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A complex image or idea resulting from synthesis by the mind.
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A Note on the Title: Herakleia Nova R

The intention of this cursive is to render a type family by using the language and functions of software; instead (of text), medium, style, etc., it should now be possible to involve other dimensions (three or qualities) the ability to move, grow, hide, read in the production and use of digital topography.

Variations on a typewriter: Herakleia Nova R, reminiscent of the illustrations for the headlines of ancient issues of Constructus. These include: resolution (low-resolution handwriting), machine handwriting (KurzCAD) and high-speed LCD display; 3-D characters for whiteboard display; a preview inside Adobe Illustrator; and a version in which the character is virtually constructed from its own postscript code.

This issue introduces two additions: Herakleia Nova R Palm by Dan Michelson and Herakleia Nova R Scanner by Ron Currivan. These titles will explore aspects of network communications from wireless devices to scripting languages.

—Paul Alman
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Patrik Schumacher, who teaches at the Architectural Association in London, asked questions concerning contemporary architecture and technology to three visiting faculty—Frank Gehry, Louis I. Kahn visiting professor; Zaha Hadid, Kôro Saarinen visiting professor; and Greg Lynn, Davenport visiting professor—all of whom are returning to Yale this spring to teach advanced studios. Gehry and Hadid’s studios focus on the World Trade Center site. Lynn’s is an exploration of ornament in a museum addition. Hadid will give a lecture on April 4, 2002. Patrik Schumacher: What are the factors driving the rapid development of architectural science today, and what is your motivation to participate in this process? Frank Gehry: I see the world moving fast, and architecture are part of it—so we work on what we see, to the time we are in and with the tools we have. It is a throw-away culture, and it is over quickly. Andy Warhol taught us that. You can be judgmental about it and say, “I would rather sit in the Hamptons all week and think about it,” or you can jump in and get wet. Terrorism changed everything, and economic ups and downs affect our lives regularly. I was working on a whole week and then not the next. I learn the times and respond intuitively. I don’t contrive to respond by saying, “OK, now we are searching for emergency in culture, so it is an interesting time to design caves.” But I do think there will be more fire escapes. I go with the flow, so to speak, and I don’t sit around worrying about the trends or the discussions. I react to them with interest, but I am not in it. I have my own thing and have maintained an office with 120 people that functions like a Swiss watch. We have worked out a dance together that is comfortable for me and for them, and we produce stuff that some clients like.

Zaha Hadid: Innovation, even mere difference, is always welcome in our dynamic modern civilization. If anything, this is going to accelerate even further. My work from five years ago is not the same as today, and it can no longer be used as a measure or a reference point for my current work. I enjoy this dynamic. I saw this as a process. I was brought up with the concept of modernization and progress—and I still believe in it.

Greg Lynn: The advent of calculi as a dimensional, descriptive, and formal paradigm for architectural design drives architecture for me. This use of a more sophisticated mathematical system fly the invention, description, and fabrication of architectural forms is pushing architecture into a vocabulary of curvature and pattern of infinitesimal variation. The design medium of the computer is only interrupting me in this regard—a tool that lets me visualize and explore forms using calculi rather than simplistic, algorithmic coordinate geometry. The proliferation of computer-controlled tools for manufacturing and assembly components allows these forms to be realized with high degrees of curvature and vast variations in form.

Patrik Schumacher: You are iconoclasts in the field of architecture. However, do you recognize essential architectural principles present in your work that can be found in modern, classical, and even world architecture in general?

Frank Gehry: My principles are similar to those in classical architecture. I am interested in form and proportion, humanistic qualities and context, being a good neighbor, and making the whole better than the sum of the parts.

If we are in a neighborhood of third-rate buildings and our structure stands out and does its work, it makes the other buildings work better. This is true of the bridge in Bilbao, which is incorporated into the building—making both structures better.

I am also interested in how people perceive a building. I understand the issue of entasis in classical temples, and much of what I do is related to classical sculpture and painting. When people want to discriminate me they do it by saying that it doesn’t relate to anything. They are totally different. A Roman scholar who came to see my work said, “You must have studied Romanesque architecture.” I did, for six months in France and Italy, but I hardly ever talk about it.

Zaha Hadid: Obviously the reliance on geometry seems to be universal in architecture. But when we work with various complex geometries today, this is different from the appearance of preconceived figures—for example, the Pyramids—that characterize most traditional architecture. As a child I went to see the monuments in Iraq and Lebanon. I also traveled to France, Spain, and Rome. But as an architect, the classical Roman or the ancient Sumerian or Babylonian architecture never served as an explicit reference point for me. All my conscious references are located within the seventeenth-century modern architecture. But I do reject the Modernist tabula rasa attitude and recognize the need to contextualize contemporary work. In fact, it was the juxtaposition of new and old that led to the general use of super-position as a compositional technique to build up formal complexity. This is also the root of the contemporary notion of meaningfulness.

Greg Lynn: I am growing more interested in developing an aesthetic discourse for contemporary architecture. There was a time when a silly anti-aesthetic was launched, and it was used in all of the wrong ways to justify an insensitivity to the effects of architectural objects on a culture. I am becoming more and more convinced that the collapse of the term formalism, along with its aesthetic, is a great loss for architects. I was trained within the analytic formalist horizon of Rowe, Eiseman, Cutlerhon, Vidler, and Wiley. So I very much in the formalist project, which in many ways is universal and essential despite its radicalism and its anti-aestheticism. But radical formalism is no longer the avant-garde of architectural theory or practice. Any contemporary aesthetic discourse that recognizes the forces of form, pattern, decoration, material, and ornament and volume as a cultural practice is doomed to be an embarrassment, despite that we all recognize this as the dominant mode of architectural design.
I do not think there are any essential principles, but there is an aesthetic univer-
salism. And that univer-
salism has its own spirit. It is not the intellectual or cultural significance of the work itself, but rather the com-
plexes of harmony, symmetry, whilism, unity, and proportion through a contempo-
rary aesthetic discourse to see what these terms might be. Symmetry as a concept is not universal. In fact, it is not even symmetric. We thought it was 100 years ago, as an organizing principle, is the surreal/futurist
movement. Now it is a sign of deconstruction, or the lack of information (hence the term symmetry breaking as a sign of higher
degrees of organization). We think we all agree upon unit and wholism, but they have not been adequately defined in archi-
tecture since the Blech- arts period. There is a need for an aesthetic literary theory, and there always will be in architecture. Because of this, certain terms, techniques, and preoccupations will persist, but the meaning and definition of these terms will constantly change and evolve.

Patrik Schumacher: Looking back on your careers—which collectively define a segment of architectural history—is there any project that you consider seminal for the development of your work? And which of your projects do you consider historically most signifi-
cant, and why?

Frank Gehry: The New York Times build-
ing, the renovation of the State Lice-
ues of New York, the client, the pro-
gress reports. The other semi-
annual was my own house, which cer-
tainly was important in my own life, and it came out pretty good. We still live there, and we love it. As architects we are doing some interesting work. I don’t know where it fits into the parade of what others are doing. But I know that we have facilitated the design of our buildings through the use of computer programs, and we work with a small cluster of contractors and subcon-
tractors. We have created a unique way of working. We put the architect more in con-
trol, allowing us to budget better. Coming on in budget isn’t easy, because you are at the mercy of the marketplace. If you can manage the schedule and the degree of accuracy that you can demystify the forms and shapes, than you can work better with the clients. There is more interac-
tion with people we work with in Germany, or even with our clients. We have more experience with other architects after our projects are com-
pleted. So there must be something there. Zaha Haddid and I never had the chance to work together for me was my winning entry in the Hol
denbeck competition in 1983. The
older projects now pile in on top of the
Peak project. But this achievement didn’t come easy, was a lot of work working on a series of competitions before that—most notably the competition to design the train prime minister’s residence in 1979. I did not win this competition, but looking back now, it was the first mature Zaha Haddid project. It was on show at the Architectural Association in 1980, and I continued to produce it and to produce my first set of elaborate paintings for my show in Amsterdam in 1985. At that same time, I also did a series of complex drawings and paintings—Strange Perspexcapes and images of floating islands. With the Peak project I rationalized some of those techniques and also started to experiment with elaborate graphic inter-
pretations of the surface. And the idea was to develop a strategic design tool that generates the formal aspects of the architectural intervention.

Greg Lynn: The most important project was the Sears Tower proposal, as it was the last project that was drawn entirely by hand. In it are all of the tech-
niques and tools later used for these other projects, only they were calculated, pro-
fected, and constructed by hand. It was probably 600-1,000 hours of work in those drawings; and now I can produce them in less than an hour. The implications of the Predator project are something we’ll be considering for quite some time. For me it has been a very significant work.

Patrik Schumacher: Can you reveal something about your creative meth-
ods? How do you create newness, and how do you develop an idea?

Frank Gehry: Newness happens because each time is a different time. It is three years
later than the last project, and what you are working with—the client, the pro-
grams, and the situation—are different. And if you do not get self-conscious about continuing something new, I think that it happens—although not always.

Sometimes you look back and you say, “I feel like I am repeating myself again.” Fortunately or unfortunately, architecture takes so long to actually change. It is a long project it is hard to change it. And it is hard to hide from the clients, because if you are not happy with what you did, they get angry. It is not nice to be unhappy, it is just that you are somewhere else three years later. So I might bring ideas into later projects. I do have a work ethic—when I have a deadline, I am very, very, very, very happy to do it. I try to avoid it. I really never give up, and I do the best I can at the smallest project. You have to look at what you have, and it is there until somebody leaves it down. There are projects that I decide not to do: when the client and I don’t make it—like selling for New York Times. I thought it was going to be difficult for them and for me. At one point—the project was coming together quickly—I had to make a decision. David Childs and I were struggling with it, but we gave it our best shot. If we had been picked, which we thought would have happened the next day, then we would have cleaned. Then we might have dropped out in the middle, and that might have been a lot more embarrassing for them. David and I don’t want to create that kind of turmoil. That kind of thing has a lot of continuity sketching. For me this is a kind of intuitive calligraphy, a kind of cloudy writing. In this way I might just draw some spatial and architec-
tural structures that I am interested in, I am interested in creating spatially and architec-
turally. Sometimes I find inspiring compo-
nient structures within photographs or paintings or in museums, or in magazines. There are spatial activities that I am interested in, I start to think about a new project—usually on the basis of com-
plexes. Then my doddles up link with the attempt to picture spatial configurations that might make sense with respect to site and program. After that my collaborators in the office come into play, and the formal possibilities and concepts are pursued. And of course the models and drawings are made and the designs are refined. And the last seven or eight years, computer-modeling techniques.

Zaha Haddid: You put your finger on a prin-
ciple: new technologies are inherently more interesting than old technologies.

This does not preclude new uses of old technologies, by the way, but the new—in terms of technology—has the capacity to produce, destabilize, and generally force creativity in a way that old technologies could not possibly, or even that is not possible. How do you think that an organically integrated, intricately fused, continues vertically, rhythmically shifting over time. Some projects, I don’t know how else I would start design-
ing if I didn’t have some upbeat impetus. Laff: Frank Gehry & Associates, Utra Tower, Honolulu, 1991. Photog-
graph courtesy Frank Gehry & Associates
Top right: Zaha Hadid Architects, Wolfburg Science Centre, Germany, 2001.
Bottom right: Greg Lynn FORM, Shanghai Expo 2010, Shanghai, China.
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Lisa Anne Couture (58), this spring’s Bishop visiting professor is launching an advanced studio on the Olympic site in Madrid. She was interviewed by Sarah E. Amato (58), senior editor of Architectural Record, who gave a lecture entitled “Convergences” on January 14, 2002.

Sarah E. Amato: Tell us about the word asymptote as it applies to your firm—its meaning in this context and how that meaning has evolved.

Lisa Anne Couture: The mathematical definition of the asymptote is two lines meeting at infinity, or on a curve or a curve meeting.

Initially we were interested in pursuing the ways practice and theory come together, not looking ourselves into one domain or the other but really investigating the area in between. As the firm has grown, we have come closer and closer that territory gets very dense. And we are interested in pursuing ourselves and pursuing several types of exploration simultaneously, such as the relationship between the digital/virtual realm and realist/realist reality. But I hesitate to summarise or “package” our practice as an opportunistic dialogue, when we do so many other ways of work as a variety of scales.

SEA: How would you characterize the respective roles that you and your partner and other partners play and share, play the in the firm?

LAC: It’s very a complementary one. We have a real need for external forces to project each taking the lead at different times. If one begins with a conceptual direction, the other takes the lead in marketing the various ideas. This makes sure the intent is carried through—whether we’re addressing a fast or a building project.

LAC: Here, we went to Cranbrook and studied under Daniel Libeskind, has a strong conceptual/theoretical background and probably brings more to that side of the practice. Although I’m more interested in the conceptual/theoretical issues, I came out of Yale—where I studied with such practicing architects as Frank Gehry—with a broader range of experience in implementation and building.

SEA: Obviously the digital realm—its culture and technology—has evolved radically since you started your firm in 1998.

LAC: I think we anticipated the digital realm in our earliest project, Steel Cloud (the now-shelved West Coast Gateway design for Los Angeles). For example, we responded to cultural globalization (largely the result of new technologies) with a bookless digital library. This might be of interest to the library professionals of today, who could potentially access every text in the world and give every person access to data bases. We also proposed digital billboards for the display of multimedia art on the exterior, as well as a sound sculpture derived from the digitalization of the traffic below. At that time these concepts were quite radical.

SEA: Besides Steel Cloud—which, though never built, launched Asymptote—what other projects had particular impact on your thinking or shifted your direction?

LAC: In reality each new project is both a shift and a continuation of a body of research and investigation. Currently, we are developing for the New York Stock Exchange and for the Guggenheim both proposed two counterparts: one virtual and the other real. As exemplified by its neighbor, the Metropolitan Museum of Art—while still remaining iconic in its scale, it is ever in flux. Bilbao is also an icon, but a further unraveling. If you try to capture its iconic flaw, you see it’s more of a blur, more in flux. So we thought, if we’re going to do another Guggenheim, the next state would be an architecture in that it is actually fluctuating. We created a spatial entity in the virtual realm that is constantly changing. We began incorporating program through points of entry that are moments in space and time—a fluctuating architecture that allows access to certain faces only at certain moments. In real space you must physically move your body to access a different place, but in the virtual realm the place can come to you. So we started asking, what if you could animate that condition and make it a dynamic?

SEA: Another aspect of the virtual realm that seems up, at least with the Stock Exchange, was the way information itself becomes available in an almost “inherent” experiential qualities.

LAC: Yes, there we had to invent the interactivity. It wasn’t just about illustrating the actual activity. We had to think about how one could sense and interact with an entity or spatial condition. In the virtual Guggenheim, a person could trigger spatial transformations—changing, say, the color, the scale, the material quality, or tuning one’s own movement in the field. But what we are very much interested in is what is this program for the virtual space we inhabit now. A lot of our installation work for museums, galleries, and the Venice Biennale has been about reworking and approximating these conditions. As buildings become increasingly connected with smart technologies, these conditions will continue to evolve.

SEA: How do you think the increased presence and changing role of the computer have affected the nature of architecture education and the design process?

LAC: For one thing, students can now experiment with notions of form that were previously unaffordable to them. That’s good and bad, because one of the computer can allow for new architectural propositions to evolve but it may also risk developing into a stylistic pursuit with little understanding of what it means.

SEA: You’re saying it risks being graphically facile and purely superficial?

LAC: Yes. And when the tools are fairly complex, it’s sometimes hard to remain in control of them. The presence of digital technologies has definitely had an impact on architectural schools, and this is equal to their presence all around us—affecting every facet of our lives.

SEA: What are the current projects in your office?

LAC: The latest projects include an invited competition for a museum for Mercedes in Stuttgart, for which we’ve currently short-listed. The museum is to display the history of the automobile. We also received an invited competition for a pavilion for the Municipality of Hartenmier, which is located adjacent to Amsterdam’s Schiphol Airport. As host to a global horticulture exhibition, it is building a permanent position to create the city through a multimedia installation and to accommodate special events. This is to be a promenade on a lake surrounded by woods with 747s soaring overhead, which truncates us as a condition of the modern world. Like much of Holland, the area results from pumping water to create usable land. Our building, called Hybrider Pier, is sited partly on water, which is constantly pumped over its surface, creating a “liquidated architecture” that shimmers and reflects the airplanes above. On the threshold between land and water, we created a gap in the building where the steel superstructure rises from the sloping roof surfaces down to two glass water walls located on either side of a floating walkway.
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Steve Izenour (’89), who died at age 51 on August 21, 2005, was a native of the Yale community both in his studies at the school and his return as a teacher in recent years. Constructed three different voices—the office of Venturi, Scott Brown & Associates, Kenneth H. Haviland (’41), and Steve Van Dyck (’70)—for their memories of him.

Learning from Izenour

Steve Izenour’s long association with Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown began in 1962 when, as a graduate student in architecture at the University of Pennsylvania, he enrolled in both Scott Brown’s and Venturi’s theory courses. In 1968, while a graduate student at Yale, Izenour became their teaching assistant in the pivotal Las Vegas studio. That studio formed the basis for Learning from Las Vegas (MIT Press, 1972), a book co-authored by Venturi, Scott Brown, and Izenour that became one of the most important books on architecture in the twentieth century.

The Yale Las Vegas studio was revolutionary in a number of ways. Venturi and Scott Brown believed that the city represented a type of urban architecture could learn from, and Izenour shared this vision. The studio acknowledged the influence of the automobile on architecture and the Automobile Age, which was happening at the time. Students in the studio conducted small-group project work on the design of functional, everyday urban spaces.

The lessons learned in Las Vegas became the basis for Venturi, Scott Brown, and Izenour as architects and urbanists, as well as an important facet of their firm’s practice. Izenour’s death is a profound loss for Venturi and Scott Brown—both personally and professionally. An ideal teaching assistant for the studio, Izenour loved the American commercial vernacular embodied in the Las Vegas strip and spent long hours with students late into the night. His infectious enthusiasm made him an inspiration. The early experience as a teacher and mentor would come back to himself and others.

And Las Vegas remains a fascination and a tool for understanding the world. As the strip constantly changes, reinvigorating itself every few years as casino operators aimed at luring visitors, Izenour watched with only some nostalgia for the 1968 version of Las Vegas. Blink your eyes and it’s gone. Izenour was lucky enough to have known it back then.

Izenour continued his study of the American urban landscape in design studios of his own at Yale and Penn. Similar to Venturi, his own work examined unique urban areas such as Camden and Wildwood, New Jersey, as well as I-45, for lessons to be learned about urbanism, humanism, and architecture. In his design projects Izenour made the most of every opportunity to incorporate bold graphics, new technology, and the most important element of all: fun. One of his most complete projects, the Children’s Garden, in Camden, New Jersey, is a primarily outdoor facility along the waterfront with a series of large, colorful gardens designed to provide a variety of experiences and appeal to a wide age range, allowing children to learn while they are having fun. Although the garden by its very nature has many small-scale, two-to-the-ground exhibits, Izenour incorporated large-scale high-rise graphics in its design, allowing for a big impact along the urban waterfront.

This summer a retrospective of the work of Venturi, Scott Brown & Associates (VSBA) was held at the Philadelphia Museum of Art. VSBA designed a section of the show called “The Architect’s Domain” to mix stills and moving images and text, and it was a collection of the firm’s attitudes, design theories, “Iwo.” The show was installed in a symposium in conjunction with the exhibit, Izenour gave a tribute to Venturi and Scott Brown.

Sparking also for the many people who have been a part of the office over the years, he offered these words: “But when the theories, the works, and the charrettes are all said and done, you’ve given your students the greatest gift that a teacher can give—the gift of sight and a little insight tempered by love, understanding, intelligence, and a hell of a lot of enthusiasm for the job.”

Eulogy for Steve Izenour

So much of the discussion today in the academy and in the press regarding every-day and popular culture owes its sub stance to Steve Izenour and his work. His approach was always evolving and it celebrated the unique aspects of the everyday particular to one place and understandable by all. Steve also brought to his work an unpassed knowledge of new technologies and their application to architecture, lighting, materials, and signs, to name a few, as well as computer software and graphic-representation techniques.

Steve was an extraordinary instructor and mentor, teaching at the University of Pennsylvania, Yale, and Drexel. He knew no hierarchy, no distinctions, no line between high or low, old or young, rich or poor, educated or not. Steve was the only teacher I have known who would be up all night with students before a jury mounting boards and giving invaluable, insightful advice.

Steve will be missed at Yale and in the community. He grew up in New Haven, graduated from the Yale School of Architecture, and pioneered the MED program. Steve worked for then dean Charles Moore on Church Street South, a canonical housing project in New Haven. In recent years he came back to Yale frequently as visiting professor, reintroducing and redefining students to his way of looking at the “Learning From” methodology that he was involved with in the original studies at Yale (1967–70).

The two recent studio—“Learning from Las Vegas Later” (2000) and “Learning from the Wildwoods” (1998)—were research-seminar-lecture studio hybrids with a diverse collection of studio participants. This was consistent with Steve’s constant way of seeing “outside the box” of architecture. They were interdisciplinary: only Steve could cut through academic bureaucracy to authorize students from, for example, graphic design, forestry, and environmental studies to enroll in the studio. Students and faculty still talk about his lively and entertaining lectures, spectacular final reviews, and allowing students the opportunity to have two reviews—one in the academy and one in the real world.

Steve’s work in Wildwood, New Jersey, represents many of his evolving ideas about design and architecture. Wildwood is a unique and independent work at Venturi, Scott Brown & Associates. Always slightly below the radar screen yet ahead of the curve, Steve taught students, collaborators, and clients how to think, and in the energy in the environment of Wildwood, and helped the community learn from itself and value its imagery and architectural resources.

Steve’s predilection, “Make It Big.” “Make It Red.” “Make It Sign.” “Make It Dumb.” “No Need to Be Putto”—are short, sweet reminders that they didn’t describe the contribution he has made to the highest level of debate in contemporary architecture. Even if they are not yet fully understood, just as the modest hero in so many of us, his contributions will endure.

—Denise Scott Brown, Robert Venturi, Eileen Law, Jeff Kuehn, and Heather Clark Venturi, Scott Brown & Associates

Steve Izenour: Teacher, Mentor, and Best Friend

I met Steve on my first day at Venturi, Scott Brown & Associates, a warm June morning in the summer of 1986. A student and an architectural history major at McGill College, I was so naive that I actually wore a coat and tie for my first day of work. I was nervous and didn’t have a clue what to expect. Steve’s nonchalant tone on the phone the day before was puzzling. “Show up when you want,” he said.

During the following years, Steve took me under his wing. It turned out that we had a whole lot more than first names in common. We both loved pop culture, gadgets, and boats. We grew up eating in Connecticut and loved the water. When I learned this, I knew we had to go sailing together at least once. Since then we have sailed 2,000 miles together, mostly offshore. I learn a lot about someone in those situations. The truth about Steve is that wherever we were—no matter how bad the weather was—he was always himself. His smile, composure, funny polyester shirts, and unforgettable laugh were always with us. He even brought his bike with him a few times.

Steve was without a doubt the most unconventional teacher I’ve ever come across, mostly because he quickly became a friend to every one of my studio students. He understood that the relationship between student and teacher were gone: we were in this together. After all, just a few years before you wouldn’t even realize that you were learning—for, that matter, that you were even teaching. The dialogue with him was natural, easy, informal, and light-hearted. Most of all, it was fun. Spending time with Steve was more like hanging out with a friend.

Steve taught us to learn from the everyday, the things we take for granted. He knew that the things that define who we are, as a culture and as individuals, were instrumental in our ability to design thoughtfully: it’s the gift of our culture that makes us special, that makes us who we are.

Steve was a real rebel. He had no qualms about disagreeing with authority, bucking the trends, and talking nobody was full of BS. He stood up for what he believed in—all the time, with quills by his side, and said anything for five. But most of all, Steve taught us to look for yourself. If he thought we were overanalyzing a problem, he’d just say, “Don’t think about it too much—just do it blindly and ask for feedback.” He wanted us to do what was natural to us, not what academia or high-falutin’ trends would dictate. Steve encouraged us to be ourselves, just as he was always himself.

The most amazing thing about Steve was that he inspired countless students just like me. He had an effect on me forever—and if that’s so, it’s a scar I’ll carry with pride.

—Stephen K. Van Dyck (’70)
The Nature of Architectural Research and the MED Program

At a roundtable discussion held this fall, faculty and graduates discussed issues of architectural research and the MED (Masters in Environmental Design) program at Yale. The participants included the director of the program, Eeva-Liisa Pelkonen (MED '94); associate dean Peggy Deemer; professor Alan Plattus; faculty members Keller Easterling and Dean Sakamoto (MED '92); Mark Linder (MED '89), faculty member at University of Syracuse; and Sarah Whiting (Yale College '89), faculty member at Harvard Graduate School of Design.

Sarah Whiting: If we pose the problem that architectural research has lost its definition, then our task would be to reestablish an unifying form of expertise and framework within which one can define a research problem both for the design studio and at the MED and Ph.D. levels. Keller Easterling: When you say "framework for expertise," what do you mean by expertise?

Sarah Whiting: Expertise lies within the boundaries of a discipline. That might be somewhat elitist, but to speak of expertise acknowledges an intellectual project, and such a project does have an aura—or to put it in less offensive terms—a defined audience, whether that audience is understood to be designers, urban theorists, or historians.

Keller Easterling: The word research has been slightly degraded in the last couple of years with ubiquitous use and narrow definitions.

Peggy Deemer: The resurgence of research in the studio was a way of seeing that architectural research is an intellectual task not just about design, form, or zoning; it puts research in a positive light, even if it becomes more elitist.

Eeva-Liisa Pelkonen: The boundaries of the profession have expanded, so we must ask, "What does an architect do?" This question was essential to the twentieth century and is the project of Modernism. Le Corbusier defined the profession to include economics and politics, with the architect as an expert who can solve social problems. For example, Ren Koolhaas is an architect who looks at himself as an expert.

Mark Linder: The first-generation Modernists, like Le Corbusier—or even the second, like those who call themselves Team 10—were able to expand the discipline of architecture by extending territories of expertise out into other areas, making claims for a certain kind of efficacy upon other fields. If we make a distinction between the discipline and expertise, it seems that Modernism degenerated into more narrowly defined areas of expertise at the expense of the discipline. By discipline I mean the history of techniques and concepts that architects claim as their own. If we identify research with expertise, we continue the Modernist trend, but maybe things can flip so that research is now not so much about extending a strong discipline but about rethinking the architectural discipline from others who unpeeled, adopted, and interpreted it. Peggy Deemer: As the trajectory of Modernism narrowed, expertise dominated and research—in the positive sense—disappeared. We just know what the task was; we didn't have to research it. The formulas were there that spurred our research. Eventually the resurgence of research was a response to postmodernism, in which the conventions really became formulaic. In this case you would want to distinguish between expertise (formula) and research (investigation) rather than align them.

Keller Easterling: Rather than speaking from a position of expertise, as we used to use the word—a position of knowing it all—it seems that architects have been recently pursuing constructive research that comes from admitting to knowing nothing: knowing nothing about places like Ghana or North Korea, or knowing nothing about practice in the wide world that are consequential in culture.

Dean Sakamoto: This emphasizes the significance of Charles Moore, who in founding the program was interested in finding another path for academics. He wanted to send students out into the world to see it and feel it as an alternative to the professional curriculum—and that is where one could find out about remote pieces.

Peggy Deemer: The 1960s with Moore was the time when the whole issue of relevance was foremost in everyone's vocabulary, and architecture was linked with social sciences.

Sarah Whiting: There is a similar aspiration now; maybe not relevance in the social-science sense but in the pragmatic sense. But returning to the earlier point:

What do you mean, Keller, by the degradation of research?

Keller Easterling: I was thinking of the moment everyone was calling their studios "research offices," in which the word research was synonymous with formal research using the computer. It was not research into the way the tool was reformulating the world and its politics, but something more hermetic, more comfortably residing in the house of architecture.

Sarah Whiting: There is a need for expertise that does not equal number crunching but that allows you to define your particular territory. It would make me nervous if anyone could define what an architect does, because everyone's expertise is so different.

Mark Linder: I think you've made an important point. Somewhat expertise is something that you develop and that has some authority that authorizes claims in other areas. Expertise is valuable for identifying a vocabulary, a set of problems, and a way of approaching them—and then you venture out and leave that cocoon. That's different from having Ph.D. programs that produce experts whose work then becomes a dead end.

Eeva-Liisa Pelkonen: It might be defined in a Ph.D. program, where the goal is more clearly an increase of existing knowledge in a checklist of what needs to be covered for the whole discipline of architectural research. The goals of MED and design research are not clearly defined in terms of a discipline or field.

Keller Easterling: It is more a curiosity than orthodoxy.
Alan Platson: We are to communicate our collaborative, and sometimes, competitive, research on places, practices, tech- nologies, and standards—a common language, at least—are needed. That may not be the model of the theory that is rooted in the med program. The med program may be able to contribute to the development of a new semiotic and tech- nomic procedures then a Ph.D. program.

Peggy Deaman: We are trying to confirm that expertise is possible and it is needed, but we don’t want commitment.

Sarah Whiting: It is more like a fluid expertise.

Peggy Deaman: I can relate that to practice, because on the one hand as an archi- tect I have no special rights but are completely snarled when a client says, “I won’t give you a project because you haven’t done the work before.” But we can transfer expertise to other related work, not limiting things.

Sarah Whiting: I can be understanding of a series of Venetian circles that point around you with overlaps that are constantly building on new information.

Eva-Lisa Pelkonen: There is a double approach in architectural research at the moment. One is the impulse for curiosity and openness to the world and the other is to bradcast openness with clearly defined expertise. I would argue that these tendencies have reached a critical point, and issues as complex as globalization require new forms of collaboration to be inscribed in a mean- ingful manner.

Sarah Whiting: One way is by framing, another is by widening your network which might help to keep the framing more open. I don’t know for what distinction there is between MED and Ph.D. research.

Peggy Deaman: Another reason it is inter- esting to look at Charles Moore is that stu- dents and professors and the MED students could go out of the world. It is a different way, it is a more open-ended approach. There is a whole other network of students, who for all their library-bound education, have access to the world by engaging and thinking about culture.

Eva-Lisa Pelkonen: We could look at the status of two types of Ph.D., those with who are already well-grounded in Architectural frame things differently. I would call it a visual intelligence and being curi- ous with regard to the world of architecture since the world.

Anna Sakamoto: The Eames are an example with their design research that is physical, visual, and cultural. Consider also the work of P. Klee, who curiously researched and demonstrated the relationship between music and architectural form. He can take us from the outside to the microscopic. I also think that the way Moore encouraged the student to engage with the world is by doing work with “Learning from Las Vegas” can be seen as a project to Kooshy’s global research.

Sarah Whiting: What Kooshy does at Harvard with the MED program is to organize a group of four to six three student projects in collective one-year projects to research and develop design work as shop- ping, the Paper River Delta, Lagos, or Rome. Ultimately each group creates a book, which can be understood as an experimental research typol- ogies, such as the man-made and the vernacular. Another example is the Rice Center for Urban Planning and Design, directed by Sarah Kooshy, where students research within the broad framework of technology and the political and social implications of an engage- ment research program that included faculty and students and included books produced as research projects.

Mark Lindkvist: One of the distinctions that needs to be stressed is the need for a natural dissertation. The scholarly apparatus for dissertation work is distinct from the direct pipeline to the book industry. The MED program could require that you are don’t publish your work in a book—but the Ph.D. couldn’t do that. That relates the question of what we produce and do afterward. If you are a published author you have different opportunities than if you produce a dissertation for you to an academic appointment or to change one.

Kellar Easterling: The Ph.D. methodology is valuable, but I think the MED might have to adopt it to adapt to the methodology or the document that permits one’s qualifications to exist. Does one framework document or a monograph (that does not deny the very information one wishes to explore?) could easily become MED thesis topics. My assistant for the China studio this year was an architecture student. I had a slightly younger student, Jackie Lin, who finished just a very interesting these titled “Imagining China” in Taiwan, raising all the sorts of questions about the interac- tion between tradition and modernity, local and global culture, that confront both our students and the Chinese students with whom we work.

Kellar Easterling: The thesis course could also operate around special projects in this way.

Sarah Whiting: Faculty and student initia- tives is needed. The Internet provides amazing material, but it also overwhelming— I am talking not only about the Web but also about the number of articles and books that students now find in online catalogs.

Peggy Deaman: It makes me think about the ironic trajectory of the MED program over the years: the wanderer who has not found a place and the less institutionalized it was, the more initiative there was from the stu- dents. One student received travel funding for research on Taliesin’s projects because he felt that he had no colleagues in the program. There was a sense of “risk or strain.” Now it might be less satisfying. It is similar to the issues that Marc Janicke, who brought up in the 1989 MED symposium. He warned that institutional support could come with bureaucratic headaches. You must be careful with what you wish for. In the end, it is not the money that is powerful to encourage students to provide their own funding and grants with some incentive of the official recognition from the institution.

Peggy Deaman: It encourages them to be guerrillas.

Sarah Whiting: I don’t think students should be effective guerrillas without a lot of guidance. The faculty shouldn’t tell the students what to do, but they have to keep the guerrillas from getting lost in the over- whelming jungle and wasting their time.

Eva-Lisa Pelkonen: The MED program is a combination of an “every man for himself” approach and a master-class system in which students work closely with a single advisor. In my case I meant working closely with Katarina, whom, who has been involved with the program since 1984. Mark, I am interested to know what your MED was different from your Ph.D. at Princeton.

Mark Lindkvist: Because it took only two years, the MED was more topical. For me it was a strategic exercise in trying to have a voice in the theory world. I thought that would be enough. But there was a point of view that the discourse was developing and the prag- matics was developing due to different reasons. So the Ph.D. seemed like a way to set up a longer term, more sophisticated project. And now that our individual design and the architect by learning what it means to work in a new way is a very different kind of commitment.
This fall Dean Robert A. M. Stern gave the College of Architecture, a series of six on topics that included European Modernism’s influence in America, American Modernism at Yale, and the activities in the 1960s, Post-Moderism, and the work of more recent Yale graduates.

If one of the qualifications for institutional leadership is superior knowledge of the field, then, of course, in question, then one can imagine no individual, living or dead, more qualified to be the dean of the Yale School of Architecture than Robert Stern. As a qualifying last, one might imagine a successor, one who has conformed that—a peculiar combination of speaking a lot, Turell Pimentel, and Who Wants To Be a Millionaire?—in which the university president, provost, senior faculty, etc., in the end, the central mission takes form like candidates obscure questions about the events, traditions, and personalities that have shaped the school. At some point, all of the other candidates drop out, while the “remaining contestant,” shows no signs of flagging. Instead he is now both setting and responding to the questions, which no one before him can even formulate or answer. Finally, by acclamations of “no contest,” the new dean is named, having both summarized and absorbed all the deeds, sins, and personalities of his predecessor. The Yale Art Gallery lecture hall, garnished with distinguished alumni, is the perfect place to witness as to testify, accompany it with a liberal dose of wit and fascinating anecdotes of his Deane’s correspondence lectures.

Indeed the subject does have inherent interest and even urgency in a profession—architecture—that has come obsessively reflexive (i.e., self-obsessed) but has relatively little to say about one of its central mysteries. It is a world in which one enters the field. For a while there it looked to be otherwise—and that moment is itself a crucial one for the recent history of architecture and indeed for Dean Stern’s story as well. In the late 1960s, as architecture began to emerge from the confinement in which it seemed to have escaped the dreams of Modernism, interest turned to the long-suppressed story of the institution the Eoes de Beaux Arts, which/vnd this time than any other has shaped Western architecture through the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The scholarly investigation of the Ecole, which was temporarily confused with an exacerbation of form, composition, and pedagogical principles, was surely—as Stern and others have argued—a crucial episode in the coming-of-age of twentieth-century architecture. As for his career, Stern’s Nancy and his students—married, he has been able to develop in this situation, all of these interesting questions, but it is interesting that he was able to show more substantive work by others on critical questions such as the actual content and operation of various architectural curricula in the periods he surveys. Is it, for example, that some schools more history was taught, and at others more at all? And what is actually included in those courses, librarians, slide collections, and privately circulating microforms and copies?

It is not as if Stern is uninterested in these kinds of questions. He loves all the details, anecdotes, and apparent mess, especially if it concerns Yale. But again, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to make sense of the footnotes without one or more texts. And lacking that, Stern, like every- one else, insistently falls back on pref- dicatable master narratives about crucial themes such as Modernism or the 1960s, which he himself has on other occasions helped to discredit. These narratives carry with them precisely the sort of ideological baggage that Stern—as suggested by his title for the whole series, “Ideals Without Ideology”—would have us believe Yale has always somehow achieved, leaving fundamentally unexamined not only a whole host of fascinating assumptions about Modernism, Postmodernism, and radicalism, and the autonomy of the arts but most conspicuously the central article of pedagogical faith for Stern and Yale, that they’re very toiled and highly ideological “tiled up” of School. His art history included, rectify it like an all-healing mantra, with appropriate echo post voice aside some academic risk for respect, but it recurs again and again with subtle and significant variations, in each new administration—from Moore (who was in many respects his high priest), to Pellet, to Baxley and Kotten, to Stern.

This, one imagines, would be a splendid opportunity not just to correct that myth of the purists but also to investigate its mechanisms (e.g., the role of the institution of the visiting critic, as pioneered by Yale, how they produce, reproduce, and repress the various disciplines and the market). Having said that, it is not only not mean-spirited a way, it remains to recog- nize and cherish some of the really splendid achievements of these lectures. For in spite of his apparent univalence, Stern is, for all the rest of us, simply more and more engaged (and therefore, more) engaging on certain topics than others. These strengths are exemplified by the early lecture that centered on the person that is arguably Stern’s real hero, perhaps as both architect and dean. I mean George Howe (not Phil Johnson—no doubt also a hero, but in a distinctly different and inevitably more ambigious way). Stern, of course, produced a great deal of work, it’s the central topic of Howe and is still clearly fascinated by the role he played in both education and the profession. Furthermore, the efferves- cent combination of academic, institutional, and social history that he provides account for Howe as both Stern’s delight and his strength as a teacher and writer. Damaging the many directions in which Howe’s career ramified illustrates the kind of creative storytelling that energized these lectures when they were at their best. One could have told similarly rambled stories built around other cultural figures of the school—including Frank Lloyd Wright, and James Stirling—but we had little of those stories and their central characters, they never quite emerged as vividly and coherently as Howe did.

Far enough. There is another natural symmetry between Stern and Howe than, say, between Stern and Stirling. But there are a number of ways to tell Stirling story that, while clearly of less importance or interest to Stern, are crucially important for Yale. Its development, and for the transformations that occurred in modern architecture and archi- tectural education in America once Stern deems. Some of those strands lead back to England and to the barely men- tioned figure of Colin Rowe (Stirling’s con- temporary and teacher at the University of Liverpool, and the work of Robert Venturi and Robert Maxwell). Through Rowes, other strands lead to Texas, and to Robert Smith and John Hejduk (both mentioned in the lectures, but not really situated temporally— to Yale, where Rowe was briefly, and, of course, to Perspecta and to jread Kostelanetz, Stern’s predecessor and an enormously influential teacher at Yale before he was dean (as Stern notes without actually describing that influence). These stories would help enhance the meaning of some of the very loaded, although in part unpacked, themes weaving through these lectures, like “ideals without ideology,” postmodernism, “contamination,” and “classicism.”

One could, with some justice, argue that compared to Howe, Moore, and Kahn, the Stirling story is after all somewhat peripheral—to Yale, at least—and does not deserve as full a treatment. That is not, however, the case with the baffled figure of Vassilis Scoula, who was quite literally in fact a figment of the most visible in these lectures, leading a curiously usually never really given center stage and discussed in terms of his own career rather than the careers of nirvana and the kingdom of heaven whole question of the influence of histori- anic/architectonic traditions— from Pevsner and Giedion, to Hitchcock, Sole, Rubly, and Verwey, and Verwey and Verwey and Lasdon, and Karian Stair, to Rowe and Tafuri as well as the various repeated, and not at all the same. Although, of course, as dean, Stern, for all his audacity and critical sophistication, seems at rewriting moments to exhibit a fundamental suspic- tion of theory, if not of ideas—at least for their own sake. Preferring, he charges—for both himself and Yale—the validation of practice and, in particular, “building,” Stern makes a convincing and at times a curiously lucid argument for his own academic and professional personality and personal passion are best seen in the small, wood-frame structures, which form the core of the “core curriculum” in the guise of the justified famous Yale first-year house, and there is a ground for so many young Yale graduates who are beginning their careers in prac- tice. This and the constant return to the vernacular as a source of inspiration and the exploration of the new through the lens of the aspects of the Yale myth as Stern and others have constructed it—and here rings true. From Rudolph’s early houses in Saratoga; to Moore at Ohrids and Sla student’s life. The School of Architecture’s Style Reflects it; to the work of my cognizable Tuner Brooks and Eeva-Lisa Pelkonen, Peggy Deamer, Deborah Burke, and Steven Horst; to the work of our stud- ents like Lisa Gray and Alan Organemi or Dan Sagans and Aline Darsowsky. I have the strangly familiar, uncommonly common, formally, technically, and programmatically almost straight but with a difference small wood buildings (in rural, suburband
DeVane Guest Lectures and Fall Lectures 2001

The DeVane lecture series is an under- ground opportunity that is open to the larger community and is accompanied by a small group of graduate seminar offered by Dean Robert Stern (65). As part of the fall 2001 tenent tear the architecture school of Architecture distinguished graduates were invited to speak about their work and experience as students at Yale. The guests also attended the architecture seminar near the following month, engaging in further discussions with the students.

James Stewart Polshek (56)
“"The History of the Future Connections and Transformations”
September 25, 2001

When I was asked what I would do differently now, after September 11, I thought I won’t change my beliefs, the primary thrust in architecture still have to be the satisfaction of human needs. The architect’s duty is to act as a bridge between the past and the present, and reinforce both time frames. There is a fear of trivializing architecture because of the pace at which architecture and fashion come together. I am showing images from 1938 to 2000 to demonstrate clearly that the new vernacular is very much the way how shapes attitudes. Some pedestrian typologies that become god fathers for me include construction and process, architecture’s relationship to history, and architecture’s relationship to the natural environment. . . . With Eugene Nale of running Yale with George Howe when I was a student here, the rigor of education was about principles, not about large ideas, the godfather was not theoretical. He was concerned with how the building materials, with the vines, the bricks, the stone, the sails, support, span, envelope, connection— the basic elements that make up both the hub and the high-rise. . . . The criticism we [the Polish Partnership] received was not a function of the Columbia Law School in 1996 was that we took the building and adapted it to a grade. I think it is a compliment. It was a new set of programs and students and relationship of the building to the city, the building built with the zoned envelope and efficient loft like Columbia adopted a few of the ideas for the past, but we just got it under the door.

Ralph Norman Foster (62)
“Exploring the City”
October 7, 2001

I had three impressions at Yale, Paul Rudolph, Louis I. Kerner, and Chayevsky, and Vincent Scully. Rudolph had the ability to draw out great architectural ideas and to take them to the extreme. He led by example to train a designer with issues of structure, space, and aesthetic dimension. And the use of the surrounding fabric. Scully’s view of history was rooted in values and forces that make architecture, as well as the relationship of old and new . . . Chayevsky was concerned with economy and privacy; infrastructure is the glue that ties the buildings together. To me the quality of infrastructure is more meaningful in our lives—the boulevard, squares, and transportation are always more valuable than individual buildings themselves. . . . September 11 may change things, but everyone needs to take time to reflect, in the context of what happened, is it the end of the concept of the super tall tower or not? But how do you go? You cannot design against that kind of knowledge. There are a few things that may come out of it is the idea of two stairways—one for fireman and the other for occupants, internal and external courts. You could have check decks and avoid excessive collapse. The issue is really global—from high-rise to slums and large stadiums.

Alexander Testa (56)
“The Struggle Over the City Idea”
October 22, 2001

Memory is highly compartmentalized and highly modular. One is the idea that the architect and the other by reconstruction and inference, and you switch between the everyday reality of an event with a highly reconstructed manufacturing of the past, so that the memory is a mixture of both. If you have an memory of an event and books you have read, Thucydides did this so well some centuries ago. And it is the same thing when the reconstruction of my time at Yale. . . . At Yale we learned about the codes, scale, and entry, and proceeded through the values of organization and architecture. The idea of universal application is a constraint for Kahn, who thought of a new architecture that had a dual purpose that the service and the user. Rudolph entered the scene and brought us a plastic architecture of humanistic values that worked in the structure with some references to the program. In the AAA theme it had a basicness of the unresolved back of the building. Rudolph goes back to Frank Lloyd Wright as the major architectural presence in the vocabulary. You can have rigor and continuity, but at the same time you have a medium that you can adapt to situations, site, and topography.

David Sellers (56)
“Architecture as Cultures and Countercultures”
November 5, 2001

We humans have no natural equipment to sustain ourselves—such as feathers, large fins, or fur. We have figured out a way to do it, but have endured natural resources for our survival, the rigors of education was about principles, not about large ideas, the godfather was not theoretical. We were concerned with how the building materials, with the vines, the bricks, the stone, the sails, support, span, envelope, connection— the basic elements that make up both the hub and the high-rise. . . . The criticism we [the Polish Partnership] received was not a function of the Columbia Law School in 1996 was that we took the building and adapted it to a grade. I think it is a compliment. It was a new set of programs and students and relationship of the building to the city, the building built with the zoned envelope and efficient loft like Columbia adopted a few of the ideas for the past, but we just got it under the door.

Norman Foster (62)
“Exploring the City”
October 7, 2001

I had three impressions at Yale, Paul Rudolph, Louis I. Kerner, and Chayevsky, and Vincent Scully. Rudolph had the ability to draw out great architectural ideas and to take them to the extreme. He led by example to train a designer with issues of structure, space, and aesthetic dimension. And the use of the surrounding fabric. Scully’s view of history was rooted in values and forces that make architecture, as well as the relationship of old and new . . . Chayevsky was concerned with economy and privacy; infrastructure is the glue that ties the buildings together. To me the quality of infrastructure is more meaningful in our lives—the boulevard, squares, and transportation are always more valuable than individual buildings themselves. . . . September 11 may change things, but everyone needs to take time to reflect, in the context of what happened, is it the end of the concept of the super tall tower or not? But how do you go? You cannot design against that kind of knowledge. There are a few things that may come out of it is the idea of two stairways—one for fireman and the other for occupants, internal and external courts. You could have check decks and avoid excessive collapse. The issue is really global—from high-rise to slums and large stadiums.

Alexandr Testa (56)
“The Struggle Over the City Idea”
October 22, 2001

Memory is highly compartmentalized and highly modular. One is the idea that the architect and the other by reconstruction and inference, and you switch between the everyday reality of an event with a highly reconstructed manufacturing of the past, so that the memory is a mixture of both. If you have an memory of an event and books you have read, Thucydides did this so well some centuries ago. And it is the same thing when the reconstruction of my time at Yale. . . . At Yale we learned about the codes, scale, and entry, and proceeded through the values of organization and architecture. The idea of universal application is a constraint for Kahn, who thought of a new architecture that had a dual purpose that the service and the user. Rudolph entered the scene and brought us a plastic architecture of humanistic values that worked in the structure with some references to the program. In the AAA theme it had a basicness of the unresolved back of the building. Rudolph goes back to Frank Lloyd Wright as the major architectural presence in the vocabulary. You can have rigor and continuity, but at the same time you have a medium that you can adapt to situations, site, and topography.

David Sellers (56)
“Architecture as Cultures and Countercultures”
November 5, 2001

We humans have no natural equipment to sustain ourselves—such as feathers, large fins, or fur. We have figured out a way to do it, but have endured natural resources for our survival, the rigors of education was about principles, not about large ideas, the godfather was not theoretical. We were concerned with how the building materials, with the vines, the bricks, the stone, the sails, support, span, envelope, connection— the basic elements that make up both the hub and the high-rise. . . . The criticism we [the Polish Partnership] received was not a function of the Columbia Law School in 1996 was that we took the building and adapted it to a grade. I think it is a compliment. It was a new set of programs and students and relationship of the building to the city, the building built with the zoned envelope and efficient loft like Columbia adopted a few of the ideas for the past, but we just got it under the door.

Norman Foster (62)
“Exploring the City”
October 7, 2001

I had three impressions at Yale, Paul Rudolph, Louis I. Kerner, and Chayevsky, and Vincent Scully. Rudolph had the ability to draw out great architectural ideas and to take them to the extreme. He led by example to train a designer with issues of structure, space, and aesthetic dimension. And the use of the surrounding fabric. Scully’s view of history was rooted in values and forces that make architecture, as well as the relationship of old and new . . . Chayevsky was concerned with economy and privacy; infrastructure is the glue that ties the buildings together. To me the quality of infrastructure is more meaningful in our lives—the boulevard, squares, and transportation are always more valuable than individual buildings themselves. . . . September 11 may change things, but everyone needs to take time to reflect, in the context of what happened, is it the end of the concept of the super tall tower or not? But how do you go? You cannot design against that kind of knowledge. There are a few things that may come out of it is the idea of two stairways—one for fireman and the other for occupants, internal and external courts. You could have check decks and avoid excessive collapse. The issue is really global—from high-rise to slums and large stadiums.

Alexandr Testa (56)
“The Struggle Over the City Idea”
October 22, 2001
Memorials and Memory

During the fall of 1997, Rep. Peter V. Espinosa was asked the question: “What are the New York City high schools that are in the process of rebuilding?” He answered that the WTC had been destroyed by a terrorist attack and that it would be reconstructed. Elected officials and elected officials were asked to respond to this question, but few provided an answer. The majority of officials did not provide a specific answer, but those who did mentioned that the WTC would be rebuilt in some form. The major issue is whether the WTC should be reconstructed or not. Those who were opposed to the reconstruction argued that it would be a “catastrophe” and that it would be a “tragedy.” Those who were in favor of the reconstruction argued that it would be a “victory” and that it would be a “triumph.”

On the WTC & the Future

It has been a year since the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center. During this time, there has been much talk about the future of the site. Many people have expressed concern about the future of the site. There have been many proposals for the future of the site. Some have proposed that the site should be turned into a park, others have proposed that it should be turned into a museum, and others have proposed that it should be turned into a memorial. However, the future of the site remains uncertain.

Memorials and Memory

The terrorist attack of September 11, 2001, changed the world. The attack was a tragic event that left thousands of people dead and injured. The attack was also a reminder of the vulnerability of the United States and the vulnerability of the world. The attack also showed the power of terrorism and the power of hate.
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is the possibility of another form of memory, one that is no longer cleaves with fragments or figuration or abstraction but with something to the task itself. The task may be a way to prevent memory without resorting to abstraction or representation. Whatever happens at the FTC site, there is to be a trace of the event of September 11th: the presence of an absence—illusion no longer in its metaphorical fullness. To think about how one might have how one makes memory after the FTC, is not to consider fact or fiction but perhaps something that lies between—something between abstraction and figuration. Gilles Deleuze, in writing about the painter Francis Bacon, cites this condition the figuration, I would like to think that our projects are stimulated by this in-between condition. In fact, the projects are not about solutions but about a way of thinking that operates between abstraction and figuration.

In looking at the idea of the trace in my work, I have tried to conceive of the work on the context of the ecocell New Urbanists, such as Colin Rowe and Andres Duany, with the work of Piers Gough. I see as icons the Nell’s map of Rome and Piranesi’s Carceri. The Carceri Marzo is both fact and fiction, like W. G. Sebald’s novel Onze Austerlitz: As a plan, Carceri Marzo probably would not function. There are no streets in this city, there are no figura-right diagonal lines. Rather the ground is filled in with what I call interstitial figures. This produces not the figura-ground relations that is in the Nell’s map, but what would be called a fig- urban society. A figura-urban society is interesting because it is no longer permeated through the ground as an original instance, rather it becomes a kind of idea, an internal field of forces between forces.

The Carceri Marzo presents a theoretical basis for urbanism as a process of memory. It is not about nostalgia, nor about social memory as a process of articulation, but as a memory some value closer, to truth. Rather the Carceri Marzo deals with fact and fiction as a web of traces. A lot of my early projects dealt with traces literally inscribed on the city. For example, since the visual urban artifact, we made an exhibition in the third dimension. Since then I have learned there is another way to look at the trace. The Habitat project in Berlin dealt not so much with representation or comparison, but with the structure of traces. It is a process of what you make of the ground, the ground surface and a top surface of two different traces of space and time. The result is not an extension that dominates the ground; rather it connects the top surface and the ground surface, potentiating a new idea of the city. The idea is not one of either or... This project makes a conceptual connection between...The Carceri Marzo presents a theoretical basis for urbanism as a process of memory. It is not about nostalgia, nor about social memory as a process of articulation, but as a memory some value closer, to truth. Rather the Carceri Marzo deals with fact and fiction as a web of traces. A lot of my early projects dealt with traces literally inscribed on the city. For example, since the visual urban artifact, we made an exhibition in the third dimension. Since then I have learned there is another way to look at the trace. The Habitat project in Berlin dealt not so much with representation or comparison, but with the structure of traces. It is a process of what you make of the ground, the ground surface and a top surface of two different traces of space and time. The result is not an extension that dominates the ground; rather it connects the top surface and the ground surface, potentiating a new idea of the city. The idea is not one of either or... This project makes a conceptual connection between...
Let Time Take Its Course Before Constructing a Monument

What took years to build was struck in seconds and dismantled in minutes. Because of the nature of the event, the site of the former World Trade Center will become a place of national pride. The tower once stood, transformed in a single day into something forever remembered. What is built in this place will not need to be timeless and able to endure an unchangeable future.

Such monuments (like the Colosseum in Rome, Until Monument in Lebanon's Nahar Al-Karama, and the Kranzlicht monument in Berlin) after the dust settles in the nature of what should be constructed at Ground Zero, either that it will need to revitalize the structures of time zero and civilization.

The memory of the catastrophe is still too recent to general reflection, and the legal pressure from both the financial district and the city’s constituents renders practically negligible a monument’s sensibility.

In lieu of constructing a monument, I suggest a memorial to any work other than site stabilization. Such a memorial will allow the event to present itself as a remnant of history to the more remote condition of time zero.

The World Trade Center’s sudden transformation from life to death, from building to ruin, from office to cemetery, produced a media and photographic coverage of the event. Yet such evidence needs careful interpretation before launching any construction projects.

The repair of the site’s perimeter, however, will make a disruption, both marking and qualifying the place. I suggest for the short term, that the site be defined by the development of its boundary, the design of what should provide its infrastructure.

Harry Smith MiRe

Relections on Commemoration

I find myself unable to express clearly and lucidly a position or theory to initiate a memorial for the World Trade Center tragedy. My experience in designing the Women’s Memorial at Arlington National Cemetery has taught me that our memory is as unkind as our forgetting.

I have postpone putting into words reflections that are no more cogent now than they were in September, just three months ago. The televised images of posters, homilies written in permanent markers, objects suspended from the construction fences of Ground Zero, and the individuals oblivious to the waste turning daily in the New York Times, cannot be brought forward, too quickly.

It is strikingly difficult to reflect on the events of September 11 without being heard by the individual and fragile communications that appeared, almost organically, in different sites throughout the city, cornered at Union Station and the Pentagon, and theAttachment, connected to the front of the Brooklyn Bridge, Prosperity: the walls of St. Women’s Hospital and Penn Station. What was consistent among these were the fragility of the moments used to create these memorials—candles and wax melons, snapshots of family members, and the pages of the New York Times with a white sleeveless dress—may be anything (I have a piece), and not just work and life numbers posted. Most of these were visible at more than one of the sites, serving a testimony of personal work.

I feel no obligation, no responsibility, no answer in the absence of a specific issue that might capture the remembrance of the event, the individual specificity of each death, or the weight of the destruction. Remembrance was conveyed at a higher level, a national symbolic claim. These were granite plinths of New York: sapphire containers of the economic power, austere containers of human life.

For me, it is too soon to determine what kind of contribution to the physical world will preserve the memory of this event, of this loss. The act of destruction I am certain is the fear of forgetting will ensure the creation of a physical marker. The time of visitors to the site—the site, the pictures, the trees, and the central battlefield—reminds us that the physical manifestation of commemoration remains a fundamental human need.

I am only with my hands and words to some drawing that you might consider. I am only with my hands and words to some drawing that you might consider. There was a time when the World Trade Center was a poem. It is not a science, but an artifice, a thing said that can become not only through the most minimal means. This horizon is even without the words, but perhaps a reflection might feel them forever.

—Morton Wallis


Building Damage September 22, 2001
World Trade Center. Courtesy the Structural Engineers Association of New York.
The symposium Architecture or Revolution: Charles Moore and Yale in the Late 1960s was held on November 2-4, 2001, in conjunction with the eponymous exhibition on display at the Yale School of Architecture from October 25, 2001, to February 1, 2002. Both events were funded in part by the George Gund Foundation, Ford Foundation, Vlock Family, Roy and Niuta Titus Foundation Inc., Suzanne Stiles and Michael Steinberg, Connecticut Architectural Foundation, and Centerbrook Architects and Planners. This symposium is reviewed for Constellations by Peter Reed.

Getting Real: Moore, Yale, and the 1960s

In his introduction to Supermanoom, a seminal text on Post-Modern architecture, the critic and historian Rey Smith claimed that “a new design movement in America is radically changing our vision—our way of seeing things as well as what we see. It is revolutionizing our expectations of architecture, of design vocabulary, and of the design professions themselves. It is altering our cultural consciousness and reshaping the country—in the houses of the adventurous, in the environments of our universities, in the commercial and business space of our cities.” Wide-ranging responses to the enormous cultural shifts in the 1960s took place in the United States and other parts of the world. Among the most significant—if not also the most radical—changes in architectural discourse surrounded the parapsychical Charles Moore, who became chairman of Yale’s School of Architecture in 1965 and dean in 1969. Under Moore’s leadership Yale was one of the most progressive design schools in the country. He attracted a variety of architects and visiting critics—notably Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown. Through their unconventional studies, innovative architectural and seminar publications, Moore, Venturi, and Scott Brown had a far-reaching impact that extended halfway around the world.

If one was familiar with Moore’s architecture from only the last two decades of his life, one might be surprised to find him the centerpiece of the superlative, titled Architecture or Revolution: Charles Moore and Yale in the Late 1960s (published by Eva Blau and installed effectively by Dean Siskaros). At the eponymous symposium organized by Blau on November 2 and 3, participants (including Venturi and Scott Brown, who provided the bookend viewpoints) recollected and analyzed architecture, planning, and education at Yale and elsewhere during the “parapsychical” decade. Both the exhibition and symposium captured the excitement and uncertainty of an era’s unscripted trajectories and seminal shifts.

Revolution might seem too strong a word to associate with Moore’s work of the 1960s, such as Sea Ranch, Holy Cross Oxnard, and the Faculty Club at University of California, Santa Barbara. In many respects these works enunciate an evolution of forms and ideas drawn from many sources, including Louis Kahn and Mies van der Rohe—two revered mentors of this generation. The exhibition’s catchy title is of course a reference to the most important architectural manifestos of the twentieth century: Le Corbusier’s Towards a New Architecture. With the zest of a political revolutionary, Corb concluded: “Architecture or Revolution. Revolution can be avoided.” Forty years later this unforgettable proclamation could be given an ironic twist. “Architecture can be avoided” was a more relevant response to Corb’s utopianism. In the 1960s a new generation of architects challenged orthodox Modernism, and concomitant with the failures of urban renewal were new paradigms in planning. The cool distillation of a Modern aesthetic (for example, the corporate complex designed by Gordon Bunshaft featured in the exhibition and controversially Saville Corporate Modernism last winter at Yale) was architecture to be avoided: this was establishment architecture. Moreover, the idea of an international style was no longer relevant, for it seemed to vary so little to the particularities of place; and its universal gridiron curtain walls, symbolic of technological rationalism, demonized little regard for the individual. Dethroned by corporate Modernism and outdated urban-planning ideas, the architects and their students decided it was time to get real.

Getting real in this context meant many things. Primarily it was an inclusive strategy that had broad social and formal implications. A major catalyst for Moore was California, the subject of Mitchell’s excellent book: Moore’s Unmodern: Taking the California Trip.” Before moving to New Haven, Moore was chairman of the Department of Architecture at the University of California, Berkeley. The perfunctory and funky pop culture of the state captivated Moore, who wrote: “Here there is everything at once, with the vitality and vulgar beauty of real commerce, quivers at a pitch of excitement which presages, more clearly than any tidy sparse geometry, an architecture for the electric priest” (“Plug It in Ramsay,” Perspectives, 1961). In contrast to the restrictive qualities of Modern architecture, Moore discovered a valuable world outside the mainstream architectural discourse. His most important and precedent-setting essay from this period is “You Have to Pay for the Public Life “(published in Perspectives 9/10, 1965), a provocative text and visual collage juxtaposing Disneyland, civic centers, vernacular architecture, and commercial klatch—the full spectrum of the West Coast environment. As Schwartz suggests, “Charles Moore’s was a revolution of the libidinous, a neonotic, overdomesticated embellishment of functional culture, play instead of work, cities like giant toy sets.”

Moore may have worked himself to an early death, but Playfulness infuses his buildings—especially the interiors—as though he were concocting glib picaresque Sunnus. William Mitchell, who studied with Moore at Yale in the newly initiated MFA program and later collaborated with him, observed that what was one way Moore confronted orthodoxy. Moore enlivened his buildings with a theatrical sensibility of baroque spaces. Shifts between small and large volumes, the insertion of cutout scenes, and the omnipresent seductions were juxtaposed with recycled stuff of architecture and everyday things that set the stage for his playful interiors. In other words “Settling Up Camp: Charles Moore’s Early Work,” Patricia Morton examined the role of camp sensibility in modernist counter-culture. At Sea Ranch, House in Oxnard, and other projects, Moore’s exaggerated gestures—such as a colorful superstructure or an oversized gill-like mirror hung on vermicular wood-paneled walls—demonstrated a predilection for the unconven- tional bordering on the proliferation of bad taste. The play on taste was deliberately relativist, or as Morton suggested, a rebellion against the “shou’m shell not” edicts of good taste. What is good and bad, and who’s to decide, are questions with broad ramifications linked closely to an appreciation of history and popular culture. This was serious fun.

If you missed out on the fun in the 1960s, Mark Wigley’s “Towards a Psychadelic Architecture” provided a con- vertible tour through the hallucinogenic landscapes, from Vernor Panton’s luminous interiors and frosted plastics, to François Dallegret’s fantastic environments, to Superstudio’s dreamscapes—all of which blurred the conventional limits of architecture. Moore’s associate Dorothy Lyndon later cautioned against the tendency to aggregate Moore’s playful side. He may have loved parties, but he was no party animal. He was extraordinarily dedicated, disciplined, and responsible—qualities Lyndon felt reflected the importance of Louis Kahn for Moore.

In his keynote address, “The ’68 Effect: Transnational Semes to Intellectual Recon- struct,” Alan Louis Cohen observed that the interest in populism and the commercial environment was not about style; rather it points toward an ethical position. Getting real implied a new awareness of the architectures’ and planners’ responsibilities. One needed to know the people and their environment to be relevant and to overcome the perceived divergence between the professionals, decision makers, and the people who lived in the housing that they were influencing. Responsibility and repute—two values that recurred with startling frequency in the sixties—had an enormous impact on the architecture schools as well. A new urgency of social relevance, coupled with student protest and a general distrust of authority, fueled changes in the curriculum. An extreme manifestation was the closing of Yale’s city-planning department.

In his carefully charted analysis of pedagogical transformations in American architecture schools in the 1960s, Brian Moran discussed the emergence of advocacy planning as a means to make architecture more responsible. This significant development was an antide to prevailing master planning and urban-design pedagogy. At the University of Pennsylvania, sociologist Charles Hirschl and futurologist Paul Davidoff were among those who found new approaches to planning by bringing the knowledge of urban design, city rights, and participatory democracy. The social problems surrounding American urban renewal were readily apparent, but finding an appropriate role for architects as well as an architectural language was less easy. Scott Brown, who had studied and taught at the University of Pennsylvania, recollected a poignant moment when a colleague confronted her with the activist’s perennial problem: “What are you going to do about it?” Community involvement was one solution, and an effective paradigm for public service. This is how architecture medi- ated in Victor and Scott Brown’s work and also in Moore’s. It also affected the kinds of studies they taught. At Yale Moore urged students to explore a less familiar side of life, not the artistic or factory. For example, in an effort to channel the incendiary energy of student activism, he devised socially responsible studio projects, such as that in rural Appalachia, where students worked in a community center in New Zion, Kentucky, and thereby became the first of the annual Building Projects. Hands-on projects like New Zion mimicked the idealism of the Peace Corps, where under the more encompassing abiding belief that responsible architecture is a community service. Venturi and Scott Brown shared Moore’s love of history and popular culture. Venturi Architecture or Revolution, A&A Gallery, Yale School of Architecture, Photograph by Carl Kaufman, November 2001
Yale Students Mold an Experimental House of Plastic Foam

In an experimental project at Yale, students are creating a house using plastic foam, a material that has gained popularity in recent years. The project is led by3a professor who is passionate about sustainable and innovative building techniques.

The house, which is under construction, is designed to be both environmentally friendly and cost-effective. It features unique elements such as solar panels and water collection systems, making it a model for future sustainable architecture.

The students involved in the project have been learning about the properties of plastic foam and exploring its potential uses in architecture. They have been working closely with the professor to develop a design that not only meets their sustainability goals but also stands the test of time.

The project is part of a larger initiative at Yale to promote innovative and sustainable design in the field of architecture. The university is known for its commitment to environmental responsibility, and this project exemplifies that commitment in action.

As the house takes shape, the students are gaining valuable hands-on experience and developing new skills. They are excited about the opportunity to make a tangible impact on the future of architecture and to contribute to a more sustainable built environment.

This project is just one example of how Yale is pushing the boundaries of what is possible in architecture and setting new standards for sustainable design. It is a testament to the university's dedication to excellence and innovation.
The Art of the Impossible

The exhibition Architecture or Revolution: Charles Moore and Yale in the Late 1980s was curated by Eve Blau, who taught a seminar about the topic in 2000. Designed by Dean Sakamoto with graphics by Angie Hurbut it was held at the A&A Gallery from October 25, 2001, to February 1, 2002. The exhibition is reviewed for Curator by Margaret Crawford.

Architectural reputations rise and fall, but few have ascended as high or collapsed as dramatically as that of Charles Moore. During the 1960s Moore dominated American architecture, exploiting a mix of Modernist discourse with a series of innovative design and provocative writings. Like the other major figures of the period, Robert Venturi, Moore reconceived architecture with history, popular culture, and the vernacular landscape. But unlike Venturi, Moore's primary obsession was purely architectural: the manipulation of space. The buildings such as the Sea Ranch Condo #1 (1963–65), his own house in New Haven (1966), and the University of California Faculty Club at Santa Barbara (1966–68) introduced a spatial complexity and ambiguity unknown to Modernist architecture. Far more than Venturi, Moore's concerns resonated with the broader culture; his buildings were widely imitated, particularly in California, trickling down into so many townhouse developments, ski condos, and restaurants that they became a kind of vernacular in themselves. In the mid-1980s, however, Moore's reputation was in eclipse, associated with the worst decorative excesses of Post-Modernism. The challenging exhibit Architecture or Revolution: Charles Moore, created by Eve Blau and designed by Dean Sakamoto, with bold graphic titles by graphic designer Angie Hurbut, reminded visitors of Moore's erstwhile influence and his architectural work just before and during those years. The structure, content, and design of the exhibition coaligned to make a compelling case for rethinking Moore's career, the 1960s, and the complex intersections between them.

Moore's firm first appeared in Los Angeles (1956–59) and then as dean (1969–70) at the School of Architecture must surely rank among the most influential moments in his professional and personal education. The extent of political drama and student activism in the school definitely colored my view of Moore—somehow someone who spent this era at another center of rebellion, U.C. Berkeley. The curator and designer have succeeded, in a manner unsurpassed in architectural exhibitions, in bringing up to ten layers of contextual information—going beyond documentation to evoke the tumult and excitement of the times. The gallery was packed with an astonishingly varied collection of contemporary materials and media: student brochures, posters, banners, magazine articles, and slide shows. Film footage and sound tracks from the period were made into three thematic films by American Beauty and projected simultaneously to form an enclosed environment. There were assorted architectural models, including a model of the Bloch House screened with a drawing of Moore sporting his trademark muttonchop whiskers. Extensive explanatory captions again, an interpretative layer often missing in architectural exhibitions, saturated this material in a chronology of controversy and protest. Student activities took on issues as broad as the Vietnam War and the Black Panther Party (whose trek in New Haven in May 1970 prompted a mass demonstration), and as specific as race and class in the architectural profession, such as the Architects' Resistance of SOW's work in South Africa. In spring 1969 the art and architecture faculty members, prompted by student demands, suspended classes to discuss the programs and policies of the school. In June a mysterious fire gutted the top floors of the Art & Architecture Building. The depth of the exhibition's documentation suggested a range of issues and narratives embedded in this material. For me one of the most interesting of these stories was the architectural press's extensive coverage of both protest and pedagogy at Yale. This is hard to imagine today, undermining how new and unexploited is the potential of education to become.

In the tumultuous and potentially destructive climate, Moore steered a positive course, opening up the school to countercultural explorations of every type, from form and inflatable structures to electronic media and supergraphics. Some were conceived as large-scale interven-

New Blue

The exhibition New Blue: Recent Work by Yale Graduates 1970–1988—curated by Aaron Betsky (58) with assistance from Joyce Hong (55), Frederick Tang (70), and Ken Kim (M.F.A. ’02)—was held at the Yale Art & Architecture Gallery from September 5 to October 19, 2001, and was organized in conjunction with the symposium “White, Gray, and Blue” (September 14–15, 2001). We asked two senior, dean-level alumni and Rob Kroloff, for their points of view.

In a sharp departure from the "isms" that ruled architecture criticism and theory in the latter half of the twentieth century, Aaron Betsky, curator of the evocative exhibition New Blue, defined six distinct classifications to organize the work of all recent graduates from the Yale School of Architecture: "The Classical Persists," "Machine Dreams," "Wool Wonders," "Fabrications," "Minimalia," and "Collage, Curves, and Sweaters." He admits that the categories are "not exhaustive" but are based on principles visible in the work. The projects included in these categories make evident the strength of Yale’s graduates and highlight the diverse mix of work. The exhibition design supported the curators’ focus on diversity by not favoring one type of project over another in groups. Instead the banners were arranged chronologically by graduation date, displaying an assortment of built work, competition proposals, digital media, etc. A complicated, three-dimensional cutout, and urban design. They hung in rows from the ceiling on thin wires, forming double-sided aisles of architecture in a subtle, successful creation of exhibition space. Each bannier design was unique, varying from overlays to pictures with backgrounds to a dizzying array of photographs—all pulled together in the exhibitor’s graphic design by Pentagram’s Michael Blund and Elizabeth Elias.

Some banners worked better than others. The most successful artistically integrated the architects’ work and images with a conscious attention to design. For example, in Cameron Armstrong’s presentation, one simultaneously experienced the image of the Metal House and saw the concept. The frame for the graphics. Other displays—such as Grey/Organsits’s and Jun Mitusa’s—were articulated by three-dimensional form, broadening the meaning of building mass or detail. Some banners, most notably those for Maya Lin, Gavin McCaw (55), Marcin Weisz, and Scott Spacht/Louisa Harman, showed progressive career development—mature work preceding work presented by other displays.

By forcing evocative descriptive texts helped unify the displays but sparked questions about how the exhibit’s classification system relates to the graduates’ education and inspiration are connected. For example, in Cameron Armstrong’s presentation, the graduates’ themes they discovered at school? Did they radically transform themselves or gain experience as an influential employer, travel experience, or some other outside influence.

Along with the evaluation of the work comes that of the architects chosen to represent the specific decades. The clear majority of the New Blue are owners, path- nars, or principals in their firms and are established in their field. It was encouraging to see less known and more regional architects exhibited together with national- ly acclaimed graduates. But I must say that the criteria for choosing these partic- pants remain mysterious. As a refreshing change from exhibits that all too often celebrate one view, one style, or one architect—even one building—New Blue was a celebration of Yale and an homage to the professors who taught their stu- dents design principles, as well as a cele- bration of the students who have success- fully pursued their art and vision.

—See J. Tobin, Tobin (Yale College ’59) works with Cesar Pelli & Associates.

Defining a Pedagogy

Last fall Yale School of Architecture host- ed an exhibition and symposium about—Yale School of Architecture. Organized by alumnus and current dean Robert A. M. Stern (’63), and curated by alumni and current director of the Neuberger Institute of Architecture, Aaron Betsky (’83), “New Blue,” as the program was titled, was very much a family affair. Compared to most self-congratulatory rat- rospectives, however, New Blue was res- pectfully sober, and happily, well produced. Also in contradiction to hype, the show provoked large questions about the pedagogy of the school, and the state of American architecture in general. This is no surprise, given the pressure on local, state, and federal officials to consider and build, and with Dean Sakamoto, Yale’s director of exhibitions, Belyay is clean, simple, incisive, and beautifully show.

Nevertheless, Yale—New Blue! For all its strengths, there are some problems. Some of its subjects—have a couple of strange notes at its center. In theory, the show cele- brates the tenure of three deans, yet they are continuously absent from the exhibit and just get a mention in the catalog (though they presented at the symposium). We never learn a thing about them, about their pedagogy, or about what effect oth- ers felt they had on the program—and by extension, the cultural education in gen- eral. The show renders them little more than bookmarks, and thus raise—and fails to answer—the question of whether they were more than that in reality.


Right from top: Aaron Betsky, Sandy Isaksen, Kasser Easterling, Cesar Pelli, Fred Koetter, Meri Wiggly, Mark Robbins, Vincent Scully, Suzanne Stephenson

From the crucial in which buildings happen" and that "is context as much a question of where as when. With the measured fals- nass of an NPR reporter, Isenstein pre- sented a careful shifting of the arguments for and against the work in the Kent brothers, O. M. Ungers, Frank Gehry, Post-Modernism, Deconstructivism, New Urbanism, and proponents of the every- day. Observing that context "is where the schism between theory and practice is at its widest," Isenstein concluded with a balanced assessment of the need to con- tribute to the repertoire of the new.

After the break, two former deans, Cesar Pelli and archetypal, offered their takes. Pelli’s talk was for me one of the most memorable at the symposium. As he decayed the destructive nihility of the attacks in New York and Washington, context—a question of when and where, as Isenstein observed—was essential to the weight of Pelli’s words. He is, of course, architect of the tallest building in the world and of New York’s World Financial Center, which was damaged in the attacks. “In many ways this was an attack on architecture,” Pelli would be quoted in the Times the following week. He took issue with Wiggly’s dark view of architecture as a depressing profession, because it is for him and his colleagues a source of happiness. That came through when Pelli observed how heartened he was to see "[former] students doing such wonderful work." The pride of a teacher was evident as he noted how many of those in the exhibition were students of his.

The symposium came to a close with Vincent Scully, described by Dean Stern as "the conscience of the architecture world." His abbreviated comments formed a succinct summation of the symposium, as he presented the work of a number of archi- tects connected with Yale in the context of the creation of human environments. Scully stated that he had intended to con- clude the symposium of Mya Lushan’s Veterans Memorial as the “most powerful work of architecture that has come from Yale in a hundred years.” His final images instead were of the World Trade Center, as he recalled the first stage of WTC’s Stevenson’s poem “The American Sublime”: "The light and space. / The empty spirit / I have seen no real place to drink? / What bread does one eat?" Daffy introducing the theme of the American technological sublime from a humanistic perspective, Scully aided on the moment of conclusion but asking ques- tions—perhaps the most vital role of a teacher in an open society.

—Richard Hayes

Hayes (’86) is a Ph.D candidate in the his- tory of architecture at Brown University.
This selection of essays highlights why Frank Gehry (1929-2021) studied both Vincent Scully and Paul Goldberger, won the Pulitzer Prize last year. He is a critic who believes in the moral obligation to lucidly explain the built environment, from subway stations to museums, in a manner that both the person in the street as well as the professional architect can understand and appreciate. For those of us in New York who must suffer through the bile of New Times critic Kenneth Machan, Kamin’s writing is a breath of fresh air. Reviewing for the Chicago Tribune, he is a loyal site of the city who fights to maintain and encourage the tradition of innovative architecture. But as Kamin points out in this compilation of newspaper articles written over the last ten years, Chicago has lost its nerve—and its recent architecture does not live up to the glorious bounty of Luis Sullivan, Frank Lloyd Wright, and Mies van der Rohe.

In wide-ranging essays, including analyses of new buildings and the politics of real estate issues, Kamin is not afraid to take on the powers in the city (as opposed to the architects who are often the victims), such as the developer John Buck and the River North Alliance. Apparently Daley takes a personal interest in every major building in Chicago, but his conservative tastes often make it difficult for architects to take aesthetic risks. Kamin is far in his criticism—which includes Yatzes such as Tom Boyle, whose traditional leanings come under fire for its “bold design,” but trapped in a time warp.” He also finds those to praise, such as Stanley Tigerman, whose Educated Center he describes “a national model for inner-city day care.”

Kamin also understands the great difference between an architectural conception and a built work, with “many a slip between the cup and the lip” before a final aesthetic decision can be rendered. In the great tradition of Chicago architectural criticism, the art of building is admired, from the development of the skyscraper to Mies, Kamin refuses to judge Rem Koolhaas’s IIT Student Union building until it is constructed, as he should be. Deth is in the details. Although not in Chicago, Peter Eisenman’s Cincinnati Architecture School, now shabby and falling apart, is roundly taken to task for a total lack of attention to its construction. One would think just how radical this criticism is at a time when many critics hardly care if something is ever built—a sexy drawing seems to be all that is necessary for a rave review. Kamin’s opinion is consistent with his view that architecture really does interact with people either in a positive or negative way depending on how the concepts are interpreted in construction—an idea that Frank Gehry understood a long time ago. In this regard, Kamin maintains a moving essay on the difference between the old Chicago Stadium, with its intimate and noise that intimidated the already frenzied Bulls basketball games, and the new Allstate Center, which is subsumed and neutral, the players too far away and the atmosphere subdued. One of Kamin’s great themes is the superiority of the dense, lively city over the hissing tear sprinklers of “live-by-suburbia,” a commonplace nightmare of the photographer Diane Arbus. He especially regrets the “encroaching homogenization of Chicago, with megastores and malls infiltrating into Michigan Avenue. Indeed Kamin spends a third of the book on the problem of public housing and the need to improve the lot of the poor and disadvantaged in the inner city. There are also many articles on parks, open space, and the Chicago skyline planning.

After reading Why Architecture Matters, one is impressed at just how difficult it is to be an architect critic who takes his position seriously as a means not only to champion ideas and projects that will improve the city but also to discuss in detail the reasons for architectural failure. Kamin is not simply writing about his favorite architects or limiting his opinion to his personal tastes and obvious philosophical point of view. In fact, one of the most important lessons with the collection as a book is that sometimes the discussions require intimate knowledge of site and circumstances, calling for more weighty treatment in the book than were possible for the newspaper.

When all is said and done, there is— as it always the case with critical analysis of the present—not enough distance to completely separate the wheat from the chaff. There is so much bad construction that Kamin’s job must get depressing at times, especially with the magnificence of Chicago’s past spread before the vast expanse of Lake Michigan. But when Kamin discovers a jewel, his joy of finding something new and optimistic shines through the gloom.

—Alexander Gorlin


Hardcover, 320 pp., $55 each

Within the past five years there has been a wave change in the attitude of American architects toward their work and its implications on the environment. Fundamental to that change is the recognition that environmentally considered design not only rewards ethical behavior but helps generate an architecture richer and more dynamic than one determined by formal considerations alone. Just as this reappraisal has been driven in part by a growing understanding of the consequences of poorly considered designs—high operating costs and a poor indoor air quality, to name but a few—it surely allows us to see beyond a desire by architects to harness the issue to reclaim authority amid the babel of voices that surround any debate about architecture or urbanism. What better design argument could there be than “the planet makes it possible”?—which is accompanied, of course, by the sotto voce threat, “Do you better do it or me, or else.”

Few architects in practice today speak with more authority on the future of architecture, urbanism, and the environment than Lord Richard Rogers, whose self-proclaimed environmental commitment has earned him kudos as well as positions of power within both the British and national governments. When Lord Rogers of Riverside speaks, all of Britain listens. He is a celebrity, appearing as frequently on the cheap newswrap of the Sun as in the glossy pages of Architectural Review. How Rogers ascended this extraordinary stratosphere proves the most insightful of the stories in Kenneth Powell’s monograph, Richard Rogers: Complete Works. Of course Powell’s tome covers the usual ground of architectural monographs: there are sufficient crisp photographs, detailed section drawings, and evocative sketches here to satisfy most admirers of the work of the Richard Rogers Partnership (RRP), Rogers’s firm for the past two decades. This photograph in particular, often focusing on the exquisite detailing that has come to mark the firm’s output, speaks to the refinement over the years of the technologically infused vocabulary that has earned them recognition as the leading exponents of the high-tech movement in British architecture.

Perhaps the most satisfying aspect of Powell’s volumes revolves itself in the discussions of how RRP buildings actually get designed and to the success headed by other partners at RRP who are often extraordinary architects in their own right. In particular, the reader becomes familiar with three longtime partners: John Young, the inspiration behind the ground-breaking financial and politically astute Merco Goldschmidt; and the polymath visionary and chief balloon Mike Davies, who is as passionate about innovative building technology as he is about his signature inflatable wardrobe. Powell also recognizes the contributions of other RRP collaborators, such as structural engineers Peter Rice and Tony Hunt, both of whom are credited rightly as key designers as much as technical consultants.

If there is an overall criticism to be leveled at Powell’s work, it lies in his technophilia: he accepts nearly without question RRP’s innovative technologies and, more suspiciously, the environmental strategies that generate them. Can Rogers really argue that the new Lloyd’s Shipping Register tower, with its floor-to-ceiling walls of udder glass, is a high-performance building? By the standards of all-glass towers it might be, but by the standards of a typical Victorian London office terraces, with its massive construction, modest glazing, and lack of air-conditioning, it isn’t. The dubiousness of the environmental achievement here shouldn’t detract one bit from the building’s breathtaking transparency, its exceptionally elegant detailing, or its thoughtful urban design, but it does open to question the seriousness of the firm’s environmental aspirations: tweaking the performance of a fundamentally energy-squandering facade down to the margin isn’t enough to satisfy Rogers’s environmentalism.

The book’s most compelling section is its discussion of his social agenda of the 1980s. Rogers’s unswillingness to associate with the high-tech movement results largely from his concern about the sorry state of the architectural vocabulary subversive to the discussion of his social agenda. An old-time lefty in the best Fabian tradition, Rogers ascribes to most of his work a social impulse, one that garners his environmental concerns with those of social justice, human rights, and their kin. Where Powell’s book becomes most helpful is when he explores the application of Rogers’s social agenda to form making in his architecture—most spectacularly at the new Barbican Law Courts, more quietly at the European Court of Human Rights. Powell also explores the social agenda underlying Rogers’s many unbuilt projects across London, in which urban regeneration strategies help shape often strikingly modern architecture. The very public nature of these projects helped propel Rogers into the role of public school for contemporary urbanism, a position that he continues to hold. Powell’s opinion is clear: the book offers an account of the shifting of the government’s Urban Task Force and a mandate to reshape the pattern of future British development. The careful analysis of such an approach to the power of the most intriguing story Powell tells. A Task Force that has recently gathered more dust than dailv for its planning support, it is a story that can only be resolved in a future volume three.

—Paul Stoler

Stoler (‘38) works at Atlass, Tar, in New York.
New Faculty

Sandy Isenstadt

Christy Anderson, assistant professor of art history at Yale, interned in the history of architecture faculty member Sandy Isenstadt, who is coming to Yale from University of Kentucky beginning this spring semester.

Christy Anderson: Sandy, you have just joined Yale University as a faculty member in the art history department, but you are already well known to the School of Architecture through your contributions to Perspectives and talks at various conferences, including the recent “New Blu” symposium in September. What will you be teaching this spring semester?

Sandy Isenstadt: I’ll be offering two courses in spring 2002. The first is a lecture course on “global modernism,” in which I’ll argue that architecture is characterized by the encounter between industrialized ways of building and more traditional methods but occurs in response to the unique conditions and circumstances of different places and people. Invaluably, the course deals with ways in which national and regional identity can be articulated through architecture, especially for the dozens of new countries created in the postwar wake of decolonization.

My graduate seminar is on the effects on architecture of an increasing concern for environmental sustainability. If architecture is truly material and constructed at its base, then just as a material and tacitonic essence of architecture—artifacts of nineteenth-century materialist science and industrial production was revolutionized—it will also seek in the seminar whether architecture can find new evaluative terms commensurate with today’s technological innovations.

CA: Are these courses that come out of your recent research?

SI: The more from new interest in the emergence of the term “architecture” in the discourse of space—that appears across a range of professions, in which virtual equivalents of space receive protection and valuation by a society that has come to enjoy and expect them. It’s an umbrella term to describe new ways of living in small houses, which were precisely where visual enhancements were most needed and appreciated. To the extent that a self-consciously modern architecture was absorbed in the United States, it was for its creation of spaciousness rather than any technological innovation. In this regard, we could say that the world we have created is more for the way it made a small house seem large than for reflecting the current state of manufacturing.

CA: How do you see these interests fitting in with the interdisciplinary nature of the practice and studio courses?

SI: As a historian I believe that architecture intersects everything, from matter to spirit. I believe that students require contexts for the achievements of the discipline in the past to the other cultures—which increases imaginative resources as it sharpens critical skills—gives them a better sense of appropriateness. At the same time, I don’t want to lose the building as a tangible and immediate object, even if its symbolic and social role is its highest symbolic moments to its facilitation of everyday mundane matters. At the same time, I don’t want to lose the building as a tangible and immediate object, even if its symbolic and social role is its highest symbolic moments to its facilitation of everyday mundane matters. Maybe it’s a fatalism, but I return again and again to the building as a unique object: representative of cultural issues but not reducible to them, affecting and affected by other forces, but always with its own cantor of gravity.

Joel Sanders

Joel Sanders joins the faculty at Yale this spring as associate professor. Formerly director of the masters of architecture program at Parsons School of Design, in New York, he was interviewed in the fall by Joseph Rosa, the newly appointed curator of design for the San Francisco Museum of Art.

Joseph Rosa: I understand that in preparation for your design projects you often do historical research that sometimes leads to published articles.

Joel Sanders: Design ideas often stem from research, and, likewise, research is often derived from practice. I’ve just completed an article entitled “Curian Wards” that focuses on the professional rivalries that have divided architects from decorators since the late nineteenth century, showing how these rifts are rooted in deep-seated animosities stoked by gender and sexuality. Although I have a longstanding interest in the broad topic of gender and architecture, I was drawn to this particular subject because I confront these issues on a daily basis as a New York-based architect who often designs interiors.

JR: How interesting about “Curian Wards” simultaneously affected the work you produced at your office?

JS: In fact, we are working on a number of commissions that attempt to weave together the two aspects of our work: interior decorators and architects: hard and soft materials, building scale and setting the more intimate, residential scale. For the Lower East Side Townhouse, a residential building in Hell’s Kitchen, the siding and concave-convex facade of old and molded terracotta—untold directly from the terra-cotta facades and floor. And at the Lake Lido, also in New York, we tried to bring the traditional distinctions between enclosures (architecture) and decorative (interior decorating); black leather is used in different guises, transforming from floor tiles to soft upholstery as it achieves horizontal and vertical surfaces.

JR: In what way have you combined your interest in how everyday space shapes human identity with that in these varying materials and scales?

JS: As architects, we think we tend to forget a lesson that both interior and fashion designers take for granted: once a set of objects that clad buildings resemble the clothing we wear: they are applied surfaces that help us express who we are, or who we wish to be.

JR: Then, in how are these issues about architecture and human identity incorporated into the architectural courses you teach?

JS: I talk about issues that we consider everyday space and what it implies about human interactions. For example, one topic—both in my first-year design studio and in my seminar entitled “ Dwelling: Homes, Houses, Housing”—is how residential design, and particularly the positioning of rooms and windows, has historically structured changing perceptions about the body. Traditionally shamed by the corporeal body, combined with the need to demand clean, efficient spaces, has caused architects to isolate these spaces from the life of the home. But today these cultural prohibitions are changing. In the seminar we will ask students to consider how this might impact the design of dwellings in the future.

JR: It seems that the emergence of new technologies has affected the way we think about the body and its relationship to the built environment—and it will even more so in the future.

JS: Clearly spending more and more time navigating virtual space alters the relationship between our beings and the material world. For this reason, I find spaces like gyms fascinating: they shuffle us back and forth between actual and virtual worlds. Working out forces us to tactfully engage surfaces—all, walls, roofs, even ceilings—but at the same time, gym design compels us to encounter the virtual—mirrors, electronics, TV monitors.

JR: So you see this combination of the virtual and the real contributing to the future emergence of single-function environments, upon you recedes in your casing essay for the exhibition Inside Space at the MIT List Center. You use the term ergolectronic—how would you describe it?

JS: Ergolectronic considers buildings as flexible multitask environments designed to accommodate the variety of roles—both personal and professional—that each of us assume each day. For example, many single parents require dwellings where they can relax and work, raise kids, and meet with friends within limited square footage. In my current projects, such as the First-Floor Prototype for the upcoming exhibition New Hotels for Global Nomads (at the Cooper Hewitt, National Design Museum through May 2003), buildings are complex systems of overlapping networks, surfaces, zones, which will allow occupants the freedom to construct more mobile ways of engaging with each other in public and private space.

JR: How do speculative projects like 24/7 Hotel Room compare with “real” projects commissioned by clients?

JR: In a reversal, almost all of the projects that we have been lucky enough to exhibit—such as the Yale House and the House for a Bachelor—were building commissions, which we later reformed to create a museum context.

JR: What about the Access House, which breaks ground in St. Simon’s Island, Georgia, this spring?

JS: The Access House, which is included in Big Brother: Surveillance and Architecture, at the National Museum of Contemporary Art in Athens, Greece, curated by Filippos Dimitratos. If surveillance has sinister connotations, as it certainly seemed to do in the past, the Access House is organized around the “e-core,” an updated version of the American hearth, which integrates multiple electronic eyes that monitor not only the movement of people but the activity of building components like sliding doors and plumbing fixtures. The e-core makes it easier and safer to navigate the house, which was designed for a retired couple. Ironically, the idea behind its development was to create both a sense of security and surveillance—have broader relevance today, post-9/11, than I could have imagined.
Spring Events

Zaha Hadid Laboratory

An exhibition of the current work of Zaha Hadid, Eero Saarinen visiting professor at Yale this spring, will be held at the AIA Gallery from March 25 to May 10, 2002.

A comprehensive exhibition, Zaha Hadid Laboratory, is an exposition of the current work and modes of work of London-based architect Zaha Hadid, who was the Eero Saarinen visiting professor at Yale in spring 2000 and has returned this spring. Taking over the full AIA Gallery, the show will feature 20 of her studio’s projects, both completed and under construction, showing how the practice pushes the boundaries of architecture, extending existing spatial repertoires to reflect the continuously evolving urban culture. Hadid’s explorations in architecture to be displayed at Yale show a vast array of concepts in spatial variation, multifunctional interiors, and artificial landscape. Flux and flexibility are among the elements of an approach that emphasizes the intersection of architecture and urban design. The work is shown in drawings, colorful field paintings, models, three-dimensional computer images, videos, and animation. Although most of us are familiar with the experimental investigations in Hadid’s early work, seen in the exhibition Deconstructivist Architecture, at MoMA in 1988, and more recently in 1998 at San Francisco MoMA—with such buildings as Vitra Fire Station and Land Formation One (both in Germany), Strasbourg Tram Station, and the Mind Zone of the Millennium Dome in London, which show formal experimentation at a smaller scale, a new exhibition in LA in 2001—experiments in design and urban design the cityscape.

The exhibition also includes the Contemporary Art and Architecture Center in Rome’s Farnesia district and the Ski Jump in Innsbruck, Austria, both under construction. The Rome center will house permanent and temporary galleries, a conference center, and a library. Here Hadid explores the concept of “irrigating” a larger urban field with linear displays that weave between the interior and exterior. The Innsbruck Ski Jump is replacing the former Olympic ski jump as a hybrid of sports facilities and place of relaxation, which continues the topography of the site slope beyond the mountain peak into the sky. Also in the show are models and drawings of an yet unrealized new projects such as the Ferry Terminal in Salerno, Italy, and the Science Center in Wolfsburg, Germany. The Salerno Ferry Terminal is like an oven with a hard shell enclosing transitional elements—three interlocking volumes with offices, a ferry terminal, and a terminal for cruise ships, along with a ramping circulation system—to provide the smooth and transition between land and sea. The Walthburg Science Center will pull pedestrian and vehicular traffic through the site under the exhibition space. The main volume of the building, which is carried above the plaza, is supported on structural concrete cores housing commercial and cultural spaces.

Arvenne: Housing on the Edge

An exhibition will be held from February 11 to March 8, 2002, at the AIA Gallery.

On February 14, 2002, in conjunction with the exhibit, a roundtable discussion, will enable participants in the exhibition, representatives from New York City, and the architects selected to carry out the project to exchange ideas.

In an effort to bring the research of leading schools of architecture to the table with the pragmatic realm of government policy and actual development, the Architectural League of New York requested four architectural/planning teams to explore alternative ways to design innovative housing incorporating environmental, infrastructure, and economic issues for the city-owned 100-acre Arvenne site in Far Rockaway, Queens, recently being planned. Three projects will be on display at the AIA Gallery, February 11-13, 2002. The exhibition, first displayed at the Urban Center (but shut by the events of 9/11. It was briefly back on view thereafter December 7, 2001–January 16, 2002), showcases the work (see Constructs, fall 2001).

The league’s project for Arvenne, a key long-term 300-acre parcel of land along the Atlantic Ocean, is a parallel exploration of ideas addressing and criticizing the city’s guidelines for market-rate single-family housing intended to provide alternative benchmarks for large-scale housing developments. Despite urban sites, as are now being addressed in cities such as San Francisco and Chicago.

The Yale team, led by members Diana Dalmon, Deborah Banke, Peggy Deamer, and Keller Easterling, proposed a double infrastructure with a “main street” that undulates through the site to the ocean with green lanes and swales at the water’s edge to handle storm water and manage the sandbar—ecology integrating the landscape with the neighborhood. New materials—louvered sandwich-floor solar panels and composite woods—are selected to create energy-efficient dwellings for use at various scales and densities, which would be fabricated and mass produced in flexible flats raised above the flood height.

The City College team, consisting of Michael Sorokin Studio, Oryx/McAvenish, and SHoP, had Sorokin develop the site master plan on which the other architects addressed specific elements, including aligning the roofs of the housing blocks with the adjacent subway tracks to create a singular roofscape. The incorporated environmental technologies such as roof collectors, wind machinery, and photovoltaic panels in the units and designed rated boardwalk platforms for pedestrians to weave through the project to the edge of the ocean, linking the housing development to the beach.

After Michael Bell Architecture designed the overall plan for the Columbia University team, the team architects—Martha Fairbank Architects, Mark Rakitasansky Studios, and BKL—worked independently designing the housing units for different portions of the site. Responding to the adjacent residential blocks of Far Rockaway—from the bungalows to the publicly funded high-rises—they designed a gradation of housing types. Rakitasansky combined housing elements from the 1900s stodgy type with the low-rise veranda, and the others integrated the infrastructure of street and sidewalk with the house ground plans.

The four members of the CASES team—John Bosh, Reiner de Gisval, Bruce Fisher, and Beth Margulies—conducted a detailed urban-planning analysis of the broader area of the Rockaway Peninsula, looking at the infrastructure and land use in the region, including the future economic potential of JFK Airport. Their scheme includes low-density housing along the beach, like the former bungalow community with double- and quadruple-family houses, but maintains the low-rise open space. They also designed future large-scale amenities.

Left: Zaha Hadid Studio. Contemporary Art Center, Cincinnati, Ohio, 2001

Roundtable on Housing at Yale

On February 14, 2002, Rosalie Ganwe, executive director of the Architectural League, will moderate a roundtable discussion with James Lima, assistant commissioner of New York City’s Department of Housing, Preservation & Development; Stan Eslab of Eslabon/Enzmann, Eslabon & Kuhn, the architects selected for the project; as well as representatives from the four design teams. The roundtable is one in a series on the Arvenne project that began with the league’s initial panel discussion in spring 2001; a second panel was sponsored by the real-estate community in December 2001; and a discussion held on January 14, 2002, at the Scandinavia House, in New York.

22
Eyrebeam: Open-Source Architecture on Exhibit

Thirteen finalist schemes from Eyrebeam Architecture Competition will be exhibited at the AAA AIA Gallery from February 11 to March 8, 2002.

Yale’s AIA Gallery will hold the exhibition of Eyrebeam Architects from their international competition for a 90,000-square-foot new media arts center at 540 West 21st Street, in New York’s Chelsea arts district. The project is expected to be completed in 2003. The new building will house exhibition spaces, offices, archives, studios, multimedia classrooms, and a flexible 500-seat theater. Eyrebeam, founded in 1998 by three former Harvard Johnson Alumnus, is dedicated to exploring ways that new media can influence society and the manner in which experimental technologies can support the arts through artist-in-residence programs, art installations, and community outreach. The Eyrebeam exhibition, featuring the architects selected in the second stage of the three-phase competition, initially was held from September 18 to October 31, 2001, in Eyrebeam’s interim space designed by Craig Newhart (197) and David Hoon (207), who also organized the competition. Figures, texts, and their installation at Yale consists of project plans showing each architect’s scheme in original scale and descriptive texts, in keeping with the media arts theme, each figure has an equal opportunity to be seen inserted into the panel. The computer capable of Eyrebeam’s Web site and torque so on a series of display stands made of aluminum strips.

The recommendations include Architecture Research Office, Asymptote Architecture, Preston Scott Cohen, Neil M. Denari Architects, Dyves, Dom Fonesca, Gluckman Mayner Architects, Raier + Union, Urban Initiatives/Richard Artschwager’s Marvel Architects, David Chipperfield Architects, and Foreign Office Architects. In keeping with the media arts theme, each figure has an equal opportunity to be seen inserted into the panel. The computer capable of Eyrebeam’s Web site and torque so on a series of display stands made of aluminum strips.

Wynona, Families, and the Architectural Profession

On Friday, January 25, 2002, at 6:30 p.m. a roundtable discussion—in support of the fall 2001 Yale tetralogical symposium “Gender Matters” and also the ongoing questions regarding the role of women in architectural practice—will be held in the Yale art gallery. The panelists will be the following: Jenny Silver, a professor at the University of Michigan, and a self-described feminist, will explore the role of women in architectural practice. Participants in the informal discussion include Lisa Kurs-Lasky (198), partner of Asymptote Architecture and Bishop visiting professor; Deborah Berke, adjunct professor and principal at Debarke Arhitects; Peggy Dejam, associate dean and partner at Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, and Paul Maltz (75), architect and principal of Audrey Maltz Architect; and Susan Rodriguez, partner at Polshek Partnership, Professor Alan Piatkus moderated the discussion.

Rome Studies

To enhance the Yale three-week Rome summer study seminar this year Stephan Willy (187) will teach a spring seminar, "Rome: La Citta Eterna," focusing on all aspects of the development of the city from Antiquity to Modern Times. Then Herby and Alexander Fiesue will lead the workshop “Rome: The Art of the City.” Summer Yale-in-Rome Program, from May 15 to June 9, 2002. The intensive course will emphasize direct observation, sketching, and independent analysis of sites and buildings.

Digital Concrete: Experiments with New Construction Technologies in Three-D Form and Materials Class

The fabrication of complex, digitally fabri- cated concrete forms for in-place concrete structures has been technically feasible for some time. Architects who make computer-generated designs create them using large-format robotic technology or CNC milling. Although these devices are good at producing complex curvilinear forms for large-scale pcurs, the time it takes to generate a given shape is often cost prohibitive. Making molds using computer-controlled foam, cutting NCAA is a time-saving alternative to CNC milling.

Last fall’s “Three-D Form and Materials” class, taught by Kent Boorman, Paul Trouche, Quentin Cox, Susan Vamcoek, Ed Patzer, and Dan Santaholm, and me, explored the possibilities of generating complex in-place concrete designs using a three-axis hot wire CNC machine. Although limited to the production of ruled surfaces, this machine provided a good demonstration of the movement of a single line through space. CNC technology can produce forms that a CNC mill cannot. Digitally cut polystyrene molds can be made with severe undulations, cuts within cuts, and deep pointed wforms—something even a five-axis mill has difficulty producing. Because of these unique capabilities, CNC technologies offer a way of relating the traditional concrete cast-in-place construction—a technique that is limited in practice by the difficulty of removing rigid formwork from a single concrete pour. With digitally cut formwork that is relatively inexpensive, the movement of a single line through space, and they appeared like interstellar waves. Although this research focused on the production of large cast-in-place concrete panels, some students also experimented with materials such as soft foam and veru-smooth wood veneer. The next phase will focus on student investigations could include double curvatures made on a CNC mill with the undercuts of CNC technology.

—Michael Silver

Silver is an assistant professor.

Symposium: Cartography in the Age of Digital Media

From Friday, April 5, 2002, at 7 p.m. in The Yale School of Architecture, 180 York Street, New Haven, Connecticut

The event is free, but reservations are requested.

Daniel Miller, director, Electronic Arts Lab, Yale School of Architecture, 180 York Street, New Haven, Connecticut
Phone: 203-432-2889, fax: 203-432-1775
E-mail: architecture@yale.edu

Michael Silver, assistant professor, has organized a daylong symposium, which he will moderate with landscape archi- tect Diana Balmori.

In recent years, new cartographic technolo- gies have begun to alter the ways we mea- sure and represent space. These tech- niques operate at many scales—from the global to the local—and are used in numerous interdisciplines, including geology, biological sciences, and now architecture. Advanced laser aerial, 3-D scanning technology, satellite remote sensing, and real-time motion-capture technology have produced unique vials of environment. This if the new forms of Cartographic representation can replace our perceptions of reality, what are the political, cultural, and artistic effects of these new technolo- gies? What changes will they bring to the different fields of cultural production?

For architecture the impact can be dra- matic. New digital-imaging technologies offer a unique range of virtual forms, with an unprecedented level of accuracy and detail. This data of site (data scans, pinging data, etc.) can be used in three dimen- sions rather than as the original, a range of surfaces made of variable curvature which is determined by the movement of a single line through space. For architecture, a technique that is limited in practice by the difficulty of removing rigid formwork from a single concrete pour. Digital cutting of concrete forms that is relatively inexpensive, the movement of a single line through space, and they appeared like interstellar waves. Although this research focused on the production of large cast-in-place concrete panels, some students also experimented with materials such as soft foam and veru-smooth wood veneer. The next phase will focus on student investigations could include double curvatures made on a CNC mill with the undercuts of CNC technology.

—Michael Silver

Silver is an assistant professor.

An exhibition of the work of 11 Japanese student of the Yale School of Architecture will be held in the AAA AIA Gallery from February 11 to March 8, 2002. It will be shown in Tokyo this summer.

Posting the question of how a region and culture influence design, an exhibition of the work of Japanese graduates from the Yale School of Architecture, Yale Japan: Revealing New Ground, highlights the simi- larities and differences between archit- ecutural projects located in one geographic area. The work of Tukasa Yamaehara (154, Kazuo Ichihara (74), Yukiko Nonguchi (78), Jun Minakawa (92), Noriko Han (94), Hiroshi Nakamura (98), Koki Yoshida (98), Hiroshi Kawashima (99), Tatsuo Morozumi (99, and Kazueko Watanabe (99) is organized to show this often-discussed relationship between site, design concept, and the broader region.

In the exhibition, organized by Tatsuki Tanaka, white abstract architectural mod- els—all at 1:1000 scale—are placed along a central “plinlaw joined with a series of aerial photographs of each project’s site. The placement of the two elements explicitly shows the buildings in their unique urban or natural landscapes in Japan. Each architect presents his individual project in more detail in a variety of mediums—concept sketches, draw- ings, larger models, computer images, and photographs—making a visual connection to each of the models on the “plinlaw,” which functions as an index to the architects and their projects.

Beyond the architects’ common culture and each one’s individual experiences, they have made individual contributions. This exhibits the areas of their practices, in terms of building types and design reductions—revealing new ground.

Yale Japan: Revealing New Ground

An exhibition of the work of 11 Japanese student of the Yale School of Architecture will be held in the AAA AIA Gallery from February 11 to March 8, 2002. It will be shown in Tokyo this summer.

Yale Architecture Revealing New Ground

An exhibition of the work of 11 Japanese student of the Yale School of Architecture will be held in the AAA AIA Gallery from February 11 to March 8, 2002. It will be shown in Tokyo this summer.

Yale Architecture Revealing New Ground

An exhibition of the work of 11 Japanese student of the Yale School of Architecture will be held in the AAA AIA Gallery from February 11 to March 8, 2002. It will be shown in Tokyo this summer.
The fall 2004 advanced studies course offered the opportunity for progressive students in depth design analyses of details to build up and refine their practice. Through September 11, spanned a time of shock and reflection, the students continued the design process in New York, France, England, and Canada.

Peter Eisenman
Peter Eisenman, Kahn visiting professor associate, examined a newly studied period of Le Corbusier’s work (1934-38), dissecting the writer’s unstable attempts to find a language from which to extrapolate new forms.

The students and their professors explored principles such as Seurat’s consistent use of his geometric designs, which he exhibited in every piece, that is, an extended formal work of art. This is the same period in which Le Corbusier began to create his own language of form. The students were able to see how Le Corbusier’s formal language began to take shape during this period.

Brigitte Shim
Brigitte Shim, Bickel visiting professor, examined the work of Le Corbusier and Peter Eisenman, and the role of architecture in form. The students were able to see how the architecture of Le Corbusier and Peter Eisenman began to take shape during this period.

Henry Smith-Miller
Henry Smith-Miller, Lethaby visiting professor, examined the work of Le Corbusier and Peter Eisenman, and the role of architecture in form. The students were able to see how the architecture of Le Corbusier and Peter Eisenman began to take shape during this period.

24
Alan Plattus

For this third China Studio Alan Plattus turned to a site on the Kunlun piedmont for a second China Academy. They were asked to design an academic center that would serve an entire city that encompassed a whole range of activities. The architects were, in fact, to create the community's social, cultural, and economic hub. The architects went through a process of understanding the relationship between site and program. They worked with local experts to create a design that would respond to the local landscape and culture. The result is a dynamic and fluid design that combines traditional and modern elements. The architects used a variety of materials, including wood, stone, and metal, to create a space that is both functional and beautiful. The result is a unique and inspiring design that will serve the local community for many years to come.

Demetri Porphyrios

Demetri Porphyrios referred to Yale as the Dwelling and Cities Office, with Mark Gergor (10) as his assistant, to continue the work for a green building that can be adapted to any climate. In a highly contested $500,000 Industrial Design competition, Porphyrios took first place for his entry, inspired by the local landscape and culture. The design was created with a focus on sustainability and efficiency, and it was well received by the judges. The architects used a variety of materials, including wood, stone, and metal, to create a space that is both functional and beautiful. The result is a unique and inspiring design that will serve the local community for many years to come.

Keller Easterling, Edward Mitchell, and Michael Silver

Led this year by associate professor Keller Easterling, the project on Waterfronts is an exploration of the ways to build on wetlands and the politics of infrastructure. With the recent rise in the number of people living near or on wetlands, the project seeks to investigate the ways to build and develop these areas. The architects have proposed a series of interventions that aim to create a more sustainable and resilient environment. The project is a collaborative effort between the architects and local residents, and it seeks to create a space that is both functional and beautiful. The result is a unique and inspiring design that will serve the local community for many years to come.
John Rondal McDonald ("49) with his firm has designed a skyscraper of stainless steel to revitalize Racine, Wisconsin, which was featured on the cover of the Racine County Times. He has designed a number of Prada Style residences throughout Wisconsin.

1960s

Robert M. Klimter ("54) with his firm, R. M. Klimter & Francis Haleford Architects, in New York, exhibited work at 1-Space, the gallery of the College of Fine and Applied Arts at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, November 16-December 22, 2001.

Hugh Newell Jacobsen ("53), with his firm in Washington D.C., has been awarded the commission to design 30,000-square-foot Wetterlen Ferry Dock of the Greek Jones Jr. Art Center for the University of Alaska. Expected to be completed late 2002, the gallery will house the world's largest private collection of French Impressionist art. He has also been commissioned to design the Riggs Alumni Center for the University of Maryland at College Park.

1970s

Theodore David ("56), of Theo, David Architects, received the Cyprus State Award for Architecture 2000 for his GSP Panagiotis Stadium and Athletic Caravan in Nikoutis, Cyprus. Given away every three years, the highest award granted by the government in recognition of an outstanding body of architectural work and was accompanied by an exhibition. The award has also been nominated for the annual European Union Mies van der Rohe Award.

Harold Roth ("68), of Roth and Moore Architects in New Haven, was inaugurated as chairman of the AIA College of Fellows. He also serves as the professional advisor to the Western European Architecture Foundation. He and William Moore ("71) recently began construction on a new academic arts complex at Drew University, in Madison, New Jersey, and a graduate student residence at the Rhode Island campus, in Wollingford, Connecticut.

Henry Smith-Miller ("69) and his firm, Smith-Miller + Hawkinson Architects in New York, was winner of the Architectural Record/Business Week Design Award for the Coming City of Glass, in Corning, New York, which was featured in the October 2001 issue of Architectural Record and November 5, 2001, issue of Business Week.

Peter Conrad ("68) was recently promoted to associate at Herbert S. Newman and Partners, in New Haven, where he is currently working on the renovation of Yale's Vanderbilt Hall. His other projects include Engleman Hall renovation and addition at Southern Connecticut State University, in New Haven, and an addition to the University of Connecticut, in Storrs.

Peter Marcus ("68), professor of urban planning at Columbia University, has written essays in two books: "Federated Urban Programs as Multicultural Planning: The Environmental Zone Approach," in Urban Planning in a Multicultural Society (Michael Ball, editor); and "Civil in Quarters," in A Companion to the City (Sophia Watson and Gary Bridge, editors; Blackwell, 2002). He was also one of the editors of the book Global Cities: A New Spatial Order (Blackwell, 1990).

1980s

Jefferson B. Riley ("72) was honored with a 25-Year Award in the AIA New England Annual Design Awards for a building that has made a continuing contribution to the field for at least 25 years. The jury cited the Riley House in Guilford, Connecticut, as a "witty vernacular modern house built on a small budget that is as fresh today as when it was first occupied."

Stephen Roberts Holt ("73) appeared on the August 22, 2001, television episode of That Old House as one of the expert on Shingle-style houses, as an urban architect for the restoration of the famed 1863 house, in Manhattan, Massachusetts. The building, which was drastically altered in the 1970s, was designed and constructed by Holt's father.

David Solis ("74) was recently named president and chief executive officer at Boston University Press in Boston. In his new position, Solis is responsible for strategic planning, day-to-day management, and overall management of the firm.

Anko Chen ("76), of VBN Architects in Oakland, California, completed the interior design for the American Airlines Atrium Club at the San Francisco International Airport Terminal E and the Harbormaster Building, in Jacksonville, Florida. He has been invited to work in Beijing as an urban design consultant for the Hepingmen District Master, located near the controversial new National Opera House in downtown Beijing. The master plan is to provide low-rise housing and office buildings as well as high-density courtyard housing while preserving the traditional urban fabric of the alleys and courtyards.

Barbara Flanagan ("77) wrote the article "Born to Be Bad," on Robert Venturi, Denise Scott Brown, as well as a review of the Manhattan exhibition in New York, for Metropolis (October 2001). She also produced and moderated the Metropolitan-sponsored September 28 roundtable "Variations/Scott Brown: In Your Face," with Rem Koolhaas, Robert Venturi, and Denise Scott Brown, at the New School for Social Research, in New York. Her piece appeared in Design In... (Princeton Architectural Press/Metropolis Books, 2001).

Gavin Macroe-Glasson ("79) offered a playground depicting a minimalist Manhattan skyline at P.S. 40, on East 19th Street in Manhattan, was published in the New York Times (November 15, 2001). Adapting standard deck chairs, bridges, slides, and ladders permitted by the School Construction Authority, he created playful variations of the Wedgewood, Chrysler, and Empire State Buildings for climbing equipment.

J. Peter Deveau ("86), of Fieldsovann Architects & Engineers in Los Angeles, was selected executive architect for the San Clemente Government Housing Community for the University of California, Santa Barbara, an $80 million project that will house 976 students as on-campus apartments opened to open in fall 2004. He has also begun work on the Southern California Regional Forensic Science Crime Laboratory, a 300,000-square-foot facility on the campus of the California State University, Los Angeles, to serve Los Angeles Police Department, L.A. County Sheriff's Department, California Department of Justice, and the university.

Jacques Richter ("83) and Ignacio Dahl Rechichi ("83), of Lassonde, Biedermann, had an exhibition of their work at the Esposito's at Archivio Cattaneo, in Como, Italy, in November 2001.

Sheren Cortez Mathews ("04) was recently appointed new executive director of the National Architectural Accrediting Board. She will write the guide "For Architects and the Craft of Defensive Design" on February 27, 2000, in Boston as part of the Boston Society of Architects lecture series "Exploring Design."

2000s

David Marten ("86), of David Marten Architects in New Haven, was co-Chair of the 2001 Emerging Architects Firm in Connecticut award. The jury was impressed with Marten's "strong and professional collection of works in the collection of the firm.

Stuart Basses ("87) with Judson Hudetz (M.F.A., "88), of the furniture and product design company Bprosthesis, have released a new line of stacking acrylic light fixtures. Their work is currently in a Campbell Art Museum traveling exhibition and was featured in Interior Design (August 2001) and Surface (March 2001). The firm is represented by the new American designers in the Toronto Art Galleries (TAS) for the Milan Furniture Fair.

Duncan Stroth ("57), associate professor of architecture at the University of Notre Dame, is editor of the journal of the School of Architecture. The spring 2001 issue included his editor's opener "The Remaking of the Democratic Reconstruction," about the history and preservation of sacred architecture. He is also principal of Duncan Stroth Architects, which has recently completed the design of a private elementary school in Virginia, a Barnedine monument in Chicago, and a parish church in Kentuck.

2000s

Lance Howey ("69), an associate at William McDonough and Partners in Virginia, published his essay "Hidden in the Fabric: Gender, Race, and the Body in Graphic Standards," in the Journal of Architectural Education (November 2001). His hypothesis memorial to the 1992 Los Angeles Riots was exhibited last fall at the Woman's Building and Monument at the National Building Museum, Washington, D.C.

Amy Landenberg ("91) with her firm Art & Design, in Atlanta, was awarded an AIA Georgia 2000 Award for the design of the Georgia 2000 Award for the design of the Kiang Gallery in Atlanta. An exhibition of her artwork entitled Spots, Blossoms, Viewers was shown at the Kiang Gallery from April 20-26, 2001.

Tae Sun Hong ("92) was recently appointed senior vice president and firm principal at MinKyu Design Associates, in Rochester, New York. His current projects include the Andamio Building, in Rome, Yoko Rokshin's mixed-use complex, and Boonung Parking-mixed-use complex under construction in Korea.

Almas Dworsky ("82) installed a temporary one-mile-long luminous Flamingo: Longitude in Time, along Route 4 in western Vermont, from mid-September to mid-October, in November 2001. The piece was completed in collaboration with Vermont Transportation for Reflection, who loaned the lights and radios for her coloration of her composition by 1,000 blue and green reflectors along the roads in both directions. Dworsky received project funding from the National Endowment for the Arts, Vermont Agency of Transportation, Vermont Community Foundation, and Onion River Arts Council. In conjunction with this installation Dworsky gave a series of talks, and her drawings were exhibited at Norwich University's Eben Haze Gallery, in October 2001.

Johannes M. P. Kocopp ("59) gave a lecture entitled "HISTORY: An Argument Against Historic Preservation" at the University of Michigan, in September 10-11, 2001, as part of the luncheon lecture series.

Parrik Gupta ("57) was awarded a 2001-2002 Resident Research Fellowship to study Golconde, an influential modern building built in 1941 in Pondicherry, India.

Stebhen Burke ("01) and Julie Fieher ("01) presented their New Haven project, Arch Street Community, at the biennial exhibition for an exterior. These aerial views, at the Arch Street Community, was created in May 2001. Supported by the Urban Community Foundation, the Friends of Environment and Forestry, and advised by Kent Bloomer, their structure documented, constructed and designed in a spiral arrangement using durable steel tubing and gratings bound together by a series of steel veins.

Book Notes


Paul Goldberger (Yale College '72) has been published The Jazz Age in America, (Universal Press, 2001), a photographic essay by Shulman and Alamos Lume and fest by Goldberger discussing the confluence of the buildings in the aftermath of the Depression.

Betsy Bonner Rogers ("44), founding presi- dents of the Oakville Park Conservancy, has published Landscape: A Cultural and Architectural History of Oakville Park, which was reviewed by Marie Tilton in the December 2, 2001, New York Times Book Review section.


Spring 2002 Events

Exhibitions

Architecture or Revolution: Charles Moore’s Years and Yale in the 1960s
Main, North, and South Galleries
Until February 1

Yale-Japan: Revealing New Ground
North Gallery
February 11–March 8

Open Source Architecture: Building Eyeball
Main Gallery
February 11–March 8

Arvane
South Gallery
February 11–March 8

Zaha Hadid Laboratory
Main, North and South Galleries
March 25–May 10

Year-End Exhibition of Student Work
Main, North and South Galleries
May 24–August 2

Exhibition hours are Monday through Saturday, 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Galleries are located on the second floor of the A&A Building, 180 York Street, New Haven, CT.

Symposia

Friday, January 25, 1–4 p.m.
A&A Building, 4th floor
"Women, Family, and the Practice of Architecture"
Participants: Deborah Berke, Lise Anne Couture, Peggy Deamer, Alan Plattus, and Susan Rodriguez

Thursday, February 14, 6:30–8 p.m.
A&A Building, Hastings Hall
"Arvane, 4 Design Teams, 4 Affordable Housing Projects," moderated by Rosalie Genevra
Participants: Michael Bell, Peggy Deamer, Bruce Fisher, Michael Sorkin and James Lima

Friday, April 5 10 a.m.–4:00 p.m.
A&A Building, Hastings Hall
"Cartography in the Age of Digital Media," moderated by Michael Silver and Dana Balmori
Participants: Jeff Albert, Justine Cooper, Denis Coqgrove, James Gymph, Eric Heller, Laura Kurgan, Lila Locurto, Bill McCallum, Conrad Perelman, and John Ziegler

Lectures

Monday, January 14
Lise Anne Couture, Bishop visiting professor, "Convergences"

Monday, January 21
William Morris, "Civilizing Terrains"

Thursday, January 24
R. Michael Hayes, Stuyvesant Bellasque
"The Autonomy Effect, or Architecture at its End"

Monday, January 28
Hon. Richard Swett, Roth-Bymonds Lecture, "Design Diplomacy: The Influence Edge"

Thursday, January 31
Phyllis Lambert, Brendan Gill Lecture, "Mies Mowa"

Monday, February 4
Stan Allen and James Corner, Timothy J. Lanahan Lecture, "Field Operations"

Monday, February 11
Yung Ho Chang, "In-situ Architecture: A Chinese Practice"

Monday, February 18
Marge Ruddick, "Working Landscapes"

Monday, March 25
Stefan Tschur, "Memory into Site"

Thursday, March 28
William Bruder, Paul Rudolph Lecture, "Looking Back, Looking Forward"

Monday, April 1
George Hargreaves, "Examining Scale and Landscape Architecture"

Thursday, April 4
Zaha Hadid, "Current Work"

Monday, April 8
Jorg Schalans, Gordon Smith Lecture, "Light Structures"

Monday April 15
Thomas Kren, Ezra Stoller Lecture, "Art, Architecture and the Phenomenon of the New Museum"

Thursday, April 18
Silvio Lavin, "Plastics: It's Enough to Make Your Skin Crawl"

** These lectures are part of the "Art, Landscape and Ecology" seminar.

Lectures begin at 6:30 p.m. in Hastings Hall (basement floor) unless otherwise noted. Doors open to the general public at 6:15 p.m.