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ARCHITECT ABUSE

MID-SIZED FIRMS IN THE MARGINS?
Dear Editor:

We are pleased that in your October issue (page 8) you noted the landmarking of the Four Seasons restaurant, which was, in fact, designated by the Landmarks Preservation Commission on October 3, 1989.

Several points warrant comment:

The writer of the article quotes Paul Byard in support of Teachers Insurance Annuity Association (TIAA) without mentioning that Mr. Byard is a consultant retained by TIAA in connection with the Seagram Building and the Four Seasons designation, while the professional affiliation of another architect, Arvid Rein, is identified in the article, giving the impression that Mr. Byard’s remarks were offered purely in an objective and unbiased manner.

It is also worthy to note that in addition to those distinguished New Yorkers that the article chose to cite in support of the designation, there were letters from prominent New Yorkers involved in preservation and the architectural fields such as Charles Gwathmey, Bernard Tschumi, Cesar Pelli, and Richard Meier, to mention a few.

While the designation does not include landmarking the use of the space as a restaurant, we (and our many supporters) believe that the space would be best used as a restaurant, so that the unique and nonlandmarked dining experience may continue into the next century.

Tom Margittai
Paul Kovi
Prospects for Dinkins  
by Kelly Shannon

As the new mayor, David Dinkins faces a host of problems. A stalled local economy is compounded by severe social problems, including crime, drugs, AIDS, and homelessness. The budget gap for the fiscal year 1991 is disheartening—it stands at approximately $400 million, reflecting Koch's cuts in services but not expected costly labor settlements. The federal government's contribution to the city budget continues to decrease, and state aid, although increasing, is vulnerable since the state must face up to its own tremendous budget gap. For the city, further cuts in expenditures and increased taxes are inevitable.

As for the implications for the architectural community, the new mayor brings uncertainty. A new mayor coupled with a significantly revised charter, government, and land-use-approval apparatus is intensifying pessimism in an already tentative and soft real-estate market. As Dinkins takes office, the pace of development projects is expected to slow. Although many recognize Dinkins's public support for recently completed projects, such as Worldwide Plaza and the West Side YMCA tower addition, others are skeptical of his true allegiances.

Many in the Dinkins circle, such as Deputy Mayor Barbara Fife, who was active in the legal challenge of the Coliseum settlement, have been labeled "antidevelopment" and "antigrowth." Dinkins's link to commercial rent control, through his alliance with new Manhattan Borough President Ruth Messinger, along with his favoring of strict warehouse limitations, may be reason for worry among the real-estate community. Of course, even "West Side" Messinger has been meeting recently with the big developers and making signs of some accommodation to them.

A dramatic shift from the Koch reign is expected at all levels of city development policies. The border war with New Jersey for business continues as a grave concern. Koch initiated packages of incentives to keep corporate headquarters and back-office facilities in New York. Dinkins is more likely to use incentives to promote development for the manufacturing sector in poorer areas rather than tax abatements for commercial development in downtown and midtown areas.

A shift of relocation tax credits to "designated distressed areas"—State Opportunity Zones (SOZ) including East Harlem, Jamaica, and Port Morris—directly contradicts the recommendations of the New York City Partnership Financial Services Task Force. Alair Townsend, publisher of Crain's New York Business, cites this move as a major defect in expected Dinkins policy: "The idea of increasing the manufacturing sector in the SOZs is plausible. However, the notion of back offices in these areas is not wise; they aren't ready for that type of development yet."

Dinkins is expected to promote aid to various smaller firms by redirecting the Public Development Corporation's focus to industrial development, security, and sanitation projects. Of diminishing interest are more high-profile projects of the past like Metrotech and the South Street Seaport.

In housing, aside from continuation of HPD's capital plan for affordable units, Dinkins is expected to continue making deals with developers of luxury projects to build low-income housing. In addition, property taxes for owners of single-family homes are expected to be kept low.

Dinkins's new policies will undoubtedly be scrutinized almost immediately. Prospects and realities are two very different concepts, and Dinkins may end up proving his own adage: "Anything that anyone says is just politics."

Dinkins's First Step  
Max Bond, formerly a member of the City Planning Commission, was appointed co-chairman of the Dinkins transition team's Planning, Environment, and Quality of Life Search Committee. He is charged with nominating potential commissioners of City Planning, Housing Preservation and Development, Landmarks, and other agencies. Alexander Cooper and Peter Samton were also appointed to serve on the search committee.

New Projects in the City

New York University already has a dormitory building near Cooper Union designed by Voorsanger and Mills at Third Avenue and Ninth Street. But soon Cooper Union will have one too—two blocks south of the school's Foundation Building at Seventh Street and Third Avenue. Architects Prentice & Chan, Ohihausen were selected by an invited competition open only to faculty and alumni. The tower, which will be approximately fifteen stories high, is being designed by Rolf Ohlhausen, who not only went to Cooper Union but even restored the nearby Astor Place subway station. Warren Gran and Joe Sultan are associated architects in the design of a public school for the retarded and handicapped in Queens. P.S. 233 will be the first new building tailored for this group of one hundred of the city's most severely disabled students. The architects are designing the school to look like a series of attached houses, with color-coded spaces, clerestories in the corridors, and large windows in the classrooms. Warren Gran and Associates is also designing a private
Competition, Controversies, Changes

Beyond City Limits

Michel Franck, an architect from Luxembourg who has had his own office in New York since 1983, has just won a competition in his home city for a mixed-use commercial, office, residential, retail, and cultural complex to be built on eight acres just outside the downtown area. The project, which will total one million square feet, will be resubmitted to City Hall after Franck is finished with the design development. Also in Luxembourg, Richard Meier has won a competition to design the 120,000-square-foot Hypobank building for the Munich-based banking company. This is just one of ten juicy projects Meier has going in Paris, Ulm, Munich, Edinburgh, Antwerp, The Hague, Montpellier, and Barcelona.

The question is: how will the "hands-on" architect do all this? In October the NYC/AIA Design Awards jury gave a citation to the New York office of Ellerbe Becket (whose principal is Peter Pran) for three projects, including the Architecture School Addition and Remodeling at the University of Minnesota (Oculus, October 1989, p. 14). Not too long after, at a lecture at the 92nd Street Y, Steven Holl unveiled a scheme for the same school that he designed in conjunction with the Minneapolis firm of Ellerbe Becket (Oculus, December 1989, p. 11). It might seem rather strange to have different offices of the same firm involved in the two designs, but as Holl says, "Our project is the one that will be built. Ours is real and has a real program." His addition, which just won a P/A Design Award (P/A, January 1990), is designed to hook into the square 1958 building through two curved arms anchored by four masonry load-bearing entry towers that contain jury rooms, exhibit areas, and studios. A lighter material—leaded copper over a steel frame—clads the curved west wing containing an auditorium, faculty offices, and studios, plus the slightly taller curved east wing, containing a library, offices, and studios.

A crucial link between all the spaces, old and new, is an enclosed promenade that rises from the ground at the north tower and circuitously connects to the second level of the older architecture school building (foreground in photo). This ramp in turn joins to the existing second-level bridges to adjacent campus buildings. In a city famous for its successful second-level indoor walkways, this spatial procession maintains a climate-based tradition while making sure that students and faculty get a proper amount of exercise. Architects Michael Manfredi of Brooklyn Heights and Marion Gail Weiss of Washington, D.C., won the design competition for the Women in Military Service for America Memorial, which will be built at the entrance to Arlington National Cemetery. The scheme incorporates the McKim, Mead and White gateway—a large neoclassical hemicycle—into its main facade, although the memorial’s educational and cultural spaces will be below ground. The jury’s chair, Robert Campbell, architect and critic of the Boston Globe, presided over the selection of the peculiar design, in which ten obtusively spiky glass needles serve as skylights to the spaces below. Well, what should they do—put a glass pyramid in the front court?... Now the American Academy in Rome can offer two Rome Prize fellowships in landscape architecture instead of one, owing to the $500,000 grant from Prince Charitable Trusts, a private family foundation. This year the academy celebrates “The Year of the Landscape,” with a series of events on the topic taking place in New York in the spring. Fittingly enough, this year also marks the completion of the master plan for the academy’s grounds on the Janiculum Hill in Rome by landscape architect (and past fellow) Laurie Olin. Edward Durell Stone Associates has just finished an expansively linear, expansively grided building for the Archeological Museum in Xalapa in the state of Veracruz. It holds the largest collection of Gulf Coast pre-Columbian art in the world. Virginia Dajani, long-time director of special projects and editor of The Livable City at the Municipal Art Society, becomes executive director of the American Academy and Institute of Arts and Letters this month. The organization, located at 155th Street and Broadway, is known for bestowing generous awards to artists, writers, composers, playwrights, and even architects.

Inside Media: Architecture

Deborah Dietsch, the new editor-in-chief of Architect, and Beverly Russell, the editorial director of Architecture and Interiors, recently discussed their editorial plans during an evening meeting of the NYC/AIA Presidential Decade. The event, chaired by Peter Samton, was occasioned by the misgivings many members of the New York chapter still have about the sale of Architect by the national AIA to BPI, a commercial publisher. Many present feared that Architect’s editorial matter would be oriented in the future more toward the perceived market of architect-reader/building-product-buyers and advertisers rather than members of a professional organization.

The argument that such a difference exists may seem specious when one considers that architect-readers and members of the AIA are often one and the same. Nevertheless, the comments consistently emphasized how the goals of a journal that is, in Arthur Rosenblatt’s words, “the voice of the profession” differed from those of a trade magazine. As Herbert Oppenheimer pointed out, the AIA’s journal used to be...
concerned with the values architecture should embody — its social, humanitarian, and artistic agenda — not solely with the real estate, public relations, and commercial aspects of architecture. Paul Segal voiced his theory that a professional journal should embody its social, commercial, and professional aspects. Doug Korves elaborated on the concern that "we are, not able to get our value across to the trade magazines."

The possible pressure of advertisers on the magazine's editorial content was seen as a real threat. The architects present brought up the concern that ads often misrepresent a product. Yet the magazines never warn architects about potential problems with advertised products for fear of losing the advertising dollar. Several architects present at the meeting suggested that architecture have a panel of experienced professionals review products and alert the editors, but others admitted that this idea was rather naive, considering that many consumer magazines fail to make comparable warnings. (The irony was that even before architect's had been hoping to get a panel to review advertising.)

For their part, Dietsch and Russell acquitied themselves well with a group that was angrier about decisions made long before these two editors became involved. Dietsch did say that architecture would seek to show more design by a broader range of architects, publish more drawings, and investigate particular firms, regions, and building types. It also plans more coverage of technical developments.

But the fact of the sale still proved to be the sticky wicket. As Herbert Oppenheimer pointed out, the sale of the magazine is seen in metaphorical terms. "The profession is concerned that big firms are getting big jobs that involve big money. That is what architecture is about these days. And this has culminated in the sale of our magazine to a big publisher. It scares the bejesus out of us." As Arthur Rosenblatt said, paraphrasing A. J. Liebling: "The free press belongs to the person who owns one."

Usually young architects moan and groan that they never receive proper credit on a project — particularly if they work for a well-known architect. But then there are cases of the reverse — where heads of firms find that employees who gain access to the (unknowing) media manage to rewrite history the way they would like to see it. This form of architect abuse — where the boss gets credited — is unusual, but it bears looking into.

Peter Samton was dumbfounded when he opened the recent publication New York Architecture, edited by Heinrich Klotz with Luminita Sabau (see Oculus, December 1989, p. 9). There, on page 100, was the Regatta apartment house he and his firm, Gruzen Samton Steinglass, designed for Battery Park City. It was attributed to a former employee, Vladimir Arsene, a project designer who had worked a fair amount on the project but had left the firm midway through construction. To be sure, Gruzen Samton Steinglass was mentioned in the book — in tiny type — but by the wording, "Vladimir Arsene for Gruzen Samton Steinglass Architects," sounded to Samton, logically enough, as if Arsene had been brought in as a "prima" design consultant to a production-drawing firm. (The index mentions only Arsene's name.) Samton notified Rizzoli International, the publisher, but found that the matter was complicated because the book had been published in Germany first, so that Rizzoli had had little to do with its editing. After much correspondence between all parties, and a reminder by Samton that his firm had the copyright to the drawings, Rizzoli inserted a card correcting the credits.

When Arsene suggested that he could settle the matter of credits in the Klotz book by getting Gruzen Samton Steinglass published in another book, New York Architects 3, which a friend of his, Livio Dimitriu, was helping put together, Samton started to get very cynical: "Everyone in the second book has to buy at least fifty copies at $20 each," he recalls. As Samton concludes, "This book business is a fancy form of brochure-making. The people who advised Klotz on New York Architecture are a group of frustrated designers who are essentially publicity brokers. They seek to conceal their own goals of self-promotion by surrounding their work by that of quality products of big-name architects. But this kind of book muddies the waters. There are people who give their life to making good buildings. They work day and night, and one of their cohorts walks away and takes the credit."

There are a lot of issues raised in this tale, one of which is the value of vanity-press books. But the question concerning us is: what does an architect do to make sure book publishers (and magazines) receive the proper credits? And if the credits are incorrect once the publication appears, what can he or she do?

Readers are invited to respond with similar (or even reverse) cases and suggested solutions.
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Urban Stories
Commentary by Alex Cohen

Ethics Exodus

Fearing a mass exodus of important city employees, the City Council, acting on a request by both Dinkins and Koch, has approved a three-month delay of a stringent new ethics code that was to go into effect January 1. The new code made it clear that the ethics change also sparks concern.

But the new code makes it clear that the ethics change also sparks concern.

The ethics change also sparks concern.

Future work in the private sector could be curtailed. One lawyer with a New York firm that represents many developers, who was interviewed before the current hiring freeze with Bill Valetta counsel to City Planning, was warned about the ethics change and limitations on his future opportunities after January. Another lawyer at LPC left immediately after the election, and several close to her regard the ethics change as a key inducement. She could not be reached for comment.

Regardless of the timing, one limitation is clear. A former city employee can still direct a private firm’s dealings with the city as long as he or she remains out of sight.

NYC/AIA Exhibit
Affordable Housing: New York, 1990

This recent housing survey exhibit, hastily mounted by the chapter’s Housing Committee, offered an incomplete history of affordable schemes from the past and uncritically presented a wide and varied range of new designs. The committee was headed by Jerry Vasisko.

The exhibition’s only text (other than that irregularly supplied by the show’s participants), found in the history section, was inconsistently set in varying type sizes and fonts and needed thorough copy-editing. Glaring in omission from the history section were the Harlem Dunbar Apartments, designed by Andrew Thomas in 1928, and the results of the Ruberoid Company housing competition of 1963. The Harlem River Houses of 1937, still the outstanding New York public housing project, was incorrectly attributed to Horace Glines instead of to a team headed by Archibald Manning Brown.

Though the Housing Committee decided to display all submitted designs, it should nonetheless have taken a critical view of the mounted projects, particularly since the show points to the participating architects’ mission of helping to solve the current “crisis in affordable housing and improving the quality of life.”
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How successful were the projects in meeting these goals? The work represented in the show ranged from excellent to mundane and depressing. Oppenheimer, Brady and Vogelstein’s comprehensive modernization and improvement of two Jersey City Housing Authority projects were laudable for the apparent community transformations they effected, as were schemes such as Levenson Meltzer Neuringer’s functional Shearson Lehman Hutton transitional residences for the homeless and Rosenblum/Harb’s contextual and varied row houses in Manhattan Valley.

Too few interiors were displayed. Those for the Shearson residence and for the dreary, dormitory-like Casa Rita shelter, also by Levenson Meltzer Neuringer, only served as evidence of very inconsistent submissions and a lack of entry requirements.

The unfortunate tendency to privatize and contain public space in many inner-city projects was reflected in two gut rehabilitations. The explicit focus of James McCullar’s and Shelly Kroop’s rehabilitation of 1660 Andrews Avenue is “a newly landscaped courtyard at the lobby level which is accessible only to tenants” and secured “through community surveillance.” The main intervention of John Ellis/Goshows Associates’ renovation of walk-up rentals for the Lower East Side Mutual Housing Association was the creation of a “new central landscaped courtyard to benefit all residents as a private amenity.” Even less inspiring were Gruzen Samton Steinglass’s four monotonous twenty-story apartment towers for the West Queens Housing Authority and Thoresen and Linard’s sterile Coney Island Townhouses with front-yard parking, continuous curb cuts, and narrow, identical fenced-in back yards.

As New York City’s own ambitious housing plan goes into full swing, with hundreds of apartments being renovated for low- and moderate-income families, a careful assessment of recently designed affordable housing is overdue. “Affordable Housing: New York, 1990” doesn’t fit the bill.

[Next month, Oculus hopes to print a rebuttal by the curators—Ed.]
Robert Gutman is both a professor of architecture at Princeton University, where he teaches the history of housing and urbanism, and a professor of sociology at Rutgers. In his last book, Architectural Practice: A Critical View (Princeton Architectural Press, 1988), Gutman brought to light some interesting if unsettling trends in the business of architecture. Recently Oculus queried Gutman on the direction he thought the profession would take in the 1990s.

Robert Gutman: We are seeing the growth of an underclass of practitioners. The polarization means that although the one-person firm may have work, it often just manages to get by. Some architects have to give up and join larger firms.

Oculus: You also wrote that clients tend to hire architectural firms to focus on specific aspects of a job, such as interior architecture or space planning. These include clients who have in-house architects or production-oriented firms who work on the technical and structural elements of a project while seeking an outside firm to "style" the building. What about this increased specialization between high-style designers and production architects?

Robert Gutman: When architectural firms collapse, they should try to benefit from marketing and business advice for the next firm they might form. A strategy that is too late for the present might help in the future.

Oculus: You do consulting. What kind?

Robert Gutman: Architects have to motivate the younger employees, give them the right opportunities and rotate them in varying jobs — in other words, develop special programs to unleash their talent. Firms also need someone who knows how to manage an office. Gehry has a manager; Pelli has one. Every successful architect has a manager who can not only run the firm but sell its services to the clients.

Oculus: What about the middle- and small-size firms that don't develop the high-design image?

Robert Gutman: The firms that do well are the large ones that offer a full range of services and the smaller ones that are known for design quality. They are not "boutique" operations, in that they are not necessarily very small — Cesar Pelli has 110 architects working for him, and Michael Graves has 76 — but they are sought after for their design "signature." They often enter into joint ventures with architectural firms that emphasize construction or administration. The French have long had this tradition, but it is not quite the Gropius ideal of one team of architects handling the project from start to finish.

Oculus: What about the middle- and small-size firms that don't develop the high-design image?

Robert Gutman: The firms that lose out are the ones that are not known for a "signature" style and those that do not specialize in a particular building type or offer some other unique capability.

In general, pressures are against the normal full-service middle-size firm. The costs of architectural practice are increasing. Liability insurance and marketing expenses are high. Marketing budgets now use up 7 to 9 percent of a firm's total revenue. Architects also have to spend more on personnel. Young architects today have a new attitude about their careers. They want to know about fringe benefits — disability, life insurance, and future possibilities in the firm.

Oculus: Large firms usually pay well. How do the others pay?

Robert Gutman: Oddly enough, signature firms can pay more to the young employees. They are getting bigger projects with their joint ventures. More money means that not only can they pay at a higher scale, but they can attract more talent.

Oculus: In 1988 you reported that the number of architects has tripled since 1960, when the number totaled 30,000. Competition is high. Is the demand for architecture?

Robert Gutman: More than ever, architects' practices are subject to market forces. To what extent the general market conditions will require architects to take lower-paying jobs remains to be seen. As we know from the mid-1970s, architecture is a volatile business. In the years 1974 to 1970, 30 to 40 percent of all firms in New York shut down. Some left town; some regrouped.

Oculus: Who has the best chance of surviving in tight times?

Robert Gutman: During economically tight periods, paradoxically, the larger firms may expand. They have the client contacts and the marketing capabilities to take over the old markets left by the medium-size firms. Larger firms have better staying power through periods of crisis simply because of additional capital. They can contract and still survive. The time to develop the firm's business is during the good times, but the medium-size firm is just concentrating on getting the work done.

Oculus: In your book you noted that more firms have been engaged in marketing and business development, and that architects are trying to expand into regional, national, and global markets.

Robert Gutman: Architects have to motivate the younger employees, give them the right opportunities and rotate them in varying jobs — in other words, develop special programs to unleash their talent. Firms also need someone who knows how to manage an office. Gehry has a manager; Pelli has one. Every successful architect has a manager who can not only run the firm but sell its services to the clients.

Oculus: What is the Architecture Business? It is about design management and how large practices achieve design quality in large projects. I want to find out what enables them to do superior work and what keeps them from being like more mundane firms. The critical difference, it seems, is the amount of talent in the firm and the degree to which the firm is able to liberate that talent.

Architecture is a special business. Its goal is to produce good design. It is not a business that can be run by accountants. Nor can it be run by architects only interested in beingarty. Architecture is not just produced by the stars. It is produced by the whole organization.
SQUEEZED IN

Addition to Reed Library, SUNY Fredonia, Pasanella and Klein

Chinese Arts and Crafts Store renovation.

MID-SIZED FIRMS

Firm: Pasanella and Klein

Partners: Giovanni Pasanella, J. Arvid Klein, Wayne Berg, Henry Stolzman
Partner interviewed: Wayne Berg

Number of architects: Currently sixteen, but ranges from eight to twenty
Projects in construction: Six
Projects on the boards: Seven

Oculus: Does your firm specialize in any one kind of project?

Wayne Berg: Everyone wants to specialize—that's the way the marketplace works. I like to think we don't specialize except in problem-solving and design. Our project range is varied, with the emphasis on university buildings and corporate interiors, but for variety we take in walk-in clients in other areas.

Oculus: Do you have a marketing person in your office?

WB: All four partners consider marketing a primary responsibility, with Henry Stolzman the key partner charged with this task. A marketing consultant (more like a psychiatrist) meets with the firm one day a month to plan marketing strategy.

Oculus: Does the firm pursue joint ventures with larger firms?

WB: The last major joint venture, with the exception of some work with Richard Weinstein, was about eight years ago. We have made joint-venture proposals with other architects, but nothing came of them. Traditionally it was easier to form joint ventures with other firms who specialized in working drawings, but we are now finding that all firms have designers in their office.

Firm: The Williams Group

Principal: Terry Williams
Number of architects: Recently fifteen, now six
Projects in construction: Four
Projects on the boards: Three

Oculus: Do you specialize?

Terry Williams: I'm one of last of the red-hot generalists. We do a lot of renovations typical of both small- and medium-size firms. The actual uses change greatly, and the scale of the projects can vary from town houses to office buildings. This is not necessarily the work I would like to be doing, but it is the kind of work that comes my way.

Oculus: Do you have marketing help?

TW: No, unfortunately. It is an overhead cost I would love to be able to afford. It would certainly help, if just to get news about my projects out to the magazines. It never happens in a firm of this size. You end up being your own worst enemy.

Oculus: How do you get clients?

TW: We still rely on referrals. I've only entered a couple of competitions. I'm rather skeptical about them. I won't enter one unless there is some serious compensation. You can't afford it unless you teach and have students working for you. One thing Tom Wolfe pointed out in From Bauhaus to Our House is that the stars of today are coming not out of practice, but out of schools. Those architects have students to draw on. This gives them a tremendous leg up with all that free labor. You don't have to take on certain projects just to pay bills.

Oculus: What do you think of the trend toward entering joint ventures?

TW: It is perfect from the client's point
of view. The client can put together an ideal team. Joint ventures allow a couple of firms to pool their best resources on a specific project without the overhead expenses of larger firms. Since our strength is in design, joint ventures have advantages.

Right now I'm pursuing three joint ventures with Rothzeid Kaiserman Thomson & Bee. Carmi Bee and I will collaborate on design. But his firm is also very strong at the production end.

**Oculus:** What size firm would you like?

**TW:** A design firm with twenty-five architects is my ideal. You can create a lean, mean machine with phenomenal design control. You could enter joint ventures with a production-oriented firm, depending on the project. I would hope that this model would flourish—that is, the firm would still offer the full range of services but focus on design.

**Oculus:** What about the star system?

**TW:** It is a disaster, but it is understandable. The press is so star-oriented that it's really hurt the profession on the whole. The lay people read the papers and magazines and hire the "stars." The New York Times used to report on new firms in a much more balanced way. We need help.

**Oculus:** How do you rate your prospects for the future against the prospects of smaller and larger firms?

**SW:** About 15 percent of our work is outside, but this is represented entirely by our work for Tower Records. We are the architects for their suburban expansion stores in the northeast. This is a freak situation—to have a growing, splashy, privately held corporation as a client.

**Oculus:** Do you envision the possibility of a merger with another firm?

**TW:** We are entering a period like the 1974 recession, if not worse. I know of few firms that are booming. A lot are cutting back on staff. Reagan allowed too much debt to accumulate during the 1980s and now too many companies are being broken up and sold for assets. All that debt is being felt everywhere.

---

**Firm: Buttrick, White and Burtis**

*Partners: Harold Buttrick, Samuel White, and Theodore Burtis*

*Partner interviewed: Samuel White*

*Number of architects: Currently thirty-four*

*Projects in construction: Eighteen Projects on the boards: Fifteen*

**Oculus:** Does your firm specialize in its work?

**Samuel White:** 90 percent of our work involves some renovation. We primarily do schools, law firms, institutions, and landmark renovations.

**Oculus:** Who is responsible for marketing in your office?

**SW:** We have a full-time marketing/public-relations coordinator, and the four partners are active in marketing. We rely for a great deal of work on repeats and referrals.

**Oculus:** Does your size and emphasis on renovation bring any limitations?

**SW:** Our projects are medium-size. Though we like our size, we would prefer fewer but larger jobs. There's always plenty of kitchen and bathroom work, and if we end up doing two hundred kitchens, so be it. A lack of specialization hurts us. People with large projects tend to look for specialized larger firms. It's tough for us to get 200,000-square-foot interior assignments because we haven't done a lot of them.

**Oculus:** Do you envision the possibility of a merger with another firm?

**SW:** Architects are not typically highly capitalized—they have money invested in a space—and merging is an expensive proposition. I'll tell you what firms like ours think about. Beyer Blinder Belle "acquired" preservationist guru James Marston Fitch, who instantly gave them a preservation department. We think about adopting a "star" every now and then.
The event of the architectural season has proved to be the opening of the Wexner Center for Visual Arts in Columbus, Ohio, on November 16. Perhaps it was the unlikely conjunction of representatives of certain strains in American culture: Peter Eisenman, East Coast artist-intellectual, designs a major arts center in a typically midwestern city for an all-American university known (until now) for football than for art. The center in turn is largely funded by Horatio Alger-type hero Les Wexner, who made his fortune marketing fashion to the middle classes.

If that sounds like it ought to be a movie, you should have been at the November 16 dedication. Overly amplified gospel singers, an overscale video of Barbara Walters congratulating Wexner, plus Philip Glass, Laurie Anderson, and Trisha Brown giving appealing avant-garde-goes-mainstream performances were followed by a "ribbon-cutting" ceremony that proved to be a laser-beam light show. This "zowie" kind of technical coup de théâtre beat even Michael Jackson's Captain EO 3-D film at Disneyworld. The grand finale had the Ohio State University Marching Band high-stepping on a crowded stage in precision formation, with Les Wexner (dabbing his eyes) and Colleen Dewhurst (misty-eyed after an extended soliloquy on artistic censorship) taking bows. The only thing missing was Ethel Merman singing "There's No Business Like Show Business." This should give one the flavor of the occasion that drew a throng of architects, deans, students, and, of course, members of the press. A symposium to discuss the Wexner Center, while not as heart-wrenching as the dedication, was almost as entertaining. It was introduced by Philip Johnson, moderated by Kurt Forster, and included Harry Cobb, Michael Graves, Charles Gwathmey, Robert Siegel, Richard Meier, and Stanley Tigerman. In other words, the architecture community's own high-steppers now claimed the stage.

Johnson started off the discussion with his usual ironic giveth-and-taketh-away compliments— the Wexner Center was "designed by a genius," he said, adding, "I have my problems, of course, due to my advanced age. I'm used to a building with front doors and rooms and I'm a bit nonplussed with all the modern stuff. But this is the way the world gets ahead."

Johnson argued that, like Mies's Barcelona Pavilion of 1929, the Wexner Center was a "monument" and similarly expensive—"Mies took all the money the German government had for the whole show and put it into one room; Peter must have taken all the funds for the future needs of the university and built a superb statement of pure architectural excitement. And there's nothing like it with all that stuff hanging in the air." Implicit—or perhaps explicit—in Johnson's comparison was the suggestion that the Wexner Center seemed to be as "temporary" as Mies's pavilion. He did allow that, while it was a "statement of pure form I can't understand," it "may be one of the turning points in the history of architecture."

Johnson's performance is still a hard act to follow, but the group rose to the occasion, relying on humor instead of actual critical debate. Not that criticism was expected: with museum openings, public comments tend to be euphoric. But in this case they were frequently so elegiac that one member of the audience murmured, "It sounds like a memorial service." To which another member replied, "Maybe that's the point. They came to bury Peter as well as praise him."

Ironics abounded in the observations from the stage. For a building that has been heralded as the physical manifestation of "deconstructivist" architectural theory, the discussion was for the most part grounded in critical approaches and values of past architectural eras. Kurt Forster showed the Wexner Center's historical precedents in El Lisitskys's exhibition for film and photography in Stuttgart of 1929 and Richard Meier's Decorative Arts Museum in Frankfurt of 1985.

Harry Cobb, who had been on the jury that selected the scheme submitted by Peter Eisenman (then Eisenman Robertson) with Richard Trott (then Trott and Bean) of Columbus in 1983, told how the jury had been taken with the "unpredictability and uncertainty" of its spaces, which would permit works of art that were not yet created to be shown there. Cobb also remarked on the Wexner Center's "specific sense of identity." Since the Wexner Center had opened before an art exhibit was installed there, and since the dedication ceremonies and symposium took place in the auditorium next door, many observers rightly wondered if the center's sense of identity in the future would have anything to do with its intended use.

Robert Siegel of Gwathmey Siegel talked about the sense of "calm" in the building, which was "sensitive to people, and easy to be in." Because Eisenman has been known to say that architecture should disturb the awareness of the observers and make its occupants grapple with the "uncanny" or the mysterious, one would assume this remark would have left him disappointed.

But about this time, no matter what was said, one began to feel that Eisenman was thinking, "But that's the point." In other words, it doesn't matter how one views the center—as a reflection of the architect's thinking, or of the viewer's response. The literary and philosophical tenets of deconstruction, to which this architecture is allied, do, after all, claim that the work is a text independent of its author. And reading or misreading can apply.

Richard Meier pointed out the misnomer in the name Wexner Center. "It ought to be called Wexner Decentered, or Wexner Uncentered, since it has no center," he quipped. Meier drew the biggest laugh when he confessed, "What I especially like about the building is its whiteness."

He also complimented the building on its public scale and its symbolic function—again terms relating to architectural values that are not exactly common to the deconstructivist parlance. In many of the panelists' comments, criticisms such as the observation that Wexner Center has no entrance and no center or, as Michael Graves argued, that it is "nonhierarchical, and deals in the realm of 'neither nor,' for it is 'neither open nor closed,'" indicated the general tendency to judge it according to recent postmodernist architectural criteria, if not earlier modernist ones. Thus when Graves complimented Eisenman for his facility in "composing," his comment was based on a traditional value system, as was other panelists' praise of the building for being "monumental." Even Gwathmey's calling the building striking in its "collage"—aspect and its "insistent abstractiveness" sounded more as if he were discussing early modernist architecture. The shared admiration expressed over the center's manipulation of space, light, and shadow harks back to premodern, modern, and postmodern architectural values. What about the architecture that pushes us to the edge, that reveals the repressed within it? wondered those who had dutifully attended the "Deconstructivist Architecture" show at the Museum of Modern Art last year.

If any repression was revealed, it seemed to be the repressed sensuality in Eisenman's intellectual constructs. Most of the panelists found the building very sensual. "It is superb and extravagant in its sensuousness,\"
Graves added, "You can feel its sensual power. . . . We have to look at it in a nontheoretical sense. People will like it not because of the theory but because of the dynamism, which is inescapable." Tigerman called it a "study in perpetual amism, which is inescapable." He said the building was an "anarchic tendencies and his demonic perceptions." This started to sound very much like the manifesto-like text of the Museum of Modern Art show Stanley Tigerman was the panelist most steeped in the deconstructivist language, but ironically some of his comments came closest to damming the building while praising it.

Tigerman saw the building as unbelievably optimistic—a "seam" where he thought there would be a "rupture." Its "physicality," Tigerman went on to say, "makes the most perverse benign."

But Tigerman did specifically laud the building on the level of its apparent intent: "Usually measurement is the means by which one becomes aware of a building," Tigerman said. "This was not the case with the Wexner Center. It was a series of grids, where the gridlike scaffolding creates an uncertainty. Its wild plan reinforces that uncertainty; for it takes the grid and pulls it apart." But Tigerman also asked, "Will art find a way to seek its 'closure' in a facility that is not about closure?" And he added, "While there is something inconclusive and unfulfilled about the Wexner's planning, and it seems troubled, so is America. Luckily, these are troublesome times."

How do you criticize a building that is conceived along an evolving and new theoretical orientation? If you criticize it according to values and attitudes emanating from past classical, modernist, and postmodernist architectural approaches, are you "misreading" it irresponsibly? "Misreading" is an activity encouraged by deconstructionist thinking, but one that prompts larger questions to take shape.

What are those larger questions in the case of the Wexner Center? Certainly one concerns the evaluation process. Another concerns the program. By not having any of the programmatic elements in place in the building for the opening — neither art nor office furniture — the Wexner Center ingeniously robbed the critical public of many of the grounds for judging the building. Ironically, it can still be evaluated as a circulation space, albeit (ostensibly) a secondary function. And on that level, the building is quite successful, for it does indeed propel people through the space, either under the open-to-the-sky lattice of the long outdoor axis or along the soft, gradually ascending ramp by the exhibition areas. Because of the shifting grids (repeating those of the city and the campus) to which the building owes its plan, and the play of structural columns occurring where the grids intersect — indeed, because this whole system is extended through the interplay of honed and polished granite and wood flooring and carpeting — a conceptual and formal work of art has been made out of an urban-design function.

But it is still basically a piece of urban design — a complicated covered passerelle inside and out that causes people to engage on some level with their environment. As urban design it belongs to the old school of Kevin Lynch's notions, for it has an edge and a node where the two diagonal axes intersect, and it serves as a link of some sort to other spaces on the campus.

Another aspect of a building that has been raised in its evaluation over the years is how well the building is made. Its craft and its maintenance are often held to be as important as the initial idea, most specifically because of architecture's claim to a certain permanence. And reality gets in the way of appreciation as time goes by. It is difficult to say now how the Wexner Center, which appears to be built well, will hold up in time. Because of its extensive use of open metal lattice-work and glass, in a climate with severe weather conditions (including tornadoes and rainstorms the day it opened), one hesitates to predict. (Will it win the AIA twenty-five-year award?) If the building were intended to self-destruct or never to have any particular program, indeed it would address these issues about "Architecture" more straightforwardly and more theoretically. As it is, it compromises its goals to the conventional demands of architecture. It has to be judged as a normal building. So maybe the old criteria and old expectations do still apply.
**AROUND THE CHAPTER**

**Four clients talk about what they like and don’t like about the architects they hire**

---

**Clients Talk About Architects**

by Lester Kozlizius, AIA

On November 8 & the Professional Practice Committee of the NYC/AIA hosted a panel discussion that explored attitudes, perceptions, and expectations clients have concerning their architects. The committee invited four representatives of different clients: Rick Pfeffer from IBM, Hank Rogers from New York University, Rudolph Rinaldi, deputy commissioner of New York City’s Department of General Services, and Sheldon Wriger from the Macklowe Organization. Jeff Gertler, AIA, and Lester Kozlizius, AIA, co-chaired the panel discussion. Below is a summary of the questions and responses.

**How do you initially screen architects for your projects? On what basis do you finally select your architect?**

**IBM:** We select architects from their own files. We look for architects with creative design capabilities and appropriate experience. The strength and depth of the organization of the architectural firm is important, but there must also be a chemistry between IBM and the architect. We have a fee in mind before we negotiate with the architect.

**DGS:** We maintain files on nearly 400 architects and hire approximately 200 consultants each year. For projects with fees over $250,000, we issue requests for proposals to approximately eight architectural firms. For lower-budget projects, we select firms on a rotating basis. We select the most qualified firm based on technical qualifications; however, the relative fee is a consideration. We are looking to simplify the RFP process.

**NYU:** We have 100 to 150 projects each year, and we select architects based on their experience with the various project types. Chemistry is important. The architects must also be based in New York. NYU will have an idea of what a fair fee should be and will negotiate on this basis.

**MACKLOWE:** We select architects based on their experience with the building type. If the project is outside Manhattan, we use New York architects for the design but look for a local firm to prepare the construction documents. Macklowe will negotiate the fee with the architect based on market rates.

**What role do you want your architect to assume in the project?**

**IBM:** IBM’s project manager assumes total responsibility for the project. The role of the architect is defined prior to selection. We seek a full-service architect who can provide a complete package of professional services, with outside consultants subcontracted to the architect. Architects are responsible for the project cost. They must redesign at their expense if the project exceeds a pre-agreed amount, although certain contingencies are taken into account.

**DGS:** We define the role of the architect prior to selection. Occasionally we retain an architect to provide alternative studies and redefine parts of the program. The architect’s services include design, contract documents, shop-drawing review, and some site observation. The architect must redesign at his or her own expense if the project exceeds the budget.

**NYU:** We have in-house project managers responsible for their projects who select full-service architectural firms. We sometimes ask architects to help with programming and creating master plans.

**MACKLOWE:** We have our own project managers and give the architect a definite program from which to work. The architects do not provide construction-administration services beyond the checking of shop drawings and follow-up site visits.

**Do you feel that your architects are responsive to your needs?**

**IBM:** We feel that architects have a tendency to overdesign and that they may not listen to our project managers. One bad experience with an architect disqualifies that architect from further work.

**DGS:** We find a number of problems stem from a lack of understanding by the architect of the project. Many architects have difficulties in developing an adequate fee at the beginning of the project. This may be due to the competitive nature of an RFP.

**NYU:** We feel that controlling costs is the biggest problem, aggravated by the inclination of the architect to overdesign the project in areas where it is not appropriate. NYU has had many problems with the mechanical engineering, which was subcontracted by the architect on many of its older buildings.

**MACKLOWE:** We find it is difficult for architects to stop designing and stay with a decision and that architects are not sensitive to the carrying costs of a project. There are deficiencies in the quality of the mechanical engineering, and mechanical contractors have to redesign much of the work.

---

**What happens to the owner-architect relationship at the end of the project?**

**IBM:** If problems develop they occur most often during construction administration. Some architects fall apart. They do not allow themselves enough money to cover this phase of the project, but for those architects who handle it well, we often use them again on similar projects.

**DGS:** We prefer to reward those architects who have performed well by giving them additional projects, rather than distributing work to the maximum number of design firms. Those architects who do not perform well are not used by us again, and we relay that information to other city agencies.

**NYU:** We often select the same architect for other projects if earlier projects went well.

**MACKLOWE:** We use the same architect again for similar building types if we feel the architect is responsive to our needs.

---

**NYC/AIA Approved Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989/1990</td>
<td>$806,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Income**

- **Budget**
  - Dues: $554,300
  - Administration: 14,000
  - Prior Year Carryover: 0
  - Contingent Reserve Fund: 12,000
  - Fund Raising: 0
  - Oculus: 30,000
  - Occupancy: 2,050
  - Documents: 75,000
  - Committees: 117,300
  - Miscellaneous: 2,000

**Expenditures**

- **Fund Balance (Deficit):** 0
- **Total Expenses:** $345,085
- **Contingent Reserve Fund:** 10,000
- **Debt Retirement:** 26,765
- **Oculus:** 127,600
- **Occupancy:** 124,735
- **Committees:** 117,465
- **Miscellaneous:** 0
The Architectural Heritage Ball

Report from Lenore M. Lucey

The Architectural Heritage Ball is the one party of the season for the profession and the industry. This year, in the stunningly restored Celeste Bartos Forum of the New York Public Library, guests enjoyed an evening of socializing and dancing to benefit the Architectural Heritage Scholarship Fund.

The event, which was sold-out thanks to the efforts of 1989 Heritage Ball Chair, John H. Winkler, marked the fourth anniversary of this happening. Established in 1986 by Randolph R. Croxton, the Heritage Ball has become the chapter's premiere fund-raising activity, and the most enjoyable. Honoring “Architectural Heritage • Preservation • Scholarship,” each party has brought the architectural community of New York together in a series of significant spaces: the Low Memorial Library at Columbia University, the Grand Ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria, the Grand Ballroom of the Plaza, and this year, the Celeste Bartos Forum. We very much appreciate the contributions of those who celebrated with us, as well as those who donated to the Scholarship Fund.

Where will the event occur next season? The chapter is now looking for a site for the 1990 Heritage Ball and needs the assistance of the membership. We need to accommodate three to four hundred (or more!) guests, and the space must be architecturally significant. Your suggestions are solicited, welcomed, and appreciated. Please drop a note to the chapter if you would like to recommend a location.
A Vision of Britain: A Personal View of Architecture
by HRH The Prince of Wales
Doublayed, $40

The Prince of Wales: Right or Wrong?
An Architect Replies
by Maxwell Hutchinson
Foreword by Richard Rogers
Faber and Faber, $8.95

A Vision of Britain, developed from the BBC film of the same name, expands on Prince Charles's opinions about the current state of architecture in Britain and offers a picturesque view of Britain's landscape and architectural heritage, along with some nasty bits of twentieth-century architecture and planning. Although his language is at times simplistic, Prince Charles does outline some sensible criteria for an architecture that respects and responds to its place through appropriate scale, harmonious materials, and judicious planning.

Unfortunately, parts of the book, like some of the prince's own watercolors included in the richly illustrated text, are painted a bit too broadly. They fail to take into account all of the external forces that shape the built landscape—not just the architects bent on its mutilation. As has been noted by many critics already, the prince's historicist architectural taste, while appropriate in some cases, fails to encourage the kind of innovation and revision that has inspired some of Britain's best buildings—even before modern architecture appeared.

Hutchinson's book is devoid of graphic representation, although his cheerleading is definitely on the side of "modernism." As a public consciousness-raising exercise, he says, the prince's book serves a valuable function. But it is wrong-headed as a primer on architectural style and lacks a basis in the reality of modern living and business. Hutchinson's text goes into Prince Charles's interest in community architecture but faults him on the lack of follow-through on a grass-roots level.

Hutchinson's own book provides an interesting background into the methods of developers, planners, and community boards—players notably absent in the prince's text—who have a role in subverting the good intentions of modern architecture.

BEST-SELLING BOOKS
As of December 1, 1989

1.ANCHORING, Steven Holl (Princeton Architectural Press, cloth, $24.95).
2. CITY: Rediscovering the Center, William H. Whyte (Doublayed, cloth, $24.95).
3. RAUMPLAN Versus Plan Libre, Max Risselada (Rizzoli, paper, $25.00).
8. A Vision of Britain, HRH the Prince of Wales (Doublayed, cloth, $40.00).
10. A+U Potential Houses, Henry Plummer (Architectural and Urbanism, paper, $49.00).

Send Oculus Calendar information to:
New York Chapter/AIA, 457 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

Oculus welcomes information for the calendar pertaining to public events about architecture and the other design professions. Information is due in writing by the first of the month for the following issue.

Because of the time lag between information received and printed, final details of events are likely to change. We recommend that you check events with sponsoring institutions before attending.

CONTINUING EXHIBITIONS


Building the New York Public Library. Second-floor gallery, New York Public Library, Fifth Ave. at 42nd St. 790-7876.


THURSDAY 4
NYC/AIA NOMINATING MEETING
Selection of Chapter Nominating Committee. 5:30 pm. NYC/AIA Members Gallery. 838-9670.

TUESDAY 9
NYC/AIA CHAPTER MEETING
Open Meeting on professional liability insurance. Discussion by Barry LePotier, Attorney, Michael Heatwole, CNA-Schinnerer, and Gregg Kumm, Proassurance Agency. The Professional Practice Committee panel discussion will address architects' needs, laws, loss prevention, and the insurance market. 6:00 pm. The Urban Center. $5. 838-9670.

WEDNESDAY 10
TOUR

EXHIBITION
Timex Personal Timepiece Competition. Winning entries presented by the Minnesota Chapter of the IDSA. Gallery 91, 91 Grand St. Noon. NYC/AIA Members Gallery. 838-9670.

FRIDAY 12
LECTURE
Roosevelt Island, Twenty Years and Growing, with Commissioner Richard Higgins, NYS Division of Housing and Community Renewal, Rosina Abraham, president of Roosevelt Island Operating Corporation, and Raquel Ramati, planner. Sponsored by the City Club of New York. Noon. CUNY Graduate Center, 33 West 42nd St., 921-9870.

TUESDAY 16
NYC/AIA COMMITTEE MEETING
"Designing and Developing on Affordable Housing Project." A meeting of the Architects in Development and Housing Committees. 6:00 pm. NYC/AIA Members Gallery. 838-9670.

EXHIBITION

FRIDAY 19
LUNCH LECTURE
Alair Townsend, publisher of Crain's New York Business, and Ron Schelp, New York City Partnership, on "Business Climate in New York City." Sponsored by the City Club of New York. Noon. CUNY Graduate Center, 33 West 42nd St. 921-9870.

MONDAY 22
PANEL
Discussion of the Proposed Expansion to the Kimbell Art Museum, with Edmund Pillsbury, director, and others to be announced. Sponsored by The Architectural League. Must call to confirm details and make reservations. 7:00-17:22.

TUESDAY 23
NYC/AIA LECTURE
Herman International Trade Center. With Gene Norman, president of the Trade Center Corporation, sponsored by the Public Architects Committee. 6:00 pm. The Urban Center. $5. 838-9670.

WEDNESDAY 24
TOUR

THURSDAY 25
LECTURE

TUESDAY 30
NYC/AIA PANEL
New Faces of 1990. New architecture editors of various publications, including Deborah Dietch, Architecture; Joan Lebow, The Wall Street Journal; Paula Rice Jackson, Interiors; Ziva Freiman, Progressive Architecture; Sara Marberry, Contract; and Suzanne Stephens, Ocul's. Joan Capelin of Capelin Communications will moderate. 5:30 pm. The Urban Center. $10 at the door. First-come seating. 838-9670.

WEDNESDAY 31
SEMINAR

FEBRUARY
THURSDAY 1
EXHIBITION
"New Schools for New York" Study Designs. Sponsored by the Architectural League of New York City. Invitation only. Must call to make reservations. 7:00-17:22. Closes March 16.