

—Emily Beglau (’04)
Rome Continuity and Change: The Eternal City Layered in Time

For the eighth consecutive year Yale School of Architecture will sponsor a Rome study trip in May and June for students entering their final year.

Last spring 18 second-year students spent three weeks in Rome studying and drawing the city and its buildings. With the Weltkunst world’s finest achievements in urbanism, art, and architecture, Rome has always backstopped the architect. In ancient times it was the model for all other cities, and when the empire’s power waned, marauders plundered its riches. During the Middle Ages, Rome’s artistic sway was like a floating candle, all but extinguished before igniting again with the Renaissance and the rise of the Roman Catholic Church. The city returned to the position of artistic powerhouse, and, with the country’s unification, became Italy’s capital, where the glory of its past would inspire its rulers and impress its subjects until today.

Across centuries, a familiarity with Rome has been considered a prerequisite for the well-trained architect. Beginning in the eighteenth century, artists, architects, and aesthetes made it an obligatory stop on the Grand Tour. Romantic, atmospheric ruins were sketched and, for those less artistically inclined, souvenir “views” were commissioned, just as today’s noshed visitor might snap a digital image or buy a postcard. Soon a more rigorous engagement became the norm, and would-be architects were expected to spend several years in Rome studying drawing and buildings and sites of antiquity, creating elaborate reconstruction drawings of how the places would have originally appeared. The coveted Prix de Rome was the ultimate career achievement for a student at the École de Beaux-Arts. In the twentieth century, architects like Mario Pavesi, Le Corbusier, Louis Kahn, and Robert Venturi were each profoundly influenced by their time spent in Rome.

Today the fundamental capacity to master issues of order, proportion, scale, context (historical and topographical), and light (in spaces and on surfaces) is a necessity for every architect, and Rome continues to provide a vital laboratory. For students to engage this unique city effectively, directly observation through on-site hand drawing is essential. Making visual diaries requires them to observe precisely, moving easily between quick notation and analytical form, but sharpening a momentary fall of sight and more sustained representation.

The four-week residential tour from Plaza del Popolo to San Giovanni in Laterano on the first day, the students gained an intimate knowledge of the city’s plan and topography. Visits to buildings, gardens, and public spaces proceeded thematically: the centrally domed space (the Domus Aurea, the Pantheon, Sant’Ivone), and buildings of the Court of Honor and Casino di degli Scalzi (Lodola della Pace, Palazzo Massimo). Two professors—Senior Staff Architect for the Rome Program participated: guest lecturer Jan Gaydkee guided us through the Foro, and Jeffrey Blanchard helped us fathom St. Peter’s and the Vatican. Joining by Yale faculty member Brian Friedmann, we visit the outlying gardens of Villa Este, Villa Lante, and Palazzo Farnese at Caprarola, where a bunch of unsumptuous Yalés got drenched by the surprising mannerist water jet also spent time in the astonishing twelfth-century Nfam grazia. There was time aside to enjoy the dynamics of Italian cultural and culinary achievements. This year’s class had the opportunity to attend the Pritsher Prize ceremony, held in the Campidoglio, and was invited to be present when the current Bishop Professor, Glenn Murcutt, was awarded the medal. When in the course of his remarks he stressed the importance in his own work of learning from direct observation, a cheer emanated from our small group.

During the course of the seminar, in addition to maintaining a sketchbook, each student identified a subject for more sustained study, using drawing to investigate and communicate their observations in final presentations. Some documented either individual buildings or public spaces; others compared solutions to a common geometrical problem, such as the relation of a domed ceiling to a rectangular plan. Some studied how facades captured light, modified a street wall, or created a silhouette. On the last day these drawings and sketches were the subject of a poster session at the American Academy, followed by a farewell celebration.

The pace of the seminar was intense, but the drawings attest to the enthusiastic curators of the results. A wanderer in all of us shared these three astonishing weeks in Rome.

—Stephen Harby and Alexander Purves Harvey (’92) is a lecturer at the school of architecture, and Purves (’82) is associate professor.

New Haven Building Notes

The Coliseum in Rome

In 1996-97, the New Haven Veteran’s Memorial Coliseum—Kevin Burns and John Pifer—spontaneously conceived yet infamous arena/parking garage—hosted its last event: a World Wrestling Entertainment Smackdown leveraging wrestlers Hardcore Holly, Mike Awesome, and Hurricane. It was absurd and depressing, perhaps an omen for a building in a historic part of the city. In May, with the city in a budget pinch, Mayor John DeLellis proposed that it might be more economical to tear it down. The training facility to go: it was losing money, in need of an expensive renovation, and increasingly unable to compete with local and regional major league venues. A few weeks later Governor John Rowland let slip, probably not so accidentally, that it was done deal. In an effort to save face, the city hastily commissioned an economic impact study, but the result seemed preordained. In early September, without a public hearing, an attempt to consider alternate uses for the building, the end was declared. Contracts were severed, workers were let go, and pieces of the coliseum were auctioned off. With a crooked banner you could buy a roof beam.

How did it come to this? How could it not happen? The building’s history flows up from the start. The few who defend it often did so for its events rather than for its architecture. But as the mayor said, “You don’t just tear something down because you don’t like how it looks.” Well, we should not hope for miracles, this building has been neglected for years, partly because of people’s disinterest in its architecture, resulting in the need for reno- voltage the city says it can afford. In a city, the city started tearing down the coliseum years ago.

It should be remembered that the colise- um was the product of the highest archi- tectural ambition, and its demise is a shame. Roche’s design was the city’s commissioning of it was visionary and idealistic—qualities that are so lacking today’s context (cross your fingers for Lower Manhattan). The coliseum’s design was the offspring of a workshop much like the one taught at the school today: intellectual, discursive, and experimental. We should all reflect on Roche’s good intention in the upcoming months and sigh: there but for the grace of God go we.

The city is seeking $10 million in state bonds to pay for the coliseum’s demolition, which may or may not be forthcoming. Until it is, there is some seri- ousness to it that should be reflected in the effort to save it. If you are interested in joining the efforts to save the building, please contact the Urban Design League at 203-604-0179 or write to urban-designleague@comcast.net.

Ikea Close to Deal on Site in Pittsfield

In brighter news, perhaps city approval, the Swedish furniture retailer IKEA has agreed to purchase 14 acres in which long-entrenched Pebble Building, next to which they intend to build a 200,000-square-foot store. The company plans to retain a large portion of Marcel Breuer’s landmark build- ing, although at the time of writing, the exact amount is in dispute with concerned preservationists.

The Pittsfield site was purchased in the late 1990s by developers intent on building a large regional shopping mall using an extended campaign led by a coalition of local merchants, environmentalists, and a rival mall developer, the project was stopped. The prospect of an IKEA super- store has been greeted differently by residents. Merchants believe that IKEA’s customers, who drive great distances to shop at the inexpensive contemporary design store, will stop in downtown New Haven before heading home. Local preservationists are happy that IKEA plots to pay for the site’s amelioration. And the city is thrilled at the prospect of $50 million in city wide but with all benefits.

The only hitch is the fate of the Pebble Building. Original plans called for the demolition of the entire two-story base, leaving only the floating precast concrete slabs. Responding to public concerns, IKEA agreed to retain the front façade and preserve the elevation visible from I-95. Pleased with the company’s cooperative attitude but still uncertain about the preservationists continue to press the issue. IKEA hopes to open the store in 2004.

For information on the fate of the Pebble Building or to get involved contact the Urban Design League at e-mail the Long Life Advocacy Group at longlife@net.

The Effort to Save Connecticut General Continues

Half of the long saga to save Connecticut General’s historic headquarters seems to be coming to a sad end. The Einhart Building, one of two historic structures by Gordon Bunshaft of Skidmore, Owings & Merrin, is scheduled to be razed for the end of this year. The fate of the other building on the grassy 900-acre campus, the Wilda Building, is unknown. The two edifices were the product of a radical and influential experiment in corporate architecture. In the 1950s the Connecticut General Life Insurance Company, hoping to keep key employees in a competitive market, assembled an all- star team of Modernist designers, includ- ing Bunshaft, Finlayson, and I.M. Pei, to speculate on a new type of office environment. The result was the suburban corporate campus: futuristic low-slung glass buildings picturesquely set on rolling fields. The offices were open, with integrated ceilings, demount- able partitions, and under-floor services. Times—and corporate culture—changed, and the company, now called CIGNA, decided a new type of campus was need- ed. New plans call for a golf course, hotel, new office space, surface parking, and upscale housing—but let’s see what the market can hold.

Go to www.savecngen.com for updates and information on joining the fight.

—Ted Whitten

Whitten (’71) works in New Haven and is a freelance architectural writer.

Urban Museum of Modern Architecture

In the 1950s and 1960s New Haven was referred to as “New York West,” notable for its innovative housing, welfare, and city planning programs. Since that time, the ultimate success of many of those pro- grams has been debated. However, the division from those years is an important collection of postwar architecture by lead- ing American architects. Mariano Angeli, a Ph.D. student in art history at Yale University, organized Urban Museum of Modern Architecture: New Haven, a public project designed to highlight the city as a museum of Modern architecture.

Before her site visit to New Haven, a Moog, a graduate student graphic design at Yale, describe the history of seven buildings around New Haven. These sit in transitu- cent acrylic kiosks, “INFOfacts” designed by Emergent Office, New York architects. The 6-foot-high kiosks include information about the building and its architect, images, related projects, a list of works by the architect in New Haven, and a map. All seven kiosks debuted at Dowell Fire Station on September 14, 2002, during the mayor’s “Start With the Arts” day. The fol- lowing day they were moved to their corresponding buildings. The institution heads and the sponsors note that the kiosks and brochures, in many cases, they have also helped to agreed to help fund the printing. Accordingly, the city is in the process of planning to extend its interest to a similar installation in other cities. The hope is that, in New Haven speak to its visitors and residents and create a shared public identity.

Kiosk Locations:

Yale University Art Gallery, 1961-53, Louis Kahn
Inagawa-Dowley Rink, 1956-58, Eero Saarinen
Blackstone Book and Magazine Library, 19-60-63, Gordon Bunshaft of SOM
Yale University Art and Architecture Building, 1956-95, Paul Rudolph
Crawford Manor Housing, 1952-56, Paul Rudolph
Yale Center for British Art and British Studies Classroom, 1939, Philip Pacholczak & Meyers
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Joseph Rose
Eero Saarinen Lecturer
"Power Architecture and the Rebuilding of New York City" September 2002

The chief fact in New York is that building things is hard, and the difficulty increases as the scale and numbers of people do.

Even if there are not new trends, the old ones are against you. In light of that context, architectural innovation is not something the government and real estate community see value in giving thought to, for better or for worse.

Fostering an environment for new construction in this city has been over...

Recent buildings are perhaps not significant as architectural icons or in the discourse in the academy, but as reinforcement in the city and the essence of the global city it is not further forward. There are ways to force the public realm into new projects and an ability to detail of public space, such as jazz at Lincoln Center, and if you engage these areas you can have incredible buildings—such as the Rose Center, MoMA, Hudson River Park—all an elaborate series of compromises and political issues that never get written about in the architectural press. Some projects get a huge amount of fame because Giuliani was against new concepts but because of practical planning issues. So now the world is safe for great architecture to come to New York. 9/11 changed the usual model of civic decision making but beyond the capacity of the usual model of developer-layyer roles. There was a clear need for poetry, symbolism, and tremor to receive issues of memorialization and to spend money to rebuild infrastructure and places to respond to challenges. It has got to be real—not just ideas, not connected to theotics of the other players—then architecture can play a leadership role and reassert itself. It can open up new worlds to play a crucial role in the city again.


Our book "Manual" records our journey after 15 years or so in architecture and our passion for how things go together—the intellectual and material parts of that craft. Our focus is on the craft. One idea is profiling the form of edgins, rails, for example, protect the body from the touch of a machine. Beautiful, new, and complex. Where wall and roof meet is one of the most prolific moments, and the roof of the church is there. If a building and its architecture must pass the test of commodity as well as art. That happens from an aspect of art and commodity. Once, especially in the vernacular, the designer and the builder were the same, but that is no longer the case. Handicraft we believe is no longer a way forward but provides a connection between thought and action. The formula "quality x scope = cost x time" is the equation we are under pressure to change. Other industries have demonstrated how...
the Future Buildings Design Group. He has also published three influential books. He discussed recent work relating to sustainable buildings and urban density, demonstrating the microclimate of green spaces inside and outside of buildings and the use of wind, rainwater, and other green and natural resources in design. As the first of the new building "envisions" that Daniels co-narrates, Daniels has been working collaboratively with urban and architectural designers, influencing regulations beyond the scale of the individual building—although not without controversy. Moving from the urban to the building detail, he described projects such as the master plan of Chongqing, China (Pomerol & Partners); the "DVG" office complex in Hannover, Germany (Heatherwick Studio); and Thomas Herzog's Hannover Indoor Expo pavilion.

—Craig Morton (03)

Paul Goldberger and Alexander Garvin Lecture on Downtown New York

On Monday, November 1, 2002, Yale alumni and Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist Paul Goldberger, architect critic for the New York magazine, delivered the Poynter Lecture in Journalism, titled "After the World Trade Center: The Struggle to Make it City for Our Time." In his talk Goldberger called for redeveloping of the WTC site that would com- mercialize those lost in the September 11, as well as make the surrounding 16 and a half acres a catalyst for the revitalization of the neighborhood—an area that should have been addressed before the towers went up 35 years ago. He noted that World Trade Center development was badly con- ceived, adding to an already overcrowded plus of office space in Lower Manhattan by building another 11 million square feet. Therefore, Goldberger advocates new mixed-use redevelopment rather than a new office tower.

Responding to a question posed by Dean Robert A. M. Stern, Goldberger stat- ed that the critical but most neglected issue in the prees to date has been to address a new program for the World Trade Center site. He also noted that expanding the transportation infrastructure in the neighborhood is essential for Lower Manhattan to thrive, like midtown. The big question that New York faces (one that applies to all American cities) is how to bring the city into the twenty-first century. Although Goldberger mentions, the 9/11 tragedy affords New York the opportunity to look at Lower Manhattan in a more holistic way, he also feels that it needs a symbolic center. Thus Goldberger proposed filling the gap left in the skyline with a memorial tower that would serve as a beacon expressing New York's essential past, as well as a monument and observatory for the people. "We need a twenty-first-centu- ry Ellis Tower for New York to employ the science technology as advanced now as the tech- nology Ellis used.

When the towers fell, Goldberger explained, what once stood as a symbol of civic institutional vitality, once was a cultural force, a victim of the events. "Like human marxism, the World Trade Center looms much larger in death than it did in life." As such, he said, the site now stands for the lives we want and fear to die. "It makes culture take a place of modern architecture and makes it represent the American ideal." This is the new architecture that Goldberger said, because it represents the first time the country has identified with modern architecture. "The traditions managed to do what no architect or architec- ture critic could ever do," he said.

Although Goldberger felt obligated to admit that the World Trade Center was not very architecturally correct, he said that in their memory the towers have been placed beyond the reach of any architectural criticism.

Alexandar Garvin in the "New York Yale" lecture, spon- sored by the senior society Elchi Yale Club, was the director of planning for the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, emphasized that "old New York" was a city with a twenty-first-century city, specifically by redeveloping the WTC site, and that beginning the development with the World Trade Center itself is backward. Instead we must recon- nect Lower Manhattan to the waterfront and encourage mixed-use neighborhoods. To make a twenty-first century downtown, he believes that we also have to reconnect the area to the airports and make it a major point of arrival through new infrastructure, such as a dramatic railroad/bus terminal. One new connector could be West Street with a loop or spine that would link it to Water Street and Broadway. Garvin was outspoken in his support of the Paterson-Littenberg scheme, noting that their consulting has influenced the direction of thinking about the WTC devel- opment. Focusing on their proposal for a promenade, it mocked the proposals exhibited test fall at the Max Protetch Gallery, saying, "Fantasies are relevant but the fantasies that the players involved, money, and any future infrastructure that we use, he emphasized. However, that a twenty-first century city must emphasize the importance of design. He believes that in addition to a memorial of the event, New York needs its skyline back. "Rebuilding Downtown should not be a police that has failed," Gaven also believes that existing surplus office buildings should be converted into residential units, because it is the residents who will provide the critical mass for downtown success.

—Aaron Paradis (03)

Rebuilding Downtown Revisited

Many Yale graduates, faculty, and former students gathered in the old phase of the design for rebuilding Downtown Manhattan. Members of the seven teams who presented their designs December 12, 2002, included Kahn visiting professor Paul Eilersman, who hosted the event with Charles Gwathmey (01) along with Richard Meier and Steven Holl. Department professor Greg Lynn teamed up with UN Studio, Foreign Office Architects, Reiser + Umemoto, and Kenneth Wee to form Unlich Architect. Former Kahn visiting professor Daniel Libeskind presented his team's design, Barbara Libetin with Steven Pavlakian, who were part of the original design team last summer, also presented their design, as also part of the phase included Lord Norman Foster and David Childs (87) firm Skidmore, Owings & Mertl, who teamed up with Sahnila & Nihalizka, Field Operations, and Michael Malcom, among others. Coordinating the RFP was Yale faculty member and graduate student Alexander Garvin (76), visiting professor and planning for the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, and Richard Grauer (96) is planning director and Alexander Garvin (76) in direction of design and development for the LMC. In addi- tion Kahn visiting professor Billia Tais is on the architecture committee. You may view all the schemes and make com- ments on the plans.

Architects working on plans for the city are doing an everyday work in designing schemes. Architect critic for the New York magazine, James Marion Weiss (84) of Weiss/Manfredi, Harvard University, and Robert M. A. Stern (95), Robert M. A. Stern Architects.
From rigorous design exercises to finding responsible ways to address environmental issues to building urban cities, the full range of projects challenged students and professors alike in defining architecture.

Peter Eisenman

Peter Eisenman, Louis Kahn visiting professor, and Emmanuel Polli led a studio that analyzed paradigmatic urban plans—the 1748 Nolfi Plan for Rome and Piranesi’s Carceri D’Invenzione—and then dissected them, transforming the project into a design exercise of increased formal complexity. After grouping into pairs, the students applied either Fransoni’s or Nolfi’s strategy to another city’s plan to develop a contemporary site plan, sometimes designing specific buildings. In presentations to crits—Enzo Jannsen, Tom Cody, and Charlie Gwathmey (102), Leon Krier, Greg Lynn, Alan Plattus, Jaqueline Robertson (91), Vincent Scully, Stanley Tigerman (106), Sarah Whiting, Mark Wigley, and Guido Zulian, the teams demonstrated devices of layering, extruding, enclosing, fragmenting, excavating, superimposing, dividing, and condensing to evolve a new plan and topography.

Toddy Palas and Federico Tengo’s Campo Marzo plan grew out of a series of thin slabs that collapsed the project in time and created symmetries as they applied to Berlin’s Museum Island. Krier wanted to make a claim about how “Campo Marzo is a fantasy of someone who went berserk, creating architectural nirvana.” He asked, “Do you want to be a designer, a topographer, or confuse the issuers?” Whiting noted how the walls move through as a ribbon rather than a scooped graphic piece. “It is extrusions that landed on top,” she said. “What does the fragmented elevation do?” Eisenman felt that only Kahn and Garity would be able to produce a hybrid space like this—one but it is too complicated and too dense.

Lynn quartered Eisenman about how he guided the students in editing their projects. “Should it end on its course, and you just accept the outcome?” Gwathmey saw the projects as an additive process but noted, “You also have to teach editing.” Krier was concerned with the idea of setting out to build ruins and asked why Eisenman is a ruin-maker; to which Eisenman responded that he is always trying to work with history as an active agent, to echo the present in the use of the past. “It is to look at history, not accept it, and bring it into the present ... it is not about deconstruction.”

Aaron Amison and Niel Baxter stripped Berlin with an interest in the open yet dense system of the city’s plan. They used the Nolfi framework to create transitions in the limits of the Berlin Wall so that the two systems overlapped and Berlin’s block system opened up to create new block forms rather than the structure of the traditional tenement housing. Jason Bond and David Pat’s project spiraled on a different scale, taking Nolfi’s strategy to develop a building with specificity of architectural detail, the slightest. Nolfi’s design of a reinforced concrete block that merges with the streetscrapes in the structures created interstitial spacings. Tigerman saw “the evolution as a sophisticated tactic continuously working toward a new scale through the section. There are splices everywhere.” Whiting remarked, “There is a pressure eating the walls from the inside out that is like a political negotiation with two stages back-to-back, more like a hinge.” He wondered if there was such a thing as a hinge, noting, “The Nolfi wall has presence and can be inhabitable.” Lynn commented that “the studio had invested a major wall with one idea: increase symmetry, decrease complexity, and turn from the block or mass. Don’t you need another dual that generates void, skin, light?”

The studio stressed working within history and spaces, which are not meant to produce better cities but allow for architecture and interior spaces. Nonetheless the discussion evolved to the following questions: What can an architect do? How much ideas one expect a project to be built as opposed to dreamt?

Leon Krier

Leon Krier, the Davenport visiting professor, and Mark Gogo (90) challenged students to translate, while maintaining the meaning in a “de-idealizing” of functional commissions into traditional urban contexts or vernacular and classical symbols.

At the outset each student selected a Modernist building to analyze in a wiscopic and illustrative way—its meaning, proportional systems, composition, materials, and record the elements for its transformation to a traditional building. At midterm they presented the analysis in a formal graphic design, as a kind of a manual of techniques and construction elements. After the semester some of the students traveled on their own to see their iconic examples. At the final presentations the guest jurors Tom Biebow (65), Peter Bohn, Peggy Deamer, Jaqueline Robertson (91), Vincent Scully, Stanley Tigerman (106), Sarah Whiting, and Ron Witte reviewed the translated Modernist icons as they were morphed into new forms in their new traditional urban or rural contexts. The students demonstrated a rigor in understanding the two building types, the thorough material and formal analysis, and the ultimate interrelation—ships. Many projects translated directly, allowing the students to fully explore the design of details, whereas others, more resistant to translation, demanded that the students create new conceptual positioning to proceed.

Commenting on Francesco Huo’s translation of Silvino Giorni’s G.1272 House to a Savaske house type, Robertson said, “What is exciting in the studio is that what you have is like offering twelve different studios. Everyone has taken a shot at their project in a totally different way.” With the Gray project, Whiting noted, “Can we default into language? How much do you let the code define the house? Are you declaring language, but you are not taking charge of it and need to exploit it? It is an opportunity.” Deemer commented on this the devolution to the everyday vernacular and the casuarina that is not really code. Whiting saw a loss in the project by having a code that then loses the form of prototypical furniture, creating rooms that are cut from reddened wood.

Li-Yu Hsu’s translation of Eisenman’s House VI into Frank Lloyd Wright’s Unity Temple emphasized the similarities in the two as she created a complete setting in which the houses “married” each other. Tigerman commented, “I was beautiful in the end. The interventions are very minor but important.” Krier said, “This one was a surprise. What is traditional is the function, but it uses Wright’s language.” Whiting said, “Whether it is traditional context, it doesn’t matter: the proposition is clear.” Scully felt that it served Eisenman better than Wright and that it was convincingly beautiful and made sense. In Aurelle Padron’s translation of Villa Borghese in a Park Slope, Brooklyn, Willy, the emphasis on the corner windows worked to create a manor elevation. To some it was a last book theoretical Modernism building going back to the classical in which Krier interjected—“No for now.” Some projects initially lean as impossible to translate so solved the issue in an innovative way. Drew Davis translated Diller Scofidio’s Slow House into a Georgian saltbox with a rational design process. Mandy McGreavy transformed John Heald’s Wolf House into a Tudox Park single-style house, maintaining a conceptual idea of translation so that the Wolf House served as an operation and concept versus a habitable structure.

Cecil Balmond

Cecil Balmond, the studio of Eero Saarinen visiting professor Cecil Balmond and John Eberhardt (98) explored animate geometry and algorithms to design the 3,400-square-foot Summer Pavilion at the Serpentine Gallery, in London’s Hyde Park, challenging the students to turn the complex number patterns into a three-dimensional habitable structure.

The study of pattern and algorithm directed students to create new forms by invasign proportions that are divergent from traditional geometries. After a trip to London to see the temporary Togyo Itsu and Cecil Balmond 2002 Summer Pavilion and a visit to the Arts office to meet with engineers, the students developed designs for a 12-foot-high demonstrable structure to be used for performances and a cafe. Each project, from circle and square forms to extruded tubular volumes, was unique in its complexity, algorithm, pattern, and configuration.

In presentations to the jurors—Koller Fastallings, Sanford Kwinter, Detlef Mertens, Tawa-Lisa Pajonk (MID 94), David Rui, and David Turnbull—students allowed projects based on algorithms and number patterns or on analogs, such as cloud formations and music. With feedback techniques they redefined space as a natural pencil generating complex by process. Students created algorithms of numbers to create interrelations in patterns, April Clark found number series embedded in other number series and unraveled a series of arcs in a fractal landscape that are interrelated and used in two-dimensional shapes. She manipulated the units in three dimensions to create a functional space that was also playful and which the algorithm could be detected. Kwinter noted, “The power of the studio manifests the birth of modernity. From the closed world to the infinite univers, we went from an
thanked the architectural character could be taken into the building and receive the water element like Kohn’s Salk Institute, where the walls in the far area are glazed so that the site receives water. Tom Jameson’s building was “like a large filter.”

Other students focused on pedestrian and vehicular circulation around the site. Christopher Dao created environments that juxtaposed traditional urban forms and, at the end of the ancillary roadways into the canyon, Daniel Guiling designed bridges at crucial viewpoint positions and an alignment with traces of the ancillary road. Akw Am consti-
trated the prehistoric roads with modern access, creating a visitors center with a long, cellular composition of rooms, from which a bus service to the top of the canyon would result in a lack of impact than would hoards of cars. Other issues included staff housing location and maintaining views, in response to which Akw dug a bus-
digging pipe down to keep the buildings low. And Robert Habacion created a nestled orientation based on the Ansel’s built and natural landscapes that functioned as sun calendars.

Hanlon Liu’s interpretive center became a transition from our world to the Ansel’s, with the park service’s needs for infrastructure, and a management strategy. He elimiated the parking lots at each site, restricting access by creating a web of great ancient houses linked by a shuttle bus. In the interpretive center he dug below the earth like archaeological excavations to help maintain the sting so the sun could raise into the rooms as it does in the ruins. Shan observed the ability to bring this-
ete research into architectural terms that enable people to experience the ruins as a place and not just a scenographic. You have taken on the role of an architect, and planer to provide a solution that is not generic."

Glenn Murcutt

Bishop-virtuosi professor Glenn Murcutt and his students were asked to create a new orientation center and strategic management plan for the 2030-year-old west-inspiring Chaco Canyon historic site, in northwest New Mexico. The project was designed to improve how the site was perceived and to help visitors to better understand the ancient culture and its importance.

After a trip early in the semester to Chaco, where the students learned how archaeologists interpret the landscape, students were taken to the historic site. This visit to the site offered the students an opportunity to learn about the history and culture of the Anasazi people.

During the visit, the students were asked to consider how they could create a new orientation center and strategic management plan for the site. The students were encouraged to think about how they could improve the visitor experience and make the site more accessible to the public.
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During the visit, the students were asked to consider how they could create a new orientation center and strategic management plan for the site. The students were encouraged to think about how they could improve the visitor experience and make the site more accessible to the public.
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During the visit, the students were asked to consider how they could create a new orientation center and strategic management plan for the site. The students were encouraged to think about how they could improve the visitor experience and make the site more accessible to the public.

Canyon historic site, in northwest New Mexico. The project was designed to improve how the site was perceived and to help visitors to better understand the ancient culture and its importance. The project was designed to improve how the site was perceived and to help visitors to better understand the ancient culture and its importance.

During the visit, the students were asked to consider how they could create a new orientation center and strategic management plan for the site. The students were encouraged to think about how they could improve the visitor experience and make the site more accessible to the public.
James Ashley, professor, participated in the Research Activities and Collaboration Workshop at the University of Nantes Department of Architecture (January 30, 2002); Room Vent 2002 in Copenhagen, Denmark (November 11, 2002); and the Intelligent Building Design Symposium in Stuttgart, Germany (November 9, 2002). He has written numerous articles including, “An Approach to the Design of Natural and Hybrid Ventilation Systems for Cooling Buildings” (urbanAir AD) Monterey, California, 2002.

Diana Balinomi, landscape architecture lecturer, described her current work at work on Green Roofs, a demonstration project for the Long Island City and the Earth Pledge exhibition on Green City. She gave the lecture “Green City” at Pratt University in September 2002 and in October presented “Explicatory Temporality” at the Parsons School of Design. As chair of the Civil Alliance Memorial Committee and a member of the Civil Alliance Steering Committee, Balinomi is involved in projects surrounding the memorial for Ground Zero.

Tom Beeby (MED ’68), adjunct associate professor, with his firm Hammond Beeby Reupart Argeo, received a Chicago Athenaeum American Architecture Award for 2002 for their Chicago Music and Dance Theater. The firm is completing the University of Oregon Museum of Art addition and renovation in Eugene, Oregon.

Dеборра Бер, adjunct associate professor for the Harvard Alumni Association Partners in New York, was honored at the 2002 New York Partnership Luncheon by Interior Design (December 9, 2002).

Phil Bernstein, lecturer, as vice president of Autodesk’s Building Industry Division was interviewed by Kim Stephens for NBC’s “Tech Now” series. The program, which aired in the San Francisco Bay Area this fall, focused on how technology has transformed architectural processes. Last July Bernstein delivered a joint presentation on new technology trends with Prof. Schucharder, Office of Zaha Hadid, at the XV World Congress of Architecture in Berlin.

Kent Bloomer, adjunct professor, was recently awarded the competition to design the eiling bris and frieza for a new entrance lobby for the Fairhaven School, in Fairhaven, Connecticut. He completed a house in Tucson, for the Family of the Public Library, in Manhattan, Kansas, designed by Brent Bowman & Associates, and the ornaments for the new Jones School of Management, at the University of Connecticut, for Architectural Digest.

Carol Burns (’63), critic in architecture, with her firm Taylor & Burns Architects, has been commissioned to undertake a feasibility study and design for an addition connecting three buildings in the Hillside Avenue Historic District, for the Yale State for Policy Studies.

Peggy Doemer, associate dean, present, the award winning Stokoe House and Old Town (TCO), on Adrian Stokes and Melanie Klein, in October at the eighty Annual Symposium of Psychoanalytic Culture and Society’s conference on emotions in Philadelphia.

Peter Doffe‘lette (98), critic in architecture, has designed an Italian restaurant on Broadway in New Haven, which will open this spring. He has designed two houses in Idaho, one a ranch house in Mackay built of recycled materials and the other a vacation home in Kuna.

Koller Easterling, associate professor, published her essay “Enduring Innocence” about the World Trade Center attacks, in Gray Room 07; her article “A Love DPRK,” on tourism in North Korea, was published in Harvard Design Magazine (fall 2002); “Tomoro World,” on high-tech agricultural installations in southern Spain, appeared in Praxis fall 2002. Easterling’s work was featured in the article “Years,” about a new generation of digital designers, in the Journal of Architectural Education (November 2002); "Dongtan" is the title of an exhibition in Kamen, PR in Prague, the Foreigner, in Melbourne, Australia, as part of the ‘Edge Oliva’ conference about cities as targets of violence. She also gave her talk “A Love DPRK” at the University of Utah Architecture and in November at Columbia University Bell tower’s "Archtourism" symposium.

Bryan Fuermann, lecturer, presented “Nature as the Next Phase of Urbanization: Reconstructing Landscapes,” at the Art Institute of Chicago, in March 2002. He participated in the spring 2002 Yale in Rome program as lecturer on Italian Renaissance gardens.

Mark Foster Gage (’91), critic in architecture, recently entered into a design partnership with Marine Clemenon-Bally. Their projects include an observation tower for the Akron Arboretum in Tennessee, a hotel in Brooklyn, and a building for Art and Architecture in Manhattan. Gage also works part-time for Robert M. Stern Architects.

Deborah Gans, critic in architecture, of Jane and Jackson Architects in New York, is currently working on plans for the Brooklyn Center for the Urban Environment. Her firm’s work was featured in "AO Architecture and Furniture Exhibit (New Haven, July 2002); July 2002 was profiled in the American Airlines in-flight magazine (August 2002); Gans and Jerel’s design, for the School Construction Authority of New York, was acquired for the permanent collection of the New York Historical Society. In addition, Gans participated in “Urban Independent,” an event staged by Creative Time and Magenta Potic.

Alexander Gardner (’67), professor, was made an honorary member of the AIA New York Chapter last June. He is vice president for planning, design, and development at the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, as well as the managing director for planning for NYCDOT, the committee to bring the Summer Olympics to New York. Gardner participated in the symposium “Building of Ground Zero: High and Onshore architecture After September 11” last summer at the Pratt Institute and focused on New York’s downtown redevelopment for the Trust for Public Land and also at the London School of Economics.

Sophia Grazyna, critic in architecture, and director of undergraduate studies, has been retained as the consulting architect for the design of the New York’s Residences, a 6,000-square-foot duplex apartment in New York City. She recently completed the twentieth perspective drawing of an 18,000-square-foot private residence in Hidalgo, California, as part of an ongoing suite of pencil drawings.

Louise Harman (’93), critic in architecture, and Scott Specht (’93), of Specht Harman, were included in New York magazine’s list of “The City’s 100 Best Architects and Decorators.” The firm’s work was also featured in the October 2002 issue of Architectural Design UK. Their design for a new residence was included in New York magazine’s list on design (December 1, 2002).

Steven Harris, critic, recently completed an addition to the Professional Children’s School, in New York, which included a new auditorium and gymnasiu. He is currently working on the Shinitzky Resort and Spa, in the Catskills, designed and designed in San Francisco. He is also working on a logistical problem situation on 5,500 acres between Brooklyn and Pur and St. Cyril Road, a 35,000-square foot mixed-use development, including corporate offices, high-rise apartments, a hotel, and retail space in the Bombay suburb of Banja. Harris’ project was included in New York magazine’s list of “The City’s 100 Best Architects and Decorators.”

Michael Horevander (’94), adjunct associate professor, received an AIA Connecticut award for the addition to the Timothy Dwight School, in New Haven, which he designed in collaboration with TAMs Architects and the Urban Design Workshop. The project was praised as a “model community-participation project resulting in a handsome new residential building.” The UIDW was profiled in a book on community-university partnerships (Princeton Architectural Press, 2002), sponsored by the NEA.

Dolores Hayden, professor in architecture and urban studies, published a revised and expanded edition of her award-winning book, Rediscovering the American Dream: Gender, Housing and Family Life (W.W. Norton, 2002). She also finished her book, Building Suburban America: Suburbs, Green Fields and Urban Growth, 1830-2000, which will be published by Princeton University Press in 2003. Hayden was a featured speaker last fall at all the symposiums entitled “Examining the New Metropolitan Form,” sponsored by the Fannie Mae Foundation, in Baltimore. She also attended the Bard Graduate Center in New York at a colloquium on methods in architectural and urban history and also in the Skidmore, Owings & Merrill lecture series.

Brian Huely (’93), critic in architecture, with his firm Brian Huely Architects, in Boston, was selected as a finalist in the competition for a visitor’s center at Frank Lloyd Wright’s Darwin Martin House, in Buffalo, New York. His winning proposal for an entrance house in the east side of Chicago was featured in Architectural Record, Competitions, and Praxis 3. The project was also included in the Chicago Architecture Foundation’s exhibition for Chicago, and at the Congress on Architecture Award Exhibition at the Max Protetch Gallery, in New York. His Rural Residences in Napa Valley was included in 2002, House and Garden and published in Architect December (2002). Heely was also a featured speaker at the Boston Society of Architects.

Gavin Hogben, critic in architecture, recently completed the Lewis House on Shelter Island, New York. Currently at work on additional projects on Shelter Island and a public housing project in Austin, Long Island, he is also researching the applications of sustainable design for architecture and developing environments for media spectatorship, interaction, and participation.

Andrea Kahn, critic in architecture, is co-curling with Carol Burns Site Matters, a cross-disciplinary anthology that ties the theme of the city to the ground. Carol Kahn participated in a roundtable on Urban Design Education for Planning Students at the Annual AIA Conference in Baltimore in November 2002.

Fred Koester, critic in architecture, with Koester Kim & Associates, was selected by the GSA as architects for a new U.S. courthouse in Rockford, Illinois. The Boston Society of Architects awarded the firm the 2002 Honor Award for architecture for 80 Landsdowne Street Parking Garage, at University Park, in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The firm has won an international design competition for a new Courthouse and Development in St. Louis, and was also selected for campus planning for the Luther College Science Laboratories, at Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire.

M. J. Long (’68), of Long & Kentish Architects, presented paper at the National Maritime Museum in Falmouth, England. Due to open in February, it has been published in the UK (2001), the Complete Guide (2001), and the Guardian November (2001), and Building Design (November 22, 2002).

John McCormick, critic in architecture, and the Architectural Design and Today’s "Architecture of Information" published in CASS: Two to Send, Mediated, published in the Sight (Harvard Graduate School and Prestie, 2002). With his firm, Avec/447, McCorm won the competition for the "Modern Affordable Housing 2002." Sponsored by the Boston Society of Architecture, Planning, and Design, Community Council and the South Shore Habitat for Humanity, it called for the design of a new Habitat for Humanity prototype to be reali- zed later this year.

Ed Mitchell, adjunct assistant professor, has been collaboration with the inaugural edition of the "Architecture of Information" published in CASS: Two to Send, Mediated, published in the Sight (Harvard Graduate School and Prestie, 2002). With his firm, Avec/447, McCorm won the competition for the "Modern Affordable Housing 2002." Sponsored by the Boston Society of Architecture, Planning, and Design, Community Council and the South Shore Habitat for Humanity, it called for the design of a new Habitat for Humanity prototype to be reali-
Foot, for their bridge in Washington, and a merit award for a 70-foot-long pedestrian bridge in Woodbridge, Connecticut.

Envo-Lisa Polkowske (M'94), adjunct assistant professor, has been awarded a fellowship from Architectural Digest Image and Phanom in the new book The Light Construction Reader, edited by Jeffrey Kipnis, Taraneh Riley, and Todd Gannon (Monacelli Press, 2003).

Alan Plattus, professor, is finishing the Togo Warden Pavilion, a park and playground on Madison Village District Guidelines and has begun a project in Unionville Village Center, in collaboration with University of Connecticut Landscape Architecture Program. Plattus serves on the board of the Connecticut Main Street Center, where he is working on the Main Street Design Manual. Plattus delivered the keynote address at ACI Art 2002: Conference at the Wolfsen Institute, in Miami, and was a speaker at Annual Meeting of the Whitney Museum, in New Haven.

Nina Rapaport, lecturer and publications editor, contributed a series of interviews with some of the participating exhibitors at the exhibition Big and Green—Princeton Architectural Press, 2003), on opening January 17, 2002. She is also curating a group exhibit at the Kiasma Museum of Contemporary Art in Helsinki, which is featuring infrastructure designed by young Swiss architects, at the Van Alen Institute (March 7-31).


Deon Samoko, (MED ‘88) critic in architecture, who curated two of the exhibitions, received a grant with Carol Susemihl from the Graham Foundation to produce a video for the Torr Williams and Bils taken exhibition at Yale this spring.

Joel Sanders, associate adjunct professor, had his Lea Residence featured in the October 2002 issue of Architectural Record. His review of the exhibition Out of Site, at the New Museum in New York, was published in the November/ December 2001 Artarmon and his essay on his work accompanying seven design projects in A+D (December 2002).

Robert Sliman, lecturer, with his firm Robert Sliman Englehards, complete major structural repairs at Frank Lloyd Wright’s Fallingwater. Sliman’s article published in REVE/REV-traces illustrates the firm’s contribution to the restoration.

The district’s first project recently designated “the best all-time work of American architecture.”

Michael Silver, assistant professor, was selected to display his designs for the Pentagon Memorial Project Competition, at the National Building Museum, in Washington, D.C. (October 30-November 9).

Robert A. M. Stern, dean, with his prac- tice, A. M. Stern Architects, was selected to design the National Center for the American Revolution to be built at the Valley Forge National Historical Park, in Pennsylvania. Four of the firm's projects were dedicated in fall 2002: the E.K. Living Environmental Distance Garden and Henri Morris Botanical Gardens at Acadia University in Wolfville, Nova Scotia; Carmera; the Jesse H. Jones Center for Classical Music at Rice University, in Houston; the John L. Volpe National Aquarium of the Teix Tall School in Watertown, Connecticut. The firm’s Manzella House at California State University Fullerton, designed in association with Peter Devenyi (92), of Fisker, Devenyi, was selected for a 2002 Preservation Achievement Award by the Chicago Athenaeum. The firm is planning a new community on a reclaomed brownfield site in the New Jersey Meadowlands for EnCap Golf Holdings and is the redevelopment of the Philadelphia Navy Yard for Liberty Property Trust.


Lindsay Suter, lecturer, received a sustainable-design award from the AIA Connecticut chapter for the Old Uropean Residences, in Richmond, Rhode Island. His Prince Residences was featured on the NEREA Greek Buildings Tour 2002, and his furniture designs are featured in the book in the Modern Style (Teuron Press, 2003).

On Exhibit

New Hotels for Global Nomads

Joel Sanders, faculty member, was commissioned by Rocco Forte Hotels to design a new hotel for an upscale hotel chain at the Cooper-Hewitt, National Design Museum in New York City (March 20-March 2, 2003). Focusing on the history of the design, contemporary programs, and full services for hotels in an ever more mobile and multimedia society, this exhibition presents 64 projects as well as specific commissions imaging new hotel scenarios. Sanders’s project—in the future a luxury hotel and business center in Washington, D.C. should be a guest curator of the exhibition. He is using the experience of designing infrastructure designed by young Swiss architects, at the Van Alen Institute (May 20).

Michaelangelo Sabatino, lectu
early housing projects—Twin Parks West (1967–73), East (1973), and a housing block in Noho (1978)—were featured in an article in the fall 2002 DOMOMO New York/Tri-State newsletter.

1960s

Jaquelin Robertson (’61), of Cooper, Robertson & Partners, was featured in the Wall Street Journal for his firm’s work on WaterColor, the 499-acre development planned near Seaside, Florida. In addition to creating the town’s architectural guidelines, the firm designed the complex’s town-center buildings and a two-story model home. Robertson and Alexander Cooper (’62) received the Seaside Prize 2002.

Carl Abbott (’53), of Saratoga, Florida, received a 2002 Award for Excellence in Architecture from the Florida AIA. Abbott’s 1960 Parich Church, an addition to the St. Thomas Moore church, was noted for its use of dynamic sunlight and open spaces and its subtle integration with the existing building form.

Donald R. Watson (’62) received an ASCA Distinguished Professor Award for his teaching both at the Yale School of Architecture and the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. Formerly chair of the MEd Program, he was described as “the idea of a great teacher, an engraved interdisciplinary scholar, leadership, and professional pursuities into the creation of educational experi- ences that are both meaningful and meritorious.” He has been a state representative and has influenced the state-wide curriculum, including the development of the curriculum, and he has been a member of the State Board of Education.

James Leider (’54) was elected a fellow by the American Society of Landscape Architects and the Council of Fellows. He is director of the landscape architecture program at Oklahoma State University.

Craig Whitaker (’65) participated as a panelist in “Ground Zero: From Dreams and Scenarios to Reality,” a discussion held at the Library of Congress on November 1, 2002. Organized by the Center for Architecture, Design, and Engineering, in association with Architectural Record, the panel addressed the continuing develop- ment and direction of proposals for the World Trade Center Site.

David Childs (’67), design partner at Skid- more Owings & Merrill, has been appointed to the U.S. Fine Arts Commission, in Washington, D.C. His design for the Small Arms Trade Treaty Center 7 will begin construction soon.

1970s

David M. Schwarz (’74), of David M. Schwarz Architectural Services, in Washington, D.C., has completed the Yale University Environmental Sciences Center, a 100,000-square-foot multi-disciplinary academic research and archival building for five departments. The National Cowboy Hall of Fame, a new museum hon- oring women of the American West, has opened in Fort Worth, Texas, and the American Airlines Center, an 85,000-square-foot civic arena and sports facility, was completed in Dallas. The firm has been retained to design the Nashville Symphony Center Hall, in downtown Nashville, which is scheduled to open in the fall of 2006.

Calvert Bowie (’77), with his firm Bowie Giddens Architects in Nashville, is currently designing the Nashville Symphony Center Hall, in downtown Nashville, which is scheduled to open in the fall of 2006.

1980s

Alexander Gorlin (’83), of Alexander Gorlin Architects, has won one of three awards given in memory of his father, whose stone and glass house in the Rockey Mountains. His winning entry for an int- national design competition for a new piano, sponsored by Piano Max, was exhibited in Florida in 1983. Gorlin was invited by architect critic Herbert Muschamp to participate in the proposed schemes for Lower Manhattan, published in the New York Times Magazine (September 9, 2002).

Danielle Holt Voth (’88), partner of Voth Shumaker Architects Inc., in Minot, North Dakota, has been named campus architect for the Millbrook School, in Katonah, New York. The firm has completed the renovation of the Moore College of Art & Design, in Philadelphia, and has been retained by the Lawrenswell School, Lawrenswell, New Jersey, to establish a standards program for campus improvements. Her firm was hon- ored by the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia, Preservation Pennsylvania, and the AIA Philadelphia for the renovation and addition of the foot of Frank Furness’s Centennial Bank Building as the Paul Peck Alumni Center for Drexel University and its renovation of the PHNOS Memorial Hall for West Chester University in Pennsylvania. Holt Voth is a juror for AIA awards programs and senior level architec- tural design for Bryan Adams College’s Growth and Structure of Cities program.

Arons Botsky (’88), director of the Netherlands Architecture Institute in Rotterdam, participated in the symposium with Jeff Kipnis and Joe Rota about cura- tional trends in architecture and design at the UCLA Department of Architecture and Urban Design last October. With Kipnis, he was a co-curator of the exhibition on a companion installation at UCLA. In addition, Botsky edits the publication of the Architecture/Schweitzer/Argyros/Coveney for Building (L’Arcadian), 2002.

Bruce Becker (’84), of Becker and Becker Associates in New York City, has won a 2001 Connecticut AIA Award for the preservation and adaptive reuse of the historic Brunswick School building in Connecticut to provide supportive hous- ing. The firm is designing and developing a two-story housing development for the Warwick Hotel redevelopment in Norwich, Connecticut, with 30 affordable housing units in a historic landmark; and the Octagon Park Apartments on Roosevelt Island, Manhattan, with 500 new housing units.

Scott Merritt (’66), of Merritt and Pastor Architects in Vero Beach, Florida, has won a 2002 Award for Excellence in Architecture for his sensitive design of the West Palm Beach Public Library. For the Seaside Chapel in Seaside, Florida, he received a Florida State AIA Award and a 2002 American Architecture Award from the Chicago Athenaeum. Merritt’s current commissions include the D. Ponte Federal Courthouse and an addition to the School of Architecture at the University of Miami, with Leon Krier.

Robert Bostwick (’80), of Cotene Gordon Bancroft Architects in Cleveland, Ohio, has completed the Cedar Point Center Park in Finale College, the Cleveland State University. The two-story, 30,000-square- foot building features an open-plan-concept classroom, a 450-seat auditorium, and conference rooms.

Lise Anne Couture (’88), of Asymptote in New York, completed Hydrophob, an exhibition pavilion in Haarlemmermeer, the Netherlands, which was featured in Architectural Record (November 2002). The metal-clad structure perched “on the edge of the station, where you would have to take about five steps” was inspired by the chimney stack and the nearby Schipol airport.

Christopher Cox (’87), vice president of Arconitectonica and managing director and founding principal of Los Angeles-based office, is designing the Mission Bay, a residential, 10-story, 279-unit apartment building in San Francisco, and the Manual Arts Elementary School #3, a prototype for the Los Angeles Unified School District.

Douglas Goroff (’87) served a visiting director of the School for Architecture at the University of Minos at Chicago, from fall 2001 to January 2003, and was just promoted to full professor. He is a full professor of the School of Architecture at the University of Wisconsin, which features a curricular structure for architecture that includes digital technol- ogy. Goroff Architects will also design and build a temporary structure in the plaza above the Renaissance Center, in Chicago, to open in the spring.

Raymond Ryan (’71), lecturer at University College Dublin, has been appointed Curator of the National Architectural Heritage in Pittsburgh. His contributions to the rebuilt, building Patmos, about Har-Vin Fiddler ( Yale MFA ’80), will be published in April (Stephen David Editions, New York).

Anthony Markese (1988) has been promot- ed to a new position in the Office of Queens, in New Haven. Since joining the firm he has led the design for the 550,000-square-foot CAREERS Headquarters Company, in San- ramarco, as well as the Colgate University Case Library and Information Technology Center, in Hamilton, New York.

Claire Weisz (199) and Mark Yoes (199), of Weisz and Yoes in New York, were fea- tured in the New York Times (October 31, 2002) for their renovation of a State, a bi- llard’s lounge in Queens, which was noted for its innovative use of materials.

1990s

Douglas Mcrthos (199), with his firm Mcrthos Mcrthos, has won two design awards: Paneras, a new night- club in Paris, was awarded a 2001 AIA Award of Honor from the American AIA for its reuse of the 1935 bus building; and a new 213-foot-tall, 18-story foot tower urban town-house renovation, receiv- ed an AIA Award of Honor and an M-Award from the Masonic Institute of Michigan, for its creative use of industrial materials.

Clayton Miller (90) was recently promot- ed to senior associate at Polkate Partners Architects, in New York.

Robin Elmhurst Oster (1990), of EDI/Elmhurst Oster Architect in New York, was featured in Interior Design (October 2002) for her renovation in Southampton, New York.

Perle Delson (192) and Maitland Jones (192) were featured in New York magazine (October 2002) for the renovation of their 1904 Brooklyn home, formerly both a combination home and office, is now the principal at Delon & Sherman Architects, and Jones is a partner at Deborah Beke & Associates Architects, in New York.

Alina Dowski (93) exhibited her work in a solo show at the AIA Gallery, in New Orleans, and featured in the Architectural Record (April 2003) for her project for a “Luminous Fields,” was featured in an arti- cle by Harriet Senie entitled, “Road Work: Reconfiguring the American Highway,” in Public Art Review (spring/summer 2003).

Johannes Marinus Knoop (95) has received an Unsalt award from the Dutch Government, and the Boston Society of Architects for their contribution to the Urban Art School #5, a prototype for the Los Angeles Unified School District.
**Apollon Space Architecture Takes Flight**

For the World Space Congress 2009, held in Houston this fall, Constance Adams (99), organized a major conference focusing on issues and design proposals for space habitats. The event was held at the Ballroom at the Hilton Americas Hotel in Houston, Texas. The conference was successful in bringing together architects, scientists, and engineers to discuss the latest developments in space architecture and construction. Adams was the driving force behind the conference, which was held at the Hilton Americas Hotel in Houston, Texas. The conference was successful in bringing together architects, scientists, and engineers to discuss the latest developments in space architecture and construction. Adams was the driving force behind the conference, which was held at the Hilton Americas Hotel in Houston, Texas.

In her keynote address, Adams emphasized the importance of creating sustainable and efficient space habitats. She highlighted the need for innovative and creative solutions to the challenges of space architecture, such as the development of new materials and construction techniques. Adams also discussed the importance of involving a diverse group of stakeholders in the design process, including engineers, architects, and scientists. The conference featured a wide range of presentations and discussions on various aspects of space architecture, including design, construction, and sustainability.

**Historical Background**

The interest in space architecture has been growing in recent years, driven by the increasing number of private and governmental space missions. The demand for sustainable and efficient space habitats has also been fueled by the increasing cost of space missions. As a result, there has been a significant increase in the number of conferences and events dedicated to space architecture, such as the World Space Congress. The conference was attended by architects, scientists, and engineers from around the world, who shared their latest developments and ideas in the field.

**Future Directions**

Adams emphasized the importance of continued research and development in space architecture. She highlighted the potential of space architecture to provide solutions to problems on Earth, such as the need for sustainable and efficient design solutions. She also emphasized the importance of involving a diverse group of stakeholders in the design process, including engineers, architects, and scientists. The conference featured a wide range of presentations and discussions on various aspects of space architecture, including design, construction, and sustainability.

**Conclusion**

The World Space Congress 2009 was a successful event that brought together architects, scientists, and engineers to discuss the latest developments in space architecture. The conference was held at the Hilton Americas Hotel in Houston, Texas, and was attended by architects, scientists, and engineers from around the world. The conference featured a wide range of presentations and discussions on various aspects of space architecture, including design, construction, and sustainability. The conference was a significant step forward in the field of space architecture, and it has paved the way for continued research and development in this exciting field.
Lectures
January
Monday, January 13, 4:45 p.m.
My Architect
A film by Catharine Kohn about her father

Monday, January 20
Leslie Robertson (Lindon Smith Lecturer)
"Structural Concepts for Tall Buildings from the World Trade Center to the Shanghai World Financial Center"

Tuesday, January 28
James Winos
"Environmental Thinking *

January, Thursday, January 30
Sculpting Cities

February
Monday, February 3
W. J. Alex
"Working With the Public"

February, Monday, February 10
Lizel Cohen
"The Landscape of Mass Consumption"

February, Thursday, February 13
Brian Toole
"Boyénd Mitsubishi: The New Parisian Landscape Project *

Monday, February 17
"Building the Transparent City"
"The Landscape of Mass Consumption"

Thursday, February 20, 5:30 p.m.
Richard Barna (B.F.A. ’82, M.F.A. ’94)
"Origami"
McNet Lecture Hall, Yale Art Gallery
Reservations required.
Kathleen Dejnigle@yale.edu

Friday, February 21, 5:30 p.m.
James Pollock (’95)
"Sculpting Cities"

February, Thursday, February 27
Peter Lutz
"Gender, Landscapes *"

March
Monday, March 25
Peter Waker, Timothy E. Lenahan Lecturer
"The Material Landscape *

Thursday, March 28
Ken Smith
"The Harlem Landscape *

Monday, March 31
Roger Barstow, Brendan Gill Lecturer
"The Architecture of a New Movement: In Search of a New Architecture"
Andrews Hall, Yale Art Gallery

April
The next three lectures are held in the New Haven CT 06520-8242

Thursday, April 3
Oliver Holt
"The Terrain and Billy Twain: The Young"

Monday, April 7
Barbara Freeman
"The Architecture of the Cuban Revolution"

Thursday, April 10
James Scott Gourley
"Hedonic Base"

April, Monday, April 11
Edward Oakley, Paul Rudolph Lecture
"Constructs of the Future"

Symposium
"Local Sites of Global Practice: Modernism and the Middle East Symposium"
Akin Adesewo, Neer Alayesi, Gulam Bajwa, Magnus Bergsholm, Sabir Buzdaghian, Lyle Dibb, Harris Udoin, Khan, Brian McLaren, Ada Kham Meahan, Jafar Munaf, Alan Nabil Shivan, Khalil Sair, Ihab Skyrmoe, Anke Reif, Whorton, and Owain Owain Kraft

Friday, April 4, 3:15 p.m. to Saturday, April 5, 6:30 p.m.
Hastings Hall, A & A Building
The symposium is free of charge, but reservations are required: 203-432-2889 or at jennifer.caslin@yale.edu

Keynotes by:
"Local Sites of Global Practice"
Friday, April 4, 3:15 p.m.
Neer Alayesi, Berkeley, University
"Manufacturing Heritage: Consuming Tradition"
Saturday, April 5, 6:30 p.m.
Third annual Ruth Sydney Lecture
Addressed: Architecture, Yale University
"The Circulation of Forms"

"Part of "Landscapes for Cities" series"

Lectures are held in Hastings Hall at 6:30 p.m.