Sir Stuart Lipton, the 2006 Edward Bass Fellow in Architecture at Yale, is chief executive of Stoneham PLC and has been a commercial developer since the 1980s. He was chairman of London’s Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment from 1999-2002. Lipton will teach a studio with architect Lord Richard Rogers (‘82), founder of the Richard Rogers Partnership, who is the Chief Advisor on architecture and urbanism to the Mayor of London and has just completed the 10 million-square-foot Madrid airport, and for the first time is working on projects in New York City. They will be joined by engineer Christopher Wise, a founding partner of Expedition Engineering and who will share the Davenport chair with Richard Rogers. Nina Rappaport discussed with them their past collaborations and experiences with urban revitalization projects as well as issues surrounding Stratford, England, the site of the studio project.

Nina Rappaport: How have you worked with developers in the past, and how do you find that work in terms of your design and expertise? How have those relationships developed?

Richard Rogers: In the late 1970s/early 1980s, after we had finished the Pompidou Center and had begun Lloyd’s of London, Stuart Lipton approached us with an amazing scheme to do a mixed-use development along the south bank of the Thames. He was near the Festival Hall and National Theater. It was the Coin Street development, which included a 15-story gallery starting at Waterloo Station and linking the South Bank cultural area to the north bank with a pedestrian bridge across the Thames, and it consisted of offices, retail shops, and dwellings. It was an amazing experience: the first scheme had already been turned down, so we did another that was called in for public inquiry.

Stuart put together a brilliant team of consultants, each of whom were full of ideas and have since become friends. It included engineers, lawyers, landscape architects, and retail, housing, and office experts. Whatever I have the chance, I return to those same people. It was a very dynamic exchange that has informed our subsequent experience. We didn’t always agree, but we had strong discussions. That is an ideal situation: where you have a developer who is full of ideas, who will listen to you; we listen to him, and somehow, out of the soup, something is created. Although the project was never built, it was still a catalyst that has stimulated later work. For a good project, 50 percent of its success is because of the relationship between architect and client. Whether it is Lloyd’s of London, the Pompidou Center, or Chiswick Park, which we are building for Stuart, in the end it is all about the relationship, even on the personal level. The paint of contact might not always be the chairman of the company, but it is critical to realize and acknowledge that you can’t play table tennis on your own.

NRF: Do you see a difference when you are working with a cultural client versus a developer whose bottom line is what matters versus design? And can more design be incorporated into a project when it is a public one versus a private development?

IR: There is a difference between clients—public and private, cultural and corporate. Many developers want to build last year’s building. This is a problem, because they will want the building core to be designed by a core specialist, the developer specifies the ascendent distance between the core and the external wall and the architect can end up merely changing the color of the wrapper around the building.

Having said that, Chiswick Business Park, where Stuart Lipton is the main client, is really a resistance as far as business parks are concerned, because as a result it is a large park enclosed by a cluster of office buildings, and behind the office buildings are the car parks. I wouldn’t say that the idea to put cars around the edges in mine or Stuart’s—it came out naturally in our discussion while we looked at the pedestrian traffic flows and the views from the building and the nature of public spaces. This has allowed us to do an amazing public space. So in that sense Stuart is an ideal client, with vision and experience.

Stuart Lipton: The brief to Richard was to redevelop the Greenwich area in a modern vernacular. We knew from experience at Stockley Park, a 1980s business park we had developed, that the old idea of buildings in a landscape standing apart from one another was outdated. People enjoy one another’s company, so the brief was to place the buildings close together in a street, giving each building on the site equal prominence to ensure equal land values. Richard and his team produced an elegant plan that cleverly utilized the site to form a strong identity.

NRF: For this second Yale studio about the developer and the architect, the idea of collaboration seems to be even more apparent since you have already worked together. How will you direct the project for the studio and what is the value for the students to focus on East Stratford, in London, near the 2012 Olympics, as the site?

SL: Each of us has strong views about urban needs. This project for Stratford is an opportunity for us to think collaboratively about a mixed-use solution that can act as a magnet to regenerate a very run-down piece of the city—which could be any city. Stratford has a wonderful transportation network, but it has been neglected for a century. The project has the potential for bringing together the community, which is very diverse. Most particularly, it offers us an opportunity to produce architecture and public space for the twenty-first century as a team. Figuring out how the activities and the uses overlap will be an interesting target. How do we build mixed-use areas for the twenty-first century? How do we take into account social and civic issues such as livability, crime, health, and education? How do we improve the quality of life by creating a place that is quite wonderful? It is interesting to look at what we tried to do twenty-five years ago for Coin Street. The mixed-use aspects there, the life and activities, are absolutely relevant— it could have been yesterday.

IR: To me, this project for Yale students is a valuable exercise because of the nature of the development and the complexity of the situation. The Thames Gateway will have one million people moving into an area the size of the city of Manchester. The Mayor of London would like to see us become a real piece of London rather than a series of new towns or suburban sprawl.
The complexity has to do with integrating this new city into the area around it. How does it both strengthen the existing neighborhood and simultaneously draw people inward? Making that life is one of the more difficult tasks, as well as giving the place a real heart, at not only the micro-level but local terms of commerce, leisure, and so on.  

As to the East Stratford area, the critical part is to be able to bridge the different levels of the city: you connect the upper town and lower town, lower the barrier to the interesting design problem. There is a fantastic amount of water and marshlands and there is danger of flooding. The Thames Gateway Barrier was supposed to last for one hundred years but is now just going to last for twenty. It is a serious problem. East Stratford sits on the northwest of the Thames Gateway, so it has a commanding and important position. Our hope is to achieve something dynamic between developer, users, and professionals.

Chris Wise: Stratford presents key issues, for the profession in a broader sense, which is how to engineer institutional systems. The most fascinating ones are those that we occupy all the time. The reason I am interested in Stratford is because it is a test. We can conduct an experiment at Yale to see how robust those systems are and whether we can establish a hierarchy. This is so that we can help ourselves, as much as the students, to understand how to make something that is not only okay on the day you build it but also will function well in the future. To my mind, that is an institutional system that can grow and develop over time, but the roots are quite strong. It is a question of how to identify the roots and understand how the system might grow.

NR: How do you build architecture and public space for the twenty-first century with systems, roots, and flexibility to adapt to change? What is the mechanism for both in flexibility?

SL: First, you must build decent buildings. In the world we live in, buildings are going to change in use. When we discussed mixed uses, the buildings change from offices to apartments, and that is the way of the future.

RR: The way we live today is completely different from the past. The past, the twentieth century, has freed us from the space of the office—we can take work home, which means that live/work/leisure realms are not so clearly defined. We are now trying to weld together and overlap activities that were once poor, young, and old, single and married, everyone and everything. In order to create an inclusive society: buildings and public activities have to reflect these requirements. Buildings are the shapers for those activities, so you have to ask, “How do you integrate these different experiences?” the right way and also have a certain amount of flexibility, knowing that it is all going to change. That is the question. The other one is: “Is that what we want to do and are we going to change it in the next years?”

CW: There has been a real change in the way people use technology in the past five years. Today more and more people are happening faster and faster. And we are right in the thick of the digital age. In the old days you could spend what you wanted without thinking, but it was difficult to ground your supposition in any data, without creating a profile. We can test scenarios of complicated interrelationships that we couldn’t just a few years ago. This is commonly done in big engineering projects and the financial world, but maybe we’ve also arrived at an all-than-a-single-moment. We’re going to travel through the lifestyle will be much more Hito-Per-Perceived. Environmental needs are going to be quite different, depending on who you are. We will meet single or a member of a family. Living conditions are different, and different with us living in a wasteful environment where energy is considered only the least part of the people’s life, and leisure is likely to be a product of habits and interests going up as from the general world we live in and create buildings that are more specific and retains individuality. This is in a 15-foot ceiling, where you can have a mechanism for an office and a live/work space. Someone else might want an apartment that could easily be adapted for your life. The city’s lifestyle has changed.

Demographics change often. Our experience is that development and demographic is not related. The other side of this is that lifestyle changes will reflect the fact that buildings are visually more temporary in nature than they used to be. We are used to making buildings with short life cycles, and science now lead us to expect the same. However, the elements of the building are usable in the longer term, but as technology changes we know that buildings will be completely different. There will be new technical moved that might be energy-generating rather than energy-demanding. And the lifestyles of the people living and working inside will be completely different; they may even have the same chips in their bodies, just in their computers.

That is a relativity on the 9—5 style, structure, services, status, and systems—has a shorter and shorter life cycle, but the longer-lived ones, like, site, stay forever. We intend to design the project so that students can look at the individual nature of buildings in the way Stuart is describing. As they get a greater understanding of how they work on their own, the students will learn how the buildings relate to community and how to make a sustainable community. This means considering the site’s multiple facets, not only with regard to energy and its built fabric but also its destructibility and livability quotient—how to make people want to live there, stay there, and dedicate their lives there. So the objective is making a place sustainable as much as it is making buildings sustainable.

SL: Absolutely. That is why my big drive in a social environment is the environment of quality; life is a number-one agenda for people today. I look to a return to the town square, a mix of uses with social cohesion in an uplifting holistic environment that will counteract crime. It will encourage better health by being safe and enjoyable so that people will work.

RR: I have some doubts that we will be tailoring environments in response to specific needs. Of course in some areas you will be designing specific buildings, but the well-served space is flexible remains a predominant factor and concern. I am a little less convinced that things will change that quickly as long as you can change the mechanical parts, which have a short life, but a lot of the plugging-in of services will be to exist structures.

We need to understand that cost and value are totally separate issues—that is where we often get lost in discussions about sustainability. Sustainability is about

NR: And what about the role of cultural projects in the development process, especially in terms of a large-scale urban revitalization project? How can public/private partnerships be more successful?

CW: Often politicians are not well-informed, and cultural projects tend to fall into a void. If you look at the Jacobs Center, New York, which we are working on with Richard, it is a similar story. They need to be part of the bigger picture and they are not.

SL: I have a passion for cultural buildings. Twenty years ago, Sir Nicholas Barcza, then director of the Whitechapel Art Gallery and now director of the Tate, asked me to help him with a renovation. Since then, I have been involved with Bob Venturi on the National Gallery, Herzog & De Meuron on the Tate Modern, and Dixon-Jones on the Royal Opera House. Perhaps this type of transformation, such as in Bilbao, was started with projects such as the Sydney Opera House. Civic buildings generate value for everyone as they add to society and businesses.

RR: It is interesting to look at Barcelona, which is the best example of a major regeneration project in Europe. It has had three mayors who have worked with a clear urban and social vision closely together with a small group of architects continuously over twenty years. If you look at Ground Zero, on the other hand, it is the most embarrassing story—not because architects or engineers have failed but because of a complete lack of political will. No one is taking leadership or thinking about quality, and the net result is that we have nothing to show for it. It should be a sustainable place that lives forward as the future as well as taking on the needs of the community. This could be the great contemporary urban place in New York.

Sunil Baid, from Studio SUMO in New York, is teaching an advanced studio as the Kate Wallace Allen Professor at Yale in the spring semester. He also gave the Lecture “Fold, Cross, and Tear: Ailing Perforation” on January 19, 2006. Nina Rappaport met with Baid to discuss his current work and interests.

Nina Rappaport: How did you jump from small-scale projects in New York to the large-scale business school project just completed at the Josiah International University in Japan? It is interesting that quite a few other New York architects, such as James Stewart Polshek and Steven Holl, did their first major buildings in Japan in the 1980s and 1990s.

Sunil Baid: After my partner, Yolande Daniels, and I gave a lecture at Josiah International University, we were asked to develop ideas for two tiny sites near the campus, but those didn’t happen, so the university asked us also to look at a much larger site for a new business school at the other campus. We were requested to develop a proposal, even though we had very little to go on programmatically. I had worked for Antoine Predock years before on comparable projects, so scale wasn’t as daunting as the issue of how something gets built in Japan and learning ways of interacting with people from different building and design culture.

NR: What was your approach to the design of your project? Was it driven by the logic of the figured out? Did they give you free rein?

SB: The clients wanted a building that was very contextual and experience it seems that the architect in Japan is given more responsibility in almost every aspect of the project, even in accommodating it. We started with an assumed and the type of architectural spaces: offices, classrooms, two auditoriums, and a 100-meter square teacher’s lounge for a concrete column/tributary system. Without much to go on in forming interior programmatic realities, we asked what kind of architectural object would organize the exterior part of this disorganized edge of the campus. As a result, probably the most interesting spatial experience of the building is outside of it and slipping through and inhabiting the external spaces that it is to organize. Sectionally, the first-floor slab lifts up to allow this slippery. The public spaces on the first two floors that conform to the landscape median between the different elevations shift of the site, connecting the building to the hillside. This also forms the base of the three-story classroom building, which is a single-loaded corridor; its 500-foot length winds back on itself in a J-shape. There is a difference in the materials used on the two sides of the building, as in the canyon of Nan, there is similarity of Flou-Flop, but this is a high-tech approach to design for New York public buildings. This is in keeping with the idea of a city that is not only about high-tech, Richard Rogers’, the Smithsons’, and the plug-in houses in Glenn Brown. More is yours about found technologies than of new or futuristic ones. The Skinny House isn’t really about the body of the space to the body in Mini-Max as different from that of Flou-Flop. Is there some other version of the relationship to the body in Mini-Max that is different from that of Mini-Max? Is there some other version of the relationship to the body in Mini-Max that is different from that of Mini-Max?

SB: Flou-Flop had a more direct relationship to the body, the body having to conform to the manipulated found objects, and it was the presence of the manipulations that constrained the form of the Mini-Max or a bit more about technologically looking at the environment rather than being “high tech”, as you say. Flou-Flop was based on “off the shelf” or “off the Grid” in how it is made and in what it contains. But the process of making and acquiring these “shelf” items still has to be coordinated for development so it is feasible.

NR: Do you think about similar issues with your recent art gallery spaces, both of which are renovations. One for the Museum of African Art’s (MMA) temporary space in Long Island City, and another for the Museum of Contemporary African Diasporan Arts (MoCADA)—wide gallery/lofts spaces without the orientation of objects. Is the white-box gallery something that you have considered?

SB: It has been interesting to take on the question of the white-box gallery for these two clients. We are not fighting it. We are not fighting it. The white-box gallery is a low-budget renovation. It is a square foot, so they couldn’t afford new walls. We used construction fencing and other economical materials for finished surfaces in the lobby/studios, and a system of cables for hanging artwork. In the gallery space, it is important to note that this is an art space, while it is not necessarily a “neutral” color but one associated in some of these cultures, with concepts as extreme as death. African art does question our assumptions about neutrality, and as an institution the Museum for African Art has historically recontextualized notions of display. Our orientation was really more focused on how to address and project the temporality and transience of this institutional space.

MoCADA is an interdisciplinary organization in Bedford-Stuyvesant, but it is moving into a new space in the old Macy’s department store next to the Brooklyn Museum. It has been an art space for its community and is now growing into a space for the art community, mostly a political challenge to balance these two institutional aspirations. One of the increasingly defined by another community is a space, but rather than identify it as aesthetic specificity to the African diaspora, we focused on the notion of diaspora itself and how the spatial mapping of the (usually forced) migration and scattering of the people of a continent might be communicative while also having its own spatial or tectonic integrity in a map that we designed for the lobby space.

NR: Would that be considered the narrative of the architecture that you have developed with your research on Brazil and the historical work on politics and power? If narrative is the work, then this is political, realism has more potency in regard to sociopolitical and economic issues—so would you say that narrative in architecture is the process of telling the story by an ironic comparison between Flou-Flop and the components in Mini-Max, but how does your research into the relationship of the body to the space in Mini-Max as different from that of Flou-Flop? Is there some other version of the relationship to the body in Mini-Max that is different from that of Flou-Flop?

SB: I’ve been looking at the theologies—that is, what are the means to frame the architecture, culturally and politically. Instead of architecture shaping identity, it examines the implications of architecture. Of course, buildings and narratives—having very different kinds of presence in our physical and psychological worlds—can and do become disaggregated from each other or institutionalize new roles.

NR: Are you conscious of making narrative in your own work so that projects tell a story about another time and place or is it just a separate aspect of your research and writing?

SB: Narrative is sometimes in our architecture, but it is not direct and is not something we feel entirely comfortable with. One recent project is an investigation of an architectural typology of the Shotgun House in Houston’s Third Ward, for an installation which looked to narrative to show that there was something there that hadn’t been there before in order to acknowledge an anearue. The Shotgun House has been traced back to African dwellings as a vernacular that became slave dwellings or housetops for the poor over here. So how do we work with it so that the house tells its own story? It is also an architectural history that has been marginalized, so the only way we could look at it was through narrative. And we found amazing stories about the domestic lives of slaves and wrote them on the surfaces, giving the words a material quality through surface and shadow to architecturize the narrative, rather than make a narrative or signifying architecture. It is interesting to contrast African art’s relation to narrative and the Western canon’s move toward abstraction, much prompted by its own abstract reading of African art that was itself imbedded with meanings indescribable to Western cultures. So the role of art has been all too easily eroded in the quest for a pure aesthetic.

Regarding the interest in these narratives of yours, in narrative, insertions, and political potential for architectural work to be incorporated into your studio at Yale?

SB: The dynamics of my interest in the power of architecture to express its potential and the political power have changed considerably in my work. One thing that is fact that globalization is talked about in terms of corporate brand names as much as nation-states. The Yale studio will examine some of these issues from the point of view of our institution, the World Social Forum. This group attempts to work in ways antithetical to the goal of centering power by advocating for issues resulting from the underside of globalization and by working polycentrically and nonhierarchically in an office in São Paulo. The city has an amazing architectural history, and I thought it would be interesting to explore an architecture site there that organizes and advocates, not by the UN model, but from a Baian perspective. Package is still about making decentralized strategic networks. The hope is to explore the spatial and political relationship between architecture and power beyond national or corporate monumentalism.

Amy Alyeldeh, critic at the School of Architecture, interviewed Bishop Voting Professor Will Bruder about his recent shift in practice and outlook on the built environment.

Amy Alyeldeh: You had a reputation for being a midwestern architect, then came over to Arizona, and you are now working on the campus of the University of Arizona. What brought you here?

Will Bruder: It was a pragmatic Midwestern kid with a great railroad project who got into making industrial design objects. These were wooden objects like a little car. I was sculpting them in clay and cnc'ming them in wood—literally, laminated mahogany— doing the whole hundreds of objects to get to what the car might be. It was on such a large scale that it required both design and hands-on sculpting. I won the regional prize, and it took me on my first big journey as a young man. I was sixteen in that August of 1963. Back then, when we won a GM regional award, they flew you to Detroit for a week as their guest, so I was also exposed to Saarinen's General Motors Technical Center in Warren, Michigan. I smiled at Yale's Saarinen conference last year, because I had walked those halls as a young man, not having a clue. At that point in my life, that was a dream: to go to the Tech Center and become a great industrial designer. GM was sort of my stepping stone. I was sponsored by Fisher Body Plant, and, after seven months, I determined industrial objects were not what I wanted to produce—either as an artist or a designer. Well, I don't know if I knew the error at that point. I just told my parents that this wasn't it. And I went on and started talking to architects, because that was a design thing.

AL: So it was then that you knew that it was architecture for you?

WB: Yes, and today my latest sandbox is a 12,000-acre site, which is the entry portal to the city of Phoenix. It is a 28-square-mile void, which is coming from the Indian reservation to the city. It is a chance to create the portal image of the fifth-largest city in America. Housing is squeezing, but not for that. What Phoenix does not need is another sativa community of the worst kind. But it really could use a 28-foot arche on the site that allows for the landing of 747s. That's the ability for corporate headquarters and manufacturing facilities to have sustainability. But what the hell do you call it? It's not Phoenix, Arizona leading in solar energy?

About halfway between Phoenix and Tucson you can be on the freeway and, suddenly, you drive through a pecan orchard that has now become quite mature. It's this profound thing. You're coming through the land and suddenly you are in this unbelievably open and vast grove of pecan trees. And it just takes your breath away, because it's such a contrast. And with that as an inspiration, wouldn't it be interesting to have the edge of Phoenix emerge like a mirror on, the sky, the sky, the lid of our city? Coming from raw desert suddenly into and under a trellis or grove, maybe two miles square, of photovoltaic collectors on racks that become the architecture for an otherworldly sort of industrial, corporate park complex, leaving the majority of the land raw. But the portal is the journey under the lattice of photovoltaics. And these photovoltaics would power everything we would ever do in these 12,000 acres. Wouldn't that be an interesting sort of spark? The development comprises a subsidiary of Arizona Public Service, the biggest utility company in Arizona. So I put forward the solar grove idea with the president of this utility company. AL: Then, you could produce even more power for the city, because that's the thrust of Phoenix—being a keck on the desert.

WB: Exactly, so we could turn it around and do the leadership thing, because they're hoping to engage companies in Asia and Europe to bring their feed granaries to this site. We are reinvigorating the collaborative process, because we're not talking about Will Bruder doing 12,000 acres, we're talking about choreographing the architects who learned from observing Saarinen who had the proper complement of pragmatism and good teachin'-more. It was the analysis of a problem and ability to solve things in really good ways. That, along with a lot of creative skill, could take you to great successes. But it was also a process. Saarinen was moving with such velocity that he developed—really, matured—the foundation for how great architecture still really happens in collaboration. Saarinen really was the first person I knew to put the envelope with the idea of the model, the three-dimensional model as a tool to think things through. If you worked at his studio and later at Richard/Dinkloer or Pelli, it was all about making models. It was about the recognition that you couldn't read buildings just in drawings, even though Saarinen could draw like a god. Bilirakis was giving commissions at that point in his life. I see the work evolve, and those are tools that I bring to my studio every day. But I wedded to have total freedom in order not to compromise. I ended up arranging Bilirakis's wine collection, from his first job to his last. So I found all the skeletons. And I looked at those skeletons. And I never wanted to be that last position.

AL: But then you had the confidence to step away from that and find your million people in the desert. And when you got there, you gained a reputation as a maverick. But from the beginning, you were a collaborator. I mean, a lot of the projects you were making were collaborative.

WB: True, I'm the best collaborator when I'm the director of the orchestra. It's about choreographing all the buildings that you build, but the spaces in between the buildings. In trying to invent silos of authenticity, buildings can be part of that authenticity, but the spaces in between—challenging the landscape and making the structure of a city—are much more interesting to me.

AL: And you became known for a sensi- sive use of tough materials, for using, the palette of the desert in elements such as masonry and metal. But given your build- er's interest in materials and a concern in the detailing, as well as how you bring light and lightness into buildings, I wonder what kind of body you'd like you when you move to a project of 12,000 acres?

WB: Well, the sculpture background never goes me up. It is the weaving and choreo- graphy of materials where joints so often become light, when two materials come together that it is the void, rather than the connection, that makes the magic. These are lectures that continue. Everything is deserving of unique attention. Projects such as the Silverbell, the renovation of the Nevada Art Museum and the Yale Apartments, where we manipulate ordinary materials into redemption and reinvention, is my great pleasure in life. The first idea for the 12,000-acre proj- ect is a sort of elder portal. I'm thinking of the grain and texture of the memory of that person grown (she, could feel the quality of walking under a dappled forest. I think the texture and the quality of life will be totally unique, which will always hold as people look at the project and relate to it all over time. Hans Scharoun was never really respected, except by those who got to experience the work, and then the myth grew on that reality. And Alvar Aalto's ideas, too, were often missed, in that geometries can't be perceived by the camera, because you're working against perspective all the time.

When the president of the Nevada Art Museum said to me, "Thank-you so much for what you gave us," I realized it is more than what these folks had. It was the same palettes of materials, and yet it isn't—it's not $1,000 a foot—it's $200,000 a foot. It's a Midwestern thing—like to make people happy.

And yet, architecture is such a fragile thing. Isn't it funny how you remember so many quotes in your life? As a young man, I found Corbusier's comment about creation being "a patient search" as beautiful, and now I see it as wise. It doesn't come easy. Sometimes you're on, and sometimes you're not. But it's about a search and not accepting the obvious. While the idea might be there in a quick way, having the rigor and discipline to keep chasing for the answer is tough. But if you know it's the right idea, you can afford to throw it out. It works. The get improved by constant- ly trying to throw it out.

AL: I came across a 1984 interview where you were asked, "Where do you go from here?" You said, "I haven't had much of a kind of potential yet. I want to do groups of buildings, more innovative uses of materials, element more, do something fresh, thinking like use the scrap brick in the back of the brickyard. Renovated earth, and roots, bigger things, smaller things, I want to do planning, more public work, less industrial sort. Throw more. You think you know something, but you really don't know anything. I've got an awful lot to learn." How does that seem seventeen years later?

WB: If I was writing that today, the last would be a lot longer!
The exhibition Ant Farm 1968–78 was curated by Constanze Lewallen, senior curator of exhibitions for the University of California Berkeley Art Museum, and Steve Sasi, associate curator for video at the Pacific Film Archive. It was on view at Yale from August 29 to November 4, 2005.

During a lecture on the opening night of the exhibition Ant Farm 1968–1978 at the Yale Art Architecture Gallery, Curtis Schreier, Ant Farm member, was asked where he thought one might see work like the collective made today or in the future? Schreier said, “We are hoping to throw it back to you and your generation to continue these experiments.” Dean Robert Stern rose, turned to the audience, and said, “Not as long as I am dean at Yale” It was a heretical moment. And despite the dean’s generosity in bringing the Ant Farm exhibit to Yale, the exhibit highlights the divide that still exists between the experimental architecture of the 1960s and ’70s and what followed.

A larger theme in the counterculture of nomedics, constantly moving around but somehow coming out of that process.—Chip Lord

The art world—curators, patrons, critics, and the public—has never had a problem appreciating Ant Farm’s projects and innovations. Its work has been placed in gallery exhibitions by Walter Hopps, David Ross, and John Hanhardt, and the group’s Media Van project was supported by a grant from the Corcoran Gallery. Ant Farm’s Cadillac Ranch, perhaps the best-known sculpture in America, was commissioned by Spiral Jetty patron Stanley Marsh, and Stewart Brand had the group construct a 50-foot-by-50-foot inflatable pillow in the Southern California desert. The collective has also been praised by critics such as Gregory Battcock, Douglas Davis, and realist Paul Krasner. Ant Farm consciously chose not to work in the traditional architectural workshop but wanted to create projects for galleries and museum spaces, and thus pioneered in video, conceptual, and performance art.

Today it is quite common for architects to organize or curate exhibitions in gallery spaces. They have forsaken building sites for the European Kuntsmalle and spacios like New York’s Artystic Space and the Storefront for Art and Architecture, among others. Some later migrate into professional building practice with a catalog of prefab projects and a public reputation. In fact, I was once told by one of New York’s most successful architects that what he arrived in the city, one of the city’s most established architects said to me, “You will never get anywhere without it in this city.” Not wanting to owe this “patron” anything, he created exhibitions in downtown galleries before beginning his building practice. He also participated in architectural debates or public discussions in the context of a downtown gallery space that could not be done in teaching, publishing, or building practice. I suspect Ant Farm chose the world of galleries, publications, and museums for very much the same reasons, as Schraier has commented, “In 1970 and 1971 we did a lot of propositions, drawings, collages—an outpouring of a lot of things that were designed to form architectural concepts but were temporary in nature. If we had a name for a project, we would go to the printer quickly and make stationery or a rubber stamp, and suddenly it was real.

This was an architectural trail already blazed by European architecture groups like England’s Archigram, the French group Utopie, the Italian radicals such as Superstudio and Archizoom, who were featured in MOMA’s 1972 landmark exhibition, The New Domestic Landscape. The work of Ant Farm belongs firmly in this international avant-garde tradition of images and propositions coming from Europe, communicated in the journals and magazines such as Domus and Architecture and Revue to American universities during the late 1960s and early ’70s. It is the only American group of the period (although Pauola, also from Yale, made similar propositions experimentally) whose body of work can stand up to the architecture propositions of Archigram, Coop Himmelesfrau, Haus Rucker, and Superstudio. One only need look at the various (and now largely forgotten) American groups featured in Jim Gibbs’ important 1972 text, Architect: New Design Futures.

But while Ant Farm sketched with the same facility and imagination as the Europeans, they took their theoretical propositions further in at least one respect. Perhaps because the Ant Farmers are a generation younger than Archigram’s Peter Cook, Michael Webb, and Superstudio’s Adalbert Nastali, Ant Farm lived their work directly, unlike the Europeans who simply speculated on the future. Archigram, for example, always claimed that its projects were buildable, yet the great importance is bound up with its vision of a future urbanism, and its design was always primarily theoretical. Brilliant, propositional, Ant Farm took its ideas on the road. They lived and worked in their Meda Van, driving it across the United States to various architecture schools.

But what is it that ‘they built’ and how do we see it as architecture?” Chip Michael Sorkin perceptively points out in his show’s catalog that “Ant Farm’s work happily and continuously turned up to the rubric and practice of architecture.” Despite their acceptance and success in the art world, all of the members of the group worked in offices (of Philip Johnson, Charles Moore, landscape architect Lawrence Halprin, to name three) but considered their work to be primarily architectural speculations. Ant Farm founder Doug Michalski was, after all, trained at the Yale School of Architecture (1970), where he noted that “the seeds of Ant Farm were sown.” He explained that it was the interdisciplinary and collaborative spirit engendered in Paul Rudolph’s Art and Architecture Building—where all the students came together in the rooftop coffee shop in an interactive and interdispersary atmosphere—that inspired him to form the group.

In 1970–71, the collective took its “pneumatic nomadic” inflatable architecture across America in the project “Truckstop Network.” In a customized Chevrolet “Media Van” trailer, like “Lunar Rover,” they transported an “Instant City” that French historian Caroline Marionneaux called a venue for “spread- ing ideas, diffusioning information, and imag- es.” In a drawing, Archigram’s Peter Cook produced his “Instant City” drizzle hovering over the English landscape; however, Ant Farm went out and designed, lived, and worked in their “Instant City” van for four months. Schraier claimed, “The guys in Europe sharing their feet said, ‘We want freedom now. We want up! We want the all architectural abilities. We’ve got campers, plenty of gasoline. Let’s come up our camper, inflate our home. Why should we stick around with order blocks and concrete and dig holes for a founda- tion!’” Lewallen, Constanze M. and Steve Sasi, Ant Farm: 1968–1978, University of California Press, 2004, p. 55.

The original intention of the van was to create an environment, according to Schreier, that would allow one to “go into the woods and inflate an ‘Artbox,’” hang out there with your girlfriend, shaded by trees, and listen to some good music. But they were ambitious, impassioned architects and chose instead to “camp” in front of various architecture schools. They would pull up to an architecture school (including Yale, sometimes unannounced, and unfurl the “Ice-9” an erotic tail-finitie inflatable—at the entrance. Schreier would say, “See, everybody?” and create situations like performances and installations that they would videotape. In New Haven, the group created its performance piece “Horns and Headlights” in a campus parking lot. Perhaps their best-known and most distinctive building project was the 1971 House of the Century, on Moos Lake, outside of Houston, Texas, where they created a brick-and-mortar (actually ferro cement) variation of their inflatable ice-9 balloon.

The house’s interior walls have—or had, since it is currently rolling away—bucket- and-rolled upholstered coverings and hippie redwood built-like floor and table assemblies rising up out of the swampy lake. Like no other house in the world, it is both unique and typical of Ant Farm—more art-world installation or folly—bringing to mind Ant Lewallen’s house for Pierre Cardin or Andy Bly’s inhabitable concrete sculptures—than a studio-designed residence (of course, Ant Farm was the contractor-sculptor builder).

I hope Yale students who spent time at the exhibition, installed with plywood walls and outposts by exhibition director Dean Saramati—understand that although Ant Farm’s imputes were more Frederick Kiesler than Frank Lloyd Wright, they nevertheless follow the great tradition of Individualistic, anarchic, activist American architectural/artists that it is one of our most valuable contributions to the culture of architecture. So students, don’t be afraid to head in that direction and stay there if you so decide.

—William Merking

Merking is editor of Architect’s Newspaper and professor of architecture and city plan- ning at Pratt Institute. He was curator of the 1999 Archigram exhibition.
The Architectural Record's 2004 Venice Biennial of Architecture exhibitions, Transcending Type, was exhibited at Yale from November 14, 2004 to February 3, 2005.

Transcending Type, an exhibition that originated at the U.S. pavilion in the Venice Biennale of Architecture in 2004, has been adapted nicely to the Yale School of Architecture Gallery, where there is ample space to compare the models, videos, collages, and other objects presented. Curated by Robert Ry and other editors of Architectural Record, the show presents six American firms engaging common building typologies in uncommon ways. In almost every case, the disruption of type is on the level of programmatic complexity and its expression in a flexible building. There is, somewhat surprisingly, little that is unexpected, aside from the occasional flourish in presentation technique. More than anything, Transcending Type presents what one hopes is the apex in architectural design's passionate love affair with digital rendering and modeling techniques, demonstrating its propensity for morphologies and typologies to transcend typologies without really articulating a new condition for the built environment.

Two projects stand out for their use of the computer as an integrative tool, developing new approaches to design based on the computation of economic, political, or social data and producing formal objects that in some way reflect the complicated milieu of the present. "Relax-Rise," originally proposed in 1999 by KOLMC (Sultan Katan and William Macdonald, AIA), is the most interesting in this regard. It proposes an iconic urban residential skyscraper that redefines the form and scale of this new concept of flexible habitation. The undulating form of the tower is produced by creative interpretation of zoning laws and the relative desirability of views and floors and is further contorted relative to a system of flexible modular living units, which themselves expand and contract with the needs of the inhabitant or investor. Flexibility is the key here, and the model is conceived most fully with the structural frame for these contingent conditions; it is a latent structure for the realization of all sorts of habits and habitats. "Reis-Rise" is similar to the "Flex City" project for Ground Zero by Archi-Tectonics of 2001 (not in the exhibition). In both, one imagines the architects emulating Dr. No, gauding to a field of computer screens and plugging into economic, political, and cultural conditions to some sort of Ubispace, the processed data producing a universally appropriate building condition. As a whole in such ventures, the formal result appears to be much more than a function of its flexible rhetoric; indeed, KOLMC's model is so striking and elegant that there is little evidence of the purported innovation in urban planning and development from which it claims to derive. George Yu's "Shop Lift Retriving Retail" shopping center is a remarkably similar take on a typology, this time presenting a horizontal structure incorporating retail, recreation, and residential uses. The model is hard to read but shows a sense of the spatial environment that would be created by such programmatic making. Further emphasizing the premise that it shares with "Reis-Rise" (aside from the importance of a catchy title), "Shop Lift" is unabashed in developing the fantasy that innovative architectural design can get away with something in the face of unbridled economic development and an emphasis on the bottom line. If architects were in charge, Yu seems to be indicating, economic resources could be unproblematically invested in experimental forms and new models of social conditions. Design, so long after the modernist fantasies have faded, can still change the world, or at least—and this is where the pitch to the developer comes in—it can pull consumers closer to the shopping mall.

What is odd about this show is that while each participant takes on a very different building typology, in each case the possibility of "transcendence" is based in the multiplication of programs. Thus, what KOLMC's is to the residential skyscraper and George Yu's is to the shopping mall, Lewis Tsunami Lewis's (LTU) is to parking, Studio Gang's (Jerome Gang, Louis I. Kahn Assistant Visiting Professor, Fall 2005) is to the sladier, and Reiser Umemoto (RUR) is to the highway. LTU is refreshingly simple in its practical inversion of parking lots into a hybrid residential/retail/office structure, although the presentation is probably the most uninteresting in the show. Studio Gang proposes a stadium that also acts as a park and amid office towers in a high-density commercial district. In terms of programmatic mix, "Baseball in the City" is the least aggressive in the exhibition; perhaps as a result, it is the most engaging as an image of an innovative urban experience. Reiser Umemoto's video Ecstatic Planning, on the other hand, is the most formulative and egregious. It is formulative because, rather than seeing any distinction between building types and transportation infrastructure, it explicitly proposes that the highway is simply another typology that is dissolving into programmatic flexibility and morphological relationships to the cultural landscape. As a result, it doesn't transcend anything. Given the rise in gas prices, wars for oil, and the destruction of the environment in which the highway system participates, RUR's project might be said to be innovative in its ability to propose a complex vision of the future of transportation infrastructure without thinking about social, political, and economic implications in any material way.

Piedzuck Fraw's kinetic sculpture Acque Aira, Spiritual Space is an exception. Designed as a quasi-slab-specific installation relating both to the aqueous condition of Venice and the position of the sighlins in the United States pavilion at the Bien- nales, it sits a little uncomfortably in the Yale Gallery. Its situation to an architecture of open structures and experiential conditions serves as a good framework to engage the rest of the show.

If Transcending Type is code for mixing programs, there are plenty of high-end, mixed-use developments already available for analysis and exhibition. In Manhattan, SOM's Time Warner building is perhaps the most transcendent of these; a developer's dream of hotel, office, residential, and retail. Pah Clarke Pelli Architects' T31 Lexington, at the other end of 56th Street, reiterates the model. KPF's recent project for the West Side Stadium puts a slight twist on the role of architecture in this economically driven programmatic excess: its stadium, though buffered by an ability to partially transform into a convention space when not being used for athletics, justifies its allocation of public land and resources by use of a solar-power-generating skin—with the building doubles as a power plant. Something has been transcended in this project, but I don't think it is an architectural typology; perhaps it is a transcendence of the myopia on the part of the current architectural culture to see architecture as design and thus limit proposals to innovations in form.

In Transcending Type, we are dealing with the type of design sensibility that emphasizes visual explorations over material concerns—seemingly thinking that if it looks really cool it will solve some amorphous problem of urban right that no one is really worried about anyway: it morphs, it warps, it reflects the urban condition. It is a type of architectural design that aims to look like it transcends. If the projects don't actually all look the same, one project feels pretty much like the next one, bulks imagining an abstract future of the digitally rendered architectural sublime, transcending, often quite beautifully, the specifics of any material concerns facing the culture of building today.

—Daniel Barber

Barber (MED '05) is a PhD candidate at Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation and a lecturer at Yale School of Architecture.

1. Transcending Type at Yale School of Architecture, showing the KOLMC Project, 2005.
Prairie Skyscraper: Frank Lloyd Wright’s Price Tower

To mark the fiftieth anniversary of Frank Lloyd Wright’s Pritzker Prize, the Price Tower Arts Center, in Bartlesville, Oklahoma, organized the exhibition "Prairie Skyscraper" in collaboration with the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation of Scottsdale, Arizona, which will be shown at the Yale Architecture Gallery, from February 13 to May 5, 2006, in an installation designed by architect Zaha Hadid. Yale Saarinen Visiting Professor 2003-2004.

Anthony Meier noted Frank Lloyd Wright’s scholarly and professor of architecture at the University of Texas at Austin, created the "Prairie Skyscraper" exhibition that will take place at the Glenstone of Monaco Ramirez-Mortadou, curator of collections and public programs at Price Tower Arts Center. On exhibit is a comprehensive selection of the center’s collection of architectural objects and artwork related to the building, including never before exhibited Wright documents, photographs, drawings, and building components from its own buildings and from those of the American System-Built Foundation, as well as original furnishings—decks, chairs, tables, and rugs.

Adapted from the catalogue introduction by Monica Ramirez-Mortadou, curator of Collections and Public Programs at the Price Tower Arts Center.

Philip Johnson and the Constancy of Change

From February 16 to 18, 2006, the Yale School of Architecture and New York’s Museum of Modern Art will cohost the symposium "Philip Johnson and the Constancy of Change." The conference will begin at MoMA on February 16 and continue through Yale’s weekend.

Men do not know how that which is drawn in different directions harmonizes with Stahl’s harmonic structure of the world; it depends upon opposite tension like that of the bow and the lyre. —Heraklitus

Johnson, who died at the age of 89 on January 5, 1998, lived a remarkably full life. His monograph provides an illuminating perspective on the life and work of the architect. His work as an architect, as well as his advocacy for modern architecture, is reflected in his writings and drawings. His writing and drawings were instrumental in the development of modern architecture, and his influence on the field continues to be felt today.

Conference: On the Waterfront

Adjunct professor Alexander Gahan has organized a conference, "On the Waterfront," from March 31 to April 1, 2005, that will showcase the world’s rapidly changing urban waterfronts, which are increasingly becoming sites of dra-
Digitally Fabricating Future Architects

After years of sensitive planning, the Yale School of Architecture is now exploring a new class of machine-oriented design and the enormous potential of manufacturing. A rich variety of digitally based fabrication techniques are being used in elective digital design and fabrication seminars.

Yale’s approach is characterized by the cultivation of a Russian intellectual sensibility to the translation of design representation into tangible form in an atmosphere of consciousness of the artist’s role that has flourished amid the enduring dominance of modernist tenets. In looking at the implications of what became the modernist call to master the means of production, this has ultimately constituted an investigation of the possibilities of making custom-crafted architecture and has, in contemporary practice, provided the ironic result of an entrenched passion toward the emergence of standardized manufacturing processes, but with a sensitivity that has so far hardly diminished.

Over this passage, this approach has brought less从离的 wider profession awareness about how architectural components are made, which makes it generally difficult for students trained in an institutional setting to design ideas involving custom project-specific solutions in rational forms of their material realization, from either a technical or an economic perspective. As Yale, through the efforts of faculty such as Kent Bloomer, the desire to design and prototype highly original building components—whether aesthetic, structural, or otherwise functional—has always been kept very much alive. The digitally based fabrication efforts of current students and faculty continue a curricular and cultural disposition that has always embraced making. But it has allowed students to engage with this relationship to architecture in a way that has never been possible before.

The digital manipulation of materials, how they are put together, and how they are used, have allowed students to explore the possibilities of making custom-crafted architecture and has, in contemporary practice, provided the ironic result of an entrenched passion toward the emergence of standardized manufacturing processes, but with a sensitivity that has so far hardly diminished.

For Ruskin, industrial processes were only acceptable for use in furniture—fine arts, social, and craft reasons—if their products typically metal castings or rolled sections were transformed or adorned in some way with skilled craftsmanship. Ruskin also valued the hands-on creativity and intellectual interpretation of the artisan who could transform a piece of material into a building component according to a designer’s rendered representation. Mechanization’s elimination of the artisan’s role diminished both the mark of the process and its suitability for the architecture and the merit of any building that utilized manufactured products untouched by artistic hands. However, to varying extents, because they could enable automation and efficient production of bespoke components, computer-aided manufacturing methods significantly alter the industrial reality to which Ruskin objected. Artistic hands have new opportunities to intervene reasonably in a standardized world.

The most important of these opportunities does not lie in the realm of hand-based transformation or decoration of tangible manufactured form but within the realm of the digital representation from which an original architectural artifact is directly or indirectly made. The craftsperson’s integrative role is no longer necessary because machinery is largely eliminated from the representation, especially for the creation of custom designs. In other words, the precision of a representation (and subsequent the digital data extracted from it) in creative innovation is more fully defined and controlled. Indeed, the computational instructions for automated making—better known as the code directing the CNC of material-forming machines—complete design representations into tangible forms. Artistry takes place during the representation’s creation, not in the skilled interpretation of it celebrated by Ruskin. A fundamental aim of digital fabrication education at Yale is to highlight this new reality for students, weave it into the historical curricular fabric of intellectually considered hands-on materi-

Theorists and architects, and set students on a professional path that includes digital exploration into the operational parameters and creative potential of CAD/CAM. These learning experiences will enable architecture students to define themselves as digital designers and to pursue both their originality and control the crafting and construction of their designs.

—Kevin Rohe, Dean of Yale School of Architecture.
The Root of Radical

Two events were devoted to Cedric Price last fall at Columbia: the exhibition Cedric Price: The Fun Palace, from September 19 to November 11, 2005, and the symposium Cedric Price Summit, on September 21, 2005.

Would you believe that OMA's Seattle Public Library was cribbed from the past? Koolhaas explained it best during a recent interview: "I look at the new library in Seattle, maybe in a pathologically way we are trying to be Cedric Price." Commenting in an interview on the occasion of the 2004 Tate exhibition: "This was Tomlinson and the cultural legacy of the 1960s, Koolhaas adds, 'It is fascinating that [Price] is making such an incredible comeback. I'm not sure anyone really knows why. Maybe in some way he represents our guilty conscience.' Architectural nostalgics can inspire even its nemesis, as it has Columbia's School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation, which last fall hosted both an exhibition on the work and a symposium on the personality of Price, who died in 2003. Organized by Dean Mark Wigley, these events gave the students and faculty a reason to ponder the rich past of price, and its myopic world.

Columbia's focus on Price is part of an ongoing and growing exhibition of the 1960s and '70s, says Wigley, who has shown repression of and nostalgia for the past avoids burying its own past. Price arrived on the London scene in '56 with the important group exhibition This Is Tomorrow. Then in his early twenties, Price was finishing his post-Cambridge education at the Architectural Association. He then opened his own firm and bailedfriend with a cast of characters that included Reyner Banham, Buckminster Fuller, Arthur Korn, and members of Team Ten. In this mix, as Britain appraised a postindustrial Pop-colored future, Price spun what Wigley calls the 'radical dream'—a reconfigurable and interactive "multiplex" for the people of East London, a massive space-frame with endless plug-and-play activities. Widely recognized as a seminal work, a precursor to Piano and Rogers's Centre Pompidou (1971-77) and an influence on student work at the time, the design was engaged as the subject of Cedric Price: The Fun Palace, exhibited at Columbia University's Arthur Ross Gallery from September 19 to November 11, 2005.

For students acquainted with Price and Price's work through Roger Lipsey's book it appears the exhibition succeeded in a way that the conference struggled to replicate. Originally commissioned by the Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA) as part of a yearlong exploration of four architects (But of the Box 2003-4), the Fun Palace exhibition was conceived by Wigley under the in-house direction of Mirko Zardini and designed by Louise-Charlene Terriot; self-consciously historiographic, the CCA project aims "to expose the process of analyzing the architectural "object" and to question and tease at their critical interpretations. The exhibition thus presents the rigors of Price's architectural drawings in a forensic lineup with newspaper clipplings, questionnaires, and reports, all neatly sealed inside slim metallic briefcases. The curators pinned nothing down figuratively or otherwise, instead, tiny magnets effortlessly press the artifacts to their supports, leaving the installation open to modification based on new research and visitor feedback. The CCA project attempts a courageous history free of the monarchical relationships between author and subject, an alternative to the monographic exhibition that Zardini explains is "loaded with the star-system attitude and self-promotion." Wigley took the risk of erecting a monolithic figure at Columbia with an exclusive focus on Price. At the CCA, Price was neighbor to Morton Matta-Clark, Aldo Rossi, and James Stirling, enabling a dialogue between what Wigley sees as opposing tendencies, the anti-monumental and the monumental, the critical and the ideological, the rental of the role of the architect in architecture, or casting their histories in sentimental and romantic terms. Harris, the Spanish team Abacos and Herreros, for whom Price was a great mentor, was the only speaker to recall the breadth of what he called Price's "heterodox" practice, touching on the architect's battle against self-satisfaction careerism, his deep meditation on the flexibility of built form, and his concerns for ecology. With a unique take on slides, Herreros made a case for Price in the history of diagrams and architectural agitprop, showing the latter's deft efforts at representing concepts and his visualization of intangibles like the obsolescence of materials and the fluctuations of programs. Herreros also notably linked Price to a critique of globalization and its bullish homogenizing effects through notions of adaptability and restraint.

"Price was very clear when architecture would be the solution," explained Matthews, a historian whose dissertation work centered on the architect. Mathews dwelled on in the summit's implicit bias toward questions of practice and professional ethics by suggesting that if Price had his way, "the architect might be "Do no harm." He pointed out that he had once successfully petitioned the RIBA to have the right not to build. Price, who strove to empower the individual in society, can be underappreciated and not always read as "social pathogens," Mathews said.

Michael Webb, Architect member and professor at Columbia, focused on the issue of architectural image-making. Architectural visions, Herbert Muschamp divided, in the obituary he wrote for the New York Times in 2003, "celebrate an utopian gesture in which Price offered a guru. Webb added that Price's apparent affinity but made a playful effort to confuse the critic's arrow of influences: 'Cedric did everything Archigram did without the eye candy.' Webb was altogether pithy and personal, and in his words, "his tool is not the straight edge, not that with chiseling Price as something of a reactionary. "Cedric came first," Webb admitted. But the architect was in comparison to Archigram, bare-boned, designing the "mechanism by which to achieve the happy state, figurative and colorless." Price's visual rigor found its expression in color of honor. According to Webb, "Cedric's dis- claimer for the privileges of architects was almost total." In both parable and satire, Webb calculated Price's affectations by demonstrating his use of a detachable stilts collar, no doubt borrowed from his partner, actor Eleanor Bron, who was in the audience. Wigley explained, "Price was Victorin his memoirs. He was like a man who stepped into a time machine and dropped in on the twentieth century."

Although perhaps a man lost in time Price was no mere detail hound, having tried his hand at oversized projects only in his career. In his masterpiece, the Ulm, for example, and, more recently, the Tate Modern project, Wigley, in his address, "Education, Yale University, has found herself trying to Price against a backdrop of spaces like the one her studio had already seen. In this and other ways, "The formalism of the project, the culture: the idea of the architect's role in the concept of magnetostructure, the urban-scale container programmed with the diversity and adaptability of a city. Recently the magnetostructure has experienced a resurgence among critics partly in relation to Price's work but also to that of Koolhaas and more generally to issues of globalization. Esterling admits that Price is part of the "panarchistic pantheon," but, "not as a formal mentor, nor media as accou- trament, but in his way of understanding technology, as part of architecture in global expansion, explored to states of exception and enclaves of territory." Esterling makes it clear that it is not easy to see Price lurking in the "postmodern festi- val of space, form, and symbol." She asks, "Is Koolhaas Price's updating?" As a former playwright and actor, Esterling identi- fied in Price a struggle for "better perfor- mance" and a serious engagement with reality. She explained that architects have techniques to deal with their own society but relatively nothing to deal with the real. Price avoided the "tragic flaw of cynicism"—that is, being in a loop of the top," according to Esterling. By virtue of being a professional he had sufficient information to act. Indeed, Price handed out surveys while designing the Fun Palace, and as Stanley Matthews notes in a 2001 catalog, "Potters Reckit Thinketh: An Architecture of Calculated Uncertainty," Price applied some of the first computer-generated data from the Ministry of Labor on popu- lation and unemployment for one of his most theoretical projects. Through active engagement transpired into terms of active organization, Price moved architecture as Esterling so memorably put it, towards "the contribution of the hush puppy." Yet contributing an active engagement even through a lecture was difficult early on for Price. Tschumi recalled that the students' mindset to have Price lecture at the Federal Institute of Technology (ETH) in Zurich was rejected by professors. If you look at that period, Tschumi continued, it was evident that Price was a "visionary," and Tschumi benefitted from his visitors. In a deferential salute to Price's magnification, Tschumi's thesis project for the E11A—"a Xarixo-gray atmospheric array of space frames, walkways, and ramps—appeared on the screen: "I've never shown it before, because it looks so much like Cedric," he said. Tschumi recounted how Price sat his path to Stanwood Thorens. 1970s London, and the "holothous and gerrator" of the Architectural Association, as Price would call it. Tschumi emphasized that aspects of Price's work were remarkably genuine to his own, like the idea of "non-naturalist delight" as well as Price's advance on the realm of the architectural program. At that time, according to Tschumi, the Architectural Association asked students Price to give a lecture as part of the per program. This authoritarian empowerment of the architect beyond the boundaries of their profession will be seen as a simple transcription of a client-defined program, for Tschumi came from Price. He noted that Wigley was working to make Columbia the home of an "expanded architect." Tschumi believes that there is a change in the mentality of the school signaled by the Price events— "Work on mastering the computer model is shifting to a more practical, technical, and social engagement." In acknowledgment of this and recent debates at Columbia over the efficiency of the architect in the public realm, Tschumi evoked the adage that architects are not specialists; they have the power of an overview.

The power equation, as any equation for that matter, cannot be applied to Price without some imitation. Tschumi seemed to address this by quoting Koolhaas's new famous characterization: "Price is a prince in a lost cause." The exercise could be helpful to add that of the notoriety com- petition entries for the redesign of the Portland Station rail yards in 1995, Price's was the only one to eschew the magnetostructure. As Tschumi explained, "Price was the developer en travail, an attitude that has of late propelled "visionary" design. The exhibition and summit successfully celebrated Price's early work to a fault. No one noticed that Price had bailed out of his own myth.

—Alexandra De Lezio (Yale College '97) works for MESH Architects in New York City.
SAFE: Design Takes On Risk

The exhibition SAFE: Design Takes On Risk, curated by Paola Antonelli, was on display at the Museum of Modern Art in New York from October 16, 2005 to January 2, 2006.

The opate of unraveling natural and technological calamities in the twenty-first century that seem to increase in both frequency and magnitude—SARS, Katrina, Bam (Iran) and Pakistani earthquakes, and 9/11—raises serious questions about our safety, health, as well as the environment and the future of design. These unpredicted events coincide with today’s urban planning where economic concerns to the low-cost driving force for form-making—will all other performance issues reduced to afterthoughts. This is a world-wide wake-up call.

What if this approach was inverted? What if providing for a healthy context generated good urban planning, architecture, and design and could do so economically? In such a scenario, public health would be an organizing structure in the city wherein systems of transit, education, global flows, zoos (acting as sensors, i.e., West Nile virus), airports, crime-detection, bird flu, monitoring stations (registering geologi-cal and weather events) would expand the boundaries of urban health from the traditional types of hospitals, clinics, and public health facilities, into toxic waste sites and dirty highways would become what the dirty highway was to the twentieth century. These new infrastructures would be able to absorb change at the building scale while remaining dense enough to equip the environment and its inhabitants. SARS proved that the presence of examining rooms equipped with infrared thermal cameras at airports stabilized fears and helped to maintain economies of affected cities severing fallout from WHO travel restrictions. These technological advances appear in the public and shape experience but in a discontinuous way. These kinds of interventions still remain specialized, episodic, and yet to be integrated into daily life, an ascension to this begins with SAFE: Design Takes On Risk.

Organized as a visual index of the latest innovative design products for safety and survival, SAFE detailed three hundred items for this growing market and predicted the future of a new design culture concerned with decreasing risk and surviving disastrous conditions.

Chinese design students create covers, a bulletin quilted duvet, a water collection device called “Waterina,” and Shigeki Ban’s “Paper Log House” were just a few of the provocative objects on exhibit. A number of issues are an array of problems resulting from emergen-cies would overwhelm any designer, but here they served as the point of departure for a pioneering show featuring projects of individual designers, artists, and collaborative teams. Reflecting the complexity of crisis, the sampling of risk presented through the elegant objects intended to mitigate or adapt to emergencies could not have been more timely. Within display categories such as “Shelter,” “Safety,” “Property,” “Privacy,” “Emergency,” and “Awareness” questions of how to cope with unexpected risks and how to maintain environmental, cities, bodies, and minds during traumatic events emerged as guiding design challenges.

A new global competition that can be represented in SAFE have been concerned with risk, catastrophe, and survival for varying lengths of time, but all predict and prepare for a future preoccupied with a—about environments and communities subject to pandemics, weather disasters, violence, terror, and terror, as well as day-to-day accidents. As society suffers these crises, these designers propose to work through design, object by object.

Articulates our tumultuous times and new culture of anxiety through this collection of objects, prototypes, products that consistently focus on safety, primarily through material fabrication and personal responses. SAFE expounds upon her previous exhibition, Objects of Design, which sought to reflect the “lay of the land.” Each object in SAFE embodies not only the forces inherent in its fabrication and the reproposed forces of the context and use. Thus, the show frames new designusions and embodies new approaches and forms—what might be called a new “risk aesthetic.”

“The real mandate of the show is not ‘products’ rather than ‘objects,’ because the works on display are not precious. They are, in fact, cheap, durable, smooth, easy to clean, and made with innovative materials hearkening a large range from an advanced material science once out of range but now readily available to anyone. The exhibition illustrates that access to NASA-level technology and an ongoing move away from traditional forms of safety design have created a mainstream market of design products concerned with quality of life, especially universal equity of health and hygiene. Each product comes with its own expiration date, such as the clean-call disposable telephone cover and “Blizzard Survival Bag,” which is used only once.

In her 1957 essay, “Pliable Plane,” textile artist in Architecture, Anni Albers described a “felt-tined” outer in Urgo Mongola that can be disinfected in fifteen minutes.” It easy to imagine a shifting landscape of adaptable nomads surviving through their limited material inventions. In many ways, SAFE realizes Albers’ thesis with transformative products like the “Panel Air Mattress,” “Basic House,” parasitE homeless shelter, and “Urban Nomad Shelter,” which is inflatable and reusable. Lasting longer than just moments are the “Ha- or Shelters,” “Global Village Shelter,” and “Paper Log House;” when installed in multiple places, they not only re-establish individual housing but re-form communities. Shigeki Ban’s “Paper Log House,” is easily readapted to one site in Turkey from Kobe, Japan, by adjusting to local material dimensions and larger family units.

SAFE launches the necessity of a knowledge-driven design culture based on risk, safety, and emergency into the mainstream. It shows both tested designs and those yet to be realized, but it under-estimates need on a massive scale. Few of the sensual products on display could perform adequately in a large urban crisis. Denise Scott Brown’s recent observa-tions in “What Should New Orleans Do?” calls on “architects, environmentalists, and planners to rethink” the city in face of disaster by “studying it in a series of overlapping systems and disciplines of thought.” To be truly visionary, designers must accept that risk is eternally present at all scales and at all times—the future of how we design, build, and plan our cities depend on it.

—Hilary Sample

Sample is an assistant professor at Yale School of Architecture.

Frank Lloyd Wright at Heinz

As Yele mounts its Zaha Hadid-designed exhibit, Prairie Skycraper, another show with a broader view of Wright and his relationship to contemporary architecture is opening in Pittsburgh. Raymond D. Wright: Reawakening the Legacy was an display through January 16, 2006, at the Heinz Architectural Center of the Carnegie Museum of Art, where a show that ran in 1971 is in curator. Both show reawakening Wright’s work for the present and future.

When Raymond Ryan was an architecture student at Yele, Frank Lloyd Wright, he notes, was "not terribly fashionable." Nonetheless, students enjoyed Alexander Gorlin’s ’90s graduate seminar on the architect, especially because frequent guests from an older generation, such as Edgar Kaufman Jr., imparted first-hand experiences with Wright to the group. Now Ryan and his contemporaries are re-engaging Wright by considering his buildings as sites for new designs. The exhibition had its genesis in Ryan’s interest in the proposed additions and competition schemes for contemporary architects for two of Wright’s projects, the Darwin D. Martin House (1903–05), in Buffalo, New York, and the H. H. Crop Company Office Tower and Apartments (1925–26), in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Ryan’s initial inquiry led to the incorporation of current restoration efforts and ongoing historical scholarship in his exhibit.

The Heinz show displays the models and drawings of five entries for a limited design competition for the Martin House Visitor Center, including those by Brian Healy Architects (’81), Architectural Research Office, Schwartz/Silver Architects, and Office ak, Toshiko Mori won the commission with a design whose shallow, inverted roofed hip and sheared glass walls contrast notably with the other, more tectonically ambitious schemes, as well as with own Wright’s project. “How do you deal with a father figure?” Mori asked. “You can’t try to kill him or imitate him.” Indeed, Mori’s illuminated, diaphanous structure faces the Martin House in restrained aesthetic opposition.

In contrast, Zaha Hadid tackles the Price Tower with characteristically formal zeal. Her project for a low-rise expansion of the Price Tower Arts Center envisions the building as a network of interweaving and overlapping horizontal ribbons aug- menting the profile of Wright’s structure. The audacious project—all in search of construction funds—seems architecturally successful partly because its emphatic horizontality is more obviously a foil than a competitor to Wright’s rich and complex high-rise. As part of Hadid’s presentation, a floor-mounted simulacrum of the build- ing’s trapezoidal plan spelled down from the gallery wall and through multiple rooms of the exhibition. A computer-animated by-through showed Hadid’s design self-conceiving, with swirling floors, walls, and roofs moving as if it were freely spayed.

A more subtle update came from Wendy Evans Joseph Architecture, whose interior renovation of the Price Tower suites transform the former office and residential building into a boutique hotel. Joseph takes a largely kil-of-personal approaches that respond to both Wright’s design sensibilities and his small elevators. At the Martin House, Houston Louisiana Architects’ recently com- pleted pavilion is similarly rich and costly renovation, shown in photographs and construction documents documenting the ruin from which the Martin House has now been rescued.

The balance of the exhibition consisted of a profusion of original drawings, let-ters, photographs, furniture, and stained-glass windows, elucidating the nature of Wright’s relationships with Darwin Martin and H. C. Price. While devoted patrons clearly valued Wright, the show made clear that the current generation of archi-tects also holds the master in high regard.

—Charles Rosenbaum

Rosenbaum (Yele College ’73) is a critic and historian of architecture living in Pittsburgh.
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Constructs editor Nina Rappaport worked with David Hecht ('03) to curate an interdisciplinary debate on Yale graduates and affiliates as well as a few specialists in the field who have been focusing on the rebuilding of New Orleans.

Rebuilding the city of New Orleans and the Gulf Coast is an incredibly complex proposition. Far from a bland state—the modernist dream of a new city-in-waiting—it is an enormous undertaking composed of diverse political and social relationships.

Vision

Free compelling visions have emerged to guide the city's rededication. Should a large-scale planning initiative rethink the city's basic morphology? What infrastructural improvements could both help the city rebuild and prepare for future needs?

Maarten Struijs| Besides the "Genetic Infrastructure," there are secondary infrastructures: mobility, energy, information, waste, and so on. All of these have the potential to reshape New Orleans as a contemporary city. Just as with water management, designers can have a big impact on the city by shaping the secondary infrastructure systems.

Diana Balmori| Imagina rebuilding New Orleans as a water city based on a partly floating modern technology, with a new infrastructural matrix that rises and sinks with the water levels, creating channels for water, and wetlands created along the Mississippi. This partially floating urban creation will include separate entities and individuals to build on it.

David Waggonner| What city are we to rebuild? To Katrina, when composer-producer Allen Toussaint was encouraged by his son to live large and leave his modest downtown neighborhood, he countered, "Large is a spirit to me, not a place." Planning initiatives and substantive input must rise from the neighborhood level to avoid the political resistance of top-down decrees. Neighborhood ideas—from a place where people were basically satisfied with the neighborhood context as they were—need to be integrated into a unified vision of the city's future.

Robert Orr| A large-scale planning initiative to rethink the city's basic morphology would be a very bad idea. Sociologists tell us that a city is made up of myriad intricate connections between people that are cemented by repetitions evolving over time. The intimacy of these connections makes what we know about neighborhoods. To change all that would make the foreign planner a real threat to community. David Waggonner| The vision of a new New Orleans starts with what remains: pedestrian precincts, fine old buildings, much of the tree canopy, beautiful street types and boulevards, and an interesting urban pattern that shifts and skews.

Tim Culvahouse| An oddity of the city's morphology is that there is little or no commercial connection perpendicular to the river between the two sides of the streets. That is, the radial streets are largely residential. Reasoning could allow periodic commercial connections linking, say, Tchoupitoulas, Magazine, and Prytania streets, which would encourage and support the utilization of neighborhoods as centers along these streets. In particular, connections between Magazine and Tchoupitoulas could promote dense, mixed-use development along the highest ground in the city.

While an obvious strategy would be to create such links on the major avenues (Louisiana, Napoleon, etc.), the history of real-estate subdivision would suggest otherwise. These major avenues were centerpieces of subdivided plantations. The minor streets at the former plantation boundaries (Esplanade, etc.) is a good example where the grids of sectional subdivisions collapsed; the area provides richer opportunities morphologically. The convergence of not-quite-parallell radial streets and the oddly shaped lots that result suggest the potential for public moments, just as the diagonal avenues of Broadway crossing the Manhattan grid has generated commercial and transit nodes.

David Waggonner| Two other elements of a vibrant, sustainable vision need mention. First, the Port of New Orleans was the reason for the Louisiana Purchase. Its needs and opportunities for improvements should be given consideration: they will condition other land uses. Second, transit is a priority. Making the city more compact would encourage redevelopment along corridors that could incorporate a major transit system. At the regional scale, the planning mission to build a fast train line between New Orleans, Jacksonvile and Houston is in place. This system would not only put New Orleans at a commercial crossroads, but also provide a new transportation infrastructure, which separates land from water and defines the city as a vital seaport and center of trade, and wind. These projects are difficult and multidisciplinary. When architects, engineers, landowners, and designers participate and cooperate, there are wonderful opportunities for creative work on themselves. Designers can influence design decisions with a poetic approach but will succeed only when they understand all the other participating disciplines.

Water

An effective water-management strategy would provide the framework to jump-start the rebuilding. Can the city be rebuilt in a meaningful way with the existing levee system, or does it require a fundamental rethink of water management and land use?

David Waggonner| Water management in New Orleans is a continental, if not global, issue. The perspective from which one needs to address today's situation begins long ago and far upriver. Time and Water| Water can be seen as a liability or an asset. This could be New Orleans' chance to become a new kind of city, a model for cities located on rivers. Seizing the opportunity would mean going further to create a city that works with the river and its fluctuating conditions. Holland is ahead in thinking in these terms, but only as far as the technology, not the reinventing of the urban form to go with it. It could be as visionary as Venice was during a time and with luck, as beautiful.

Kimberly Brown| New Orleans is a pre-industrial city with a mysterious reputation. However, the levee system would be robust, but not to its previous level. The city needs to address the fact that some of it will (and should) be underwater in the future.

Tim Culvahouse| The pre-hurricane levee system at New Orleans was fundamental to a fundamental problem: It was an all-or-nothing enclosure. A prudent rebuilding would subdivide the city into numerous discrete cells so that a single levee break would not flood it entirely.

David Waggonner| Land must be allocated for improved levees, flood walls, and water-retention areas. Water management becomes a land use when integrated with parks and pathways. A special economic zone for urban waterfront conservation and development—incorporating the lakelike to the north with the river on the south, as well as the internal walkways and canals—might be established.

Robert Orr| In Mississippi, water solutions were sought worldwide. The prototypical low-lying and flood-prone situation in the Netherlands occupied considerable space time.

David Waggonner| Mississippi Ilassa "swamped," with side debates about water and land management, floating houses, and many similar pertinent issues. Ultimately the debate subsided because the Netherlands does not experience the same wave-velocity issues that coastal Mississippi does. However, the greater protection that New Orleans enjoys from wave velocity may pose more compelling comparisons with the Netherlands.

Maarten Struijs| In Rotterdam, we understand that the city, as both a seaport and a city, is 100 feet below sea level and surrounded by the North Sea and wind. These projects are difficult and multidisciplinary. When architects, engineers, landowners, and designers participate and cooperate, there are wonderful opportunities for creative work on themselves. Designers can influence design decisions with a poetic approach but will succeed only when they understand all the other participating disciplines.

Water and Power

Devising and implementing a water-management strategy requires cooperation between cities, parishes, and the state and the federal government. Who can take the lead in this process? And more generally, who should be in charge of rebuilding the city, and how would they be empowered?

David Waggonner| A bit of history would be helpful. The deltas of southern Louisiana began forming about 5,000 years ago, and since then the lower Mississippi River—a world-famous curvaceous surface from a like 1.4 million square miles of North America—has shifted channels multiple times. Its current channel was activated and the delta formed that created the site of New Orleans 2,000 years ago. About fifty years ago, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers constructed the Old River Control Structure to maintain the Mississippi in its present channel through the Mississippi Delta. Yet the river is not an issue that is manageable at a state or local level. Tim Culvahouse| Although one might want to imagine a single person in charge of the levee's rebuilding and management (as on the model of Florence Nightingale at Scutari), it's a stretch. The jurisdictional battle to be struck, however, should be between local interests and regional consistency—the logic behind a unified levee board.

David Waggonner| A federal government responsible to its people, occupying its new-empty seat in the world environmental community, is a fundamentally different one. A comprehensive view of water management is the responsible and effective approach. The question of who directs the city's rebuilding and the water-management measures to be deployed within the urban settlement is a different issue—one better suited to the mind-set of the architect-planner.

Leadership

In the immediate aftermath of Katrina, an absence of strong leadership exposed the deep social, economic, and political divisions that now hinder the rebuilding. Today, a void of leadership is impeding a comprehensive reconstructor effort. What form should this leadership take? Can it adequately represent the people of New Orleans? Or does real long-term planning in New Orleans require that "experts" make hard decisions that may be unpopular today?

Wade Ragas| Most of the parishes (surrounding New Orleans) are now functioning almost normally, although lists of repair needs remain. The most devastated areas in St. Bernard and Plaquemines are projected to be the last to recover, as the destruction of almost 90 percent of their housing stock. It is only in Orleans Parish that the majority of displaced residents have been able to return. Or- concrete action has occurred to allow the citi- zens and business community to take their role in rebuilding their lives. Electricity is still off in large tracts of Orleans. Plans for ten years in the future are being debated, while little progress is being made to stem the torrent of job losses.

Diana Balmori| Leadership will probably have to come from the outside, but the independent water-management body will eventually need to be empowered locally. An old argument about water management is that it leads to centralized authoritarian rule due to the need to orga- nize large geographic areas. It explained early efforts in the Eastern land, where water was scarce and critical. We ourselves have placed the manage- ment of our rivers with the U.S. Corps of Engineers, a military body. But Holland does not need a worse Everglades, and it has very good water management.

Robert Orr| Whereas the situation in Louisiana continues to digest into increasingly episodic bickering over individual entitlements and irritative finger-pointing, Mississippians have enjoyed effective leadership in Governor Haley Barbour. The governor mandated his commission to organize through consensus rather than trial and error. Unlike other "experts" making real decisions on long-term planning that may be unpopular, the governor's consensus approach has offered informed real choices by the "experts," from which citizens can make their own long-term planning decisions. The result in Mississippi has been a wide-
spread engagement of common vision with surprisingly little dissent. Tim Culvahouse: It would be worth revisiting the rise of the Vieux Carre Courir and the related preservation movement that took place in response to Robert Moses’s plan for a riverfront expressway. Much of the negative grassroots response—but it also occasioned racial and class fissures. The expressway was instead bisected through the Creole African-American community, exacerbating the Sixth Ward. One might also take care not to oppose “the people” and the “aspirants,” significant historic-preservation enterprise emerged locally in the development of the earlier French Quarter pres- servation movement, and the Vieux Carre Commission was not staffed by experts from Dallas.

Wide Rages: The citizens have a chance to take back their government through an election in April of this year. The willing- nesses of the citizens to accept the responsi- bility of electing a capable government that will have to make hard decisions and do unpopular acts in the short run to save the patient is a test for democracy in New Orleans. David Waggonner: There is no Huxleyan to lead this effort; there is no Robert Moses to force the way. One must hope that whoever leads the recon- struction efforts not only appreciates the particulars of place and people but also has the courage to direct the redesign and reinvestment for the common and future good. Leadership must come from within. How will the affected have to avert themselves? Who will stand before and behind the hard decisions about the urban footprint, neighborhoods, commu- nities, private properties, competing land uses, and the forces that must be made?

Whether a candidate’s “two Americas” message adequately encom- passes issues raised by Katrina is debat- able. New Orleans’s recovery for the past three weeks after the storm asking “Why Bush Failed” and people are asking “What if Katrina: Lessons of a National Shame” appropriately identifies our failures could be questioned. What cannot be denied is that we in America have to attend to our house. The lack of real leadership in our political culture and in New Orleans’s past, the lack of an inclusive and sustainable course, are fundamental issues.

Tragedy of the Commons

In the current absence of leadership, indi- viduals are making individual decisions about their homes and neighborhoods. An individual in Lafitte decides to rob the post office. Her neighbor down the street does not return; her next-door neighbor abandons his property, and the other neighbor site on his damaged home, neither repairing nor razing. Here, four factors—loss, lack of knowledge, lack of self-interest—drive new multiply the scenario across the city. How can we empower individuals to make local decisions without compromising large- scale goals and shared renaissance in the

current vacuum of leadership, can the city be rebuilt at a local level? Must govern- ment take the lead on these issues or can private enterprise take control?

Kimberly Brown: New Orleans was not developed by one big-business entity, and it would be detrimental to the city for it to be overturned by large developers. New Orleans’s ambience and cool intrigue lie in the fact that many individuals devel- oped it over a long period of time. Let the norms and standards get in place. If the homeowner decides to rebuild her house in Lakeview, she should. If in a few years the last nest door becomes a mechanic’s shop, it will work itself out. I am interested in some of the zones of the city turning into “O- zones,” or places of zero zoning, where the flavors of New Orleans are able to surface in new and thought-provoking ways. I am also interested in seeing parts of the city turn into “no zones,” where water is embraced and is integral to city planning. Just to note: “O-zone” was coined by the archi- tectural firm Bumpzdall, during its com- mentary on the 1999 FCOA’s competition for New York City’s Westside. I developed a No Zone this past summer for a project in Rotterdam.

David Waggonner: Louisiana lacks a planning culture. The tradition is one of individual decisions making instead of community planning. Activists too urban represent particular interests rather than broader concerns. Even the grain of neighborhoods is complex. The City Planning Commission’s map of neighborhoods indicates a city with seventy-three divisions. And those here are betting on the future, by placing and keeping the time and money on the line, they win their right to a certain way. Individual actors can be empowered to make local decisions through a reliable framework for planning and reevaluation that reinforces and reinvests neighborhoods and collections of new neighborhoods.

Maarten Struijs: When infrastructure elements, rebuilding can start from the idea of a hybrid city, a place where anybody can respond to local opportunities. And for those who don’t have opportunities, the collective—the state or the city— must offer support. Otherwise Katrina will work to destroy the power and influence of modern urban design that excludes everybody who is not wanted.

Tim Culvahouse: A model for consider- ation would be the city’s program for the improvement of tax-deferred elements, which allows or (allowed) a prospective entrepreneur owner to take possession of a delinquent property and invest its improvement as a prerequisite to rezealing ownership. The process was a reunion of resources, so on, an incentive system is much more likely to be successful than any program requiring action by the municipality.

Wide Rages: The insurance and mort- gage industry are likely to be the real decision-makers, both on the Gulf Coast and in New York. Insurers in the future cannot continue to sustain these losses. They will withdraw their product, effectively ceasing development. Once lenders experience the enormity of their losses and the taxpayer is called upon to help shoulder the load, you will see a far more conservative stance emerge on lending along the coast. This will be the beginning of the marketplace deciding where development will and will not occur.

Changing Demographics

Post-Katrina New Orleans will look extremely different demographically from the city that existed before the storm. New Orleans is going to be a smaller and more diverse city. How should planning and land-use decisions respond to these demographic shifts? Can a successful rebuilding campaign help to open New Orleans’s traditionally closed money class and modernize its social contract?

Robert Orr: New Orleans’s historic his- toric neighborhoods and renowned jazz heritage have allowed it to sleep through the bad years of urban renewal as well as the good years of urban renaissance that other American cities are beginning to experience. No one seemed to notice that the city was stagnating while others were changing, and that the moneyed class was held up in its comfortable splendor, just as full of self-interest as the “tragedy of commons.” Perhaps Katrina is the wake-up call New Orleans needs to force everybody to begin looking at both the city’s advantages and its feet dragging interfering on the latter for the benefit of the former. Daniella Balzany: Spatially, technologically, and administratively, New Orleans can be reinvented, but it will be a new city. Kennedy Jackson has described New Orleans’s social fabric as the most closed society in the United States. Is that to be reconstructed? No infrastructure, no type of urban planning alone, can solve social issues. The images we see of people left stranded in the city resembled scenes of disasters in third-world countries like Rwanda or Bangladesh. Social structure resists change. But the upheaval has been so wrenching and the dislocations so severe that economic intervention of the kind used in third-world counties to encourage individual initiatives and small businesses may provide a way to attract new people and economic activity. Imagine New Orleans as an inclusive new waker city.

David Waggonner: The ethnic mix in New Orleans has shifted often in its 300 years. While the racial underclass makes it hard for people of color to stand, the roof prob- lem we face in America is class and race. The traditional ruling class in New Orleans and beyond would perhaps want to insert itself into the present void. This group’s historic lack of competitive instinct and fixation upon old-line strategy, such as the Mardi Gras balls, with their quaint tableaus, is likely to continue. Yet in these uneasy times, some voice must rise up outside the circle and embrace the force of history; new alignments will take shape to reflect the flow of capital into the market, and new opportunities can create an

effected money class. Tim Culvahouse: The closed money class of New Orleans has for a long time been paralyzed by an absentee moneyed class: corporations based in Texas and elsewhere. What the city needs are men- united interests who desire to be a part of its culture but do not desire to belong to Comus the Mardi Gras crew and party.

Wide Rages: The U.S. labor market is one of the most mobile in the world. Now, through these unforeseen events, many citizens of New Orleans and the Mississippi coast have become aware of the higher standards of living, better edu- cation, and better social services available in other parts of the country. Over time, each city becomes populat- ed by the mix of income and skills needed to make it thrive. Many employers are diversifying geographically so that no one storm can severely cripple them. The popu- lation of New Orleans and the Gulf Coast will be diminished for some years to come. The marketplace in a private-property rights environment will decide what is built where and by whom and who can afford to live there. The demographics will reflect the skill set required within this geography and the resulting income distribution. David Waggonner: The objective is not to be a city with a smaller population than before. It is to be a smarter, more sustain- able and defendable city—less stretched and more elegant, if lesse wide—where one still feels the beat of the drum and the spirit ever present. Participate junior: Diana Balzany, principal of Balzany & Associates, who last fall taught an advanced studio, Balzany has developed a website that allows users to view New Orleans and frontier cities; Kimberly Brown (CM), Spatially, technologically, and administratively, New Orleans can be reinvented, but it will be a new city. Kennedy Jackson has described New Orleans’s social fabric as the most closed society in the United States. Is that to be reconstructed? No infrastructure, no type of urban planning alone, can solve social issues. The images we see of people left stranded in the city resembled scenes of disasters in third-world countries like Rwanda or Bangladesh. Social structure resists change. But the upheaval has been so wrenching and the dislocations so severe that economic intervention of the kind used in third-world counties to encourage individual initiatives and small businesses may provide a way to attract new people and economic activity. Imagine New Orleans as an inclusive new waker city.

David Waggonner: The ethnic mix in New Orleans has shifted often in its 300 years. While the racial underclass makes it hard for people of color to stand, the roof prob- lem we face in America is class and race. The traditional ruling class in New Orleans and beyond would perhaps want to insert itself into the present void. This group’s historic lack of competitive instinct and fixation upon old-line strategy, such as the Mardi Gras balls, with their quaint tableaus, is likely to continue. Yet in these uneasy times, some voice must rise up outside the circle and embrace the force of history; new alignments will take shape to reflect the flow of capital into the market, and new opportunities can create an
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Towards the center of New Orleans, photographed by David Halc, 2005.

tools, it’s a fantastic new situation.

When we organized the exhibition Massive Change, one of the most important things was to say, “Let’s look at design, not from the designer’s perspec-
tive but from that of the citizen. What areas of our life are being transformed, shaped, and worked over by these new capacities that are doubling every year?” If you look at that way, you realize that the design
practice comes from the culture of guilds, which was a protectivist idea of keeping
people out. “I am going to make a body of knowledge and keep it within a bound-
ary.” But what is happening now is that the knowledge base is porous. The boundary
Student Sara Rubenstein: What is it about cities in this age of exponentially
expanded technology that makes them the driving force of commerce versus the Internet?
Bruce Mau: One of the ideas I got in my head while working on Massive Change is
that if you take an image of the globe today and draw a line around it anywhere,
during the next fifty years we will rebuild everything on one side of the line. Today,
we are about 6½ half billion people; by 2050 we should be about nine billion.
That is 3 billion more in fifty years—half of everything that is already built. Are we
going to build everything in North and
producing then? Shouldn’t we steer our-

selves in some kind of direction? It seems

Bruce Mau: I am always staggered when people in your situation talk me to about
being powerless. And it happens a lot. One of the best examples is when I did a

Student Julia McCarthy: What is the forum for “fundamentally collaborative
global design” as you present in your book? And how will this discourse cross
practices, cities, nations, international boundaries, and so on? What do the tools
produce if the power to effect change is the capacity to produce work?
Bruce Mau: So what I ask myself out of those questions is: What is already hap-
ingen? How is the discourse already behaving in this way? In the World is Flat,
Tom Friedman outlines a shift in the global situation from a world where the haves
have all it and the have-nots have very little—and how we still have a worldview
that is shaped like a hill, where we are on top of the hill looking down into
the valley of the have-nots. It is a stark picture, because there are only about a
billion at the top of the hill and about five billion in the valley. What Friedman
suggests is that the hill is flattening out because of the tools we are developing. We are
living through a period in world history where nothing like this has ever happened.
The capacity of our tools is doubling every year. It’s an absolutely staggering situ-
ation. It used to double every eighteen months; for most of history it doubled
every hundred years.
In a way it is just the beginning of the

drewvention, and we are just begin-
ing to see its effects. I made a presen-
tation at the first Red Hat conference,
organized by the company that supports the open-source platform Linux. One of
the presenters at the conference was the
director of IIT Bangalore, which is now
vaster than any technical university in
America. India is producing more pro-
grammers than America, so the idea that
we have a lock on this kind of work in this
part of the world is a myth that we must
debunk as soon as possible, because we need to work in a global way. The director
of IIT Bangalore noted that we don’t have
any idea what the open-source movement
means for the developing world.
Before its emergence, if you lived in
Africa, India, China, or Brazil, you
would have to either buy software
or figure out how to hack your way into
the market, and when you liberate that
kind of intellectual power and the
is becoming more and more difficult to
protest. In Canada there is a movement to
register graphic designers like architects, which is absolutely going in the opposite
direction of the rest of the world. That is
not to say that expertise does not need to
be regulated, but when the tools double
every year the capacity to do things is in-
creasingly liquid. For example, we did a
high-definition cinema piece for Samsung
that has five screens, which five or ten
years ago would have been possible only
with a Hollywood studio. Now it can be
integrated into the tool. Therefore, our
capacity to solve problems is broader and
has to do with our client’s interest and less
to do with the product we produce.

South America again to meet the needs
of an additional three billion people? How
do we do that? If we open the paper today
we can see how stupidly we are doing it.
Germany can’t deal with the fact that
they are not going to be German in the
future. Canada says, “Bring ‘em on in.”
We are going to add 340,000 people a year
to deal with an aging workforce. All over
Europe they are struggling with population
decline, because when you educate and
women don’t want to have
have

Student Laura Killiam: The anti-globaliza-
tion stance is not limited to radical activ-
ists. This is the case, for example, in the
City of Vancouver, which turned down Wal-Mart’s bid
to build a store in South Vancouver. Although
the concept of Massive Change—to be “ambitious” positive about the pos-
sibilities of designing nature—broadens the scope of what design can be and
questions the position that the art world
must be anti-capitalist, what are the limits on the degree to which we are willing to embrace global capital.

Bruce Mau: Let’s start with a reality check, because this gets complex, and one of the most difficult things to understand is where you are in this sweeping change in history. One of the most extraordinary talents of the human mind is its capacity to naturalize almost any desired effect, to make normal what is quite new and unique. So we understand the situation we are in to be the natural order, but in fact it is anything but. And one of the things that we realized with Massive Change is that almost all of your experience is a designed one. If you could imagine the number of times you can close your eyes and open them in an environment that is not designed and produced for you, you would realize how much of your reality is designed. If we look at all of the effects of the innovation we have experienced during the last several centuries over what it was in the past, we saw that most of the problems we have are from success rather than our failures. There are great assessments that would never support our free-floating economy that don’t get challenged: for example, the conflict between an individual in global sustainability and the corporate interest in profit at all costs. For the most part even corporate, interest isn’t for profit at all costs. Within a capitalist model, which contrary to rhetoric is hugely regulated by social input, we control our business in two ways: one by what we do and the other by what we buy. Wal-Mart is a mirror of our society: in other words, what we do, if we didn’t go there and buy all those things, they would not be in business.

Student Lauren Kilham: If the arts community stops questioning the direction we are moving in as a global culture, who will? How can you reconcile an interest in global sustainability and corporate interest in profit at all costs? Is being radically opposed and reimagining the corporatization of the world simply retrograde?

Bruce Mau: My interaction with the art world over the last decade has been pretty harrowing. If you imagine that the critical voice is there and that it is where the innovation is coming from, I think we are in trouble. The art world is ultimately a capitalist model—there is nothing new here. The artist is ripped off: Work is bought at a low price and then circulated in a capitalist system that rapidly inflates the price, and then someone like Larry Gagosian makes a fortune. Wal-Mart couldn’t even come close to the difference between what Gagosian makes and what the average artist makes. So to think of the art world as the avant-garde because it invented the concept—that there is a critical voice that is somehow discrete from capitalism—it is a fallacy. Zio & Co. Inc. Corporations, a book project I worked on in 1992, is about the end of the object. We all think of things as being made from separate and dynamics that we can somehow understand as a discrete entity, but it is a part of a network of force, energy, and matter that we’ve put in a complex web of everything else. So within the art world is a complex interaction with capital. You can map the global market by the number of pages in Artforum. In 2001, the market was down and the number of pages in the magazine was down, so they track back. But the single most interesting thing to me is this conflabulation between critical and non-critical. Something happens in the art world that is to be critical and serious you had to have a marginalized articulation of the real voice of art. Most of the artists in history were not negative; they were doing beautiful things that we still look at today. It’s not that they weren’t critical in methodology and practice: There is a critical methodology to get to the most critical thing you can say, which is a new idea.

Student Lauren Kilham: Your stance in Massive Change is that “embracing advanced capitalism, advanced socialism, and advanced globalization” is “ambitiously positive.” But in the show it seems to be politically unjust and critically simplistic, to be leaving things out to make people’s reaction or reaction to changing globalization. One could take issue with you and ask whether you are anti-globalist or not.

Bruce Mau: Yes, I find a balanced argument there, but the fact is that there is a mountain of discussion on something on the other side. Hernando de Soto, who is working on property law in twenty-one developing countries, wrote the book The Mystery of Capital. Why Capitalism Triumphs in the West and Fails Everywhere Else [2000], in which the real point was to say that the market is not a natural ecology but a designed ecology and that we determine what happens. The way that we design is what will determine what has value.

De Soto says that if we don’t design the infrastructure of the market right, then people who don’t have the capacity to

canadians bought their houses with cash, we would also look at the RIeva electrolux. It’s the infrastructure of property that supports that. De Soto has identified $4 trillion of unregistered property values in the developing world, which turns out to be

critical of it. We should as be critical as possible of the corporations, because they are powerful and they make a lot of changes. And the things they do thing they do other things to see the implications; they aren’t designed to see the market. They are designed to see how the market changes. The producers should be directed at the governments, because they are responsible for regulating what these things can do. We do a lot of work in branding and communications, and the single most interesting realization is that companies think they own brands. Naomi Klein says that companies control brands and manipulate it. That is not true: People own brands. You have a five in your head that says “Nike”; you decide what Nike is going to be, and if Nike transgresses that line then you punish them by not buying it. Branding is a mechanism in our culture that functions as a public address system. Branding is way that we send messages back. The companies you should be afraid of have in mind, such as those that are dumping chemicals into the Niagara River.

I own an anti-global concept: that we will not have a global world—I want to collaborate with people in Korea and Tokyo. And I want to see how all local effects in India change the way we do things. One of the new cars there is the REVA electrolux, and it is a sweet beauty. We had that car today the air quality would be better. So I don’t want an anti-global world, and I don’t agree with the criticism that has been pointed forward. A lot of the anxiety that is produced is from change, pure and simple: Things are going to be different. In the twenty years that I’ve had my design business, we’ve introduced computers and fax machines. For example, the danialles of the family farm is a transformation that has been going on for a long, long time. And it’s what happens in business every day. At a particular point in time a certain scale of operations works because it makes sense economically: the economy of technology distribution, things fit together, and how the whole system works supports a particular scale. But as you produce new possibilities, some things change and some things are not longer plausible. Typographers used to be a big business in Toronto, and they supported the text industry as messengers. The ads would be sent by taxi and from the typewriter for a series of corrections, so that in one day seven to eight ads would go around. Those typewriting businesses are gone now, and texts take mostly people around; hundreds of jobs are gone. Not because someone decided that it is going to globalize typography, but because the industry changed so that it was no longer necessary for typographers to be there. We incorporated those tools, for better or worse, into the order we can do these typestsetting quasiations that we would have sent to an expert. And that is what is happening in every profession.

Student Sarah Rubenstein: Massive Change is largely about reducing our dependence on traditional resources and technology and instead using innovation and new technology to find other means. Do you think that those seemingly essential products are happening fast enough and implemented broadly enough to displace the depletion of more traditional resources as well as to secure the resources needed for living in future generations?

Bruce Mau: If you take the example of clean water and the INDEPENDENCE™ IBOT Mobility System, one invention has the possibility to change entire cities. This is from one person who is critical but also creates a real solution to a problem. The fact is that the pressure on innovation goes up. All the things that are marginal become plausible options. In the movement economy, we focused on cars from all over; they are staggeringly beautiful—as such as the Smart Car—and they are radically different in terms of the economy. The ecological movement took the past was the way going principle: get out of the car. People are not getting out of their cars. People are desperate to get into cars, and there are decades of evidence that it isn’t going to change. The way to get them out of cars is to get them into something different.

1. Bruce Mau with Brigitte Shim. In a way, what has happened is that the regulators have become quite concerned about the people, so they can respond to public opinion—because they want to sell their products.
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Houston’s urbanism was very absorbed with the idea of ‘design’—the work of Michael Hensel, Turrell, and the essay by Bruno Reichlin on La Corbusier’s ribbon window—which combined the utopian spirit of urban design with the idea of constructing landscapes. The way architecture regulates the eye and body of the viewer emerged out of thinking about the nature of art gallery architecture. I was convinced that the gesture of the glass-walled, ship-like museum space, might be applied to domestic space. Subsequent projects were about engaging the other human senses: how the taste interacts with the visual. Projects such as the Vitale Loft or the 24/7 Hotel feature molds surfaces calibrated to respond to the body. Modernist horizontal and vertical planes have different purposes in your early work. The horizontal realm is rudimentary, pragmatic, and anonymous. Vertical space you can breathe in and out, you can’t penetrate your feet. The vertical plane extends vertically, the plane you can’t step on, but my instinct is that now you are much more like it, you are just as much in the vertical as the horizontal. The planes transition from the horizontal and vertical and fold back on themselves. The spaces are not just a copy of not so much the visual apparatus of your earlier work.

JBB: Yes, in later projects the reciprocal relationship between vision and the other senses is explored. As a consequence, projects like the House for a Bachelor and Five-Minute Bathroom attempt to merge rather than separate the experience associated with vision and horizontal surfaces—floors and walls. This move away from the idea of ‘garden’ created the experience of tactile environments through the use of continuous surfaces and the definition of soft materials. The computer was the next step in a personal learning process: allowed me to uncover the contours of bodies as they interact with architectural space.

In your “I Am Making a Painting on a Theme” essay: “The Gym: A Site for Social Action”, you discuss the relationships between visual and tactile, virtual and actual space, and the way technology facilitates opportunities for sensory experiences. The Access House, 24/7 Hotel, and FIT all feature soft but wired environments where the senses meet through the merging of architecture and technology.

MB: The Access House has a continuous strip, its surfaces are continuous, and the building was struggling to be single-sided surfaced, but there are orthogonal geometries and flat surfaces. There was a strong distinction, but in this way the space flowed versus the surfaces, between the mechanisms of construction and the virtual surfaces of the skin. But other concepts of vision influenced my work such as in the DMA exhibition Vision and Visibility. From visual subjectivity and the construction of power by Hal Foster, Norman Bryson, and Rosalind Krauss. Bryson’s idea that the construction of vision was a political one. He writes: “The system of social powerless social/political work on subjectivity was significant and brought to the fore how visuality and visualizing is a form of power. Your Houston project has that reference.

JBB: Your work also begins to focus on the political. Its focus on the politics of the gaze eventually led me to consider the work of feminist cultural critics that linked vision, human masculinity, and gender. My preoccupation with the role architecture plays in staging identity gender, a theme first explored in the ‘Enduring Innocence’ project for House, a Bachelor, stemmed directly from these discussions of vision and power.

MB: Robert Stutely and John Ciccone’s essay “Color Structure Painting,” where they demonstrate how Stutely’s paintings were “turning space inside out,” engaged me as it relates to architecture. The space was not just layered, it was pulled into and through itself. Frank Stella’s essays and Robert Venturi’s “Learning from Las Vegas” seduced you.

JBB: That is right. Michael, I will say that your project House for a Bachelor, Stutely, and Venturi are all about an essay on devoidness, emptiness, and the way architecture addresses the urban void.

MB: This is the essay on the “Architectural Vocabulary of the Void” and its role in the “Enduring Innocence” project for House, a Bachelor.

JBB: The current exhibition 16 Houses explores techniques of power such as the experience of power of public spaces, and the role of architecture in focusing and focused urbanism as a form of power, which so essentially manipulates mass—emptied by money and its processes. Instead of the bleneness of downtown Houston, it is presumed that downtown Houston is a place where the architecture of urbanity, as dyskolic and as slowed or dripped, was transformed into some other kind of space. With 16 Houses, I stopped working with Enduring Innocence. Global Architecture and Its Political Masquerades. Following Henri Barjans, the masquerade is treated as “comic” because it occludes nature; “political masquerades” are projects where the nature of politics itself. Neither a matter of paranoia nor coercentiousness, politics becomes a tool of propaganda even as they “recognize the altered land-scape in which they have been fooled” (p. 198). The political masquerades of global architecture can veil and index a number of proportions. Each of the six “stories” that form the core of Enduring Innocence concentrates on the possible effects of one or more “duty-free” spatial products—a flag, a national border, a sphere, an aerial view, a real estate play, a political maneuver, a “maneuver, terrorism and war” (p. 163).

This comprehensive index does not especially urge contact sensitivity as much as it shows the interactivity of encounters between practices and ideologies. The global therefore does not emerge from the debate but comes out of a non-categorical and noncontemporary territories, such as nations. Rather, Easterling’s method makes us aware of the utility of the global with more canonical objects of cultural production, including nations and regions. “Bourdieu,” for example, reinforces a global field “commerces” with the broad dimensions of the salient territories themselves, “by vaguely referring any number of traditions of the modern, which can be combined and layered, and which are said to maintain a standard degree of readiness.”

Easterling’s visual subject to the landscape of contemporary politics and violence can be read through the dispositions of the material rather than through conceptual-philosophical concepts of consumption or production. Spatial productions become indicators in “characterizing the mark having mechanical weakness, resilience, or violence.” How does one locate the hierarchy of the contemporary in the same set of mechanisms associated with spatial products? What do these mechanisms say about the political possibilities of our time? The author power perversely, not in a manner. The violence of contemporary moments of nationalizing—whether the ideological of neoliberalism embodied or redemptive or one of heroic resistance—is countered with the possibility of a “multi-sphere” which is made possible by practices of piracy and economical undercover management. These practices direct our gaze critically toward naturalization of the man that unearbs postipl socialized or, at least, assumed to be self-evident.

“Enduring Innocence” presents the contributions of the market through the machinations of the organizers, tourists, gurus, and brand managers, the figure of the citizen—the classical horizon of modern politics—is no longer a real figure. The histories practiced by these characters through their machinations and do not contribute to the present-day layer of the social and make them more malleable in the sense of the general. In these variations also the horizon of the outside, a social etiological layering, and thus the accumulation strategies and its accompanying strategies of the way the subject refers to “innocence and the violence of remaining intact”—with something else. They expose a world in which “more many sites are political fronts and [because] they move through political revolution, the only possibility of continual revolutionizing” (p. 134). This is the profound political and philosophical condition of the end of Innocence, and it should effectively reinvent our readings of contemporary urban political practices in the case of all sorts of architectural sites—from duty-free zones to globalization narratives.

Enduring Innocence is a subtle and poetic meditation on the state of the contemporary project, and much of the author’s virtuality in selling through diverse landscapes, perverting and ingesting actions of making, sorting, and harvesting, Meaning is located and dispersed in such acts, and the medium of the medium is conceptual and ideas and ideologies. From “suffering” or juridical states of self-containment, architecture moves into a much more social realm, both of one exposure and contagion. The meaning is expresses via a precise and complex platform for unravelling the nature of the global everyday.

---

Vijayshri Rao
Visiting Associate Professor at the New School for Social Research
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Joint Forestry and Architecture Program

During the past several decades the School of Architecture and the School of Forestry and Environmental Studies have cooperated, off and on, in a variety of programs—sometimes offering collaborative-ly taught courses but more often simply providing students with enriching, complemen-tary views of both the built and natural environment. This has been no exception, however, changes in the architectural and environmental fields have brought a new urgency to forging this long-standing relationship.

Shaken by Michael Schellenberger and Ted Nordhaus's controversial essay “The Death of Environmentalism,” the environmental community has become increasingly aware that its perspective on the environmental science and policy alone is not sufficient to solve impending environmental crises. Environmentalists are therefore struggling desperately to shape a new direction of action through design without the expertise to do so. This pivotal moment in the environmental community is matched by a simultaneous transition in the architecture community to address the biological and soci-etal dimensions of sustainable design with rigor and sophistication. Since methods to achieve eco-efficiency in architecture and urban planning are mature, the profession must now turn its objectives to be realized through designing diverse new applications of scalable ecosystem, func-tionality and dynamics, as well as their applica-tion to the many critical issues of responsible design.

Recognizing that Yale’s schools of the “built and natural environments”—the School of Architecture (SOA) and the School of Forestry and Environmental Studies (FES)—have the complementary expertise to realize these internal synergies, Stephen Kaelber of FES and Jim Axley of SOA worked with a broad cross-section of faculty members from both schools to draft a proposal for a joint master’s degree program, which was approved enthusiastically by both faculties last spring. After a thorough review by the provost’s office—and some fine-tuning—the proposal was then submitted to the Yale Corporation, where it was accepted. It was official on August 31, allowing exceptionally qualified students to obtain both a professional master’s degree in architecture (MARCH) for students without an undergraduate professional degree and M For those with a bachelor’s of environmental management (MEM) degree in one year less time than would be required to obtain the two degrees sepa-rately. In addition, the joint program has been structured so that students will com-ply with both schools’ curricula and will also develop a new understanding of sustainable design and action.

The news has spread rapidly, with a number of first-year students and new applic-ants showing interest in the program. There is every expecta-tion that the program will achieve its primary objectives: one to train individuals to become the leaders of a new generation of restorative environmental man-agement; and, in the process, to catalyze a new generation of design professionals who will serve to maintain their international posi-tions as the leading schools in their respec-tive fields.

The prospects of this new joint program are reflected in the success of past grad-uates who took advantage of the resources of both schools during their years as students at Yale like William McDonough ‘76, perhaps the best known “green architect” in North America, and Peter Calthorpe ‘79, North America’s “green urban design” prodigy. His work has made him one of the most influential in the field of architecture. By understanding the needs of diverse communities and applying new technologies, they have been able to create a sustainable future. This new program will allow students to pursue their interests at the highest level.

Kurt Forster’s “Surface Tensions”

At the beginning of the stimulating, pro- vocational, and intellectual lecture in our latest Hastings Hall at Yale University on October 10, Kurt Forster—Vincent Scully Visiting Professor of the history of architecture— instructed the audience to sit aside the customary anxious addresses of daily affairs and to relax into the visual spectacle about to unfold before them. As unprepared as the audience, Forster’s injunction disarmed the audience: critical listening had now become an opportunity for pleasure. The crowd visibly relaxed.

Forster proceeded to lead his barnstorming audience into the labyrinth of surface rep- resentation in contemporary architecture, with a very long, historical overview. Beginning with seductive images of the Tiffany Chapel House seen through its plate-glass casing, he described the relevance of surface and material to building, the potential- ity of glass in the promotion of multiple readings (transparency and reflectivity) and the relationship of plate glass to the pho-tographic plate. Forster then discussed the particularly symbiotic relationship between photography and architecture, seen from the perspectival of nineteenth-century tech-nical limitations but advancing into twenty-first-century surface treatments, both archi-tectural and photographic. He underscored the well-established argument that photography made modern architecture; or, rather, that photography made architecture modern, a truth first revealed more than twenty years ago by Reyner Banham, Richard Pommer, and Susanne Colissa. But Forster’s pur-pose was not to reinforce established arguments. He moved quickly from the architectural photograph back to building surface and the range of treatments pos-sible in modernistic living. The last panel of the talk surveyed surface treatment in buildings from Karl Friedrich Schinkel to Louis Sullivan to Frank Gehry, ending with Herzog & de Meuron’s Eberswalde University to underscore his main point and conclude the lecture.

In discussing surface in Gehry’s recent work, Forster noted that, “his ‘vaulted’ lies on the surface rather than beneath it. The vaulted iconic effect ... springs at least in part from the projective power of surfaces rather than a conventional recourse to edges.” The vaulted form has something of the power of epiphany, calling up for me the memorizable words of the poet John Ashbery: “there are no words for the sur-face, that is, / No words to say what it really is, / That it is not / Superficial but a visible core” ("Self-Portrait in a Convex Mirror," 1974). This sensibility was enhanced by the ensuing discussion of the Eberswalde Library, where Forster focused on the con- quest of depth in his attempt to understand surface of space by surface—however one likes to see it, there is a depth mapped onto architectural sur-face, the refusal to accept the superficiality of surface treatment or the superfluous at all. Forster urged his audience to acknowledge and re-examining the appearance as an independent-evaluation of what has been, add, and for the design of high-density towers, and even moderate-and low-density housing and office structures, has a great deal to learn about eco-effectiveness.

For the past fifty years, Yale students have had the opportunity to take a new type of course in environmental sciences, one that links systems and environmental issues together in the design studio. This course, a requirement of the MARCH program, is led by two of the formidable forces in sustainable design today: Thomas Auer, of Trieneroln, Germany, and Patrick Bellove, of Atelier Ten, in London. Conceived by professor Jim Axley, the course aims to think beyond the basic calculations of U-values to the greater environmental, global, and social aspects of design, incorporating sustainable-design principles into their larger studio projects.

Teaching the physics, design methods, and tools involved in sustainable design— including thermodynamics, climate influ-ence and climate-responsive building design, acoustics and thermal comfort, building materials, embodied energy, daylighting, and environmental sources of energy (passive and active systems, e.g., lapharmics and earth ducts, etc.)—Auer and Bellove, with the assistance of Atelier Ona’s New York–based Paul Stoller,’98, provide the students with a wealth of information. Below notes that they introduce students to design strategies often found in vernacu-lar architecture that are great resources for designing in a variety of climates. As Auer notes, "Before air-conditioning was
invented, people had to design their building
in- stead of waiting for a new design. This
innovation in geometry has been pro-
duced by modern methods of design.

The “Architectural Student Is a Design Team”
Neil Thomas and Aron Chadwick of the engineering firm Atelier One, in the
United Kingdom, offered a seminar at Yale on philosophy of structures
called “Liquid Threshold, Chaotic Structure.”

Nina Rapaport: What is liquid engineering, architecture, and what does it mean for the student? Are you talking about process or production?

Neil Thomas: It implicates something that is not rigid or fixed, which we prac-
tically think of as being fluid. The term
“Liquid Thresholds” refers to the line that
goes toward chaos. Some of the projects we have shown the students, such as our plan for Federation Square in Melbourne, demonstrate that liquid design is not just
debatable ideas but can be chaotic—and therefore undeniable—and maintain its oneness with all the conditions of the environment and the enve-
lope—and why it might be the way it is. So they
looked to think about structural systems and
to ecology the environmental system as
they did. So they now where the lands and
and the external affects upon the building
and making the interface decision in design and systems; it is integrated
design. They could do a report, draw, or build it up. They had to build something
every two weeks.

NRT: Do you mean a failure is what you showed them?

NB: Yes. We were asked to think about
this. And as you know, the students are
very important for him.

The seminars also encourage participa-
tion from professionals outside of the field as the Seminars has a diverse roster of professionals, from Nobel Prize winners, political leaders, and artists who will become a valuable resource to our own Yale community. Some of the more dynamic speakers brought their insights into the history, literature, and cultural studies. Warren Hofert of Stanford University spoke on the struggles between the seventeenth-century global economies of sugar and tobacco on the coast of the Caribbean.

Edward Mitchell

Edward Mitchell is an associate professor and
and worked on the following projects with

Edward Mitchell and Keith Krumwiede, who assisted in the planning and
of events, analyzed urban patterns of growth
using digital tools. Their informal talk
introduced the formal design concepts
by the fellows, who shared their research
and design projects in many of the world’s
global capital.

Afternoon sessions were in seminars and
discussion groups. Attila Petkuss conducted
a charrette on the symbolic aspects of
of culture, Mezheve Russian Constructivists in Moscow.

The “Architectural Student Is a Design Team”
Neil Thomas and Aron Chadwick of the engineering firm Atelier One, in the
United Kingdom, offered a seminar at Yale on philosophy of structures
called “Liquid Threshold, Chaotic Structure.”

Nina Rapaport: What is liquid engineering, architecture, and what does it mean for the student? Are you talking about process or production?

Neil Thomas: It implicates something that is not rigid or fixed, which we prac-
tically think of as being fluid. The term
“Liquid Thresholds” refers to the line that
goes toward chaos. Some of the projects we have shown the students, such as our plan for Federation Square in Melbourne, demonstrate that liquid design is not just
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lope—and why it might be the way it is. So they
looked to think about structural systems and
to ecology the environmental system as
they did. So they now where the lands and
and the external affects upon the building
and making the interface decision in design and systems; it is integrated
design. They could do a report, draw, or build it up. They had to build something
every two weeks.

NRT: Do you mean a failure is what you showed them?

NB: Yes. We were asked to think about
this. And as you know, the students are
very important for him.
September 8

Chip Lord and Curtis Schreier
"Ant Farm"

We were influenced by the 1960s, Buckminster Fuller, and rock bands. Modernism was the dominant dogma of design, and the Barkers Architecture Lab was designed as a brutalist design, so we rebelled against the gallery and ended up at Yale on a tour with Doug Michels (97). We made nonpermanent structures with form surprised by function and took them to the beach and infilled them. The wind would create the building, and eventually it would die. We added performance works and architectural performances staged and decorated by Ant Farm. Some were guerrilla events with, say, fashion models at computer labs, and we made photographs to signiﬁcantly environmentally generated experiences. In a sense it predicted virtual reality; however, we were not interested in the technology but rather the idea of the Electric Oasis, which was Archigram-influenced and was set up like a rock festival.

In an art park, we created a temporary sculpture, Citizen’s Time Capsule, with suitcases that were buried in upstate New York for twelve years. The earth-core sample came back questionable as having toxic content. We used gossamer materials and then faience materials; we went from the ephemeral to the permanent. We are the first technology to decay in permanence.

Why do we do architecture at all? To have mobility—with an emphasis on architecture in the built environment. Doug Michels worked with dolphins and had the idea like a lab that would raise the seas; it would be new for architecture. For us, it is new; we were kind of a "was." So he thought the dolphins was for the future and proposed a dolphin planet and ways to get water and dolphins into outer space.

In spending all of our dollars on the Vietnam War we were pruned to believe in the space age. There is very little new in architecture. The vision of architecture is to see broadly, and all politicians are narrow.

There is not much analogous to our work in architecture today. Our work was instructive. At the time there was an authoritative way and nothing else; there was also great support from peers for group and alternative works; we worked at Ant Farm in São Paulo. Today, too many outliers exist within the profession. It’s a different circumstance.

September 12

Jeanne Gang
"Through Material"

Our ideas are developed through material rather than in a narrative. Material is a position and a different relationship, where ideas are possible through materials rather than in a more baroque use of materials, which is what I see in architecture now. We started working with something, such as a construction detail, and zoom out and in to get at certain meanings. In our works, we are zoomed out. There is an urban process in our work, and we say we think about things in the subject matter of compressor space and architecture. For the exhibition at the National Building Museum, we wanted to see how we could support the stone from the ceiling, but there was no place for it, so it hangs in tension. We made a composite with the stone backed in laminate and glass to keep the stone in place. There is no data for this kind of stone in tension, but we found a way to fit it into a dovetail, or like a puzzle piece, using airspace material testing with a fiber coating. People are so experienced to use wax and glue, but glue is a material as much as glass or stone. We started with a material and moved out to the form.

In a speculative project we looked at two Sleeping Parks, both accessible by train near the Chicago city center, and found that what was normally a transparent facility became a huge building over time. At Wrigley Field, people park their cars in the surrounding neighborhood, and we had our students map the parking on game days. The stadium bleeds into the city, and people end up watching the games in and around the city. It is the only sport where the field is defined by a triangular base, making it ideal for urban conditions. The idea became to build on existing infrastructures, putting the project downtown with a kinetic stadium that floats out and connects to different buildings at all floor plate levels.

In our work we respond to the particular and new. There is no longer an interest in the decorative as a process of looking for something to add that has structural necessity in building. It is then a zooming out.

September 15

Esther McCoy
Brendan Gill Lecture
"The Raw and the Cooked: Lina Bo Bardi"

Cured by the environment, Lina Bo Bardi rejects the use of nature as a foil, relying instead on a mimetic interplay with the surroundings. For a tiny building, hidden by a tangled veil of thick vegetation and a bamboo grove, Bo Bo Bardi chose nonnatural homoeopathic materials: traditional tiles for the roof, wooden planks for the floor, and wooden paneling on the exterior. Only the nylon sliding doors allude to the urban and the modern, recalling the Japanese influence.

Bo Bardi presents a critique not just of Modernist architecture, but of colonialism. In the end, Bo Bardi remained European, though perhaps her architecture did not. We see in her works and see things grow—from the slowly and rauca to the elegant and ethereal—and her unlikeliness to take anything for granted gave her a critical distance that marked her as different. But the most important thing is to see things in the way the woman and the man tells it, to find the sense of disposition that characterizes her work, a hunger for the irreducible and the primordial. The quest that led from the Glass House to the willful eclecticism of the little wooden institute stemmed neither from a refinement or from a search for origins, but from what one critic has identified as a "profound sense of bareness." Perhaps this is what Bo Bardi implied when she once described Brazilian architecture after the war as "a light shining in a field of death." Perhaps the past was not in abeyance after all, even after so many years: a contempo- rary dictatorship could not help but evoke another, awakening old fears and opening old wounds.

September 26

Massimiliano Fuksas
"Four Projects: Lost in Translation"

The Venice Biennale of 2000 was very important to me, because I discovered that it is not enough to be a good architect, to do good architecture, or to do good buildings. We must be part of one causa: I don’t know which thing, but I think it is to be engaged in this thinking.

Bruno Zevi asked, "What are you planning for the next ten years?" And after three months, I was obsessed with this question. The biennial was the result of this question. And what I want to do is not to make only buildings, but to do something else for life.

To be an architect is a project of life. I think that in what we are doing now we have many possibilities. We can really do what we want. But we are in a space that is concentrated, and we live also in one minute of all our life. We are so concentrated today, and we even know it, and for that reason I think of the concept of the habitation, that is, the idea of doing that is too far, too much that is completely irrelevant. Ours is fixed, because we can do avant-garde in real time. We can give, today, the avant-garde. For 2000 years, we throw away the program that was utopia. People said that, politically, I started to be antiestablishment, but now I have built such a huge building, the Fiera, that is very "establishment." You have to ask Berlusconi if he thinks the same; he controls all the media—but to speak with him and ask him why he was not at the opening of the building.

I was in a Luis Barragán house two days ago in Mexico, and I was so touched by the work that I think I have to change a lot of my life. I will try to give emotion with my architecture to the people who have not enough good emotion in their life.

October 10

Kurt Forster
Vincent Scully Visiting Professor
"Surface Tension in Contemporary Architecture"

We have been taught to mistrust appearance. That may be one of the reasons we pay them so much attention. We are always asked to consider the substance of things and not be distracted by superficial matters. In moral terms, this may well be for the better, but in terms of sense and experience, how can we be responsive to interact with our environment if we must do so against injunctions? Surfaces have a lure of their own. More than just gaze at them, we’re tempted to touch them—again fighting injunctions or at least overextending them. The impressions emanating from a surface—sprays of light or wandering shad-

ows—exercise a curious power over our thoughts. Eye and hand, touching and seeing, pur up and equip us with formidable instruments of perception. As we face surfaces, we spontaneously scrutinize them, clearing minor variances and fleeting changes, as if the very act of observing conjured up what we observe. It is precisely for this mysterious transformation of a work into a thing, of a building into an image of its reality, that the Library at Eisenhowe by Herzog & de Meuron begins to speak to our sensibilities. Its purpose then that the presence of the building does not depend on any of the familiar quantities—volume, composition, type, or material—but rather on the power images exercise upon our imagination, as if the senses acted faster and in more diverse registers than our disciplined cognition. All is surface, and surface is everything.

Content is thereby not brought back in one term or another, that abstract, abstract approach and professional procedure already holds, for content. It is not by nark- ing back to a particular typology, by pick- ing up one or another motif, by layering in something that comes from a completely differing context supposedly establishing a link to the past that causes the content to come out. The content comes out in the same sense as Valley, as the thing; the art- fact itself is in the end a thing.

We are always asked to consider the substance of things and not be distracted by superficial matters. In moral terms, this may well be for the better, but in terms of sense and experience, how can we be responsive to interact with our environment if we must do so against injunctions? Surfaces have a lure of their own. More than just gaze at them, we’re tempted to touch them—again fighting injunctions or at least overextending them. The impressions emanating from a surface—sprays of light or wandering shad-
The argument is that iconic buildings are here to stay whether we like it or not, and in Bribian, architects don’t like it. They light it, they take it off the grid, and they rescript the model. I just had a debate with Peter Eisenman at Columbia three or four days ago, and we all know that, Elain Harwood, like the other usual suspects, is always on the list of iconic architects. He is a professional architect, of course, producing anti-architectonic buildings, of which there are quite a few now. So my argument is that the iconic position is very strong in architecture.

The declarative narratives, the skepticism toward meta-narratives—that is, narratives of history, progress, emancipation, democracy, and so forth—are now very relevant. What you read history, people have less belief in them. And the same thing has been going on for well over two hundred years, not only in the Nietzschean death of God but meta-narratives in general. And with this decline comes the decline in the role of the monument. With that double decline, the iconic building has risen because soci- ety still wants landmarks; it still wants to use scale and other iconic buildings and still demands an architect of them, who somehow give them the kind of excitement that architecture is in the past.

As in the art world, there is a demand among professional and academic and among other archi- tects, at least on a certain level, for iconic buildings—for the risk-taking, creative, never-secure kind of statement. Although at one level this is liberating, I’ll be arguing that the problems of iconic building as a genre are obvious: its explicit as one-liner, its destruction of city fabric, its bland, simple, signifier itself—one iconic building after another renders the previous one obsolete—its lan- densy toward male- proponency, and its mistake, as well as a host of other problems.

It seems to me that an iconography of our time has been built upon something that is affecting all of us, and today—par- ticularly in the cities—people are understanding things about the universe that other ages haven’t understood so well. That is, we are in a cosmogenesis—a process—and we now know its age: 13.7 billion years. We know our place back to the first few sec- onds; we can tell it as a single, creative, unfolding kind. And it is that narrative, like the Genesis narrative, which holds a possible iconography.

November 3
Glenn Murcutt
Bishop Visiting Professor
"Sustaining Dignity: The Design for Good Design"

My lecture tonight is about the questions of sustainability and whether in fact it’s a cop- out of those other fundamental values. I have to say that in the whole we see sustainability—the death end of it—using sustainability for a replace- ment of good-quality design.

A lot of the formers (LEED, BSS) are a great problem because architects and lots of people outside of architecture tend to think that if you fulfill this requirement, it’s going to produce architecture. And of course it doesn’t; it often produces very bad buildings.

There are so many issues that need to be considered in the making of an archi- tecture and the spirit of place, of place-making, such as not limited to understanding following the geography of the region, the geology, the hydrology, the topography, the climate, the eco- and geo-towers—such as we have in our bodies from our foreheads to our eyebrows, to our eyelids, to our eyelashes, this gradua- tion through our bodies. These are all elements important in the landscape, so why shouldn’t we be accepting our build- ings to these changes? How do we locate a building in relation to prevailing winds in summer that bring the beautiful water-laid perfumes? Do we do it? No, we don’t think about it because we seal our buildings. How do we deal with waste, what do we do with waste, what are the issues with waste management? Remember, waste is a product of our so-called standard of living, which in fact is a misnomer—a standard of consumption. Why don’t we start working with the place, working with climate instead of against it? And working with culture—the European culture in which we are, the mixture of the European culture and the Aborigenal cul- ture. Human needs and human aspirations and how those needs can fulfill those aspirations are essential.

All of these issues must form a natural part of thinking about an architecture that is responsible. And I find, an architect of response, I would prefer to think it is not an architecture of imposition.

Sustainability is tall on its face unless we pull out all together and start bringing other factors into it.

November 7
Neil Denari
Myssy Residential Memorial Lecture "Formographics"

Formographics, as you might imagine, is the place where something like the two-and- a-half-dimensional interface and more extensistically, it is also the place of material discourse. What I mean by "material," of course, is not just the material of architecture meets a kind of cultural dis- course. I openly admit that I’m a pretty intuitive person and an intuitive designer; and architecture for me has been a twenty- year process of trying to discipline the intu- ition, of trying to engage the ability to make work from a very personal standpoint but to struggle with the issue of legitimiza- tion. To struggle with the issue of relevance, and possibly with issues of meaning, is about trying to carry out a continuous discourse.

I had always hoped and imagined that building outside of where I live, Los Angeles, would raise questions as to what the architecture would be. So I was searchign for an architecture that had the potential to be a vessel of meaning on the one hand, and on the other would be entirely buildable but would still have the possibility of a cultural discourse as well as one about materialization.

Dycky, today was about trying not to necessarily make you wonder what the references are, but mostly to outline the ambition that the work is or wants to be readable by or you see somebody else in a par- ticular way. The work has perhaps obvious characteristics to it and things that are also obscure and filtered at the same time. Over the years I have been able to allow thickness, poché if you will, to come into play in the work, whereas when it first came out in the Gallery MA project, it was very much “I have a two-dimensional sur- face.” Frankly, you can only do so much with that, and allowing it to become solid with relief, allowing it to disengage, is a lit- erating kind of a moment.

November 14
Michael Mattman
"Oblique Actions"

I am fascinated by contemporary cities and spaces like Los Angeles. I was born in Longview, Texas and I don’t think how about our work and urban life, espec- ially my respect for issues of social and public space as well as what role architec- ture has in that equation, mediating those contexts and the conflicts they productively produce. I am continuously exploring how these issues are experienced by the user, the inhabitant, or the participant through the tools and devices of things like move- ment and visual perception.

I was looking at a different way of observing the relationship between this exterior form and the interior form. And I got very interested in an idea that is a game that mathematicians play, I guess among themselves, called “geometric topology,” in which you can take a shape, very often a pure shape, and by looking at different ways of dissecting it geometrically you can begin to create other shapes. In this case a series of irregularly sized figures. What was interesting to me about that was that, in a sense, the exterior and interior shapes shared an almost geometric memory of each other, but it meant that the exterior form did not depend on a typical way of generalizing that form—it had, for instance, a heptagon. In our case, or in this dis- sections, it has no real center but is much more about potentially a kind of grain of the space—not so much a center that you look through or occupy but that you potentially look across.

Because the area where we are building a booklet in China is swamp from the river, a concrete building—especially one that ties to cantilever in both directions like this—was going to be too heavy on its point loads, so we had to make a steel building. The problem with that is, if you’re trying an engineering standpoint, there is very little allowable that has been done at this level of complexity in China. Guy Nordenson, a structural engineer who we work with a great deal, was very involved in this project in developing a system that could both work from an engineering standpoint but also take into consideration all of these perforations. It is a beautiful system where these almost vierendeel ladders happen periodically through the building, and then a nar of tansill bracing covers the entire exterior and is also the thing that allows the panels of metal to bolt into it.

In this competition [Frem] I started to see the possibility, and really the impor- tance, in a more open and convenient network of movement, where the building user and the viewer, as well as the passage of the incidental urban habitant, play both- active and reactive roles. It is connected to a continually emerging and elas- tic set of relationships with form, program, site, and, hopefully, each other.

Lecture excerpts were compiled with the assistance of Marc Guberman (’07), Armande Young (’07), and Alexander Bieng (Yale College, ’07).
Peter Eisenman, Louis I. Kahn Visiting Professor with Michael Young

Peter Eisenman’s studio investigated “an idea of critically in architecture based on a different relationship of the architectural unit to the general idea of the city.” Using the competition program for a 250,000-square-foot central library in Hamburg, Germany, the seminar’s approach was based on an argument put forward by PhD student Pier Vittorio Aureli in his thesis for Delft University. The argument presents Albert’s reflection on the house as a small city and a small city as a house as a way to understand the design of the city—through that of its constituent parts. But Aureli noted that when architecture’s utopian vision died in 1939, becoming more modest, partial, and realistic, the building no longer prefigured an idea of the whole, which would have been able to be reconstructed only by juxtaposing single fragments. Thus, it is the form of architecture that must be first recognized in the building of the city.

In the first part of the semester, the students analyzed formal strategies for the critical role of architecture in the city such as Nolli’s Map of Rome, Piranesi’s Campo Marzio, Venturi’s Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture, Rossi’s Architecture of the City, Ungers’ Green Archipelago, and Koolhaas’s Bigism. Then they explored buildings discussed in Aureli’s thesis by OMA, Ungers, Rossi, and Koolhaas. The students divided into teams to design a library building with housing, retail space, a community center, and parking, realizing St. Pieters, a historical theme that was above an ancient Roman Castrum. For the complex site and program, the students were asked to engage both the theoretical issues and the urban implications proposed by Aureli’s thesis. Both of these tasks were handled by a realistic building proposal that could effectively incorporate program, site, and structure. However, the formal outcome was a direct impact on the senses and need not require a complex diagrammatic explanation. The resulting projects were primarily orthogonal, turning both in on themselves and opening up to the city. The merging of the two types of issues—theoretical and urban—through a real building program for dynamic building that mini-

ien. As Krier said, the studio was “about understanding urban structure and relating it to this” that “builds and others are horizontal, in a compacted crash course in all of the skills that make up traditional architecture.”

Students traveled to the site and then prepared comprehensive urban analysis that started with the position of Williamsburg in the region, the natural environment, and the major landforms that shape its physical setting. This work extended to a more detailed understanding of the historical city, its physical and symbolic organization, and the hierarchy of its neighborhoods, streets, blocks, and lots. Students also made a parallel study of individual buildings and the interdependent relationship of “vernacular” and “classical” in the creation of an urban environment. Through detailed, measured drawings, they looked at the inherent relationship of architectural vocabulary to construction, considering the materials, forms, proportion, and architectural elements of each building. Details were then organized in a comprehensive vision of building elements that was shared within the studio, combined with analyses and drawings.

This study became the basis for a master plan to reorganize Williamsburg and create a series of new neighborhoods. Krier and Ramo’s strategy was to develop a new typology of buildings to allow for a more flexible and diverse urban environment. As the framework for design studies that the students undertook in the second half of the semester. The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, which lent its assistance to the studio, had implemented a site plan that would be redeveloped. The students also developed a new typology of existing residential neighborhoods, forming a new quarter within the city that would embody the spirit of the place. Each designed a block or series of blocks within the master plan. They then selected principal buildings and configured spaces from which to complete more detailed designs. Through an ongoing discussion of what defines traditional building and the vernacular within the language of Williamsburg, the students created convincing solutions for a new neighborhood,” developed a convention, looking creatively at materials and technology. In the final review the jurors—Pier Aureli, Thomas Buechner (16), Ed Chapell, Peter Eisenman, Jeff Klee, James Howard Kunst, and Richard Robinson (16), David Schwartz (16, and Stanley Tigerman (16)—were shown designs for streets, blocks, individual lots, open spaces, and significant buildings that comprised a compelling new model for town planning.

Alain Platou, Professor

Alain Platou led his sixth China Studio in a three-way collaboration with architects and faculty at Hong Kong University and Tongji University, in Shanghai. Platou scouted the site in Shanghai last summer with Leslie Lu (77), head of architecture at the University of Hong Kong, noting that “the city is now experiencing all the side effects of overdevelopment but is seemingly less raw and unfamiliar. It is also more sophisticated, it also more predictable than before.” This year’s site on the banks of Sushui Creek was where three previous studios had studied the redevelopment of former industrial areas. Now it is an emergent district where the community is reusing old factories and warehouses as art galleries, design offices, and show rooms, with a wealth of cultural synergy.

Students went to Hong Kong to meet their counterparts, and together they proceeded to Shanghai. There, the students from all three schools toured the development sites and then worked in mixed groups on a series of analyses designed to introduce them to Shanghai’s urban and architectural landscape. They also traveled to Suzhou to visit the classical Ming gardens.

Students were confronted with the development of several adjacent blocks where traditional low-rise high-density housing and historic warehouses have survived. They considered the possible redevelopment options in light of current urban development trends in Shanghai, including the phenomenon of so-called art areas, preservation-based commercial and residential projects, and the development of new public spaces.

The final review with the Hong Kong students, at Yale, revealed divergent approaches to the problem. While the Hong Kong students worked in larger groups and developed detailed analyses of the site and its programmatic possibilities leading to master plans for predominantly low-rise high-density housing and historic warehouse housing, the students from Suzhou presented the project to the jury of Tony Atkin, Diana Balmori, Ellen Brennan-Garvin, Kevin Easteering, Edward Mitchell, Joel Sanders, Graham Shanks, Gary McDonough, and Adam Yanikov.

Brigitte Shim

Saarinen Visiting Professor with Hilary Sample

Brigitte Shim with Hilary Sample, organized a studio to design a 65,000-square-foot building based on the concept of the Toronto-based organization City Cultures: The Terrace mainly to propose to bring together global experts in finance, urban planning, housing, community relations, multiculturalism, policing, architecture, and human rights. The students worked on a studio based on the idea of a physical embodiment of the goals of the organization.

The students traveled to Toronto, a multicultural city, with 52 percent foreign-born residents, for an intensive immersion in the urban issues. There they met with Bruce Max (p. 101), urban specialist, and toured the site on the campus of the University of Toronto. They also visited sites such as the University’s Field’s Institute for Research in the Mathematical Sciences and the Muriel Centre for International Studies, as well as the Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, in Waterloo, Ontario. These projects served as precedents for studies of the relationship between public and private
spaces that are typical of study centers. However, the City Centre studio proposed to invent these models and asked the students to design spaces that actively engage the public, along with providing the research and housing facilities.

Each student worked to develop a critical relationship with the city, program, site, and current construction methods, as they investigated design at fundamentally different scales, from the city and its existing viable infrastructures to tectonic analysis, in an integrated and synthetic manner.

During the studio, a rigorous process of modeling, including large-scale fabrications and drawing, was emphasized as a tool for understanding each scale of investigation as well as their overlapping and interrelationships. Shim and Sample asked the students to explore questions of skin, envelope, and circulation, as well as “the building’s presence and its role in terms of housing, regulating, and making palatable the architectural conditions upon which we are often quite invasive.” They invited faculty speculates including Diane Balmori, Neil Thomas and Aran Chadwick, Thomas Aver, Patrick Bellow, John Eberhardt, and Kevin Rotheroe to assist with landscape design, fabrication, engineering, and sustain-ability issues.

The studio resulted in speculative investigations wherein in one project, surfaces of glass were layered with wood floors. Wood louvers and green walls inverted the narrow knit and emphasized each student’s ideas about light, air, and weather in relation to their individual studio public, private, and impromptu spaces. Circulation through layered spaces internalized public courtyards, atria, and atria-like spaces and screened airwalls that filtered light deep into the buildings and allowed for natural light. The next project was a development driven research that the students were invited to develop their own ideas about a city’s perimeter and the way that it interacts with the existing environment.

Fred Koetter and Ed Mitchell Post-Pro Studio

Using a development site in Helsinki, Finland, Ed Mitchell and Fred Koetter led an “exploration of relationships and settings, and how architecture relates to the situational city”... looking at emerging urbanism and what’s happening at the edges of cities as they transform into something other than what they are determined.” Students analyzed how infrastructure needs to be reconfigured in order to have a city emerge in a new form so that urban design can be adapted to managing temporal structures, changing urbanism and constructing future trends without the aid of specific programs or clients and without the traditional zoning diagrams and spatial devices on which architects have historically relied.

Through a special grant in Finland, the studio worked in cooperation with the Helsinki University of Technology on plans for an area at the edge of the city, which they visited and then participated in a joint workshop with Finnish students to discuss possible urban scenarios. They also analyzed significant works of architecture in and around the city and explored their new proposals with city planners and stakeholders.

Helsinki’s regional population of more than one million represents roughly 20 percent of the population of Finland. The city’s new position in relation to the rest of Europe, with potential direct train links to St. Petersburg, looks toward increased density and population. Extensive plans for new housing are aimed at drawing the formerly dilapidated suburban population back to the city core while maintaining affordable alternatives for the working population. Helsinki’s settlement patterns of outer areas are strongly associated with the Gatsby urban movement of the early twentieth century and postwar suburbanization; however, these concepts were seen to be detrimental to the future ecolo-gy and social structure of the city. The studio proposed new urbanism for Helsinki that would break down the existing quantities and resources of the city and its surrounding environment.

As the students addressed the historic importance of the city—their vision focused on a constructed building land-scape. Because the Helsinki students were not as restricted by local politics, their approach was different from that of the Finnish teams. The studio’s approach was more developed-driven than dependent on public funding. The goal was to retain urbanism hand in hand with the excitement of the northern landscape while not con-tradicting the basic building system. Looking for remeasurement of the Garden City model, some students incorporated alternative energy sources, such as wind turbines, and interrupted ice and water so that the building and the garden became one. Others preserved the 19th-century suburban model, as well as the 1930’s Villa type and interlinked the town with its connections through the highway infrastructure. Some made large-scale buildings that punctuated the site and altered the city’s periphery and circulation and cross-axis. In a lively review the jury—Arif Aliava, Keller Easterling, Chris Gerik, Eave-Liis Helakorpi [94], Alan Platts, Hilaire Sample, Richard Saul Wurman, Charles Waldheim, and Michael Weintraub—debated the historic mode versus a new paradigm.

Jeanne Gang Kahn Visiting Assistant Professor

Jeanne Gang chose as the premise of her studio a concept for a Labor History Museum in Chicago. Historically the center of important labor struggles, the site, that of the 1956 Haymarket Riots—the event that led to the eight-hour workday—was only marked with a commemorative plaque. In 1995 the students first conducted research on making and technology, site and environment. A visit to Chicago introduced the students to experts like historian Tarry Tatum from the City of Chicago and labor representative Lee O’Rear. Each student selected an area of research (labor history, construction, the movement, museum, and social hub [typology]), creating a graphic analysis that was incorporated into their programmatic concep-t of what a labor history museum could be in this “city that works.”

Potential artifacts and narratives that form the worker’s struggles in industries such as manufacturing, skilled manufacturing, farm equipment, printing, candy making, and railroad production, were contrasted with today’s service-industry orientation. Some students designed vast halls for the display of large-scale manufacturing equipment and others created classrooms to provide a closer interaction with history. The students were encouraged to incorporate ideas for architecture that conceptualized making in relationship to both physical labor as well as using new digital design tools. This resulted in an exploration of materials in new juxtapositions, structural configurations, and hybrid spatial con-texts. Structural engineer Neil Thomas and environmental engineer Thomas Aver assisted the analysis. To push design concepts that embodied the physicality of making and technology, the students identified a verb to explore: e.g., stacking, bending, casting, or assembling. These processes were explored for conceptual connections to labor and work through large-scale models that helped to establish an idea within a physical point of reference prior to the development of program analy-sis. Site and environmental studies were then developed simultaneously with the museum program.

Some students looked at the assembly of the building as a meeting place for a gathering as well as people gathering in parks and meeting in city squares. You could foreground own assembly as it is. Others thought of the museum as bending, both spatially and technically, leading to formal invention using steel. The jurors—Burk Bidz, Alan Platts, and Hilaire Sample, Neil Thomas and Michael Weintraub—debated the work and morals as Gang emphasized that the studio was “between industry and the worker.” It was developing the physicality of buildings and the way that they are made.

Diana Balmori and Joel Sanders

In a studio that worked to define the border where building and landscape, architecture and design, art and city, were asked to undertake the design of the Shanghai Theater and Park for a site in the French Concession, the subject of a competition that was won by Bing Thom with Balmori Associates. Students were challenged to blur architecture and landscape rather than buying or erasing the other. The studio traveled to China to visit the historic city of Beijing and the new Shanghai gardens, with pavilions, lakes, bridges, and courtyards that flow easily into one another. They also met with the head of the government’s media department, the client for the theater, and the head of city plan ning, the client for the park. Not only had they the architecture and the landscape been separated in concept, but they also had two totally different government agencies as clients. The city-planning department primarily wanted the park to function as a lung for the city, while the media office wanted a “theater of the people,” with the park as a service area.

Precedent analysis concentrated on the relationship between buildings and landscape in the past and at the histori-cal Chinese sites. At the same time, the theater as a building type was studied in detail. Theaters tend to be conceived of as freestanding objects whose opaque walls shelter a series of interior functions—auditori um, stage, and back-of-the-house facilities—spaces that are indifferent to their surroundings. This project offered an opportunity to rethink these conventions and design schemes that would allow for rich spatial and programmatic overlaps between theater and park, while coming to terms with the formal concerns that resist material and spatial continuity.

In teams of two, the students focused on two different scales, developing comprehensi-ve schemes for the overall site and its relationship to the urban context. At the smaller scale, a detailed sample vignette: paradigmatic spaces where building, body, and landscape meet. Shifting back and forth between these two scales, the students created provocative environments that allowed an audience to meet at the interface between inte rior and exterior, nature and architecture. The first exercises included abstracting a successful instance of the integration of architecture and landscape at the Suzhou garden into a principle that could apply to our time and place. The translation was a double one—across time and culture. In presentations to the jurors—Frederick Brand, Aniruddha Mudhoo, Geoffrey Lynch, Alan Platts, Ali Rahim, Joseph Rosa, Ken Smith, Valeria Smith, and Charles Waldheim—the diverse approaches were revealed. Some students used layered methods through walls and screens openings and concealing views, or through terraces creating an outdoor theater that merged with the cityscape. Others used groves of trees that were interspersed with- cells of buildings as they worked to define landscape elements to organize the entire site. For some, circulation routes traversing the site were integrated with a total theatri-cal experience.

7. Abigail Ramsay (105), Project for Diane Balmori and Joel Sanders studio, fall 2005.
Deans Discuss Education Today

At a roundtable discussion in October 25, 2005, organized by Judy DiMaio dean of the School of Architecture and Design of the New York Institute of Technology and led by Roy Gestel, director of the Manhattan Office of City Planning, the deans of seven New York metropolitan-area architecture schools discussed the direction of teaching architecture and design study in the last five years, focusing on the increased need for professionalism, collaboration, skills, and identity.

Robert A. M. Stern emphasized that a problem with "infantilizing" projects exists in the schools because not all disciplines are represented—for example, structural and environmental. "Being in architecture school without working on buildings is akin to medical students working without a body," Stern said. Mark Wilgoye (Columbia University) added that an "interdisciplinary" of the schools has occurred as well significant areas that have emerged in the last five years in both the university and the profession—political, monetary, and economic conditions—must be acknowledged in teaching architecture students.

Whether or not architecture schools should be research-focused was a major topic. Stern noted that it is the faculty that performs independent research and determines ideas, but he would not separate the research arm of practice and education, since architecture schools are not "think tanks" but rather places where students are taught to build structures. And perhaps more postmodern analysis of buildings' successes and failures could also take place.

Wilgoye emphasized that architects should be taught beyond a five-year horizon, while Stern pondered how one could predict what would happen in five years and that perhaps it would be better for architecture students to be trained simply to have solid skills. Georgia Randell (City College) noted that there are hidden myths in the professions: "You're taught that things are "tartan-based" rather than "real-based," and in time you realize that false is just a straw plot or the success of an architecture." Both Randell and Stern agreed that basic skills and a nimble attitude would best prepare an architect for the future.

Another hot topic—often revisited in schools but never discussed altogether—was the relevance of the jury system as a pedagogical tool. Whereas DiMaio suggested that the jury format is antiquated, Urs Goochel (New Jersey Institute of Technology) stated that juries require students to learn how to present an idea and address an audience, which are important skills. Randell observed that a jury obliges students to ferret out what is important, and that the faculty has an obligation not to "steal" the jury with friends but rather to foster the varied exchanges that constitute a healthy academic environment. Goochel said that with the emergence of the "global jury," the format is increasingly "nuanced." While Stern continued to express the belief that architecture is indeed a profession that has to be taught, Wilgoye suggested that the novice of a young graduate can actually enhance an office environment. Peter Wheeler (Parsons School of Design) added that students must also be taught to love the built environment. Goochel suggested that design adds value to projects and that architects must share their tendency to apologize for the profession.

In conclusion, most everyone commented that firms often choose architects because of the schools from which they have graduated, and as Wilgoye emphasized, schools are obliged to nurture their respective identities. Wheelwright suggested that architects need to get a better grip on the discourse of architecture. But Thomas Hanrahan (Pratt Institute) concluded that there is "an interest in building again," a positive interest in the behavior of buildings, which has surfaced in the last five years.

Sophie Guczdy Gluska is director of the undergraduate architecture program at Yale.

Tropical House Travels

The exhibition, Tropical House, curated by Robert Rubin, was disassembled and re-erected at the Hammer Museum at UCLA last fall, where it was exhibited in its new tropical habitat.

Arts Area Renovation Update

Louis Kahn's Yale Art Gallery, now under going a major restoration by Polshek Partnership (James Stewart Polshek '50), is slated for completion in 2007. With the opening up of the gallery spaces, the reengineering of a new "pogo" wall unit, and the replacement of the original glass and window wall facing York Street, the 1953 museum will take its place as part of the University's master plan for the Yale Arts area among its most significant expansion in a generation. The new sculpture department's building on Howe Street by Kieran Timberlake is expected to be completed in 2006. A new drama school building is being programmed, and the forthcoming renovated A & B Building, with the addition of a new art library and the History of Art Building by Goodhart-Siegel & Associates, is slated to open in 2008.

1. Peter de Bretteville, de Bretteville-Simon Houses, Los Angeles, 1976.
Alumni Book Notes


Christopher Glass (98), practicing in Camden, Maine, recently published a book on house design, At Home in Maine: Houses Designed to Fit the Land (Down East Books, Maine, 2005).

Sara Caples (76) and Everardo Jefferson (73) edited "The New Mix: Culturally Dynamic Architecture" (Architectural Design, 6, 2005). In the issue, they pose the question, "Is there a direct correlation between the widening of the ethnic origins of practitioners and diversity in design?" A panel discussion with the editors and authors Ruth Patton and Razi Ashraf was held at the Urban Center in New York on December 2, 2005. The event was cosponsored with Urban Continuum Books and was moderated by John Morris Dixon, former chief editor of Progressive Architecture.


AIA Connecticut Awards

Yale graduates and faculty were honored with various AIA Connecticut Design Awards in fall 2005. The juried included Doug Asher, Jonathan Lavi (81), and L.Chung Suh. Gary Posch Architects (97 and 98) received a Built Award for their Two Bridge project in Washington and Madison, Connecticut, and a Residential Award for the Puggio House in Newtowk Northwest Connecticut. Cesar Pelli & Associates received a Built Award for the National Museum of Art in Osaka, Japan. The firm of Tal Rosko (62) garnered a Citation for Interior Architecture for their Ross Common-La Fiere Hall at Middlebury College. Peter L. Giuck (75) and Partners received a Residential Award for the Double House in New Canaan, Connecticut. The New Haven firm of Craig Novicki (37) won a citation for the Cahill-Maguin House facade detail in Clinton, Connecticut.

Rome Continuity and Change

For centuries, Rome has beckoned artists, historians, aesthetes, and architects with its romantic ruins, perfect architectural proportions, and subtle geology. In May last year, more than 50 up-and-coming second-year architecture students and three Yale faculty mentors—Alc Purves, Stephen Harky, and Sophia Gouskos—flew to Rome to participate in a four-week drawing seminar. Titled "Rome: Continuity, and Change," the course explored the city's many architectural layers—from Nazian's buried palaces to Renzo Piano's recently completed Auditorium Perro della Musica—and offered a formative journey through Rome's built heritage.

Like numerous architects in History—Michelangelo, Richard Meier, Le Corbusier, and Louis Kahn—we spent our days walking, observing, and drawing the city. To give the course theoretical structure and to facilitate our drawing skills, staff visits were organized to examine the key archtectonic moments of the city. Of particular note were Parco della Cappella, Santa Maria degli Angeli, San Giovanni in Laterano, and Santa Maria della Pace. All were conceived with an eye on the future, such as the Roman Forum and Hadrian's Villa near Tivoli, and examined Bernini's sculptures at the Galeria Borghese. These visits were enriched by the insights of guides Javier García and Anna Blasi-Ochandi, and Yale faculty member Bryan Fuemmeland. With a wealth of historical and theoretical context, class exercises centered on recording observations with pencil, pen, or brush. As stressed by Alc Purves, "The most effective way to engage architecture is by direct observation, and that observation is best served by on-site drawing. Nothing gives more pleasure, nor directs us more strongly to notice things that they would have otherwise overlooked."

In our weeks together, we recorded daily observations and completed a more sustained study during the trip's final days. During that period, it was not rare to see a classmate carefully documenting every tile of the floor of the Basilica in Ara Coeli, or lying down on the ground drawing the negative space formed by columns at the Plaza di San Ignazio—or diagramming the space needed to park Smart Cars and Vespas on Rome's cobblestone streets. At the seminar's end, a gathering at the American Academy in Rome, faculty and guest critics reviewed the final projects, inspiring Alc Purves to say, "My greatest satisfaction during the four astonishing weeks in Rome was to watch others develop this same enthused curiosity and truly end to see them find delight and inspiration in observing everything from an underlying geometric structure to the monumetnary fall of light." And so it was in the city we did.

—Argelio Roca-Romasa and Meliana Dominio (95)

2005 Building Project

When New Haven Mayor John DeStefano jr. visited the 2005 Building Project at 901 Orchard Street in mid-August, it was no surprise—given his own recent contributions to the city—that much of his interest centered on its sustainable aspects. DeStefano's initiatives with New Haven public schools—specifically, the Ballard Environmental Magnet Magnet School's massive solar power project, slated to be the fifth largest solar photovoltaic system operating in New England—parallel the Class of 2005's attention to improving the environment as well as the city.

As it has since 1996, the students worked in collaboration with Neighborhood Housing Services of New Haven, but for the first time in the project's 38-year history, the state supplied additional funds. The Connecticut Clean Energy Fund provided an educational grant to pay for the inclusion of photovoltaic panels in the 1,500-square-foot, single-family residence located in a low-income neighborhood. It works to everyone's advantage: while 980 Orchard's PV panels will generate energy for the entire city, the project will pay for the students' education. Their new dimensions and responsibilities are underscored by the students: "The teaching affects for both the program and the community. The fifth Building Project differs from precedent in other ways. Initial designs were formed based on cost and aesthetics, such as fenestration, low-cost housing, the environment, contemporary lifestyle, and comfort. Although the context group's proposal won out, general interest in sustainable building techniques and economic efficiency arose from the project's potential leading to a new set of conditions for building. "Good neighbor" was not enough. It was architecture directly or not, imply respect for others, for environment, for its area. But what expectations come with that designation, and how it has changed over time? Given the context of a traditional residential street, the Class of 2005 understood the idea of "good neighbor" to be not only an architectural necessity but a design challenge. Instead of quiet integration, they opted for a visible impact and sustainable features for the whole community.

Since the building would be smaller than the neighboring houses, the students placed its greatest mass in front, facing south. This provided the major plane for the house's photovoltaic panel system. At the back of the house, a north-facing window floods the primary living space with light. The house's ridge, or "roof" line, describes its energy-gathering function: a high front gable sloping down low to a rear shed roof. This dramatic transformation is accomplished by a standing-seam metal roof on the exterior, while interior luminosity is enhanced by whitewashed brick walls with quarter-inch offsets. These various ruled surfaces reiterate the shifting conditions and changing geometry of the structure throughout. Its most dramatic moment occurs, however, with the insertion of a north, walled-glass window, which symbolically holds the light.

The students made such major design decisions, placing the master bedroom at the front on the ground floor and creating a side entrance. The latter decision is another "first" in the program and was determined not only from the private function of the bedroom but from the width of the site's facade. The front, to the right, leads directly into the heart of the house, which contains the service core of kitchen and full bathroom. Other features contribute to overall energy efficiency, including south-facing windows with solar shades (made of re-usable material) and a window placed high on a second-floor exterior wall. An upstairs patio features built-in cabinetry. The 2005 Building Project held valuable lessons regarding social responsibility and physical context. The class of 2005 found that challenging traditional assumptions, such as the need for a front door that faces the street and incorporating sustainable concerns is necessary for meeting the new requirements of our growing cities that respond to our environment.

—Marc Gubern (77)
