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Established during the 1849 Gold Rush, Tadich Grill has grown into one of San Francisco's most popular restaurants. Long recognized for its fine food, the Tadich Grill was also recognized by the California Historical Society for over 100 years of continuous service.

For over a century, Tadich Grill has prided itself on offering customers the finest cuisine and service in a pleasant, Old San Francisco-style environment. An environment which now includes the cleanliness and convenience of modern Sloan OPTIMA® No-Hands automated flushometer fixtures.

A Sloan OPTIMA system uses an electronic device that "senses" the user and automatically turns the faucet or appliance on and off — or flushes the sanitary fixture — only as needed. This assures that faucets and hand dryers are turned off after use and eliminates unflushed urinals and toilets.

The results: Increased customer comfort with more sanitary restrooms. And peace of mind for management with increased cleanliness, reduced odors, reduced costs from lower energy and water consumption, fewer repairs, and less daily maintenance.

The Sloan OPTIMA system meets all building codes and installs easily — and unobtrusively — in any new or retrofit situation. The system also adapts to soap dispensers, hand dryers, shower heads, and more.

Ask your Sloan representative about Sloan No-Hands automated systems. Or write us.

“California’s oldest restaurant now has the newest restroom technology.”

SLOAN VALVE COMPANY
10500 Seymour Avenue, Franklin Park, IL 60131
A Tradition of Quality and Pride

Circle 3 on information card
MORE ENERGY-EFFICIENT BY DESIGN

With natural gas you've got the power to make every size project more energy efficient. Because today, there's a whole new generation of super-efficient gas equipment to give you the options you need. Advanced, fuel-saving gas heating and cooling systems that keep operating costs down. And that can make whatever you're designing look even better.

Gas. America's best energy value.


**EVENTS**

**Jan. 3-5:** Workshop on Better Color and Graphics in Design, Washington, D.C. Contact: Tom Martineau, School of Architecture, Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, Fla. 32307.

**Jan. 6-8:** Energy in Architecture Workshop, Atlanta. Contact: Brenda Henderson at Institute headquarters, (202) 626-7353.


**Jan. 19-22:** The National Concrete Masonry Association Annual Convention, San Antonio, Tex. Contact: NCMA, Box 781, Herndon, Va. 22070.

**Jan. 21-22:** Seminar on Standing Seam Metal Roofing Systems, West Palm Beach, Fla. Contact: Construction Specifications Institute, Education Programs Manager, 601 Madison St., Alexandria, Va. 22314.

**Jan. 22:** Seminar on Designing for Futuristic Intelligence Buildings, San Francisco. Contact: Office of Continuing Education, Iowa State University, 102 Scheman, Ames, Iowa 50011.

**Jan. 26-30:** Associated Landscape Contractors of America Convention, Tampa, Fla. Contact: ACLA, 405 N. Washington St., Falls Church, Va. 22046.


**Jan. 29-31:** CONDES '86—Information That Works, Dallas. Contact: Deborah Eschenbacker, Dallas Market Center, 2100 Stemmons Freeway, Dallas, Texas 75207.


**June 8-11:** AIA Annual Convention, San Antonio, Tex.

**LETTERS**

**Reflection on Design Precedents:** Contributing Editor Robert Campbell's perceptive observations and sensitive comments on Mayer Campus Center at Tufts University (Oct., page 42) are on target, and his emphasis on the design sources demands serious reflection on the design process.

In retrospect, the design of the Mayer Campus Center essentially rises out of Tufts' desire for a physical counterpart of "linkage" in its education philosophy. This is a concept that started out in the liberal arts tradition of linkage among the various academic disciplines. It soon became a call for nonacademic linkage between students and faculties and was manifested by a physical link between the upper and lower Tufts' campuses. In Mayer Campus Center, we understood it as the spiritual linkage between all Tufts students, present and future; a collective linkage that shared the special ingredients of certain memories and experiences engraved permanently in their individual "Tufts experiences." This called for a design that is both "new" and "always there" in time, while "standing out" and "belonging" in place.

The hip roofs, cluster of connecting masses, watch tower (not implemented due to cost), extending terraces ... came right out of the spirit of the program and setting. When developed, they resembled these lovely "sources" Bob Campbell mentioned, plus a few he did not identify.

He was right to say that recent changes in architecture made it O.K. to talk turkey about precedents. Now, shall we start talking? I think not. I am too suspicious about anything that is fashionable. Besides, I would not have much to talk about before the fact anyway.

Robert Y. C. Hsiung, AIA
Jung/Brannen Associates
Boston

**Watts Forum, a Reply:** Contributing Editor John Pastier's letter on the Watts Towers forum (Oct., page 89) was so full of ill-tempered inaccuracies that I feel impelled to set the record straight.

Pastier says that the action committee that organized the international forum was "largely if not totally determined by Whiteman." Untrue. The committee included such luminaries as Richard Koshalek, director of the Los Angeles Museum of Contemporary Art, Robert Harris, dean of USC school of architecture, John Outterbridge, director of the Watts Towers Arts Center, and Samuel Aroni, acting dean of UCLA graduate school of architecture and planning, among others.

Pastier later misrepresents the committee, and the Watts Towers Community and Conservation Trust that evolved from it, as "predominantly composed of whites." In fact, the trust has worked hard to include the citizens of Watts in its initiatives and continues to hold regular meetings with local activists to discuss ways in which the towers can be used to help the immediate locality. The Watts community has responded by awarding me and the *Herald Examiner* with several citations for such concern.

The board of directors of the trust includes four prominent Wattsians among a total of 18 members. Mayor Tom Bradley is a strong supporter of our initiative precisely because we have taken great care to include the people of Watts in this campaign.

The *Herald Examiner* has been an active force in this campaign to ensure the future of Watts Towers because of its concern for the community. Such enlightened self-interest seems to me to be admirable.

Daralice Boles, writing in *Progressive Architecture* for July 1985, said that "the Los Angeles Herald Examiner can take credit for ... a series that did much to raise L.A. awareness of a monument better known, and perhaps respected, outside the city than within, but also for spearheading an unusual event that brought together representatives of community interests, city and state governments, and the arts."

The very positive and concrete result of the trust's actions has been to spur the city of Los Angeles to allocate $800,000 to the towers' ongoing conservation over the next five years. In addition the city will fund the trust with a grant of $150,000 to operate as an independent fundraising body.

A major focus of the trust's future initiatives will be precisely those issues Pastier mocks: the funding and provision of social and cultural services for the people of Watts centered on the towers.

It might have been more useful if John Pastier had joined in working for the towers instead of bitching on the sidelines. His is the only sour voice I have heard raised against our initiative, in Los Angeles or elsewhere. Is his chagrin due to the fact that the notion of mounting a campaign to ensure the future of the towers and the welfare of the people of Watts was not his own? 

Leon Whiteson
*Los Angeles Herald Examiner*

**Correction:** The photographs of the Vermont stair and Connecticut sliding door sculpture in the October issue (page 27) are by Ross Chapple.
Old and New

Gwathmey Siegel’s Guggenheim Addition Draws Mixed Reactions

A proposed addition by Gwathmey Siegel & Associates to Frank Lloyd Wright’s Guggenheim Museum in Manhattan has met with strong opposition from preservation groups and some local residents, but there has been notable absence of the kind of architectural furor stimulated by Michael Graves’ proposed Whitney Museum addition.

The Fine Arts Federation, an umbrella organization that includes the New York Chapter AIA, the Architectural League, and the Municipal Arts Society, said in a letter to the city’s board of standards and appeals that while the addition “is a distinguished building in its own terms, it nevertheless impacts the integrity of the Guggenheim Museum adversely, ... A more modest and less demanding building would be more sympathetic and in better context with the monumental work of Frank Lloyd Wright.”

And William Wesley Peters, Wright’s former son-in-law and director of the Taliesin foundation, said, “If the presently proposed highrise attempt to second guess Wright’s design is realized, the world may well bid farewell to the quality and spirit that are inherent in this major work of transcendent genius.”

However, in a letter to the board of standards and appeal, Henry N. Cobb, AIA, said that the Gwathmey Siegel scheme is “distinguished by its sensitivity to the many difficult contextual problems impinging on this site,” and Kevin Roche wrote, “I believe that not only will it solve the museum’s functional needs in a sensible and appropriate way, but it will do so without impairing the character of one of Wright’s great masterpieces.”

Other architects who have supported the proposed scheme include Lewis Davis, FAIA, and William Pedersen, AIA.

Gwathmey Siegel’s 11-story addition on 89th Street would rise behind the museum and directly over the small annex built in 1968. The $12 million scheme calls for a 148-foot-high slab covered in beige-colored tiles that will serve as a backdrop for a projecting, box-like component covered in pale gray-green porcelain panels. The new building, which is 80 feet long and 50 feet deep, would cantilever over the small rotunda as far forward as the center of the great rotunda. It would house an enlarged bookstore, permanent collection galleries, and relocated administration offices to allow public access to the original building.

In describing the scheme, Charles Gwathmey, FAIA, said, “The palette and materials were selected to render each component as an articulate element of the whole. Our purpose was to preserve the integrity of the Wright masterpiece.”

Although the Guggenheim will need the approval of the city’s board of standards and appeals because of zoning variances, the proposal is not required to go through the rigorous review process of the New York Landmarks Preservation Commission. The 1959 Wright building is not an official landmark—New York law requires any individual landmark to be at least 30 years old—and it is not located within a historic district (unlike the Whitney Museum, which is located 15 blocks south on Madison Avenue within the Upper East Side Historic District). However, the New York departments of city planning and environmental protection have determined that the construction of an addition to the Guggenheim “may significantly impair the character or quality of an important architectural resource.”

The Friends of the Upper East Side Historic District recently adopted a formal position that opposes “the current proposal to alter one of New York City’s truly irreplaceable and invaluable architectural treasures.” Halina Rosenthal, president of the group that oversees historic districts and landmarks in the area, said that the museum is under an obligation to ensure the integrity of the building. “Although the Wright building has four years to go to be recognized as an official landmark, it was a landmark the moment it was built,” she said.

The most active opponents are a group of local citizens, named Guggenheim Neighbors, formed specifically to fight the expansion plan. Michael Kwartler, AIA, who serves as a consultant to the group, questions the sheer size and height of the addition. “The museum will no longer be a freestanding object that can be seen in space,” he said. Architectural historian Andrew S. Dolkart said people outside the profession are actively opposing the proposed addition because “the original Guggenheim is a very easy building to love.” The group has retained the law firm of Berle, Kass & Case to challenge the museum’s application for a zoning variance. LYNNE NESMITH

News continued on page 12
Preservationists, Collectors Debate Stripping of Details

"The interiors of many of our greatest houses are threatened and will continue to be under siege. Single-family dwellings are being viewed simply as warehouses of pieces by our greatest masters."

So warned Edward Stone, executive director of the White House preservation fund. The occasion was a forum, held during the recent National Preservation Conference in Seattle, on Greene & Greene's beleagured Blacker house in Pasadena, Calif. Texas rancher and art collector Barton English bought the house last May for $1.2 million and immediately stripped it of some 50 hand-crafted light fixtures (see Aug., page 16). His action was described by preservationists and architectural historians as "an atrocity," "scavenging of the worst sort," and a "rape of our national heritage." The debate continued in Seattle, with English participating. If he said nothing to appease his critics, at least helped to enlarge the boundaries of the discussion.

"The primary focus initially was on me as the problem," English said. "What we are seeing now is that the same problem exists for many other historic structures."

English insisted throughout the forum that he had acted as any astute collector and investor would. "I saw from the beginning that this house was worth more than the marketplace thought it was," he explained. "Until the market value and the real value of the property come into line, there's going to be a problem."

Cheryl Ingham, a preservation appraiser from Chicago, provided a startling illustration of what these market discrepancies can mean. The 1982 book value of Frank Lloyd Wrights's Ward Willets house in Highland Park, Ill., was $425,000. But the estimated value of the 117 Wright windows alone was approximately $1.2 million. Add the value of Wright's fireplaces, furniture, and light fixtures, and the latter figure would approach $2 million, nearly five times the value of the house as a residence. A possible solution, Ingham explained, is a new appraisal method whereby the difference in value between the house as house and house as a collection of objects could be taken as a charitable deduction for tax purposes.

The legal standing of such a procedure is unclear, however.

Nancy McClelland, vice president of Christie's for 20th century decorative arts, said that since the Blacker house controversy erupted, she has received numerous inquiries from persons interested in disassembling their historic houses in the most expedient and profitable manner. "Wright houses are especially vulnerable," she said, "because they are so expensive to maintain."

"It can cost $6,000 or $7,000 just to replace a few windows," she said. "Some of those houses are economic time bombs." A major problem, panelists agreed, is that historic interiors enjoy scant legal protection. Preservationists must rely on a combination of moral suasion, local landmark ordinances (Pasadena recently passed an emergency ordinance forbidding the removal of fixtures from buildings more than 50 years old), and the reluctance of museum and auction houses to traffic in goods that are traveling under a cloud of bad publicity.

McClelland said that had she been offered pieces from the Blacker house she would have declined them. "I would have told Mr. English that this is not an appropriate time. There would be resistance from buyers because of the uneasiness in the market." [As reported by contributing editor John Pastier in August, however, McClelland stated that if approached, Christie's "would sell the objects."—Ed.] Donald Stover, curator of American sculpture and decorative arts at the de Young Museum in San Francisco, said that he would be "strongly opposed to proposing these pieces for collection." Both speakers urged museums and auction houses to support citizens that pass ordinances protecting their prized artifacts, while acknowledging that shoring up the private art collecting market is extremely difficult.

The Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission has been trying since May to persuade English to return the fixtures and resell the house to a friendly buyer. English rejected their first offer because, he said, it would not even have covered his expenses on the house. He and commission representatives met again after the Seattle forum but could not reach an agreement.

“We now have a legitimate buyer for the house and fixtures,” said Pasadena Heritage Executive Director Claire Boe-aard, “but Mr. English said he doesn’t want to discuss it. It was the world’s most discouraging meeting. He doesn’t have in his mind what he wants to do.” She said that Pasadena Heritage’s buyer is willing to pay $1.2 million for the house, plus a substantial premium for the light fixtures.

English has said on several occasions that he plans to sell the house but keep the fixtures, though whether for his own collection or for resale is not clear. Two small wall lamps from Greene & Greene’s Culbertson house in Pasadena sold at auction recently for $30,000 each. The Blacker house fixtures, larger and more intricate, could be worth as much as $2 million.

As for his feelings about the controversy, English replied, "What I’ve done is not the most admirable thing in my life. I was in the wrong place at the wrong time and ended up on the wrong side of the fence. Emotionally, I’d just as soon be on the other side."

DAVID DIILLION

First Exhibitions Mounted In National Building Museum

With the inauguration in late October of the National Building Museum in the 100-year-old Pension Building, one of Washington’s great interior spaces, is now the first time open as a public attraction.

The Pension Building was designed by Gen. Montgomery C. Meigs as an oversized version of the Palazzo Farnese in Rome. Exterior dimensions are an impressive 400x200 feet, and a 1,200-foot-long, 3-foot-high terra cotta frieze encircles the brick perimeter. The interior, now only partially restored, centers on a hall of gargantuan proportions—361 feet long, 111 feet wide, and 159 feet high—that contains eight huge Corinthian columns. This great hall is ringed by colonnades lined with rooms that are being converted to galleries.

A circular fountain 28 feet across has...
The program for the first international design competition ever held in Arizona wasn't stated as directly as this, but its thrust was clear: make a heart for Phoenix, a city that doesn't have one.

On Oct. 25, a jury of five citizens, two architects, and an art historian chose the winning design of Barton Myers Associates, Toronto, over those of three other finalists: Michael Graves, FAIA; Arata Isozaki & Associates, and Ricardo Legorreta. The architects' presentations, jury deliberations, and voting all took place in public, and it required six ballots before Graves and Isozaki were eliminated. Legorreta lagged a distant fourth.

The seed for this competition was planted in the fall of 1983, when Phoenix Mayor Terry Goddard appeared at a Central Arizona Chapter/AIA seminar. Someone asked him why the city of Phoenix has never had a design competition. Goddard didn't know, but he did share many of the architects' dismay at the banality of the city's post-World War II municipal buildings, and he liked the idea of attracting both international design talent and publicity to Phoenix.

Phoenix had an available site perhaps unique among big American cities: 12 city-owned blocks between its 1963 city hall and the state capitol, which could be redeveloped without peeling off anything of historical or esthetic value. Most of this corridor is surface parking; the remainder is seedy, low-rise municipal annexes in sore need of a coat of paint.

In 1984, Phoenix voters approved $24.4 million in bonds for one new municipal building, an omnium-gatherum for criminal justice, fire administration, etc. et al. Seeing that as a springboard, Goddard and the city council decided to set up a design competition for a master plan for the 12 blocks, a clutch of municipal buildings, a civic plaza—something for Phoenix to show on its postcards besides resorts and sunsets. The balance of the money (at least $75 million will be needed for construction alone) depends on the passage of future bond issues.

Goddard, a 38-year-old Democrat, is candid about Phoenix' need for a downtown identity. The present city hall, he says, is "a warehouse you put government people in." The commercial skyline surrounding it strikes him as dull and anonymous.

"I'm a little sick of the steel box," Goddard says. "What we see here is a failure to take into account the unique heritage, geography, and climate of this place. What we're looking for is something different. We asked these architects to hold up a mirror to the community and interpret it for us in this government center."

Phoenicians may debate for decades whether Myers or any of the finalists succeeded in doing so. Symbols abounded in their plans, to be sure. Some were the stuff of which Phoenix is made—the palm landscape, the oasis, the quest for shade. Graves even interpreted the sprawling city's tedious square-mile arterial grid in microcosm. But the finalists also gathered in pre-Columbian, Pueblo Indian, Renaissance, and contemporary Mexican images, seeming to underscore the difficulty of reflecting this young, diffuse desert metropolis in any single project.

Legorreta, alone among the finalists, proposed to banish vehicular traffic from Phoenix' new heart. Washington Street, a five-lane artery bisecting the site and linking downtown to the capitol, was rerouted. The cross streets either were blocked off or sunken. The new city hall, council chambers, courts, and water department buildings then were arrayed about a multilevel environment of elevated plazas, sunken gardens, bridges, and moats; an attempt, Legorreta said, to create a kind of village pregnant with mystery and discovery.

Legorreta told the jury an anecdote to illustrate his design philosophy. "A friend of mine, an architect who is famous for his work in the International Style, called me one day and said, 'Ricardo, you gave me an emotion I never felt in a building before.'

"I asked him, thinking he would reply in the language of the International Style, continued on page 16
Competitions from page 15 what it was. He said, 'Getting lost.'"

Legorreta's proposed buildings were straightforward, undecorated masses with deeply pocked fenestration.

The exterior walls were to be painted with a palette of exuberant reds, yellows, violets, and pinks — colors certain to ignite controversy in an environment where summer temperatures regularly climb to 115 degrees. When some jurors expressed reservations, Legorreta laughingly scolded himself, "We Mexicans, we're absolutely irresponsible in our use of color."

Isozaki offered the city the most provocative forms. His plan employed an arching "city gate" — a monumental bridge spanning Washington Street and framing views of the capitol 15 blocks away. Beyond the gate and astride the street would be an outdoor "city room" of sculpture and landscape, a "city sanctuary" in the form of a Pueblo-inspired art museum, and a complex of classicist municipal buildings. All would be clad in a "city color," a deep red sandstone evoking the dramatic red buttes of Northern Arizona.

Isozaki intended the complex to be a sweeping symbolic gesture bringing together elements of the land, its indigenous people, and its Anglo and Hispanic settlers whose cultural memories trace back to European classicism. Some people observed that he was a bit wide of the mark, particularly in borrowing the stepped Pueblo massing for the "city sanctuary." The Pueblo Indians never settled anywhere near Phoenix, nor even in Arizona. He also drew criticism for failing to separate pedestrian and vehicular traffic, but, disarmed the critics with good humor. "Experience inside of car is equal to pedestrian experience," he said. "I like to put all of them on the same level. Maybe [you] have to use a stoplight. Maybe a stoplight is a kind of sculpture."

Graves seemed to enter the competition as the favorite. Mayor Goddard was rumored to lean his way. Charles Jencks, one of the two architects on the jury, was a certified Gravesian. The talk on the street seemed to be that Graves's scheme would be the best PR the city could buy. It would, in short, make the best postcard.

Graves organized his buildings around a civic square of gardens, plazas, and pools, opening them onto it. The complex bristled with symbols. The council chambers, its formal focal point, was cast as a pyramid, suggesting the Jeffersonian ideal of democratic power flowing from the bottom up. Atop it was a water source, which flowed down to the gridlike palm court in the civic square, symbolizing government's gift of life to an oasis-city. Towering 180 feet over the square, atop a classical column-cum-Indian totem would be a phoenix bird, the city's symbol of life and rebirth. As in the Statue of Liberty, people could climb through the interior to the top. The water building would be a squat, six-story drum recalling the early water towers that served the Southwest's desert towns. City Hall recalled, surely inadvertently, the old Romanesque gymnasium at the University of Arizona, 120 miles to the south in Tucson.

Juror Dino DeConcini, a Phoenix attorney, told Graves his proposal was "the most intriguing, the most puzzling, and at the same time the most troubling." This architecture, he said, would challenge the public so severely that it would fail to function as the community's heart. Graves responded with a metaphor: "I'm almost tone deaf, unfortunately, but I love Mozart. I've always supposed it was because he's so tuneful. But recently it was explained to me by a musician that while a gondolier in Venice can sing an aria from Don Giovanni because it's so superficially simple, at another level there is the richest kind of musical intrigue one could have. It seems to me that's what we as architects are always striving for."

Myers's scheme was no less rich and complex in texture, but its symbols were both more restrained and abstract. His objective, he said, was to create a governmental center that is "appropriately monumental and dignified in character but also informal and lively."

Like Isozaki and Graves, he grouped his low-rise buildings around a "city room," this one an agora 300 feet square, skewed 45 degrees from the prevailing north-south grid. Loggias lined the buildings facing the square, and steel trellises were cantilevered from the cornices, thematically unifying the municipal buildings and casting some shade into the "city room."

An abstract phoenix perched atop a tower which at 250 feet seriously one-upped Graves's bird. Myers also welcomed the automobile into the Phoenix heart, although he suggested closing it off for special events.

Myers alone proposed something that would make his plaza useful through the five months that comprise Phoenix's sum
The jury's choice was controversial. The entire competition was controversial. Opinion tended to crystallize like this: Architects grumbled because none of the finalists seemed to have captured Phoenix's presence in an honest yet dramatic form; the public seemed daunted by the difficult symbolism and monumentality of all of them.

Phoenix Planning Director Richard Plants told the jury that "the gutsy thing would be for you to send all four packing." Architect William Bruder told the jury, "These are four schemes bankrupt of vision for this city."

For Goddard, all this carping missed the point. "I've observed some disappointment in the architectural community that we're not getting some kind of obelisk or space needle. But first, it has to be a functioning city hall. The symbolic importance is second."

The mayor, surveying downtown from the ninth-floor city hall office, also ventured an astute layman's opinion that "after Phoenix [government center] is built, there won't be a building going up in Phoenix that isn't debated."

Lawrence W. Cheek, Hon. AIA

Cheek is an architecture critic who writes for the Tucson Citizen.

News continued on page 20.
Every washroom design is a different animal.

And only Bradley helps you tame every kind of challenge.

You know that high-usage washroom jobs can pose very different kinds of challenges. For example, washing requirements for a factory are very different than those for an airport. That's why Bradley offers you so many Washfountain models—and our new, 16-page Washfountain brochure. It'll help you select the Washfountain model that's best for each different application.

This free "Q & A" guide reflects over 60 years of Bradley experience in designing and manufacturing Washfountains. It's indexed by type of application to provide quick answers to the most frequently asked questions about Washfountains and their use. Such as where stainless steel makes sense and where it doesn't. The most efficient ways to meet barrier-free codes. And one case where watersaving options actually do more harm than good!

Send for your Washfountain guide today by circling the reader service number. Bradley Corporation, 9101 Fountain Blvd., Menomonee Falls, WI 53051, 1 414 251-6000.

We get the job done better.

Circle 10 on information card
AIA members: Get Benefits from Hertz with a card you already have.

Hertz introduces new, low daily rates for AIA members.

Your AIA Executive card can get you a really terrific rate on a wide range of Hertz cars. From the fuel-efficient Ford Escort to the roomy Ford LTD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAR CLASS</th>
<th>NEW DAILY RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subcompact</td>
<td>$33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact</td>
<td>$37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-size</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-size, 2 door</td>
<td>$42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-size, 4 door</td>
<td>$44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And in some cases (weekly or weekend rentals, for example), you may even get lower rates than the ones you see here.

So call Hertz at 1-800-654-2200 for details and reservations.

The #1 way to rent a car.™

Hertz rents Fords and other fine cars.

*Refueling service charge, taxes, optional CDW, PAI, and PEC (where available), not included. Cars must be returned to renting city. Available at all corporate and participating licensee locations except in Manhattan from 3PM Friday to 3PM Sunday and during certain holiday periods. Rates slightly higher in certain cities.

Circle 11 on information card
Long-Awaited Portlandia
In Place on Portland Building

She is—shall we say—a titan of estrogenic prowess. And with her nine-foot-long thighs and plunging décolletage, some have even called her X-rated. At once heroic, reve¬aling, and statuesque, Portlandia, the monumental figurative sculpture commissioned to grace the entrance of Michael Graves’ Portland Building, has finally arrived in Portland, Ore. Three years in the making and built at a cost of more than $198,000, Portlandia is a classically graceful maiden designed to symbolize Portland’s emerging cultural prowess, its commercial aspirations, and its new-found identity as an architectural showpiece on the West Coast.

While still unassembled, the sculpture made its first public appearance in August before a gala welcoming committee at Portland’s Union Station. Mayor Bud Clark twice released his legendary “Whoop whoop” war cry as Portlandia’s somber face appeared behind the sliding door of a HyCube Hydra-Cushion boxcar donated by Southern Pacific for the 5,000-mile transcontinental journey. “The last time we did anything like this,” confided George Kraus, director of public relations for the Portland office of Southern Pacific, “was when we hauled a 24-foot papier-mâché cowboy from Baltimore to a casino in Sparks, Nev.” When a member of the 100-strong throng clamored for a sign of affection, the mayor acquiesced, planting a firm kiss on Portlandia’s apple cheeks and then short-lining, “It’s a good thing no one asked me to kiss her on the lips.”

These days, you can’t be too careful.

Commissioned by the city’s Metropolitan Arts Commission after winning a juried competition, Portlandia is the largest poured copper sculpture since the Statue of Liberty. Inspired by a William Blake engraving, “The Ancient Days,” and Rodin’s “Crouching Woman,” the 6.25-ton, 35-foot, 10-inch-high copper piece was conceived and created by sculptor-cum-architect Raymond J. Kaskey of Washington, D.C. For Kaskey, who worked on the piece in a converted wine wholesaler’s warehouse in Cottage City, Md., the monumental sculpture—modeled after his wife, Sherry Kaskey—was a baptism by fire of sorts. Bent on making a bold state¬ment with his first public commission, the sculptor’s unquenchable thirst for the Brobdingnagian and timeless encouraged him to revive copper repoussé, a painstaking technique in which copper coils are pounded to fit a plywood form and then riveted together. It is the same tech¬nique Frederic Bartholdi used for the Statue of Liberty almost exactly a cen¬tury ago. “Every square inch will have 50 blows on it by the time we’re finished,” Kaskey explained last summer. “I’ve given my life to this project.”

And that he did. Several million blows later and two years overdue, the copper behemoth arrived at Portland’s Gunderson Warehouse in early mid-August. There, with the feverish urgency of surgeons conven¬ed in an operating room, Kaskey’s retinue labored for two months to assem¬ble the copper lady into her final form. On Sunday, Oct. 6, this titan of heroic femininity made her belated but regal jour¬ney to the Portland Building by barge via the Willamette River. With more than 50,000 Portlanders crowding onto bridges and lining embankments, the river turned into a gigantic, liquid equivalent of the runway at a Miss American pageant.

To a cacophony of boat whistles, toots, and fireboats gushing mighty jets of water “Miss” Portlandia inched down the river with more hoopla than had greeted the dedication of the Portland Building itself three years earlier. If the cruise down the Willamette had the air of a carnival, the last stretch to Graves’ polychrome edifice had all the solemnity and passion of a religious procession. Hundreds of peo¬ple dotted alongside the low-boy trans¬port truck trying to clutch Portlandia’s outsretched thumb, while others held up babies to touch the copper lady’s palm.

Author Tom Wolfe, who was in Portland for a lecture engagement, could barely contain his enthusiasm for Kaskey’s addi¬tion to Graves’ building. Hailing the revivi¬fication of figurative sculpture, Wolfe dubbed Portlandia “one of America’s four or five most important public artworks” and praised the work for its ability “to emo¬tionally move the people of Portland.”

Framed by Graves’ painterly facade, Portlandia is now spotlighted atop the building’s formidable portal. While in on sense it stands alone as a neoclassical work in an age dominated by abstract art, in another its creation now seems integral to the completion of Graves’ vision and his ambitions for the Portland project. In the case of the Portland Building, which has yearned for an historicizing figurative work made from time-hallowed materials, the addition of Portlandia has been its saving grace.

“The building and the sculpture are each made better because of the other,” Graves said at Portlandia’s dedication.

Few will quibble with the architect’s observation. Yet, in some respects, plac¬ing this meticulously hewn copper lady atop the building’s portal is a little bit like wearing a Georgio Armani tie with an Arrow shirt. The two are compatible but one bristles with that extra touch of class and consumate workmanship. With its coruscating copper skin, painstaking craftsmanship, and eye-pleasing propor¬tions, Portlandia has taken the neoclassi¬cising impulse one step further than the building itself. “My objective,” Kaskey explained was to make a figurative sculp¬ture that represented the genius loci of Portland . . . if you want to be preten¬tious about it. And judging from the reaction, I think I achieved it.”

Tempering Kaskey’s jubilation is the fear that Portlandia will be viewed exclusively as a public decoration for a controversial building. “I don’t think people have looked at this as a work of art,” he said. But, indeed, they have. Portlandia has already been criticized as being a neoclassical knock-off that draws too glibly from the past. In some respects, she is stolen directly out of the allegory-ridden 18th century, bursting with muscle-bound titans from classical antiquity and heroic feminine sym¬bols of civic virtues and stately aspira¬tions.
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The Institute

Conference Addresses Problems Of Housing for the Homeless

As winter's chill spreads across the nation so does the visibility and vulnerability of hundreds of thousands, if not more, homeless people. Theirs is an epidemic that grows faster than the remedies, the most basic of which is secure, dignified shelter. But what form that housing should take, whether it should be privately or publicly financed, how it should be managed, where it should be located, and what role architects and other professionals can play are urgent questions that often generate more controversy than action.

It was a search for answers to such questions that brought 190 architects, government officials, social service providers, and homeless people to AIA headquarters in late October for a conference entitled “Housing the Homeless.”

Opening remarks by John Philips, AIA, chairman of AIA’s housing committee (the conference’s sponsor, along with eight cosponsors) set the tone for the next two and one-half days. “This symposium,” he said, “shouts that this crisis exists and as Americans we can and we will take action to resolve it . . . . We must acknowledge that homelessness is a major social crisis today. We need to understand with compassion the causes of homelessness and the rights of the homeless person.”

Robert Hayes, legal counsel and founder of the National Coalition for the Homeless, stressed the need to dispel myths such as “homeless people want to live on the streets.” Dr. Michael Vergare, a psychiatrist with the Albert Einstein Medical Center in Philadelphia, said, “We struggle to comprehend how in this day and age when so many people are so well off we have people who cannot find shelter.” Conrad Levenson, an architect whose practice in New York City specializes in low-income housing and who teaches at New York City College, said, “Homelessness is a complex problem, but it is first and foremost a housing problem.” Hayes echoed Levenson’s sentiment, “What is the solution to homelessness?” Hayes asked rhetorically, “Housing, housing, housing.”

What is crucial in designing housing for the homeless is understanding who the homeless are and why they are living on the streets. “We are dealing with a population that is quite diverse and ranges from victims of spouse abuse to unwanted children to adults with chronic schizophrenia. We cannot assume that any one housing alternative will fit all their needs,” Vergare said, and added, “Any of the shelters that you might study that are creating adequate or more than adequate environments for those who must use them are programs that focus on the individual’s needs. I think that is the most important issue today. In order to understand the diversities, we have to really begin to understand the individuals within that group.”

It is also important to remember, Vergare suggested, that “in comparison to the surrounding community, the prevalence and nature of physical and mental illness is high. In addition to the acute and chronic effects of alcoholism and drug abuse, the homeless also suffer from the ravages of exposure, trauma, untreated infections, and infestations with serious and systemic disease. Along with this comes either the primary or secondary emotional turmoil of being without shelter.” Generally 20 to 50 percent of the homeless population is thought to be chronically mentally ill.

Unlike the skidrowers of the ’50s and ’60s, the majority of whom were older white men suffering from alcoholism or drug addiction, the homeless population today represents a broad cross-section of American society—the young and old, single people and families, the mentally and physically disabled and the afflicted.

“...The population is as diverse as the community in which it is located,” Vergare said. The average age is thought to be 34.

“A whole new wave of homeless people in the U.S. is comprised of the young and able-bodied with little chance of winning a place in a tight job market and consequently no ability of winning the competition for housing in a tighter and tighter housing market,” Hayes said.

The causes of homelessness are just as diverse as the population. As mentioned by several of the conference participants, the sharp increase in homelessness can be attributed to:

• a radical decline in availability of low-cost housing, including what were once called flop houses and are now referred to as single room occupancy (SRO) units an extremely viable housing type for certain segments of the homeless population.
• Between 1970 and ’82 nearly half of the nation’s supply of SRO housing (or 1,116,000 units) was lost, first to urban development and highway projects and then to abandonment, gentrification, and arson.

• a shift in the care of the long-term mentally ill. During the ’70s, hundreds of thousands of patients were released from state institutions. However, the community health centers that were to provide

continued on page 90
Graphics Taken to New Dimensions

If you asked a New Yorker to name the most amusing piece of modern, public sculpture in Manhattan, the answer might well be the red, 10-foot-tall Number Nine outside the Solow Building on 57th Street, west of Fifth Avenue (right).

Except, of course, that your respondent might hesitate to call it “Art”—isn’t it really a sign, or some kind of logo, or possibly a joke?

Well, yes and no. The Number Nine—and dozens of other related sculptures, paintings, friezes, tapestries, neon works, collages, and much, much more—are indeed witty, decorative, often directional, and otherwise functional. But since they are the work of artists—Ivan Chermayeff and Thomas H. Geismar, of the design firm of Chermayeff & Geismar Associates (CGA)—they are also works of art.

Both Chermayeff and Geismar possess impressive credentials as artists; but aside from those credentials, CGA are obviously knowledgeable about the contemporary art scene: Their Big Red O, for the Mobil logo, owes something to the paintings of Joan Miro and to the sculpture of Alexander Calder—especially when magnified into a 20-foot-tall monument at Mobil’s headquarters in Virginia (page 00); their Lion Drinking Fountain in the St. Louis Zoo (page 00) owes something to Grooms; and there are references to such artists as Oldenburg, Rauschenberg, and Flavin in what CGA have wrought for adventurous clients and their architects.

Although much of CGA’s work is highly original—especially in its wit—their particular talent is an ability to translate gallery art into public art. Their work is right in scale with the buildings for which it has been produced, and it is exceedingly well made. No wonder: As charter members of Cambridge Seven, C. & G. have been intimately involved in projects that range from aquariums to world’s fairs. They understand how buildings go together, and they understand the place of public art in them.

Mr. Blake is chairman of the architecture department, Catholic University.

Top. General Fireproofing showroom in Manhattan is a play of primary geometric forms. Above. Number Nine is CGA’s best known public sculpture.
Flying red O, possibly the most successful American logo since McDonald's M, has been memorialized in CGA's monument outside the Mobil USA Headquarters in Fairfax, Va.
Top. Lion Drinking Fountain is an inspired piece of pop fun in the St. Louis Children's Zoo. Above 32-foot-high, welded aluminum columns outside Philip Morris Operations Center, Richmond, Va., (designed by Davis Brody & Associates of New York City) are reflected in man-made lake. They establish points of interest in mid-distance, as seen from the building's employee cafeteria.
The Arts

Top, construction fence at 9 West 57th Street, Manhattan, employs op-art typography. Above, mural in Torin Mfg. Co.'s Belgian headquarters was done for Marcel Breuer, the building's architect.
Canopy at Frank Gehry's 'Temporary Contemporary' museum in Los Angeles sports a three-dimensional collage of auto parts that announce the exhibit's theme, 'Automobile and Culture.'
What Do These Prestigious Buildings Have In Common?

**FORDHAM UNIVERSITY**
Lincoln Square of Fordham University
New York, NY
Architect: The Perkins & Will Partnership

**CARPENTER CENTER, HARVARD UNIV.**
Carpenter Center For The Visual Arts
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts
Architect: Le Corbusier

**SEALED WITH POLYSULFIDE 1963**

**SEALED WITH POLYSULFIDE 1965**

**UNITED AIRLINES HEADQUARTERS**
United Airlines Headquarters
Libertyville, Illinois

**SEALED WITH POLYSULFIDE 1966**

---

To find out about other prestigious buildings that have been sealed for more than 15 years with Morton Thiokol LP polysulfide base sealant, send for your copy of, "It All Started Here".

Morton Thiokol, Inc.
Morton Chemical Division
Mkt. Comm. Dept AIA
333 W. Wacker Dr.
Chicago, IL 60606

---
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This issue completes what has been, in many ways, the best year in the modern history of this magazine. Advertising and circulation have continued to rise, and editorially, while we cannot be objective, we feel that there have been more high points and fewer lows than before. Readership surveys indicate that many of you share the feeling. We thank you for your attention and your response.

Still, as they say, wait until next year. As this is written in early November our new year—in the form of the deadline for the January 1986 issue—is not much more than a month away. That issue will contain the results of our post-bicentennial poll plus a review of major trends in architecture in the period 1976-1986: namely, the emergence of museums as the showcase building type, the use of an enriched palette of architectural elements and materials, the new freedom (and audacity) in skyscraper design.

The issue also will introduce a new section on interiors. Continuing in the new year will be our evaluation stories and profiles on significant clients.

Also on the calendar are the May and September annual reviews of U.S. and world architecture and another set of school profiles in August. And so, although it seems a bit early to write these words, a happy new year. D.C.
Japan’s Magnificent Folkhouses

Text and photos by Norman F. Carver Jr., AIA
Most histories of architecture have ignored the traditional common house; yet it is among man's most complex and ubiquitous creations—a product of a physical and emotional relationship with human existence that has been constant, intimate, and profound.

As shelter, folkhouses were essential to survival by moderating the extremes of climate, by keeping the terrors of the outside world at bay, and by providing the spaces and storage that made life and work possible in an uncertain world. But the folkhouse provided more than shelter; it was also a powerful, emotional symbol—a symbol, for example, of the inhabitants' wealth and status in the community.

In Japan during the last few decades, just as they began rapidly disappearing, folkhouses suddenly have been hailed as the embodiment of Japanese architecture's most fundamental values, if not its highest aspirations.

To appreciate the fit of the Japanese folkhouse to Japanese life, some understanding of the physical, cultural, and historical background is necessary. In brief, Japan combined a physical environment of limited space, mild climate, plentiful rainfall, and abundant forests with a rigid social structure under strong central authority that grew out of an early history of fierce clan rivalries. The Native Shinto reverence for nature overlaid by Buddhist asceticism led to cultural ideals of frugality and physical self-denial. More crucial was Japan's cultural and geographic isolation from the rest of the world for most of its existence.

Architecturally these circumstances resulted in an open and flexible wood architecture that was both surprisingly uniform throughout Japan and richly varied region to region; a folk architecture that is unique and yet vaguely reminiscent of folk forms in other, distant cultures with similar environments (the Alps, for example). In other words, Japanese folk architecture exemplifies the idea of folk architecture as the pragmatic resolution of both cultural and environmental forces in which these forces modify each other over time to produce a high degree of integration between house style and life style.

The four large Japanese islands, formed by a series of volcanic peaks rising from the ocean floor, stretch for some 1,200 miles along the Asian mainland. The climate ranges from semitropical in the south to semi-Siberian in the north—similar to the American East Coast or the European continent.

The precise origins of the Japanese culture and Japanese people are unknown. If, as seems likely, some of the Japanese originated in Southeast Asia or the Pacific Islands, they undoubtedly brought with them a house type still in use today in that

*Previous pages, farm houses along a narrow valley in Miyamacho, one of the few remaining places in Japan with a large number of simple thatched houses. Left, gables in southwestern Japan provide a place to display the family crest, vent the interior, or decorate. Right, a soaring thatch roof and highly decorated ridge of a small farm house near Himeji.*
Below, a series of patterns and planes of reference define portions of continuous space within a house in Tohoku in north-east Japan, for much of its history the frontier. Right, houses amid fields near Wachi west of Kyoto; the more typical sitting clusters houses in villages, requiring long treks to the fields.

region—a raised platform on poles covered by a large thatched roof. Another primitive house type, whether indigenous or not is unknown, consisted of a circular or squared off pit a few feet deep with a pounded earth floor covered with a thatched roof. The roof poles were dug into the ground around the pit and lashed together at the peak.

The abundance of wood profoundly influenced the course of all Japanese architecture, for it was the primary material for every building style (except, of course, castles). As a consequence Japan is one of the few places where wood has been the dominant building material throughout history. Other cultures often evolved from wood to masonry buildings or combined the two materials. In Japan, not only were the earliest primitive huts built of wood, but also the most sophisticated palaces and temples of recent history—resulting in an architecture of unparalleled unity over type and time.

Norman F. Carver, AIA, who practices architecture with his wife in Kalamazoo, Mich., has photographed vernacular architecture in many parts of the world since the mid-1950s. These photographs by Carver are from Japanese Folkhouse, published by Documan Press, Ltd., P.O. Box 387, Kalamazoo, Mich. 49005. The text is adapted from the book. © 1984, Norman F. Carver Jr.
Neither guidebooks to Greece nor the first glimpses of barren hillsides sticking up out of the blue sea intimates the richness that awaits the visitor to Symi. This steep, arid island is reached by sailing two hours due north from Rhodes, the largest, most populous, and most modern of the Dodecanese group. Symi (pronounced seamy, more or less) is so neatly fitted against the Turkish coast—less than three miles distant—that one can see Asia Minor's deep purple mountains from almost every vantage point. Symi is a fascinating, beautiful place in which to discover an unexpected architectural idiom: an ebullient neoclassicism unique among the Greek islands.

The island's fame and wealth derived from three major occupations. Symiotes were renowned and talented shipbuilders. Their soumbekir were the fastest sailing ships in the Aegean in Ottoman times. The men of Symi were daring sponge divers and astute merchants.

In turn these dominant economic activities determined the distribution of the population over the 36 square miles of the stony island. Symiotes, living directly or indirectly from the sea, congregated in a single hillside settlement, Chorio. During the second half of the 19th century, when the island reached the zenith of its prosperity and population size, construction of houses also spilled down into the harbor area. The concentration of virtually an entire island's population in one settlement is unlike the more typical settlement pattern of Greek islands in which the inhabitants are spread out in a number of towns, both coastal and inland.

In Symi the climb from the harbor is abundantly rewarding. Step by step—nearly 500 in all—as one clears the rooftops of the port, more and more houses come into view. Chorio, the upper town, is only partially visible from sea level. Some of it is over the crest of the ridge, fitted into the contours of the hills. Yet it makes no great spectacle from a distance, a mosaic of multihued geometric shapes. While pleasing to the eye, it reveals its astonishing grandeur only close at hand.

The main avenue—partly wide flights of steps and partly a smooth, gradual gradient—leads upward to a warren of side streets and small squares. It is a secret city, high above the humming little harbor with its restaurants and tourist shops. Chorio is a self-contained town, with its own restaurants, provision shops, and civic institutions.

As an English poet and recent visitor to Symi remarked, in the upper town one is "amid a setting that mingle dignity and stateliness with brooding melancholy and with a bright every-

**Ms. Taboroff**, an architectural historian, has a special interest in vernacular architecture in the Middle East and Mediterranean.

Below, the settlement of Chorio spills down hillside to the port. Right, street stairs in Chorio leading from the main avenue.
No left, sponges still play a role in the local economy. Left above, three houses in Chorio, showing such typical features pedimented roofs and street portals, forecourts, and painted do. Color is used for floors, window shutters, and wall surfaces, while white is used to articulate stone paving.

ty cheerfulness." A good half of the houses are empty, and not only empty but derelict and roofless, with trees growing inside the rooms. But the reflective, melancholy mood aroused by these ruins is continually challenged by the cheerfulness of the houses that are inhabited. They are sparkling clean, freshly painted, and brimming with sounds and scents.

The two- and three-story houses, with tile roofs and painted woodwork, densely cover the hills of Chorio. Built in large part in the mid-19th century, these houses are very handsome. At once urbane and attuned to the character and scale of the island town, they present a unique record of eastern Mediterranean neoclassicism. The houses are all made of the best materials, all of white marble and pebble mosaic pavements, fine woodwork, and wrought ironwork. They are beautifully proportioned and sited.

In Symi the classical architectural language has been used with particular expressiveness and imagination. Of special note are the neoclassical forms of doorways, windows, and entrance pediments. Nearly every house has a detail worthy of recording, whether it is the placement of a window, its molding, or the colored steps arranged in front of the entrance.

A favorite configuration in Symi is the double doorway with molding replicating the pediment of the roofline. Such doorways are threaded through the streets of the town.

Another hallmark of the island’s architecture is the pedimented roof and facade. Frequently such features have been added to older and simpler dwellings.

In many cases a pedimented entrance facade precedes an interior courtyard: The finest of the courtyards have pebbled mosaic pavements reminiscent of the designs of the embroideries of the region with cypress trees and scroll patterns arranged along the edges.

The entrance facades convey a sense of dignity and substance to less than grand houses. The spirited play of pilasters, applied columns, and ornamental pediments enlivens the geometrical shapes and flat surfaces of the stuccoed brick dwellings.

One is struck too by the Symiotēs’ brilliant sensitivity to color. Whitewashed streets and buff colored stucco walls are animated with doors, windows, and shutters colored turquoise, emerald, and sapphire. Colored bands, used as a dado or as vertical markers, create sharp, clean edges and punctuate the street landscape. Smooth stone streets and intense blue skies anchor the architecture.

Neoclassical traits are also present in the plan and organization of the town itself. Despite its steep site, there is a general concern for the betterment of thoroughfares, in particular the majestic flight of stairs that leads from the harbor to the acropolis of Chorio. Private dwellings are showpieces of classical embellishment. Civic institutions play an important role in town life.

Despite the economic decline of Symi in this century, the tradition of fine craftsmanship has not been lost. As one wanders the streets, the smell of wood cuttings and the sounds of saws and hammers are strong. Wood craftsmen, whether carpenters or shipbuilders, are highly visible. In the last decade they have reclaimed many of Symi’s deserted houses.

Symi’s proximity to Turkey and its years of merchantile activity have left traces on the island’s architecture. The Ottoman heritage of the island is obvious in two features of house interiors. Many of the oldest houses are fitted with raised wooden platform souphas used as sleeping areas. This Arabic loan word, which entered the English language as sofa, is used to describe an interior arrangement that is widespread in the Middle East.
A second feature is the mousandra, built-in cabinets used to store spices; they are carved with highly decorative motifs. Such cabinetry is to found in houses throughout Asia Minor and the Middle East, from Cairo to Teheran to Istanbul.

Clearly the present-day inhabitants of the town—not more than 2,300—are living in what remains of a much richer and more populous center. At its apogee Symi had a population of nearly 20,000.

Much of the wealth that built the fine houses of Symi was based on sponge fishing, at which the men of Symi had excelled since the 15th century. With the invention of the covered diving suit with air tubes in 1819, the sponge trade boomed. In turn, new houses were going up as fast as carpenters could work. The 1880s saw the peak of sponge fishing. Every household bathroom in Europe and America and every seraglio in the Middle East had its sponges. But the invention of foam rubber and the overharvesting of the sponge beds brought a collapse of the industry.

The economic depression that began in earnest with the Italian occupation of 1912 forced many Symiotes to seek a livelihood in Rhodes, Athens, the United States, or Australia. They lost their land holdings in Asia Minor at the same time as steamships began to take over shipping in the Aegean. The result was a severe economic recession for the island.

During World War II the island was occupied by the Germans, bombed by the British from the air, and witnessed guerrilla and commando action. Before withdrawing from the island in December 1944, the Germans detonated their remaining ammunition, stored in Symi's finest church.

Most of the things that Symi has to offer can be found on any Greek island—sea, sun, rocky coasts, protected harbors, olive and fig trees. What makes it unique is the town of Chorio. In its use of rich materials, symmetry of forms, and fine workmanship, Chorio is a model of neoclassical urban design. □
The recently launched search for meaning and definition in contemporary architecture has led to its examination from the inside out. The perspective is that architecture not only encloses private spaces but defines, walls, and shapes the public realm—communal spaces open and enclosed.

The premise is that the discipline of architecture has more profound purposes than the design of individual buildings. The most famous and beautiful buildings of recent decades have largely failed to produce public places of equal note or beauty, and the result is that the critical measure of buildings is extending to the places they help create as well as the artifacts themselves.

The concept of architecture as a descriptor of public places is not without precedent, but the precedents are being newly studied from a perspective that seeks not to replicate the past but learn from it. A culture that produced Los Angeles, Houston, and New York City embodies different values, energies, aspirations, and technology than those producing Rome or even Savannah. But the vision that provides unity of place and culture remains critical to the creation of place today.

The vision is at once more modest and more ambitious than current architectural practice would suggest. It reverses the traditional figure/ground perception of buildings and landscape and looks to buildings as landscape. The negative field of open space becomes the positive element in urban composition, and buildings become its walls and openings, lending their color, texture, scale, and expression to the creation of place. The significance of buildings becomes collective rather than individual and joins with the sounds and movements and images of people, commerce, art, and nature in the city.

The landscape then becomes a landscape of the mind. It speaks to our perceptions, experience, and knowledge of a place more than it speaks to its spaces and objects. Its definition is more cultural than physical or formal, its creation more complex.

J. B. Jackson described this landscape well in *The Necessity for Ruins*: "This is how we should think of landscapes: not merely how they look, how they conform to an aesthetic ideal, but how they satisfy elementary needs: the need for sharing some of those sensory experiences in a familiar place: popular songs, popular dishes, a special kind of weather supposedly found nowhere else or a special kind of sport or game, played only here in this spot. These things remind us that we belong—or used to belong—to a specific place: a country, a town, a neighborhood. A landscape should establish bonds between people, the bond of language, of manners, of the same kind of work and leisure, and above all a landscape should contain the kind of spatial organization which fosters such experience and relationships; spaces for coming together, to celebrate, spaces for solitude, spaces that never change and are always as memory depicted them. These are some of the characteristics that give a landscape its uniqueness, that give it style. These are what make us recall it with emotion."

The concept cannot be realized simplistically. It is neither stylistically nor esthetically bound. The idea of landscape is unlike the naturalistic, romantic, or moral terms of the City Beautiful Movement or the visionary, didactic schemes of this century's early decades. It is a profoundly public definition, neither intrinsically urban or agrarian. It is an argument for meaning more than beauty. In this sense it lends itself to the complex condition of cities today. The heterogeneity, consumerism, and enterprise of contemporary cities suggests confrontation as well as consensus, contradiction as well as coherence, nostalgia for imagined pasts as well as anticipation of imagined futures. The public realm is no longer understood ceremoniously.

Especially in the years following World War II, with their emphasis on building bigger and more economically, the public realm has been neglected as a critical element of architecture. The trend toward buildings as objects has culminated in a proliferation of signature, or designer buildings analogous in fashion to designer jeans. Efforts on the part of policymakers...
d citizens to create plazas, height limits, and setbacks resulted often in rote compliance to the letter of the law rather than the spirit. Conceptually, the buildings stood alone and isolated. The spaces between buildings, the spaces defined and walled by buildings and constituting our primary experience of the city, came ancillary to the more immediate concerns of site, program, and client.

Now there are signs this is starting to change. Designers and citizens are uncomfortable with the results, and attention to the public realm and larger urban landscape is becoming current, a rhetoric even urgent.

In Battery Park City in New York City and in MacArthur Park in Los Angeles there is a conscious effort to create places that are works of art. In Battery Park City, rising from landfill along the Hudson River, earlier dreams of housing for the poor and other social purposes have given way to a pragmatic acknowledgment of economic conditions governing its use, but the image place sought by its designers has been sustained through a difficult process mandating the collaboration of architects, landscape architects, and artists in the creation of public spaces. The results are not yet in; for some, the art has been constrained by the process; for others the architectural process was truncated. But the experiment is earnest in its attempt to enliven, conceptually and physically, ideas of urban open spaces.

In Los Angeles, MacArthur Park is engaged in revitalization as an example of reassembling on a vision of place where landscape, art, and architecture join in making the city's largest urban park a work of art. In other examples, controversy about style has masked more significant debate about the role of architecture in creating a public urban space. The controversy about the AT&T headquarters in New York City focused on its broken pediment in the sky. But the building is perhaps more significant for its attitude toward the people who use its land. Noted Philip Johnson, FAIA, "How can I ignore them now? I might have in the old royal buccaneering days, but those are gone."

The building is raised 65 feet above the sidewalk, which is slanted as a plaza penetrating the domain of the building. Johnson originally wanted the building raised even higher. Undershot and surrounding the glass-fron ted lobby with the colossal golden Boy statue are public spaces reminiscent of Renaissance plazas, sculpted in stone, tall yet enclosed by the architecture, dark and a little bit cold on their own but enlivened by the public stream spilling from Madison Avenue as Johnson notes, "People like to cut through on the diagonal."

Behind the building a separate structure joined to AT&T by glass roofed arcade opens to the wintergarden of the IBM building across the street to the north. Built about the same time as AT&T, the IBM building by Edward Larrabee Barnes, FAIA, takes a different attitude toward architecture (it is steadfastly modern) and the public domain. Unlike AT&T, which provides for the penetration of public space, IBM establishes a public precinct, facing south, which brings public parkland indoors. And, while the trees have died several times over and the space itself is bland, the visual accessibility of the garden and the climatic and psychic shelter it provides combines with AT&T to make their corner of the city remarkable.

More recently, Trump Tower by Swanke Hayden Connell triangulates this public realm, incorporating an interior vertical mainstreet in its red marble and brass lobby and offering a small park in the sky that looks back on AT&T as well as over Fifth Avenue. The strength of these projects is in combination. Each is conceptually limited and seriously flawed on its own, yet the urban possibilities suggested by the whole are remarkable. One experiences this part of the city differently than its surrounding blocks because it is publically accessible on so many more levels. The facades hold the sidewalk, yet the interpenetration of building and public spaces, and of indoors and outdoors, and of commerce and monumentality all enlarge the public experience. Similar gestures, some more successful than others, have been made before, but located in individual buildings, unaccompanied by their neighbors. The Crocker Center in San Francisco, by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, boasts a glass-vaulted, blockwide shopping gallery that runs laterally behind its tower. Shoppers line the street-facing base of the tower itself. The Galleria is 75 feet tall and 275 feet long with three levels of shops behind portals made of the same granite as the tower. With shops, restaurants, and spaces to sit and stroll, the Galleria is a public event of note in the city, echoing the commercial arcades of European cities as well as the current fascination with atria and sheltered shopping malls. But the Galleria fails to become a public street because it stops and ends at its own property line; the public space it shelters is more a lobby than a boulevard.

Johnson/Burgee's PPG Building in Pittsburgh seems almost a perversion of attention to the public realm. Formally, the crazed cathedral tower anchors a public plaza of adequate dimension and contains a wintergarden of generous proportions. Lowrise versions of the tower surround the plaza with shops visible through arcades. The plaza is accessible and visible by a pedestrian street connecting it to Market Square one block away. But just as the 22,000 panes of glass disintegrate the tower's cathedral image, the public spaces are not what they appear. The wintergarden and the plaza are unconnected; one reaches the wintergarden by entering the domain of the tower and passing through doors on either side of it, or by a staircase rising along a blank wall facing the street behind the tower. Once inside, the planting is lush, but there is little reason to stay. A few chairs and tables seem almost gratuitous. A guard notes that tourist buses have made it a stop and regularly run people through it.

The plaza is the one solid surface amid the myriad glass reflections of the architecture; in the center a small obelisk is the only adornment. There is no seating, ledges, or amenity beyond the square's own existence; it resists public use as much by management as design. Those coming from Market Square can cut and leave; staying would be difficult. On an early visit, the arcaded shops were visible but inaccessible from the sidewalk; entry was from inside the building despite exterior doorways. Less "architectural" in conception but susceptible to incorporation into the public realm are the shopping malls replacing main streets around the nation. The malls have become important not only as convenient places to buy things but as the place to shop and be seen. With parking lots replacing the public green and public offerings day and night, the mall has become the teenager's hangout, the destination for public outings, and occasionally the site for public meetings. A stroll along its interior boulevards is a contemporary version of the river promenade and no less ritualized. With mannequins as monuments, these controlled, interior, and supervised environments provide a place for public participation that many downtowns cannot.

The social importance of malls is extended even further in Olympia, Wash., where residents of a nearby home for the elderly take buses to a local mall to stroll, window shop, and see what's happening in the world. Called the "mall-walkers" in local parlance, they arrive before the stores open and may or may not stay around when the rest of the crowds arrive.

The shopping mall is not our image of the public realm, but for many it is the experience of the public realm our environment provides. Aldo Rossi has written that, "Architecture, attesting to the tastes and attitudes of generations, to public events and private tragedies, to new and old facts, is the fixed stage for human events. The collective and the private, society and the individual, balance and confront one another in the city. The city is composed of many people seeking a general order that is consistent with their own particular environment." The balance and confrontation of public/private order is a concern for architecture today, resulting in the paradoxical assertion that a building must be designed as though the whole city depended on it and that architecture, in and of itself, doesn't matter very much.
Evaluation: Neglected Relic of the '60s

Riis Plaza, New York, M. Paul Frieberg and Pomerance & Brenies. By Allen Freeman
Twenty years ago, the City of New York turned a barren man's-land of three acres surrounded by highrise public housing into an experimental park that was dedicated with optimism by Lady Bird Johnson. The plaza at Jacob Riis Houses was landscaped by architect Pomerance & Brenies and landscape architect M. Paul Friedberg & Associates was praised by a Times editorial for uniting "beauty and utility in a true understanding of sociological needs." Ada Louise Huxtable, Hon. AIA, wrote it broke "every sterile mold and stale convention" of the park, playground, and open space policy of the previous years. It was featured in two national architectural monthlies given design awards by HUD, AIA, and the American Society of Landscape Architects.

The history of Riis from the project's completion in 1949 to plaza's current semi-neglect is a small parable of the problems in making design relevant to the lives of the hardcore urban poor.

Riis Houses, typical of New York's postwar public housing, what planners of that era, influenced by Ebenezer Howard's Garden City concepts and Le Corbusier's visionary Radiocity, thought would answer the problems of neglect and slums in crowded tenement slums. The scale is immense, containing 19 buildings with 1,768 apartments housing some 4,200 people on a site seven blocks long and one block wide between Drive and Avenue D on Manhattan's lower east side. The site is tucked into the project's southern superblock where it is surrounded by 14- and 6-story buildings that cover less than 20 percent of the site, leaving a cavernous, north-south mall between two rows of eight highrises. The buildings are turned away from both the streets and the mall, with entrances on the east and south sides opening into introverted, cheerless plazas. The mall itself was originally landscaped to standards thought to be all that low-income tenants might want (or perhaps deserve): square vistas of grass, punctuated by twin rows of London plane trees; squared-off asphalt paths; a few pieces of "play sculptures"; and chain link to keep young people in their place. Early photographs show this space as vast, raw, and dull.

A dozen years after Riis Houses were built, Jane Jacobs turned such large-scale projects as wrongheaded in her 1961 book, The Death and Life of Great American Cities: The high-crime, high-delinquency area on the lower east side was the parklike area of public housing projects, she reported. Highrise projects like Riis, she observed, lacked the safety provided by traditional, blockly surveillance of "eyes on the streets" in tenement neighborhoods. She concluded that such projects don't replace slums; they merely shift slums from here to there. Not surprisingly, Jacobs' thesis was at first rejected by the planners whose ideas were attacked. As one veteran architectural journalist observes, "the route by which her ideas became accepted was indirect."

Paul Friedberg recently bore this out. "Jane Jacobs made the housing authority very nervous about doing all this crap," he said. "It was a daisy chain: She made mincemeat of the housing authority, who beat on consultants, who turned to the consultants—I was one—saying, 'We can't change the architecture because that means big bucks.' They replied, 'Mr. Friedberg, give us some ideas.'"

In 1964, Mrs. Vincent Astor cast a vote in a sense for Jane Jacobs when she had the Vincent Astor Foundation put up money to restore the park.
for Pomerance & Brenies and Friedberg to relandscape George Washington Carver Houses in East Harlem. A year later the foundation invited the same designers to redesign part of the mall at Riis, a larger area with a much bigger budget, $1 million. On the 260x640-foot site, utterly flat and skewed slightly to the northwest along the parallel rows of 16-year-old pine trees, the designers programmed four "rooms.

A small garden for the elderly anchored the southern tip. Enclosed on three sides by six-foot-high brick walls, the garden was lined by benches on the inner periphery and a fountain played in its center.

The garden opened to the southern rim of a large amphitheater, where Friedberg et al. created grade changes around the pre-existing trees by scooping out a basin between six of them and extending the grade up and around their bases. The architects rimmed the top tier with a pergola of Douglas fir timbers on 24 cruciform brick columns and provided dressing rooms and lighting and amplification equipment. Spray jets built into the concrete risers converted the amphitheater into a wading pool on hot days when it was not otherwise being used.

Just north of the amphitheater was an area intended for sitting or passing through. Here, a year after Riis Plaza was opened, the city built a restroom pavilion because the plaza was being used extensively by people from outside the project.

The designers anchored the north end with a playground. Friedberg says he had observed children becoming quickly bored with the standard play areas, usually concrete turtly porpoises on flat expanses of concrete or asphalt. So, for Riis he designed sensuous forms and intimate spaces for children to climb on, swing from, slide down, hide in, and otherwise engage their imaginations. He recycled granite blocks, first used on the site as tree pits, as playground surfaces; he designed climbing structures from pressure-treated timbers; and, as a concession to Mrs. Astor's childhood memories, he built a treehouse.

The entire plaza was conceived as permissive. There were no fences to imply that children should "keep off." Totem-like cast concrete sculptures provided toeholds and handholds for climbing. Rich and textured materials, calculated to take abuse and defend themselves, encouraged touch and play.
Today, nearly two decades after completion, Riis Plaza is underused and inadequately maintained. At least it was when I visited it on a lovely, crisp day last August while schools were still in summer recess. In marked contrast, the stores along Avenue D opposite the project were buzzing with life.

Showing the most serious signs of abuse and neglect was the intimate, walled garden for the elderly on the southern tip. The high walls were graffiti-laden, and about half of their precast capstones were missing. Concrete planters integrated into the walls were empty except for weeds and trash, and some of the benches along the walls had been pried from their anchors. The central fountain had long-since stopped functioning. The only visitors that I observed during my five-hour stay on the plaza were boys climbing on the walls and surrounding trees.

Friedberg now explains: "We had an upper-middle income notion that the elderly would take a book, sit, read, and look at the fountain. But this group immediately saw danger and wouldn't enter. If someone stood in the entrance, they'd be
trapped. We learned that you don't attempt to segregate this age group in this kind of environment."

The adjacent amphitheater was in better shape, although about half of the three-foot-diameter globe lights in the pergola were broken and the poured concrete decks were badly cracked in places. Significantly, its uses are very different from those anticipated. During the first summers in the '60s, five or six community gatherings or performances, planned and funded by the city, were held there each week. Now, absent such funding, events average only about one a month. During my visit, the handsome facility was largely deserted. A resident told me it has become a popular spot for adolescents, working in teams of two or three, to sell drugs, but that a police raid five days before had temporarily moved that activity a few blocks south. Because of a citywide water shortage, the wading pool spray jets remained turned off this summer.

Nearby, the rest room pavilion stood badly vandalized. Its doors were permanently locked, I was told, a lack of funds for maintenance. Boys playing ball were using the sad little building as a backstop.

At the north end of the plaza, the playground's most durable materials—the granite sets and steel sliding boards—have held up well. But entrances to the little granite igloo structure that children crawled through have been bricked up, because, Friedberg says, older adolescents would take mattresses inside, which would later be set afire. Most of the wooden play structures are badly worn, and the treehouse is gone without a trace. Only a stump of the tree that held it remains.

I later asked the manager of Riis Houses, William Russo, about problems particular to Riis Plaza. He repeatedly alluded to difficulties related to the plaza's remoteness from the streets. "The globe lights would be subject to less vandalism if the plaza were on the avenue... Because the amphitheater is not visible from the street, there is a propensity for drug addicts to make deals or shoot up in its nooks and crannies," he said. The garden for the elderly is "dominated by teen-agers, people who want to drink, people who do not want to be visible from the street."

Russo said the housing authority plans to replace the globe lights with higher, brighter fixtures; remove a section of the south wall and in its place install steel bars to make the interior of the garden for the elderly visible from East Sixth Street; and substitute asphalt covered with a safety material for the playground sand. Consideration also is being given to turning the rest room pavilion into a police substation, he said.

I found the atmosphere of Riis Plaza quite different from that reported on the day of its dedication in May of 1966, when Lady Bird Johnson strolled under the trees and chatted with residents. "Now I know you'll take care of this park," she told a group of young boys. During ceremonies attended by Mrs. Astor, housing officials, and 2,000 residents, Mrs. Johnson also expressed greater expectations: "This is one answer to our urban living today, not just in New York City but across the land... not simply to escape the city but to channel our energies into creating within it parks and plazas for living the good life."

But it now seems apparent that no degree of innovation in landscaping could bring sufficient cheer to these highrise walls of anonymous windows with their backyards of "indefensible space," in Oscar Newman's term. Like the ubiquitous small-town Main Streets-turned-shopping-malls of the '60s and early '70s, Riis Plaza was a Band-Aid that could not hold. Fortunately, the lessons of Riis, both project and plaza, have been learned and absorbed.
Evaluation: A Prototype Left Unrelicated

Paley Park, New York, Zion & Breen.
By Stanley Abercrombie, AIA

The shadows across Paley Park are deeper now. Construction around this mid-Manhattan oasis has burgeoned remarkably in the 19 years since it was built. But as the density of building increases, so does the value of relief from it; as its context becomes less likable, Paley Park becomes more so.

Just east of Fifth Avenue on 53rd Street, the site was formerly the home of Sherman Billingsley’s Stork Club. William S. Paley, chairman of the board of CBS (with offices a block west in Eero Saarinen’s granite tower) bought the 42x100-foot parcel for three-quarters of a million dollars and provided another quarter million for design and construction, with more funds set aside for maintenance. What he envisioned was a memorial to his father, Samuel Paley, a Russian-born businessman and philanthropist who had died in 1963. The design was by landscape architects Robert Zion and Harold Breen of Zion & Breen Associates. A. Preston Moore was architectural consultant. The scheme, with a scale model by Alexander & Jones, was unveiled in Paley’s office in February 1966, and the park opened—despite a five-month plumbers’ strike that halted work on the fountain—in May 1967. The next year it won the City Club of New York’s prestigious Bard Award, in company with two other newcomers to the city, Roche/Dinkeloo’s Ford Foundation building and Marcel Breuer’s now-threatened Whitney Museum.

But Zion & Breen’s park design was conceived two years before they had even met William Paley. In 1963 they had prepared an exhibition for the Architectural League of New York and the Park Association of New York, Inc. It was seen in the league’s headquarters, was titled “New Parks for New York,” and proposed in it was every major feature of the Paley Park design. These included:

- Size. “A myth, without foundation,” the exhibition catalog stated, “has arisen among some park administrators that three acres is the minimum feasible size for an urban park.” The new park, however, would be small (“as small as 50x100 feet”).
- Purpose. “For adults” and “for rest.”
- Furnishings. None of the traditional park benches, but instead “the revival of the single chair, light and portable . . . as in the parks of Paris.” The final choice was of Bertoia-designed wire mesh chairs clustered around Saarinen-designed pedestal tables, all in white.
- Walls. The midtown park was conceived as “a room, with walls, floors, and ceiling,” and the walls were to be those of neighboring buildings, covered with vines.
- Floor. “It must have an interest of texture underfoot” and therefore “be more than something to walk on.” One of several flooring designs shown in the catalogue—small, roughly hewn granite squares in a fanning pattern—was repeated literally in Paley Park.
- Ceiling. The cover of the outdoor room was to be “the dense canopy of leaves formed by the close . . . planting of trees (12 to 15 feet apart).”
- Kiosks. These would house vending machines for drinks and food or “in the larger parks, cafés.”
- Water. Perhaps the most distinctive single element of Paley Park is its rear wall of water tumbling over stone, creating a sound not only delightful in itself but also effective in hiding less pleasant city noises. Even this was envisioned in Zion & Breen’s 1963 proposal: “a roaring cascade . . . to drown the harsh sounds of traffic.” It was an idea, Robert Zion says, borrowed from an inexpensive hotel he once visited in Acapulco. The hotel “could not afford a standard filter system for its pool and therefore substituted a lava wall over which the pool water would be pumped in order to aerate it. At that time I resolved that I would someday use this concept for a fountain since it could be run totally independent of wind.”

Even though the concept was almost whole before being applied to the 53rd Street site, many details remained to be

Mr. Abercrombie is editor of Interior Design magazine.
ved. These continued to be changed—for the better, in every sense—even after the February 1966 presentation in Paley's office. That scheme, for example, had called for 24 honey locust trees, faced 10 feet on center in a rigid grid; the final design called for 17 trees in a more interesting staggered pattern. The first scheme proposed side walls faced with concrete arches within which were to be set mirrored panels; the final design, plain walls of handsome gray brick. The first, a central and rather macho food-dispensing kiosk; the final, an open central area and a very discreet kiosk at one side of the entrance gate.

This final design, indeed, is notable for what it does not do. It refrains from visual acrobatics and dramatic effects. It is not showy. It is not playful or decorative. It is instead something finer and more appropriate, a marvel of restraint, sophistication, and urbanity.

Yet there is a negative aspect to the Paley Park story, and that, simply, is our failure to profit from its example. Announced the same day in 1966 was another small New York park at Second Avenue and 29th Street, designed by M. Paul Friedberg. On a larger, corner lot (a site previously acquired by the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority as the first leg of a proposed cross-Manhattan expressway) and in a less dense, more residential neighborhood, it quite properly was more varied and playful (with snack shop, wading pool, and timber constructions for climbing) than its uptown contemporary. Since then, however, several other "vest-pocket" parks have been built near Paley Park (for a few examples, one on East 51st Street, one at Sixth Avenue and 43rd Street, one behind the Exxon building, and another behind the McGraw-Hill building), and in no case does the design quality approach that of Paley. Even more dreary, for the most part, are the number of through-block pedestrian spaces opened in new construction as zoning trade-offs for additional floor area, but these hardly qualify as parks.

It is also true that the small park concept can be an important urban amenity only if it is repeated frequently. As Zion & Breen's Architectural League catalogue explained, "For such parks to contribute effectively to city life, they must be readily available.... If such a system of parks is to succeed, there must be a profitability as well as a profusion. One such park for each square block."

Neither in quality nor in quantity have we been able to duplicate Paley Park's success. The relative vulgarity of Paley's neighboring imitators may be due to the lack of talent to match that of Robert Zion or Paul Friedberg. The more fundamental problem, however, is the lack "for each square block" of a donor to match William Paley. Ada Louise Huxtable, Hon. AIA, in a New York Times article greeting the Paley announcement, commented that "the thought of this kind of use for prime land in New York makes real estate men blanch.... The laws of economics and the good of the public seldom mix. Obviously, only public action or private philanthropy can make the small-park dream possible." And city officials may blanch along with the real estate men, as park use removes valuable land from the tax rolls and thus diminishes city income.

Zion and Breen were aware of the problem and offered this solution in their 1963 catalogue: "The cost of the midtown park can be shared by those who benefit most from its presence: those who own or rent space in adjoining office buildings, whose property has become more valuable because of the nearness of such an amenity; the neighboring merchant who inevitably will profit from the fact that the weary shopper can now rest and return refreshed to shop; and, finally, the park user can help to defray the expense by paying a modest sum (a subway token, perhaps) for its use."

The urban park network remains a vision of which Paley Park is only a partial manifestation. Yet, in the heart of Manhattan, looking better than ever, we still have one-tenth of an acre of elegance and calm. It is both a blessing and an admonition.
Connective Tissue Among
A Group of College Buildings

The setting for Quinnipiac College, a four-year school in Hamen, Conn., could be described as bucolic—with its gently rolling hills and winding drives. The setting for a pair of dormitories built a decade or more ago, however, was anything but. The two cruciform buildings with their gable roofs were not only uninspiring in themselves, they were sited with little regard for the spaces between them. As part of a master plan for the college, Centerbrook Architects of Essex, Conn., created a modestly scaled and thoughtfully contrived series of "events" along the one-eighth-mile drive that passes the dormitories. One of the goals was "to create a lively village street out of the bleak and barren 'dorm' road," says Jefferson B. Riley, AIA.

Passage down the road due west to the dormitories starts softly, in the form of Bradford pear trees that line the drive, thin at the dormitories' public spaces, then huddle again. The pear trees were chosen, Riley explains, because they bloom early in spring while the students are still on campus. Where the trees stop, the interstitial elements begin. There is a broad, circular rim that steps down toward the dormitory, and a half wall curved to complement the rim. Between these two elements stands a portal with a broken pediment—a triumphal entrance to the dormitory. In the space between the two dormitories farther west is another circular element (this one tighter and stepping up), another portal, and a zigzag wall that steps back and down.

The point of all these public spaces is not only communal, but thermal as well. Riley calls these little spaces "sun traps," comfortable corners where one can ease back and bask. More sun traps are found against the east dormitory's south wall, away from the bustle of the two public spaces, in the form of a canted wall that Riley describes as a "built-in chaise longue." The sun traps make these public areas habitable for most of the year.

Materials were chosen to create a subdued foreground for the dormitories, to soak up the sun's warmth, and for durability. The walls and steps are of ground face gray granite block. The zigzag wall combines granite with glass block, used, says Riley, so that sun would be admitted into the dormitory's entry corner. The glass walls also allow limited views into the sun trap from the dormitory side and discourage prowlers from hiding behind the wall. The concrete block pavers are a color palette of the dormitories' materials.

Michael J. Crosbie

Left, roadside seating with 'sun traps' and dormitories beyond; below, dormitories 'before'; right top, sun traps with triumphal portals; right middle, circular element provides for curbside chats.
Above, Quinnipiac's western most sun trap with zigzag wall of concrete and glass block and portal; left, ancillary sun traps on south wall of east dormitory allow sunning with privacy. Walls near dormitory entrance direct traffic away from grass.
Lake Washington is a long, freshwater body that parallels Puget Sound for 15 or so miles on the east side of Seattle. Renton, where Boeing makes its planes, is a city of 30,000 at the southern tip of the lake, and Gene Coulon Memorial Beach Park, by Jones & Jones of Seattle, is the community's major watersport center. Johnpaul Jones was the principal designer. Occupying a 57-acre, linear, former industrial tract bordered by a rail line, the park reclaims the land's northern strip as a natural marsh with a nature walk and groups the facilities shown here at the southern tip. The built waterfront comprises boat landings, picnic areas, and swimming and boating areas.

In the three-building cluster, the largest structure is a long, enclosed picnic shelter, aptly called the Belvedere, with a tower at one end that affords fine views across the lake while providing the shoreline's sole vertical element. Sited perpendicular to the Belvedere is a little boat rental building; a concession stand/restaurant stands on slightly higher ground.

The three buildings, nautically detailed and airy, are steel framed with infill of corrugated, enameled steel panels and glass, a system chosen for its resistance to vandalism and because soil conditions dictated relatively lightweight construction. Low roofs with deep overhangs and the glazed-roof cupola on the Belvedere recall the architecture of carpenter Gothic hotels built along the lakeshore around the turn of the century.

Up and down the park, the architects provided a variety of ways in which the land meets water, including well scaled boat launches and bulkheads, some nicely suited for dangling one's feet in the water. Altogether, the park reclaims more than a mile of formerly derelict shoreline. A.F.
Mustangs Bound Proudly Across Prairie-Like Plaza
The plaza at Williams Square, in the Dallas suburb of Irving, plates every rule of thumb for outdoor public space in Texas. is vast, hard, and open, with trees and seating confined to e edges, and only a single large sculpture to lend it scale. The eliminary consensus among local architects was that it was somed because of its 300-foot-square size and the almost polemical absence of soft elements to make it inviting to the public. But the skeptics were wrong. Not only is Williams Square aised by the design community (it received a 1985 honor award m the American Society of Landscape Architects), it is also hit with the locals, who flock to the site on evenings and weekends as though it were an extension of Six Flags Over Texas. hey come primarily to see Robert Glen's new bronze mustangs, of the more astounding pieces of public sculpture in the untry. But many of them probably depart with a clearer understand of urban public space as well.

For Williams Square is deliberately, almost defiantly heroic and overscaled, a place designed for ceremony and community assembly rather than solitary musings. "I knew I was going to make either an A or an F on it," says architect James Reeves the SWA Group of Houston. "It is not a middle-of-the-road design."

Williams Square is the product of a strong collaboration mong responsive architects—Reeves and associate Dan Mock or the plaza and Charles Bassett, FAIA, of SOM/San Francisco for the three surrounding buildings—and a forceful client, this case Ben Carpenter, developer of the 12,000-acre Las olinas project of which Williams Square is far and away the high point. Carpenter visited dozens of European plazas in developing the project and also had seen Glen's work in Africa and an Antonio. By the time Reeves and Bassett were employed, the basic organization of the plaza and the centrality of the musings had been established.

"I knew I wanted to surround the plaza on three sides with buildings that represented strength, stability, and permanence," carpenter explains. "As for the mustangs, they are the van-sculpted 1.5 times life size, nine mustangs splash through an abstracted Texas stream in a vast, three-sided, south-facing plaza surfaced in a wide variety of granite finishes. The buildings also are clad in granite and have standing seam copper roofs and are crisp, straightforward . . . modern rectangles. The plaza will eventually be enclosed by a fourth building, a hotel, to be built across the road opposite the 26-story tower. A

guard of our civilization in Texas. They are part of our tradition and mean something to those who see them here." What is surprising is how faithfully Carpenter stuck to his original scheme. Reeves says that his client initially had a strong feeling about the hardness of the space but not for the necessary abstractness of it: "That was my job, to bring all the pieces together. To express the hardness without having it affect the horses."

Reeves achieved this by making the plaza an abstraction of the flat, arid Texas prairie, across which the larger-than-life mustangs gallop. The stream that flows diagonally across the site, together with the depressions and texturing in the granite paving, become a kind of geological microcosm in which water appears to have worn away layer after layer of earth. Different colors and cuts of granite are used to simulate the subtle variability of a real prairie landscape.

From a distance, against the background of tall buildings, the mustangs appear relatively small. As we approach, however, they grow larger and larger, until finally their true proportions—one and a half times lifespan—become evident. Smaller pieces would have been devoured by the surrounding space. The trek across the vast plaza thus involves subtle shifts in perception of scale and texture that make it more exhilarating, and far less daunting, than we might have suspected.

The office buildings—a pair of 14-story towers and a 26-story central tower—are crisp, straightforward, impeccably detailed modern rectangles. With their pink granite facades and standing seam copper roofs, which seem to float about the walls like coolie hats, they convey the impression of stability and permanence that Carpenter was after. Bassett kept the cornices of the smaller buildings and the base of the tall central building the same height, a simple reminder that Williams Square is an ensemble of buildings instead of a collection of discrete objects. The impression is reinforced by the repetition of identical flat surfaces and crisp edges, and by the glazed walkways that connect all three buildings at ground level.

The focal point of Williams Square is obviously Glen's mustangs. They are classical in feeling and detailing, a representational counterpoint to the crisp geometry of the buildings and the plaza.

In making his maquettes, Glen measured the muscles and tendons of horse cadavers; the final placement of the sculptures was done on site, without the aid of elaborate sketches and blueprints. David Dillon
Mr. Jefferson and His Successors

Not all have built so well at his university, but there is new promise. By Carleton Knight III

rom the start, Thomas Jefferson wanted his university to be a special place, revolutionary in concept and style, and thus more attractive to potential students. He had noticed that some schools often built one large building to serve many functions, but the very practical Jefferson perceived that a collection of smaller buildings would enable easy expansion as needs and finances permitted. "A university should not be a house but a village," he said of his model, self-contained community in Charlottesville, Va.

And so it was that with the advice of two friends, architects Benjamin Henry Latrobe and William Thornton, Jefferson created a series of some 30 interconnected buildings at the heart of which was "an open square of grass and trees" that has come to be called simply the lawn. Ten pavilions inspired by the works of such architects as Palladio, Chambray, and Ledoux accommodated the teaching classrooms for the major professors downstairs with their living quarters above. These pavilions are linked by long rows of student dorm rooms set behind Tuscan columns. To the rear of and paralleling this initial grouping, a second row in the east and the west, the ranges, would contain additional dormitory rooms and "hotels," as Jefferson described the refectories where the students would eat. Gardens, divided by serpentine brick walls, filled the space between the rows of buildings.

Lacking a focal point for his University of Virginia composition, Jefferson drew inspiration, at Latrobe's suggestion, from the Pantheon. A large, domed rotunda, at one-half the scale of its Roman predecessor, would serve not as the chapel but the library to symbolize the primacy of learning. Different periods of architecture were utilized in the design, according to the founder, as "examples of the precepts . . . taught in that art."

This complex was ideal for a small university in the 1800s, but times change and with them attitudes. Jefferson's teaching methods, small tutorials, became outmoded as the student body grew. His village became a city. Only 25 years after the university opened, one of the founder's protégés, Robert Mills, added to the rotunda an annex containing classrooms and a 1,200-seat auditorium. Jefferson, concerned about crowds and the potential for mob action, had specifically not included such a facility in his design. Students soon nicknamed this somewhat ungainly building, which was completed in 1853 and took care of most of the university's expansion needs for nearly a half-century, the choo-choo train. The extension of the rotunda, on the side away from the lawn, combined with the addition in 1877 of the somewhat oddly Victorian Brooks Hall and the equally strange Gothic chapel in 1885, cast the die for enlargement of the university, changing forever the focus of Jefferson's concept.

Following an 1895 fire that destroyed the annex and left the rotunda a shell, Stanford White was asked to reconstruct the rotunda, but without its Millsian appendage. He added a north

Opposite, Jefferson's lawn through the columns of the rotunda. Below, the terraced lawn edged by interconnected pavilions.
portico and flanking wings to match those on the south and combined the first- and second-floor interiors into a single, heavily decorated room under a coffered dome. Because the school was built on the crown of a hill, it was not possible to extend indefinitely the axial plan, as Jefferson had intended. Thus, in 1898, McKim Mead & White also undertook the first master plan for an expanded university. They created a new cross axis at the open end of the lawn, suggesting a number of buildings running perpendicular to the originals, but not all of these were constructed. Cabell Hall, which blocks the vista at the end of the lawn, and the flanking structures, Rouss Hall and Cocke Hall, were built to designs by White. According to Professor Richard G. Wilson of the university's architecture school, White opposed the placement of Cabell Hall, but he was overruled by the faculty, who wanted to cut out the view of a messy shantytown that had sprung up at the bottom of the hill.

About this same time at the turn of the century, Paul Pelz, architect of the Library of Congress, designed Randall Hall according to the new master plan, and soon thereafter, the first university hospital. These buildings, as well as those by McKim Mead & White, helped cement a return to the Roman tradition favored by Jefferson.

In 1913, a formal master plan, by a Boston landscape architect Warren H. Manning, and reflective of the "city beautiful" movement, was unveiled but did not get very far. "It totally ignored the realities of topography," Werner K. Sensbach, the university's director of planning, notes. For 50 years after that, planning was limited more to individual projects and lacked any overall thrust according to Sensbach. Expansion in the only direction possible onto the adjoining, rolling hills, had begun and would continue despite the residential nature of the area. Although the architecture remained rooted in the Jeffersonian tradition, with few exceptions it is unmemorable. The Monroe Hill houses, a dormitory complex dating from 1929, offers arcaded spaces evocative...
Jefferson, and the Memorial Gymnasium of 1924 is today a historicist's delight. The pace of construction through the 1950s, like life at the university, was slow and easy. Beginning some 25 years ago, however, the university saw major increases in enrollment (it has doubled since the mid-’60s to 16,000), which required a massive building program. At the same time, the university sought to rid itself of an image as a socially proper finishing school for the outh of the landed gentry and heightened its aspirations of national prominence. A new master plan was prepared in 1965 by Asaki, Dawson & DeMay, but it was quickly overcome by events and had to be updated in 1973. Planning director Sensbach says today that “the grounds are like a sausage squeezed out at both ends,” because of very limited land resources. Crescent in shape with the original property at the center, today’s grounds are intermingled with the city of Charlottesville, blurring the distinct Jefferson created between town and gown. University buildings are grouped in clusters, but the formal axial plan is missing. The spaces in between allow for the intermingling of nature, which Jefferson wanted, and a number of wooded glades provide quiet respites from busy academe.

To design the buildings for this expansion, the university quite naturally turned to some of the better-known collegiate architects of the day, including an entire cadre from Cambridge, Mass. The result was a generation of buildings that might be called academic semi-brutalist. Brick was used in a gesture toward earlier generations, but it was often held within heavy, exposed concrete frames. While architects kept the materials, they lost Jefferson’s unique sense of scale. Overall, the architecture was...
not distinguished, and it was not only the well-known, out-of-state architects who contributed to this scene. Virginia firms working there did no better, and in some cases worse.

Peter Bohlin, FAIA, who has the somewhat unenviable task adding to one of these structures, does not blame the architect of the period for the rash of mediocrity. "They were doing the best," he says, "and the times changed." He notes that the university "seemed to have a lack of vision at the time," but adds, "hindsight makes that easy to say now." Richard Wilson explains that the university building committee was "a captive of a plot in time."

The best of the lot is the fine arts node—a library, the school architecture, and the theater buildings—which has the advantage of being hidden behind a large, wooded hill. But the north grounds, which are located a mile from the rest of the university and house the graduate business school, the law school, and the Judge Advocate General's School (the U.S. Army's law school run under long-term contract by the university), are barren, both botanically and architecturally.

"It looks like some Strategic Air Command base in Nebraska: architecture Dean Jaquelin T. Robertson, FAIA, says bluntly. "The buildings could have been airlifted to Namibia. (The fling analogy is not inappropriate because the JAG School looks from the distance of the main grounds like a gargantuan mobile lounge, rolling across the Blue Ridge Mountains to Dulles International Airport.) "It's an alien environment with no collegial ambience and no connection to the university," declares Robertson, who laments that the north grounds are "a great lost opportunity."

There have been others as well, such as the rows of dormitories near the football stadium, which students have taken to calling "the Holiday Inn" because of the rows of balconies. Even the rotunda suffered. Until the 1960s, Stanford White seemed well-respected enough, but with the revival of nostalgic interest in Jefferson, fueled by Jeffersonian scholar Frederick D. Nichols and no doubt helped along by the U.S. bicentennial, White's reputation lost some of its lustre. The result was the re-restoration of the rotunda, starting in 1973. A legitimate preservation question can be raised here. To what period do you restore a building, especially one on which three significant architects had worked? The university, aided by $1 million from HUI and another $1.3 million from private sources, sort of returned it to Jefferson's day, but with the exterior additions of White. As one long-time Charlottesvillian noted of the resulting amalgam, "We had a perfectly good Stanford White building. Now we don't have anything."

The other problem is that the quality of the restoration and adaptation work was much less than it should have been. The perforated aluminum ceiling and inexpensive-looking, motel-type railing in the dome room as well as the large airconditioning grill in the oval rooms downstairs should have had more care and imagination taken in their design, considering the structure and its pedigree. The off-center hole cut in the carpet for the Jefferson statue on the main floor is but another example of what appears to be a lack of follow-through.

But changes for the better began appearing after January 1982, when Robertson arrived. In addition to making the school of architecture an important presence nationally, Robertson had three goals: "To get the university to hire good architects, to save the original buildings on the lawn, and to develop an overall plan." By regulation, on all significant architectural projects, the dean serves as chairman of the architect selection panel, and his presence has been felt. Robertson has promoted the hiring of a number of prominent architects—Edward Larrabee Barnes, FAIA; Robert A. M. Stern, FAIA; Kliment & Halsband; David Brody; Hartman Cox; and Bohlin, Powell, Larkin & Cywinski.

But it has not been easy for the Virginia-bred Robertson (see related story, page 85). Virginia architects had long thought of the university as their private preserve, and there has been a strong negative reaction statewide to what one describes as "all that
New York glitz.” (Even today, Robertson’s detractors point out that he was educated in “the North,” at Yale, somehow implying that he is a traitor to his heritage.) He has overcome some of these complaints by having out-of-state architects enter joint ventures with local firms, but questions are still raised. Some Virginia architects really wonder why, with so many famous architects around, the results are not any better.

Part of the problem can be attributed to parochialism, but also to a drawn-out review process. Architects working at the university do face a formidable procedural gauntlet. Despite its image as a private school, the University of Virginia is a state school, and all buildings must undergo seemingly endless review by what one architect describes as an often “lethargic and obdurate bureaucracy,” not only at the university level, but at the state level as well. But there is even more. Robert S. Buford Jr., AIA, an alumnus of the university who has worked for both in-state and out-of-state firms, points out, “It is the state school, and under everyone’s eye, from the garden club to the alumni to the legislature. Everybody gets into the act.”

The university’s office of physical plant is a 600-person operation responsible for everything from construction to maintenance. Waller S. Hunt, AIA, the university architect, says, “We don’t impose any design guidelines, except to try to maintain a central theme.” He describes that theme as “red and white,” utilizing brick and stone, wood or stucco. Hunt also says there is an informal rule not to build above the spring line of the rotunda dome. He welcomes different styles, noting, “Thomas Jefferson introduced the idea of using many architects,” and says a restricted style “would get pretty boring in a hurry.”

Despite this degree of design freedom, planning director Sensbach thinks it is easy to explain why so many architects have difficulty. They are overwhelmed by the majesty of Jefferson’s lawn,” he says. “Too many want to try to equal or outdo Jefferson. They want to make a definitive statement.” In most cases, a statement

Above, two views of a new dormitory complex by Edward Larrabee Barnes, sited in the hilly woods on the southwest corner of the main campus near the university’s football stadium.
is not what is called for, and that may help explain why architects such as Louis Kahn, Marcel Breuer, and Ulrich Franzen, FAIA were unable to complete commissions offered them by the university.

The current crop of buildings does seem to demonstrate a greater sensitivity to Jefferson's original vision, perhaps because their designers are surer of themselves. Warren J. Cox, FAIA, has designed an addition to Monroe Hall, a 1920s Georgian building housing the McIntire School of Commerce, that is as simple and unpretentious as the original building. Cox admits that "it is unlikely we would have done this 15 years ago." He believed the central campus site just across the street from Jefferson's West Range demanded a background building. "Finally in the 1980s, we don't have to assert something new and different. What will fit in is the best solution," he declares, adding, "I don't care if nobody knows we did a building there."

Perhaps surprisingly, Robert Stern feels the same way about the Sprigg Lane dormitories, constructed under a design-build contract to save money. "I'm happy if nobody notices the building. This was not the place for a strong, unique statement," he says, because of the context, which includes a historic mansion next door. For the Observatory Hill Dining Hall, on the other hand, Stern thought forceful architecture, but based in the Jeffersonian tradition, seemed appropriate. The architect had the difficult task of doubling the seating capacity of a 10-year-old existing, shed-roof-modern facility that bears little relationship to the university.

His solution, done in conjunction with Marcellus Wright, Cox & Smith (as were the dorms), was to camouflage the existing building by adding enclosed, four-bay, hip-roof porches on the two main facades. In joining the designs, Stern admits, "the fit is not seamless, but neither is it totally jarring. You can see the history of the place." The result, especially at night, is a building that glows with a festive air and recreates the long-lost atmosphere of great dining halls. This, most assuredly, is a fun place to eat.

For an $8 million addition to Gilmer Hall, a 1960s-modern building complete with screened-grille facade, architects Kliment & Halsband with Wank, Adams & Slavin, have also taken a leaf from Jefferson's book. Their 60,000-square-foot, brick and stone-trimmed addition, due for completion next summer, is directly across the street from a neo-Georgian dormitory centered on an axis. Until now that axis had no ending, but taking their cue from the lawn and rotunda, the architects have placed a two-story, semicircular element with a Palladian window on the facade to serve just that purpose. It is visible from some distance and will give primary focus to the lecture hall and the library, the most important parts of the building programmatically, notes Robert M. Kliment, AIA. A delightful little porticoed pavilion provides a graceful touch at the entry.

It is perhaps difficult to see direct Jeffersonian echoes in the handsome, 650-bed, $13.6 million dormitory complex by Edward Larrabee Barnes completed recently. The open-ended plan and small-scale parts favored by Jefferson are there, however, despite the fact that the buildings, hidden in a wooded glade and draped over a hill, look almost Scandinavian.

While these new buildings and designs bode well for the future there is also a bright spot from the past: the original precinct is getting the close-up attention it has long needed and deserved. Under the guidance of Robertson, a Jeffersonian restoration advisory board composed of a number of noted architects, historians, philanthropists, business leaders, and scholars has been created to raise $10 million for work in and an endowment for the historic area. The 24-member group will serve as "a mechanism which will guarantee the protection of the buildings and grounds," notes Robertson. Despite concern by some to the contrary, there is no wish to preserve the complex "as a museum in the frozen sense," notes J. Murray Howard, AIA, the university's architect in charge of the restoration. The buildings will con-
Above, quartet of hip roofs on Stern's addition to Observatory Hill Dining Hall provides light-filled room, right. Far right, new meets old.
Above, approach from north to rotunda. Opposite, view from west.

tinue to be used. Howard points to Pavilion VIII, now under restoration and soon to be returned to its original use, with a faculty apartment upstairs and classrooms on the main floor. He also reports that they would like to re-establish one of the hotels as a dining facility. Robertson would also like to rebuild the anatomical theater, the only Jefferson-designed building intentionally demolished. The square, brick building with unusual eyebrow windows was torn down in 1938 to make way for the library.

The lawn buildings will also serve as a living laboratory for conservation, acting as a studio for the historic preservation program at the architecture school. One detail already discovered is that Jefferson’s color for the trim was not green, but rather a gray-brown. Much of the actual restoration, including such work as graining, is undertaken by university staff trained in building conservation techniques by National Park Service experts.

The lawn is not only buildings, however. With the aid of a $30,000 grant from the Dewitt Wallace Foundation, EDAW Inc., a landscape architecture firm, is preparing a landscape master plan that calls for a number of changes on the lawn. Last winter, Philip Johnson, FAIA, a member of the advisory board, created something of an uproar at the university when he suggested in a magazine interview that all the trees on the lawn ought to be removed because they have grown up and obscure views of the pavilions. Beth Meyer of EDAW says, “Johnson has a terrific point,” but “people don’t like change.” She says it is clear from a thorough review of historical writings that the trees were not intended to block the pavilions.

Her firm’s suggestions, which she admits “may be controversial, but the rationale is straightforward,” call for altering the species and spacing of the trees. The ash and maples, which are too dense and low and have killed the grass, would be replaced by locusts, which are historically correct. She notes that the alterations would not happen overnight, but rather at “the rate of one or two trees a year.” Other recommended work includes redoing the alleys at the rear where poor drainage threatens the serpentine walls and pruning the boxwood that has created a mini-forest on the north front of the rotunda.

Meyer observes this “is the first time the university has examined the landscape in relation to the buildings.” Daniel Montgomery, a university planner, adds, “Just as the buildings are considered an important collection, so are the grounds thought of as an arboretum with an important collection of trees and plants.”

And so change has come, albeit slowly, to Charlottesville. William Middleton, assistant vice president in the office of physical plant, says, “One of the things that makes this place so interesting is the care people have for it. We don’t cut a tree down without a large community debate. Here, to do it right, you have to care.” And that trait seems to be growing, especially when the past is involved.

Robertson believes “it will take 10 years to see the results” of the renewed emphasis on the university’s architectural roots. The dean continues to stress overall urban planning issues, which he defines as “design of the larger order, not circulation or the location of sewer pipes,” rather than single buildings. He says, “Yale hired the very best and got a zoo. Hiring just good architects won’t get you a good town, just good buildings.”

At a recent honors convocation, Robertson discussed the widespread disappointment over holding the September installation of the university’s new president in University Hall, the toothpaste-cap-looking basketball arena, due to bad weather. Addressing a gathering on the lawn, Robertson asked rhetorically why people were distressed. Then, pointing to the pavilions and rotunda around him, he declared, “The architecture is why Setting is everything.”
'Scattering of Buildings Softened By Landscape'

University of California's Berkeley Campus. By David Littlejohn

John Galen Howard, the University of California at Berkeley's first supervising architect, called its location "the greatest site in the world for a university." The space was first chosen because of, among other things, "the rolling landscape abundantly covered with oak, sycamore, and bay trees, the superb views of the Golden Gate and Sausalito mountains, the rather convenient but not pressing proximity of Oakland and San Francisco."

Topography and idealism came together in this 160-acre, downsloping, rectangular plot, with its dead-straight vistas toward the unbridged Golden Gate. Howard, who served as the university's chief architect from 1901 to 1924 (and who designed 41 of its buildings), wrote, "The view westward from the summit is one of absolute repose, the lines and masses of the landscape in foreground, middle ground, and distance group and balance exquisitely about the axis, and conduct the eye as by an index to the Golden Gate."

The site is defined and sheltered by the hills of Strawberry Canyon to the east, which rise to a crest of just over a thousand feet. Originally barren, they were planted with evergreens and eucalyptus in the 1870s and '80s and now offer a steep and satisfying green background for the campus below. By a series of purchases between 1909 and 1960, the university acquired all of the eastern hills up to the ridge.

The lower reaches of the hills, divided from the main campus by curving (and private) Gayley Road, were also planted with eucalyptus, pines, and cypress late in the last century. This handsome edge provides a setting for two admirable student residence halls; a Greco-Roman amphitheater built in 1903 (now used mainly for rock concerts); an 80,000-seat football stadium; and, slightly higher up, William Wurster's impeccably sited Strawberry Canyon Recreation Area of 1959.

One reason for the original choice of site for the campus was that Strawberry Canyon offered an abundant source of water; streams from the foothills converged into three branches of Strawberry Creek, which traversed the campus on its way to the bay.

The university now gets its water from other sources, but the north and south branches of Strawberry Creek (the central branch was drained early on) have remained visible and natural over all these years. In an aerial view of the site, one can trace the two branches of the creek by the dense lines of natural foliage (California live oaks and bays, white alders, bigleaf maples, box elders) that delineate their meandering paths. Strawberry Creek remains the most Arcadian element of this densely built campus.

Mr. Littlejohn, a teacher at Berkeley since 1963, is the author of Architect: The Life and Work of Charles W. Moore.

Above, one of two lively plazas around 1960s Student Union complex, center of Berkeley demonstrations. Sather Gate is at left in photo (and photo right), and Sather Tower—the Campanile—is prominent above the hills and (photo above left) over roofs of Faculty Club.

Below the foothills, and beyond the creeks, little remains of the rural landscape of 19th century Berkeley. One notable exception is the Eucalyptus Grove—a stand of Tasmanian blue gums planted in 1877 as a windbreak for the running track. The trees, now over 200 feet high, compose the finest grove of its kind in the world. Several portions of the 19th century university were planted out with specimen trees for the study of agriculture, medicine, and botany. Some of those that remain are now venerable, huge, and handsome: a great Chinese ginkgo, a Chilean
palm, a grand magnolia. Near the north branch of Strawberry Creek, these and other exotic trees blend with redwoods and other natives to form a near-perfect composition. The consciously Italianate landscaping around the president's house and Howard's agriculture complex (stone pines, Lombardy poplars, cypresses, and olives) is as picturesque today as it was 70 years ago.

John Galen Howard's central campus buildings—the outgrowth of an international campus design competition held in 1897—generally were meant to be surrounded and connected by formal landscaping, to secure their Beaux-Arts symmetry into an axial plan. Some traces of these intentions remain, most notably the grand esplanade of pollarded plane trees that reaches north from, and provides a perfect setting for, his Campanile.

To the west and south of this neoclassical core lie two large areas of lawn, watered and mown meadows in the English style,
backed by picturesque clumps of trees. Now used for lunching, naps, necking, sunbathing, outdoor seminars, Frisbee, commencements, and wedding receptions—as well as for the simple luxury of empty green space—the bowls and swales of West Meadow and Faculty Glade have a great deal to do with the fact that 50,000 people can enter and move about this campus each day without going mad.

Campus planning at Berkeley began with a series of romantic ideals. Those of the 1868 founders included an uplifting mix of militant Christianity, regional chauvinism (they called for “buildings commensurate with the pride of a great and glorious state” —then all of 20 years old); capital-C Culture, primarily Greek and Roman; pastoral fantasies; and a starry-eyed vision of everlasting progress.

A lot of nonsense was uttered hereabouts during the gilded era concerning Berkeley’s supposed role as “the Athens of the West.” One more than usually pompous regent of the university wrote, in 1895: “Let us build, not rapidly, notlavishly, but slowly, yet grandly, that there may greet the commerce which shall whiten the Golden Gate and the civilization which shall
race this western shore an architectural pile of stately and glo-
rous buildings which shall rival the dreams of the builders of
the Columbian Exposition, which shall do honor and justice to
the superb Republic and to its most favored State, and which,
even in their ruins, shall strike a beholder with wonder and
apture."

"Progress" at Berkeley, at least in terms of honors won, dol-
ars spent, and square feet covered with buildings, has begun
to seem everlasting. But for the last 25 years, it has also seemed
increasingly incompatible with other, no less defensible ideals.
In its ardent efforts to become the equal of any other univer-
sity, by whatever terms measured, anywhere in the world, the
University of California at Berkeley has paid some heavy fines
out of its once-incomparable capital of open land, planting, vis-
tas, and what is now perhaps too casually called its quality of
life.

It may be too late to accomplish much in the way of damage
repair. "Cal," as the tranquil, collegiate, provincial prewar cam-
pus was familiarly called, is never going to return. Today's reform-
ers may have insufficient clout to say No! to campus adminis-
trators, faculty entrepreneurs, and alumni donors eager for
ever-greater institutional prestige—prestige that seems inevita-
ably, nowadays, to require newer and bigger buildings.

But a few promising signs have begun to appear. The buldoze-
Left, an axial view east from the West Gate hemicycle, with high-rise Evans Hall a massive presence in the center distance. Above left, the west approach to the Campanile. Above, an alfresco lecture on the tree-filled lawn at the tower’s southern edge. Facing page, the south branch of Strawberry Creek, looking east toward the rear of Dining Commons in the Student Union complex.

and-build-anyhow era of the '60s does seem to be over. Most of the university's surviving treasures, both of architecture and landscape, are probably as safe as any building or grove of trees can possibly be. Given a fortuitous conjunction of politics, philanthropy, and administrative priorities, there is even a chance that a few of the more grotesque depredations of the '60s can be, if not torn down, at least covered up by or merged into new and better buildings. A few of the 19th century founders' abandoned ideals may even be realized.

Architecturally, the Berkeley campus remains inharmonious, and in some places sordid. It is very much a mixed bag, a zoo of warring styles, tastes, and budgets: an interesting, if rarely beautiful scattering of buildings softened by landscape.

A good cultural historian, alert to campus politics and state budgeting policies, could learn a lot about Californian values, ideals, and fantasies between 1873 and 1985 by looking over the Second Empire brick, tile-roofed Beaux-Arts granite, collegiate Tudor, Egypto/Assyrian, Moorish/mission, California redwood rustic, Maybeckian eclectic, 1930s moderne, International Style modern, Navy surplus, industrial cheap, and (most recently) postmodern erections that have sometimes enhanced and some-
mes disfigured the beautiful open spaces of the Berkeley campus.

Good architects have worked here, and occasionally designed good buildings. But there is no question that what has kept the University of California at Berkeley one of the most handsome, humane, and appealing academic precincts in this country for most of the last 117 years has been the spaces in between.

Frederick Law Olmsted, who drew up a plan for the Berkeley campus as early as 1865, complained in 1886 to Senator Leland Stanford (for whom he designed another campus) about the awkward way things were developing across the bay. "What I have in mind at Berkeley," he wrote to Stanford, "is not alone that the buildings are in a 'cheap and nasty' style, but that the disposition of them and of all the grounds and offices about them betrays heedlessness of the requirements of convenience and comfort . . . ."

Olmsted's remarks could have been repeated with stingling validity almost any time during the 1960s and '70s.

"The devastation of the Berkeley campus during the past two decades," wrote San Francisco Chronicle architecture critic Allan Temko in 1965, "when a series of insensitive pseudomunments were strewn haphazardly on one of the finest natural sites in the world, must be counted a major cultural disaster for California and the nation." Thirteen years later, he added, "Since the campus was largely unspoiled in 1945 . . . it has taken just about 30 years for bumbling administrators, meddling regents, an apathetic faculty, and—above all—so-called modern architects to ruin most of the rest."

The Berkeley campus retained most of its rus in urbis features through World War II. But as early as 1931, bulky and insensitive buildings began to take the place of glades and groves. During the war, Ernest O. Lawrence's Radiation Laboratory began to colonize the middle reaches of "The Hill." While the number of students at Berkeley has increased only about 20 percent since the war, the acreage of built space has more than doubled. If the Berkeley ideal remains one of "buildings in a park" (a phrase the present chancellor seems to like), then the "park" is certainly losing ground.

Many of the postwar buildings spread out into the city, leapingfrogging over the supposed boundaries of the campus. Other new buildings filled up the campus edges, creating forbidding concrete walls where once green slopes and domestic-scaled buildings invited visitors into what had become one of the most precious public parks in an increasingly built-up urban area. The engineering precinct and the chemistry-physics complex grew especially dense, treeless, and thick with concrete as Berkeley took the lead in the science-and-technology boom. The middle reaches of the eastern hills filled with the buildings of the Radiation Laboratory—now the mammoth Lawrence Berkeley Lab, a closed research campus of its own. Later, three modern scientific palazzi (the Lawrence Hall of Science, the Space Sciences Laboratory, and now the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute) were built higher up on the ridge, breaking the hilltop skyline. Thirty-eight green wooden barracks were bought from the Navy for $200,000 in 1946-48 and moved onto campus to help accommodate the waves of returning G.I. students. Six of these
"temporary buildings" still squat in the Central Glade. Howard's grand axis to the Golden Gate was blocked at one end by an unusually brutal highrise for mathematics, at the other by an undergraduate library. His formal "Mining Circle" was surrounded by ugly, out-of-scale buildings. Campanile Way, intended as a pedestrian mall leading to the Golden Gate view, was asphalted, driven over, and essentially abandoned. Playing fields were astroturfed. Historic nature areas and glades of trees were allowed to die without replanting, or to grow dense and untrimmed. Surface parking for 3,500 cars in the central cam-

pus filled up formal courtyards, displaced green open space, and offered the "bright, shining glintings of automobiles" (Lawrence Halprin) along every straight or curving road.

The only notable planning success of the modern era (beyond two domestically scaled Wurster projects, all but hidden in the foothill eucalyptus) was DeMars & Ray's competition-winning Student Union complex of 1959-67. By demolishing a block of city shops and apartments and then positioning four new buildings around two spacious urban plazas, the architects moved the center of campus activity south from the Campanile Esplanade of 1914 and Dwinelle Plaza of 1952. In these new plazas thousands of university and Berkeley citizens meet, eat, pass, and pause in the sun (or the fog) every day. As many as five or ten thousand may gather when charismatic speakers and television cameras are present.

DeMars' civilized, sensible Student Union project should have marked a turnaround in thinking about where and how to locate new buildings within a shrinking campus space. But competitive opportunism and insensitive planning went on. Even the better-designed new buildings of recent years appear to have been shoe-horned into their spaces, as if jealous of yielding a single cubic inch to unprofitable open space. The only serious changes came about as a result of uninvited external pressures.

Late in 1975, George Matsumoto was chosen to design a $5 million engineering center, to be named for alumnus Stephen D. Bechtel. Private fund raising was already well under way when a local preservation group learned that the Bechtel Center was to be built on the space under a 1914 brown-shingle building used by the department of naval architecture. The preservationists mounted a flamboyant (and ultimately successful) campaign to "Save Naval Architecture." To the annoyance of Chancellor Albert Bowker, Stephen Bechtel, and the college of engineering, they forced the regents to rescind their approval of the original site; to commission a more elaborate environmental impact report; and eased the old building onto the National Register of Historic Places. Eventually, their efforts led to the selection of a new site (formerly a grassy meadow), and a new, sem-underground design, which includes a popular rooftop terrace cafe.

More significantly, the Bechtel Center controversy led Chancellor Bowker to appoint, in 1978, a campus planning study group under the leadership of Richard Bender, the new dean of the college of environmental design. One of the first projects the group sponsored was a historic and esthetic evaluation of every campus building, which led to the nomination of 11 of them for the National Register: no more surprise attacks from the preservationist lobby. The Bender group also assumed the role of spokesman for the unrepresented, silent campus landscape, by producing a series of guidelines for more civilized future development, as well as specific case studies for building projects already under consideration.

The next step toward more comprehensive and sensitive planning came in 1980 when the Berkeley campus learned that it could expect no more state funds for new building or rehabilitation (despite egregious signs of decay) until it had proven its needs by means of a detailed, building-by-building, university-wide inventory. This gigantic effort took more than a year and yielded a small library of spiral-bound studies. Among them was a sane and visionary report on the campus's landscape and open spaces drafted by a task force led by landscape architect Russell Beatty.

This impressive report, along with several urban design studies produced by Bender's original group, remain the basis for most current decision making, and for discussions still in progress.
or a new set of campus planning guidelines, designed to avoid
and ameliorate the grosser errors of the last 25 years.

None of this is law, yet, or even university policy. The new
goals and principles for future campus planning are not sched-
uled for submission to the regents until June 1986. Meanwhile,
diministrators and planners are being pressured by almost every
deptartment on campus for bigger and better spaces.

Computer science complains that Stanford, MIT, and Car-
egie-Mellon—its major rivals—have far more space per stu-
dent than they do: It will take them 54,000 square feet to catch
up. The business school is unhappy with its ugly highrise of 1964
and wants a new one of 100,000 square feet (to "enhance the
prestige of the school"). Chemical engineering insists on a six-
story building promised 25 years ago.

In a 1982 national survey, all the biological science depart-
ments at Berkeley had slipped out of the front rank. Instant
panic. Already, a $56 million state-of-the-art annex is being
erected for them (MBT Associates, architects), just a few yards
away from the sacred Eucalyptus Grove of 1877. ("The Euca-
lyptus Grove should be preserved," insisted Russ Beatty's land-
From the Lawrence Hall of Science, Berkeley’s main campus stretches below, with domed cyclotron on the grounds of Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, closed to the public, prominent on the left. On the horizon, the skyscrapers of San Francisco.

scape and open space report of 1982. “This will require protection from encroachment by new buildings by imposing a 100-foot setback from the edge of the grove to any excavation.”

These same hungry bio-scientists have been promised another 169,000 square feet of new buildings, atop a two-level parking garage, in the northwest corner of campus. Eventually, they will also get a 60 million renovation of their current headquarters, a neo-Babylonian monstrosity built in 1930.

Everyone agrees that the shabby green war surplus shack must go and Howard’s Central Glade be reclaimed. But then, of course, the university must build a decent new home for all the student services the despised T-buildings contained—preferably in a convenient central location, like... the Central Glade.

Nothing is safe, nothing is secure, nothing is sacred. This is, after all, California. “When push comes to shove,” says campus landscape architect Joanna Kaufmann, “it’s always the trees that go, the open space that goes.” When I asked him about the planned intrusions into Howard’s “inviolable” Central Glade, Donlyn Lyndon, FAIA (professor of architecture at Berkeley and one of the driving forces behind the new planning guidelines) replied, “Inviolable? That’s not an operative word with us any more. We need an alternative way of looking at the glade, a different vision from Howard’s.”

The current chancellor, I. Michael Heyman, an attorney and regional planner by profession, has some priorities and “open spaces” of his own. Like the decision-makers at Yosemite Park, he is dead set against visible cars in the center of his realm—a position not all the faculty share. But he regards the quality of research and teaching at Berkeley as his first responsibility and is still waiting for his fellow planners to convince him that this can be achieved without more and bigger buildings on the central campus.

At present, 500,000 new square feet of building have been officially approved. Eight-hundred thousand more are under serious consideration. One and a half million beyond that have been submitted by various units as their contribution to a campus-wide “wish list” for the next 20 years.

So one hears talk of “extending” the campus boundaries to the south; of developing still other acres the university owns farther out; of putting up student housing (as Howard once planned) on the supposedly unbuildable slopes of the eastern hills; of trying to persuade big-equipment researchers and high-tech entrepreneurs (who deal rarely with students) to move to a satellite campus somewhere else. One hears of many schemes by which Berkeley can stay, or become, Number One, and still preserve the utopian, once-Idyllic, pedestrian-scale parkland that remains at its heart.

Dean Bender, meanwhile, has persuaded the chancellor to accept a new design review board (made up of himself, Lyndon, Claude Stoller, FAIA, and Sam Davis, FAIA, from the Berkeley architecture faculty, along with campus planner William Liskamm, FAIA, and campus architect Gene Metz as ex officio members, and two outside professionals, architect Laura Hartman and landscape architect Chris Degenhardt). In existence for less than a year, this group already appears to be winning a few small but significant victories.

The architect of the new chemical engineering building (Stone Marraccini & Patterson) has agreed to reshape that building to fit its neighbors and to allow for a formally landscaped promenade to the west that was part of Howard’s original plan. Hellmuth Obata & Kassabaum has been persuaded to split its big new genetics building in two to preserve pathways, views, and scale. At the image-conscious business school, a new dean has been persuaded to accept rehousing in picturesque Cowell Hospital, Arthur Brown’s sprawling 1930 tile-roofed infirmary, instead of
Demolishing a row of pleasant old houses and fraternities for a new 10-story block.

Perhaps the greatest gap between the ideals of the founders of the university and those who manage its affairs today is the change it has undergone from being primarily an institution offering four years of higher education to gifted young people to being primarily a conglomeration of research facilities, to which students, graduate and undergraduate, are sometimes seen as peripheral.

Most of the justifications that have been brought forward for the campus as Utopia" (in Lawrence Halprin's phrase) are based on the educational benefits of a tranquil, separate, and civilized environment, which offers an image of humaneness and order to impressionable young people.

The more a university thinks of itself as an international class research organization, competing for geniuses and grants, for publications, productivity, and prestige with other universities (as well as national libraries and industrial laboratories) around the world; as a dynamic urban enterprise dominated by Big Science and High Technology, rather than an educational complex with the humanities at its heart—the less winding creeks, rolling lawns, and ancient trees may seem to matter.
Solarcool. After 12 Years

Since PPG introduced Solarcool 15 years ago, it's been a favorite of architects, builders and owners. Because it's durable: in proper storage, there's no limit to its shelf life, and it keeps its great look for years and years after application. So it retains its value for long-term rentability.

Architects like the way Solarcool...
Robertson and Eisenman:
We Are an Odd Couple

Editor's note: The following interview of Peter Eisenman, FAIA, and Jaquelin Robertson, FAIA, is an abridged excerpt from Barbaralee Diamonstein's American Architecture Now II, published by Rizzoli (25). ©Barbaralee Diamonstein.

Fifteen years ago the collaboration of architects Peter Eisenman and Jaquelin Robertson would have been highly unlikely. In the 1960s, Jaque Robertson, an urban designer and planner, was often referred to as Mayor Lindsay's "Golden Boy," while Peter Eisenman was a favorite of architecture's avant-garde, one of its premier spokesmen and the designer-in-theory—of buildings. Currently they are partners in Design Development resources, working together to create buildings that are visually distinctive as well as responsive to community needs.

LD: Now the two of you are partners. Considering your past experience, what changes to make your recent collaboration desirable or even possible?
R: We are older.
E: And we've grown up.
R: Also, we've identified important situations that we can probably handle better together than singly.
E: When Jaque and I were working separately, we were working primarily in the public domain, working for planning commissions, developers, institutions. We were never ready to put our own names on something. We did not want to do it in the traditional manner of the individual architect, the mythic architectural figure, the Howard Roark figure. We wanted to be identified individually but also have our collaboration.
LD: Are you an odd couple, or do you balance each other well?
R: We are an odd couple—perhaps therefore a good balance!
LD: What does that mean?
R: Peter and I do share a fundamental interest in institutions and in the structure of society, as well as certain formal attitudes about the importance of architecture as a vehicle for describing in physical terms ideas about society and about how men and women might live together.
LD: How did the two of you meet?

Jr: We have known each other since we met in Cambridge, England, in 1961. I was working for Sir Leslie Martin on my first job out of architecture school, and Peter was getting his Ph.D. in architecture at Cambridge. We were two Yanks abroad and we became close friends.

Pe: One of the significant points of our interaction came out of the Five Architects book. The New York Five wasn't really a group, but the book was an interesting project, anyway. Jaque wrote a response to it, as part of an article in Architectural Forum called "Five on Five." We had often met and talked when he was with the Urban Design Group and I was at the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies. In fact, the institute's first commission was given to us by Jaque when he was at the Urban Design Group. It was a design opportunity study in the Kingsbridge Heights/Jerome Park area of the Bronx. Jaque and I have always had a mutual respect. In fact, Jaque is one of the few people I have always been able to talk to about architecture. Even though we never agreed, we agreed to disagree. He is still a very important catalyst, critic, corrector, and refiner for my ideas. I think we are a very interesting couple. We work symbolically and are probably one of the few partnerships in which there are two equally strong designers, two equally strong thinkers—neither of us takes a back seat to the other. We also have two very strong egos, and that's sometimes difficult for both of us. It probably wouldn't have worked if we hadn't already had gray hair.

Bld: In 1967 you both were involved in a symposium at the Museum of Modern Art at the time of an exhibition called "Forty Under Forty." Can you tell us about the exhibition and why it was a catalyst in your relationship?
Pe: That exhibition took place in 1967, but it is important to go back to 1964, when Jaque and I were part of a group of young architects called CASE, Conference of Architects for the Study of Environment. Probably every leading architect of our generation in this country was at one time or another involved in that group. We were all young and wet behind the ears. We would meet in the country with no publicity and talk about architecture. It was one of the first such groups formed in this country.

Bld: Who was involved?
At various times the group included Bob Venturi, Richard Meier, Michael Graves, Tim Vreeland, Charles Moore, Mike McKinnell, Vincent Scully, and Colin Rowe. That group honed our capacity to criticize one another. We had nothing to lose. There was no camera on us. Nobody knew we were doing it. It wasn't only for the initiated; it wasn't an "in" group. We were doing it because we wanted to get together. When Arthur Drexler had the idea for a show at the Museum of Modern Art featuring young architects involved in urban problems, he did not know how many young architects actually were interested in urban problems. At the time, Michael Graves and I were designing a city stretching between New York and Philadelphia. That's the kind of craziness that was going on in 1965. Jaque, along with Richard Weinstein, Jonathan Barnett, and Gio Passanella, was involved in urban issues in New York and was getting involved with John Lindsay's campaign. Arthur Drexler's idea was to do an exhibition to show that young architects were involved in the city. That is how it started.

The museum show was a kind of origin in both Peter's and my separate careers. Peter and Michael did quite an elegant, highly theoretical scheme for the river, and Jonathan, Richard, Gio, and I did what we thought was a nuts and bolts, hard-hitting, practical solution to deck the Park Avenue railroad track with replacement housing. We were concerned with the Urban Design Group was a unique institution and public agency, while the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies was a unique quasi-academic institution of advanced studies in architecture. Neither existed before and both have had spin-offs.

Peter was trying to bring theory and ideas back into the practice of architecture. In looking at each other's work over the years, we've carried on a constant critique and dialogue.

At the University of Virginia, we emphasize the idea of the architect as someone who understands the world by providing students with a strong liberal-arts base. The architect must first of his time, then an architect; architecture must always be in the service of life, not the other way around.

Blurred: Jaque, you have been dean of the University of Virginia school of architecture since 1980. What educational approach do you encourage in that role?

JR: As an architect you really have to understand how the world works, not just the technical craft of architecture, or you're not very useful as an architect. You certainly have to understand, for example, what cities are about.

PE: There's a danger in getting students too late, which I think is a real problem with graduate schools. Students that have studied English literature or philosophy have minds and egos that are very well developed. It is difficult to break down that kind of thinking, to get them to give up the ego structure that they have spent four years forming, to think in a totally different way. That is a real problem.

JR: It's a problem, but the other extreme is equally difficult. Technocrats who only know how to put things together and can't think a problem through can be hopeless as students.

BLLD: How are you influenced by your students or by newcomers to the field?

PE: Both of us think of ourselves as architects first, educators second. I teach because I find great stimulation in asking and learning how to ask questions. Teaching students is a good way to focus questions. Learning is about asking questions, and you cannot do that if you are cut off from the vitality that students represent.

BLLD: Both of you have led very com-

Project to deck over New York's Park Avenue railroad tracks by Robertson et al.

relocation and how much it would cost, trying to show that a "practical" solution could be achieved. At the end of that show, Peter and I were talking one day over a cup of coffee and Peter said, "Listen, why don't you join me? I'm going to start an institute." And I said, "Peter, why don't you join me? We're putting together a group that will work for the city on practical problems." We went out and set up these two new institutions that were really examining some of the same issues but from very different perspectives. We were very pragmatic and obsessed with trying to understand how the world worked.

PE: Both of us were also interested in the notion of creating institutions. The things you have to teach, but these ideas change all the time. The particular architectures and buildings that are considered important change in cycles that can be documented.

BLLD: And what was your commitment and that of the Institute?

PE: The students at the Institute were basically from liberal-arts institutions. We were not concerned with the training of professionals. We were interested in taking young people before they had a commitment to anything and exposing them to a way of thinking visually. There is verbal thinking and there is visual thinking, and if you want to be an architect, you've got to think visually. We also were trying to expose them to the community at large—to the professional architectural community and to the city, where architecture is. I would like to think that the Institute was very effective in this dual role in the '70s.

JR: That is one of those areas of interest we share. At the University of Virginia we emphasize the idea of the architect as someone who understands the world by providing students with a strong liberal-arts base. The architect must first of his time, then an architect; architecture must always be in the service of life, not the other way around.

BLLD: Jaque, you have been dean of the University of Virginia school of architecture since 1980. What educational approach do you encourage in that role?

JR: As an architect you really have to understand how the world works, not just the technical craft of architecture, or you're not very useful as an architect. You certainly have to understand, for example, what cities are about.

PE: There's a danger in getting students too late, which I think is a real problem with graduate schools. Students that have studied English literature or philosophy have minds and egos that are very well developed. It is difficult to break down that kind of thinking, to get them to give up the ego structure that they have spent four years forming, to think in a totally different way. That is a real problem.

JR: It's a problem, but the other extreme is equally difficult. Technocrats who only know how to put things together and can't think a problem through can be hopeless as students.

BLLD: How are you influenced by your students or by newcomers to the field?

PE: Both of us think of ourselves as architects first, educators second. I teach because I find great stimulation in asking and learning how to ask questions. Teaching students is a good way to focus questions. Learning is about asking questions, and you cannot do that if you are cut off from the vitality that students represent.

BLLD: Both of you have led very com-
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ex and rich lives. Jaque, you spent an
tart of your childhood in China, event-
ually became a Rhodes scholar, then lived
in the Middle East. But you say—at least
once you’ve been back there—that you‘re
really a Virginian. How has being
there influenced your ideas? Did
the architect/critic/historian/statesman/
former Thomas Jefferson particularly influ-
ence you? What can Jefferson’s work teach
today’s architect?
R: How to concentrate on essential issues.
That’s important in architecture is to find
and clarify the significant relationship be-
 tween people and then try to build it.
The University of Virginia is the clearest
example in the United States of ideas
about how men and women live together
translated into physical form. It’s an abso-
lutely modern complex; it has nothing to
do with nostalgia. The University of Vir-
ginia—he called it his “academic village”
is one of the three best urban environ-
ments in the United States. In fact, the
est or most sensible urban plans in Amer-
cas are in this Jefferson village, in Wil-
liamsburg, Savannah, and some of the New
England villages like Edgartown or East
hampton. So I look at Charlottesville as a
generic type of American urbanism,
though it is indeed in a beautiful natural
setting.
E: Jefferson’s design for the University
of Virginia is one of the least understood
pieces of architecture in the country.
There’s no question it has nothing to do
with romantic nostalgia or pastoral seren-
ty. I was knocked out by it when I went
here. I was overwhelmed by it. People
look at it too quickly and say, “Oh, that’s
old buildings.”
P: “That’s Georgian” or “that’s Palladian”
or “that’s neo-classical.” They don’t ac-
tually see anything. It is like reading
James Joyce very literally and saying,
“Those words do not make any sense to
me.” An architect has to look very care-
fully. You must observe what he has to
draw again and again. It’s a dedication
that very few of us in this media-hype
society have.
BLDD: Most people think of Virginia as
the mother of presidents, and you, Jaque,
have referred to it as the mother of archi-
itecture. What prompts that attitude?
JR: It’s the mother of presidents and of
architects. It’s the oldest colony and prob-
ably has the best inventory of buildings,
gardens, and landscape conceived togeth-
er in the United States. It has a long tradi-
tion of people interested in architecture.
There’s no real interest in painting in Vir-
ginia, but there’s an enormous interest in
architecture. Architecture is the state’s
mother art. Jefferson said that you should
use architecture in a young republic as a
way to teach people about the arts, be-
cause there are never enough paintings
in a young country. Architecture was thus
the mother of art with which to teach
people about their own and other cul-
tures and about the arts in general.
Because they were so closely related to
architecture, furniture and the decorative
arts—how you fitted out architecture—also
became important.
BLDD: Does that interest persist in
Virginia?
JR: I think it does. Virginia is very con-
servative and architecture is very conser-
ervative. So the two are now perhaps get-
ing back in sync.
BLDD: Are you still thought of as maver-
icks or are your ideas more widely ac-
cepted today?
JR: We’re older, so I think we’re proba-
ably less maverick-like than before.
P: I think we are thought of as “estab-
lishment,” unfortunately.
JR: No. We haven’t built enough. You
cannot be “establishment” until you build
a lot and people get tired of it, and they
start looking for something else.
BLDD: If each of you had your lives to
live over again, what, if anything, would
you do differently?
JR: I would have had the Shah of Iran,
my client [for Teheran’s capital center],
stay in power for 20 years so he could
build my city.
P: I was hoping you would say you
wouldn’t have gone to Iran!
BLDD: What would you say for yourself?
P: I guess I would have tried to grow
up sooner.
JR: Start building sooner?
P: Yes, and take responsibility for my
actions.
BLDD: An architect, especially one who
is a teacher, must be able to look to the
future as well as at his own time. What
do the coming years hold?
JR: My answer will probably be different
from Peter’s. The future is not very inter-
esting to me in that you can’t learn any-
thing from it because you haven’t been
there. I’m interested in architects who
attempt to solve today’s problems in the
most elegant and practical way possible.
I have almost no interest in futurology.
If I were to project trends, though, the
one that is most terrifying to me is the
proliferation of Mexico Cities, a destruc-
tive mode of building that this culture is
addicted to and that is killing our world.
BLDD: Peter, what do you see for the
future? What would you like to be doing
10 years from now?
P: My concern is to find an architecture
today. I’m not interested in futurology
either. I could do two or three projects
that I knew were architecture and that
would cause one of my colleagues—Jaque
would probably be the one whose opinion
I would respect most—to say, “That’s a
piece of architecture.” I would be very
happy.
Books continued on page 88
The Production of Houses. Christopher Alexander. (Oxford University Press, $39.95.)

This completes a five-volume series that presents Christopher Alexander’s ideas on how the built environment can be designed in a way that reflects the values, visions, and idiosyncrasies of those who will inhabit or work in it. The first two volumes—The Timeless Way of Building and A Pattern Language—laid the theoretical foundation of designing and building with “patterns”—those configurations and qualities of space, light, materials, color, texture, and structure that are part of our culture, intelligible to us at a very basic level. Alexander believes that the client’s manipulation of patterns removes architecture from the cerebral gyrations of academic architects and puts it back into the control of the layman. The last three volumes, The Oregon Experiment, The Linz Cafe, and this one, document projects completed under Alexander’s direction according to his theories.

The Production of Houses presents an alternative to mass housing, which is designed and built without the imprint of those who will dwell there. Alexander’s critique of how industrialized countries house their masses probes beneath the surface of housing design. He is interested, as was John Habraken 15 years ago in Supports, in the forces that bring these human shelters into being—the methods of production that, he argues, taint its products with a quality that persists long after the paint is dry and the mortgage paid off.

He describes his intent vividly when he writes: “We have tried to construct a housing process in which human feeling and human dignity come first; in which the housing process is re-established as the fundamental human process in which people integrate their values and themselves, in which they form social bonds, in which they become anchored to the earth, in which the houses which are made have, above all, human worth, in the simple, old-fashioned sense that people feel proud and happy to be living in them and would not give them up for anything, because they are their houses, because they are the product of their lives, because the house is everything to them, the concrete expression of their place in the world, the concrete expression of themselves.”

He believes that these human qualities cannot be expressed in tract houses or apartments merely by ‘improving their design,’ so long as the underlying systems of production which create them remain unchanged.”

A new system of production, which Alexander believes preserves these qualities, is offered to us in “The Mexicali Project” a housing community for five families in a Mexican town, the design and construction of which in 1976 was guided by Alexander and three colleagues—Howard Davis, Julio Martinez, and Don Corner.

Alexander addresses the issue of control—who makes the decisions that shape the dwelling. “Most of the processes which govern the shape of houses and their parts,” he writes, “are controlled at levels of government, or levels of industry, or levels of business, which are remote from the minute particulars of the house and the family itself . . . .”

Alexander outlines a new system of production, this one based on seven principles, each of which attempts to place control back into the hands of those who will live in the houses. Each principle is presented and then discussed in the context of the Mexicali project.

The first principle is that of the architect-builder, a contemporary version of the master builder who aids the family with the design and construction of its house. The architect-builder would be responsible for no more than 20 houses per year. This allows design decisions to be made house by house and even during construction. “It rules out,” writes Alexander, “any attempt to make these decisions abstractly, for 50 houses at a time, on a drawing.”

This decentralized method of design and construction is supported by the “builder’s yard,” the system’s second principle. Each yard contains tools, equipment, materials, and offices for building houses in the area. Alexander sees these yards as quasi community centers where homeowners can continue to get design and construction assistance for additions and alterations.

The collective design of common land is the third principle, and it allows the members of the community to plan the spaces between their houses and to control their use. In this way, Alexander believes, these common parcels (which are usually no one’s particular responsibility) will be maintained collectively for the benefit of the community.

The fourth principle is one of a pattern language used to guide design of the individual houses. In the absence of a commonly held body of design knowledge, Alexander believes a pattern language articulated by the architect is essential. “When a culture is broken apart and the people of that culture have no living pattern language, then no amount of self-help or self-design will give them the knowledge they need to build a house wisely for themselves.”

Although Alexander espouses the
 governo's control of the design process, he so supports the architect's "right" to make up the design rules and govern their enforcement. At times Alexander's design suggestions seem to carry the weight of evitability. In the Mexicali project, all the families wanted an extra bedroom other than a porch, suggested by Alexander. In determining construction costs, tacked on the porches as "overhead," that the families got it anyway, whether they wanted it or not. So much for control.

Principle five is step-by-step construction, a system of standardized operations—of materials or dimensions—which allow or individual variations from house to house without, Alexander claims, added cost. Each operation, such as laying out takes, pouring the slab, or installing door 'ames, is intended to be complete in itself and can be adjusted to a certain extent to make changes in the design as it unfolds on the building site. The system of operations for constructing the Mexicali project are given in great detail.

Controlling costs, the sixth principle, is achieved by assigning each operation a unit value, a cost per unit, number of units in a dwelling, and the percentage of each unit's cost in the entire cost of a house. The system is applied to both materials and labor, and can then be easily adjusted by the family to meet its resources.

The final, and perhaps most important principle, is "the human rhythm of the process." Alexander writes of the involvement of the families in constructing the Mexicali project, of their breaks in the hot summer sun, of celebrations following the completion of work. He ties his system of production to the rhythm of human life, not the lockstep of mechanical production. "The building process," he writes, "becomes a record of achievement, a human struggle to be remembered, a memory, a moment of life, which will remain in the houses, once occupied, a process which will continue, in the years that follow, in the slow improvement, growth, and maintenance of the same houses. . . ."

The book is less satisfying as it draws to a close. Here, Alexander writes of using his method for the large-scale production of houses in the U.S. and becomes mired in numbers, how the present system would need to be replaced, adjustments necessary in the housing industry, regulatory bodies, and the architectural profession. But the Mexicali project was a success to a great extent because it was exempt from much regulation, it received government support, it took place in a third world context, and it encompassed only five houses. Alexander's original plan was to build 30 houses, but after the first five the government withdrew its support. Even with

the sweeping changes necessary in this country to make Alexander's system work, he estimates that a builder's yard could construct 15 houses every six months "providing that each family provide two able-bodied people for four hours per day each. . . ." Good luck.

Alexander credits resistance to these scenarios and the withdrawn support of the Mexican government to the threat his system poses to the status quo. It may also be that the possibility of overturning the way housing is constructed in America today to accommodate his unique vision is pretty slim.

Still, his approach might be grafted onto the current activity of owner-builders in the U.S. today who, with little or no help from the housing industry, the government, or the architectural profession (and in a fairly disorganized way), managed to design and construct 168,000 single-family houses last year and renovate and remodel millions more.

There is no doubt that the ground is fertile for Alexander's ideas to take root among these owner-builders. Perhaps the real value of The Production of Houses will be in its ability to tap into the creative energy already evident among those who wish to shelter themselves.

MICHAEL J. CROSBIE
The Institute from page 22

follow-up care never materialized in great numbers.
- the transformation of an industrial economy to a high-tech one and the resulting unemployment of industrial workers, the so-called “new poor” whose job skills are no longer useful.
- a sharp decline in government assistance to the poor, coupled with a decrease in federal housing assistance.

The most widely accepted approach to housing the homeless is a three tier system. The first tier consists of emergency shelters, for which Levenson offered the following as basic requirements: “a daytime drop-in facility and overnight sleeping accommodations that are welcoming, easily accessible, and undemanding; that offer facilities for personal hygiene and health; and that have some kind of privacy, a sense of dignity and amenities such as a kitchen, infirmary, and laundry facilities.”

The second tier is transitional accommodations, which is the intermediate step from homelessness to long-term housing. Transitional and long-term housing can take various forms, from supervised group houses to individual apartments.

Most, if not all, of the examples of successful shelters at the conference were achieved by a coalition of many players—nonprofit groups, architects, psychiatrists, service providers, religious organizations, with money or materials donated by the private sector or charitable organizations or money secured from local and state governments. The government agencies most often provide grants or low-interest loans to nonprofit organizations. Some cities and states offer to shelter groups for as little as $1 in properties that have been secured by default.

Meanwhile, there has been only minimal response from the federal government. In fact, under the Reagan Administration the construction of new public housing has come to a halt and federal housing assistance has all but disappeared. “There has been no more radical shift in public policy in this country over the past five years than the shift in federal responsibility to help create housing for poor people,” Hayes maintained. Said Rep. Bruce Vento (D-Minn.), “The federal government has ignored its responsibility to house the homeless. . . . It has relied upon the efforts of churches, private charities, volunteers, and ad-hoc efforts of local governments to shelter the homeless. These efforts have brought millions of nights of shelter to the homeless Americans, but they suffer from the absence of a national policy that could assist providers of shelter.”

Efforts in Congress to appropriate funding for housing the homeless have had only minimal success. Over a three-year period, Congress has only appropriated $280 million for emergency housing and food provisions, an amount that will have questionable impact considering that New York City alone will probably have spent around $217 million by the end of ’85. Provisions in the HUD appropriations bill now in the Congress call for up to $216 million for the next three years.

In the short term it seems highly unlikely that more dollars will be coming from the federal government. “I’m not here to tell you that we have a major program. We don’t,” said Dr. Harvey Vieth, director of the Federal Interagency Task Force on Homelessness. “I’m not here to tell you that the federal government is going to create a new program because I don’t think in this [budget cutting] atmosphere that is going to happen,” he added.

That brings us back to the importance of individuals joining in a coalition. “There is a role for the architect, together with the service provider, the service operator, the municipality, the government groups in building a coalition to stop this epidemic,” Philips said. The most basic task for architects is determining whether a group’s rehab or construction plans are economically and technically feasible.
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4. Insulation with the highest (R) resistance factor
5. No gaps or voids inside the slab
6. Two faces of galvanized steel to protect the insulation

DEAN
College of Architecture and Urban Planning

You are invited to submit nominations and applications for the position of Dean of the College of Architecture and Urban Planning

Programs include an undergraduate degree in architecture and masters degrees in architecture and urban planning. A doctoral degree in architecture is offered, along with a research and service program through the Architecture and Planning Research Laboratory.

The Dean, who reports to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, is the College’s chief administrative and academic officer. Compensation will be commensurate with this level of responsibility.

In keeping with the University’s commitment to affirmative action, we strongly encourage nominations and applications from women and minorities.

Nominations and applications will be reviewed on an ongoing basis from December 1, 1985 to March 1, 1986.

Correspondence should be addressed to: Professor Colin Clipson, Chair, Dean Search Committee, College of Architecture and Urban Planning, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109.

The University of Michigan
A non-discriminatory, affirmative action employer
Perhaps the reason architects should be involved was best articulated by \textit{de}enson: "In city after city, the homeless are gathered in the streets, bused to gymnasiaums, armories, and church basements for a night's sleep in spaces jammed with cots. In the morning they return to the streets to wander in search of warmth, food, or a public bathroom until evening comes again. It is now clear that the homeless population is rapidly growing and that long-term housing solutions will not come next winter or the winters that will soon follow. But quality shelter must be provided. Who more than architects should be concerned and involved in creation of shelter?" \textsc{Nora Richter Greer}

\textbf{Awards}

\textbf{Prestressed Concrete Institute Recognizes Nine Buildings}

Nine buildings and three bridges were cited by the Prestressed Concrete Institute in its 1985 awards program that recognizes "achievements in esthetic expression, function, and economy using precast prestressed concrete."

The winning buildings are:

- IBM Field Engineering and Training Center in Atlanta by Cooper Carry & Associates of Atlanta;
- Broward County Main Library in Fort Lauderdale, Fla., by Gajte Papachristou Smith of New York City and Miller & Meier & Associates of Fort Lauderdale;
- Consolidated Edison 49th Street substation in New York City by Beyer Blinder Belle;
- Whitehead Institute in Cambridge, Mass., by Goody Clancy & Associates of Boston;
- Denver Technological Center parking garage in Englewood, Colo., by C. W. Fentress & Associates of Denver;
- Robert L. Millender Center in Detroit by Ehrenkranz Group in New York City;
- Angeles Plaza in Los Angeles by Dworsky Associates of Los Angeles;
- TransAlta Utilities Corporation in Calgary, Alberta, by J. H. Cook Architects & Engineers of Calgary;
- The Montreal Convention Center by the team of Victor Prus; LeMoyn & Associates; Labelle, Marchand, Geoffroy; and Herbert & Lalonde of Montreal.

The three winning bridges were the Marta Rapid Transit Bridges in Atlanta; East Huntington Bridge over the Ohio River; and the S-1369/Wataga River bridge in Washington County, Tenn.

The jury was comprised of R. Bruce Patty, FAIA (chairman); Gerald Horn, FAIA; Canadian architect Brian E. Eldred; and engineers Wayne Henneberger and Richard W. Karr.

\textbf{DEATHS}

Thornton M. Abell, FAIA, Santa Monica, Calif.
F. H. Baden, AIA, S. Lake Tahoe, Calif.
Joseph Blumenkran, FAIA, Cranbury, N.J.
Thomas D. Broad, FAIA, Dallas
Bill D. Burns, AIA, Lubbock, Tex.
J. W. Byers, FAIA, Santa Monica, Calif.
G. W. Courtley, FAIA, Sunnyvale, Calif.
A. R. Curry, AIA, Kansas City, Mo.
J. E. Decell III, AIA, Yazoo City, Miss.
E. T. Dunlap, FAIA, Bethesda, Md.
Peter Ficker, FAIA, Pomona, Calif.
E. M. Fuller, FAIA, Kansas City, Mo.
T. Gulbrand, FAIA, Tarzana, Calif.
F. Herding, FAIA, Los Angeles
J. B. Holliday, AIA, Sarasota, Fla.
Arthur D. Kline, AIA, Seffner, Fla.
R. B. Kurzon, FAIA, Beverly Hills, Calif.
John A. Massman, FAIA, Dunnington, Fla.
E. H. McDowell, FAIA, St. Thomas, V.I.
I. M. Mykolyk, AIA, Perkinston, Miss.
Wallace Neff, FAIA, Pasadena, Calif.
J. Normile, FAIA, Des Moines, Iowa
M. B. Parker, AIA, Fort Worth, Tex.
J. W. Pickett, FAIA, Vienna, Va.
William F. Poole, AIA, Bloomfield, N.J.
Raymond A. Ruge, FAIA, Cornwall-on-Hudson, N.Y.
A. W. Schlicting, AIA, Allentown, Pa.
Philip T. Shutze, FAIA, Atlanta
J. E. Stanton, FAIA, St. Helena, Calif. □
Furnishings

As resources for design and objects of design.

By Nora Richter Greer

Koch + Lowy's Mirage Tables (1) have tabletops of ribbon-honed slate or frosted glass. Available in square, round, or rectangular shapes of varying sizes, the tabletops are supported by cylindrical legs that from some angles appear delicate and thin and from others bulky and assertive. The legs are made of aluminum covered with black or gray Nextel suede. From the Pace Collection Inc. are two transparent beauties: the Vetrina Err vitrine (2) and the Nastro coffee table (3). The oval-shaped vitrine is made entirely of glass except for the black lacquer top, base, and connecting support beams. Available in several sizes, the coffee table's round glass top reveals a gently curving, tripodal glass base. Both the cabinet and the coffee table are imported from Fiam of Italy. The Dream mirror (4) indulges a rainy day fantasy. Manufactured by the Italian firm Morphos, the mirror is shaped like a cloud and has silver dots silkscreened over either a blue tinted or a silver mirror. (The mirrors in the illustration above reflect miniature silvery planes.) Designer Pier
Giuseppe Ramella meant the regularly patterned dots to appear like rain drops as one looks upward toward the clouds in the sky. Another exploration in whimsy is Morphos' Araldo (5) bookshelf. In a style reminiscent of Aldo Rossi, the shelving system is a play upon bold geometric forms. Five semicircular shelves are set into a rectangular back and spine and are arranged in a pyramidal shape with the largest shelf (93 centimeters diameter) at the bottom and the smallest (61 centimeters) at the top. A triangular piece acts as a pediment. The unit is two-toned lacquered wood, and two units can be placed side by side to create a circular configuration. IPE's Collage sofas (6) are a study in versatility. Manufactured in Rome, the sofas come in four sizes (105, 140, 175, and 240 centimeters). There is a corner piece (90x90 centimeters), a table (90x90 centimeters), and triangular-shaped arm pieces that simply slip under the seat cover. In addition to the armrest, the sofa has four other cushions, which when combined wrap around the steel frame.
public housing, Melbourne, Australia Sep 120;
Quodrupod house, Australia Jr 80; Ronald
McDonald house, Charleston, S.C. May 84;
Tidewater house, Delaware May 268; vacation
house, Captiva Island, Fla. Jy 72; Woodbury
Place, Woodbury, Conn. Jy 82; Yerba Buena
Plaza Annex, San Francisco Jy 49

*Source Directory* Apr 95

Tieńtan, Jr. Aug 27

Rhode Island School of Design. Aug 54

io Grande Valley, N.M. Duncan House. Jy 68

loche, Kevin, John Dinkelo & Associates. Feb
60; May 51

logers, Richard. Mar 17

loosevct, N.J. senior citizen housing May 290

towe, Colin. Mar 22

lye, N.Y. General Foods corporate headquarters
Feb 66

1984 Group. Dec 60

iaarinen, Eiel. Oct 32

iacopoulos, Christos A.: [bk rev] Oct 84

iafie, Moshe. Sep 54

it. Mary's, Ga. city hall Oct 72

it. Meinard, Ind. monastery May 234

it. Paul, Minn. Leonard Nataratorium, Macalester
College, Feb 80; Ordway Music Center May 189

san Antonio, Tex. Ferguson's Map and Travel
Store Jan 50; InterFirst Plaza Feb 57; Saint
Paul Square Apr 68

san Diego. Horton Plaza Nov 16

san Francisco. advertising agency offices Jan 75;
Citicorp Center Mar 136; law firm offices Jan
78; Mei Lan housing Jy 54; Primate
Discovery Center, San Francisco Zoo Je 42;
Yerba Buena Plaza Annex housing Jy 49; Mar
issue

Sanibel Island, Fla. city hall May 224

Santa Clara, Calif. The Thomas E. Leavey Activ-
ities Center/Harold L. Tosco Pavilion, University
of Santa Clara Mar 128

Santa Monica, Calif. Pacific Townhouses May 294

Scranon, Pa. Marywood College Apr 70

Seashore development. California Je 76; South-
east Je 70

Seattle. Pike Place Market May 274

Sedgley, Harry. Sep 120

Serra, Richard. Tilted Arc Jy 11; Oct 16

Sert, Josep Lluis. Apr 88

Shepherd, Sir Peter: [bk rev] May 328

Simon, Cathy: May 242

Simon, Mark: May 240

Skidmore, Owings & Merrill. Jy 54; Feb 56; May
298; Nov 46, 64

Solar energy. AIA testimony May 83

Solfsburg, Roy J. Jy 72

Spriggs Group. Oct 72

Spring, Bernard P.: Evaluation: *Well Used
Pathway.* Apr 88

Stafford, James G. May 294

Stern, Robert A. M. May 262

Stewart Corporation. May 224

Stirling, James. Sep 94

Stores. Ferguson's Map and Travel Store, San
Antonio, Tex. Jan 50; Limm, San Francisco
Mar 138

Stuart Island, Wash. school May 198

Stufl & Lee. Apr 65

Sweden. Parliament building renovation Sep 117;
Volvo Corporate Headquarters May 282

T

Taboroff, June: *Island of Ebbullient Classicism.*
Dec 40

Tacoma, Wash. Weyerhaeuser Technology Cen-
ter May 298

Tjad Architects. May 210

Taylor & Williams. Jy 62

Television, public architecture series Nov 20

Thompson, Benjamin, & Associates. May 188

Thomson, J. W. Sep 126

Trott & Bean Architects. May 221; Aug 79

Tulsa, Okla. Mid-Continental Tower Oct 15

U

Uglen, Zlatko. Sep 145

Underground architecture. Scheininger Clinic,
Jacksonville, Fla. Aug 74

Ungers, Oswald Mathias. Sep 102

United States Commission of Fine Arts. May 99

University of California, Berkeley. campus archi-
teecture Dec 72; college of environmental design
Aug 38

University of Illinois. school of architecture Aug
46

University of Pennsylvania. department of archi-
teecture Aug 64

University of Texas. school of architecture Aug
59

University of Virginia. architectural heritage Dec
62; building restoration Jan 37

Urban design. developing nations Jan 26

Uxbridge, Mass. Crown & Eagle Mill Apartments
Oct 74

V

Vancouver, British Columbia. EXPO '86 Sep 19

Venturi, Rauch & Scott Brown. Feb 70; May 226;
Oct 54

Villecco, Marguerite: *The Renewed Importance
of the Public Realm.* Dec 46; Rhode Island
School of Design: *Architecture as Criticism.*
Aug 54

Von Eckardt, Wolf: [bk rev] Sep 154

Voorsanger & Mills. Jan 73

W

Wagner, Gary. Oct 70

Walker, Roger. Sep 119

Walker, J. Jackson. May 82

Washington, D.C. Intelsat headquarters, Nov 68;
Jefferson Court, Georgetown Nov 64; Old
Executive Office Building Apr 80

Watanabe, Hiroshi: *Brooding, Domed Museum
in a Sea of Marshland.* Sep 132; Small Apart-
ment Building with the Profile of a City: Sep
135; Steel-Cored Bank Tower Gives the City a
Needed Landmark. Sep 74

Waterbury, Conn. Centre Village Jy 83; Woodbury
Place Jy 82

Weese Hickey Weese. Jan 45

Weingarten, David. May 312

West Germany. German architecture museums,
Frankfurt Sep 102; Staatsgalerie, Stuttgart
Sep 94

Westwork Architects. Jy 68

Whitney Museum of Modern Art. Aug 11, Sep
48, Oct 18, Nov 24

Wilson, Richard Guy: [bk rev] Feb 163, Apr 106

Wolfe, Tom. Jy 27

Woo & Williams. Sep 54

Woodbury, Conn. Woodbury Place Condomini-
ums Jy 82

Woolen, Molzan & Partners. May 234

World Architecture Annual 1985. Sep issue

Wright, Bruce N.: *School Changes as It Steps
Down Its Hillside Site.* Sep 82

Wright, Frank Lloyd. Tatesien West May 51

Y

Yugoslavia. Ferodectro Motel Sep 145

Z

Zion & Breen. Dec 54

Zoos. Primate Discovery Center, San Francisco
May 42; Treehouse, Philadelphia Zoo Oct 54
Before you specify a product, specify a directory: MASTERGUIDE.

MASTERGUIDE™ is exactly what you need, a complete specifying and buying directory for architects, contractors, engineers, and spec writers. It's the only comprehensive directory that you can keep on your desk—right where a directory belongs.

Over 70,000 suppliers are included in an easy-to-use format, organized in the 16 standard divisions of CSI's MASTERFORMAT. And with a directory that's so complete, those hard-to-find suppliers are suddenly at your fingertips.

MASTERGUIDE is published in five regional editions so that wherever you work—from Maine to California—you have an extensive listing of nearby sources.

This is the directory designed by working professionals for working professionals. Because you need quick, up-to-date, and accurate product information, you need MASTERGUIDE. It's as simple to order as it is to use: just pick up the phone and call 1-800-874-7717, ext. 68; in California, call 1-800-831-6900, ext. 68.

MASTERGUIDE™
The Official Specifying and Buying Directory of The American Institute of Architects

Get What You Need, When You Need It.

Circle 26 on information card
Products

A selection of notable offerings and applications.

By Lynn Nesmith

Kite Lites (1) by MAWA Design are wall-mounted triangular lighting fixtures with molded acrylic shades in red, blue, yellow, black, white, or gray and matching spiral cords. The lamps measure 10 inches wide and 11 inches high and project 5.5 inches from the wall. (Circle 201 on information card.)

Bright yellow directional bidet (2) is part of the Epic Colours collection of bath and kitchen accessories. The fixtures are made of solid brass with an acrylic finish in red, white, brown, almond, and gray. Faucets are hand-assembled with a Delta ceramic valve. (Circle 202.)

The Stratus office furniture system (3) by Norman Cherner for Modern Mode consists of interchangeable panels in three heights and work surfaces, cabinet, and storage units. The 32.5-inch-high base panel is used with stackable components and glazed and open panels to create individualized work stations. All panels are available either straight or curved, in lengths from 24 to 72 inches. The system comes in 15 color lacquered and 14 natural wood finishes. (Circle 203.)

Products continued on page 100
Surfacing Material.
ARP surfacing material has the properties of conventional laminates and includes a very thin deposit of microscopic particles of aluminum oxide bonded to the melamine layer to provide resistance to abrasion and scuffing. (Nevamar Corporation, Odenton, Md. Circle 220 on information card.)

Floor Tiles.
Ceramic floor tiles have semi-matte, glazed surface with sculptured edges and rounded corners. Available in six colors, tiles are designed for residential and light commercial applications. (Florida Tile, Lake- land, Fla. Circle 221 on information card.)

Drafting Table.
Futur-Matic tables have drafting tops made of steel, wood, or laminate in a variety of sizes. Bases are available with straight black feet, straight chrome feet, or angled chrome feet, and two three-wire grounded outlets and adjustable floor levels are standard. The optional semiautomatic pedestal offers one hand, counterbalanced tilt control and push button electric height adjustment, and automatic bases have two bearing-actuated electric drive systems with fingertip controls. (Mayline Co., Sheboygan, Wis. Circle 222 on information card.)

Roof Tiles.
San Joaquin clay roofing tiles (above) for commercial, institutional, and residential applications are available in three fire-resistance colors. (Craycroft Brick Co., Fresno, Calif. Circle 205 on information card.)

Work Station.
PlanMaster Plus drafting tables and reference tables for architects, drafters, and artists are available with a number of accessories, including plan drawers, locking tool drawers, storage trays, and bookcases. The drafting table is 37.5 inches deep and 50, 60, or 72 inches wide with a nonglare top. Height adjustment from 30 to 37 inches is spring assisted. A ratchet mechanism provides 13 preset drawing angles from flat to 60 degrees. The matching reference table measures 30x60 inches. (Plan Hold, Irvine, Calif. Circle 206 on information card.)

Fabrics and Wallcoverings.
Hand screened and hand painted fabrics and wallcoverings designed by Robert W. Jensen range from simple, one-color prints with a seven-inch repeat to a complex pattern requiring 16 screens to print and a 111-inch repeat. Fabrics are 52 to 54 inches wide and wallcoverings measure 27 inches in width. (Jensen & Walker, Los Angeles. Circle 207 on information card.)

Security System.
Security and monitoring system provides control of multiple functions for a maximum of 240 locations in commercial and institutional installations. Three independent, fully supervised monitoring points are provided for each doorway, and multiple wiring controls several functions with a single two-wire cord. The system encompasses monitoring, control, communications, local access, door position, and lock

POSITIONS WANTED
SUNY AT BUFFALO's Department of Architecture will have three or more openings in September 1986 for positions from assistant to full professor rank. The young, developing and fully accredited department is seeking additional experienced design studio faculty and wishes to augment existing expertise in architectural design, graphic communications, building science, advanced building technology, environmental controls, computer applications, history, adaptive re-use, design theory and research methods. Experience and continuing interest in architectural research or design exploration activities will be advantageous to applicants. One open position is designated by the Chairman as Director for Undergraduate Studies. A second position will primarily focus on the further development of our second professional M.Arch. degree program in Advanced Building Technology. Salary for all positions according to rank and qualifications. Applicants should write to Professor Michael Brill, Chairman, Faculty Search Committee, Department of Architecture, School of Architecture and Environmental Design, State University of New York at Buffalo, Hayes Hall, Buffalo, New York, 14214. Applicants should be submitted no later than 15 February, 1986 and should include: a complete resume; a list of at least three references with full names, addresses, and phone numbers; and samples of professional, artistic, and scholarly work. SUNYAB is an EO/AA employer.
The control unit has a momentary press push-button switch and four independent indicator lamps in red, green, yellow, and blue. Three separate audio signals are also provided to signify alarm or communications request. An optional printer will identify all system actions, including time, date, zone number, situation, and other requested information. (Von Duprin, Inc., Indianapolis. Circle 209 on information card.)

Ceiling System. Linear metal ceiling system has fingertip panels removable by a spring action device to allow access to heating, cooling, lighting, or communication equipment. Panels are available in four, six, and eight-inch modules in varying profiles in more than 100 colors. (Levolor Lorentzen, Inc., Yndhurst, N.J. Circle 210 on information card.)

Heating System. Electric/radiant convection heaters are available in nine lengths from 22 to 142 inches with power from 225 to 1,800 watts. Units have an aluminum heating element set behind an angled radiant panel treated with a high-silicate vitreous enamel coating and a vented back that circulates warm air. Each heater has its own control but may be adapted to room thermostat or centralized systems. (Elektra Systems, West Babylon, N.Y. Circle 208 on information card.)

Wall Panels. Granex exposed aggregate panels are constructed of natural stone embedded in an integral glass fiber reinforced composite of sand, polyester resin, and inorganic fillers. Sized in widths to six feet, panels are available in three textures and five colors and are suitable for commercial and residential installations. (Sanspray Corporation, Santa Clara, Calif. Circle 223 on information card.)

Casement Windows. Divided light windows have 1-inch wide muntin bars joined by a mortise and tenon system. Lights are available with ¾-inch insulating glass or select single pane glass. Wood stops and an adhesive compound form a tight seal to the glass. Exterior wood surfaces are protected with a factory-applied coat of latex paint, and interior surfaces are unfinished natural wood. (Norco Windows, Inc., Hawkins, Wis. Circle 224 on information card.)

Skylight System. Pre-engineered, cross-arched skylight system is made of single or multiple modules of structural steel in sizes ranging from 8x8 to 4x40 feet in four-foot increments. The framing is covered with Vestar architectural fabrics that vary in translucency through fabric composition, coating thickness, pigmentation, and insulation. Greater sags can be achieved by the addition of a valley cable bearing on the fabric. (ODC, Inc., Norcross, Ga. Circle 225 on information card.)

Wall Board. Asbestos-free Ultra-Board is a UL-listed impact resistant building board with a cement finish that adheres to most applied coatings without wire mesh. Cement or aggregate coatings can be sprayed on for a textured look in both interior and exterior applications, and panels can be tiled, stained, or laminated. Available in four thicknesses, panels are machinable with standard hand tools and can be cut, drilled, sanded, and nailed. (BRIT-AM Venture Marketing, Middlesex, N.J. Circle 226 on information card.)

Cable System. Poke-Thru power and communication wire service fitting is designed to handle computer cabling and 100 pair telephone cables. The fitting adapts to floor thicknesses of approximately three to seven inches. (Midland-Ross, Pittsburgh. Circle 213 on information card.)

********

DEAN POSITION AVAILABLE

THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA announces the opportunity for the position of Dean of The College of Architecture which will be filled by 1 May 1986. Programs within the College include: Architecture, Building Construction, Landscape Architecture, Interior Design and Urban and Regional Planning. Qualifications include: (1) an advanced degree or equivalent professional qualifications, (2) broad based experience in the field appropriate to training, (3) command of significant administrative skills, and, (4) a record of creative management. Applicants are to send their letter of qualifications including curriculum vitae, 3 references and 3 documents illustrative of the applicant’s creative management and scholarly work to Dr. Earl M. Starnes, Chairman, Search Committee, College of Architecture, 431 ARCH, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611. Telephone (904) 392-0997 for further information. Applications will be received until 30 January 1986.

The University of Florida is an Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity Employer and is governed by the Public Records Law of Florida.
SENIOR ARCHITECT FACILITIES DESIGN

Temple University has an immediate opening in the Department of Physical Plant for a Senior Architect. Successful candidate must possess a professional degree in Architecture as well as licensure and extensive experience in providing professional architectural services with emphasis in design and management of renovation and construction projects; supervisory experience is required.

Responsible for the management and direction of construction, alteration and renovation projects including supervision of staff providing professional services in development, design, construction, renovation, alteration and repair of real property including office buildings, dormitories and medical facilities at all University locations.

Qualified candidates should send resume including salary requirements to Ms. Theresa Mahoney, Personnel Representative, TEMPLE UNIVERSITY, RM. 203 University Services Bldg. 1601 N. Broad St., Philadelphia, PA 19122. Temple University is an Equal Opportunity Employer.
1111 W 22nd Street Building

Custom walls that are flush or recessed. Surfaces flat or sculptured. Sweeping curves, oblique corners. Colors that are striking or subtle. Long-life painted finishes or our porcelain enamel. All are possible with products and systems designed and manufactured by Inryco, a single-source for your curtain wall needs including panels, windows, support framing, extrusions and accessories. Services include design assistance and construction management.

For more information on Inryco curtain walls, write or call Ms. Pamela Petersen, Inryco, Inc., P.O. Box 393, Milwaukee, WI 53201. Wire: (ITT) 4993931 Inryco AVMIL.

Inryco
an Inland Steel company

Preassembled wall units consisting of matte white Inryco honeycomb panels on an Inryco lightweight steel frame were delivered to the site and put into place. The units, 20 ft. x 5 ft. and 20 ft. x 7½ ft., were coated with Inryco’s Duofinish 500 (Kynar 500™ PVDF Resin™).

CURTAIN WALLS BY INRYCO

*Kynar 500 is a registered Trademark of PENNWALT Corp.
Introducing

Nova®
Electronic Touch-Switch

A new concept in lighting control systems.*

---

Single Location

Two Locations

Multiple Locations

---

Architectural Switches

- 1 to 10 locations
- On/off control - Incandescent, Fluorescent
- 1000W capacity
- Full voltage, 120V wiring
- Full ganging and retrofit capability
- White is standard; black, gray, brown, and beige available from stock
- U.L. Listed

Call today for free color brochure 800 523-9466 800 222-4509 in Pennsylvania
Or write: Lutron Suter Road, Box 205 Coopersburg, PA 18036

Lutron
Circle 37 on information card

---

Light touch, micro-travel activation

* This product is covered by one or more of the following U.S. Patents: 4,342,359; 3,755,020; 3,746,823; 3,827,345; 3,824,428; 3,919,902; 3,977,349; 4,350,930; 4,276,491; 3,731,442; 3,852,273,57; and corresponding foreign patents. Foreign and U.S. Patents pending. Lutron, Nova, and Save Energy are registered trademarks.

Copyright © Lutron 1985