



Announcements/Annonces

The EAAE Prize 2001/2002

EAAE Project Leader, Ebbe Harder

As a conclusion to the **EAAE Prize Competition 2001-2002**, **The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, School of Architecture** in Copenhagen hosted a workshop, 22 - 24 November 2002. The **EAAE Prize Competition 2001-2002** was sponsored by **Velux**.

The **EAAE Prize 2001-2002** invited teachers from all membership schools and individual members of the **EAAE** to participate in the competition:

Writings in Architectural Education - Research and results from research and/or new ideas implemented in architectural education.

The **EAAE Prize** aims to stimulate original writings on the subject of architectural education in order to improve the quality of the teaching of architecture in Europe.

The jury consisting of **Michael Hays**, **Neil Leach**, **Jean-Claude Ludi**, **Jean-Francois Mabardi**, and **Carsten Thau** had selected 13 papers for presentation at the workshop out of a total of 57 entries. A sum of 12 authors/groups of authors contributed with presentations during the workshop.

There were 75 participants from 20 different countries represented at the workshop.

The first key-note speaker at the workshop was **Jean-Francois Mabardi**, and he presented a thought-provoking paper entitled **Architectural Education - Writings and Tradition** which will be

published in its entirety in the workshop publication at a later date.

The workshop furthermore presented key-note speeches from **Neil Leach** entitled **Swarm Tectonics**, and by **Jean-Claude Ludi** about the process of teaching, and finally **Kjeld Vindum**, **The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, School of Architecture** with an introduction to the excursion to the Louisiana Museum's temporary exhibition about the great Danish modernist Arne Jacobsen.

The prize awarding of the jury came as the grand finale of the workshop. The following prizes were awarded:

- **Rosie Parnell**, United Kingdom
Knowledge, Skills and Arrogance: Educating for Collaborative Practice
Shared 1st prize 6000 EUR
- **Jörg Rainer Noennig**, Germany
Adventures of Complexity
Shared 1st prize 6000 EUR
- **Marc M. Angélil**, Switzerland
Inchoate - An Experiment in Architectural Education
3rd prize 5000 EUR
- **Christiane Rose Duarte** and **Regina Cohen**, Brazil
Méthodologies d'enseignement de l'architecture inclusive
Grant 2000 EUR



Content/Contenu

- 1 Announcements
Annonces
- 3 Editorial
Editorial
- 6 Announcements
Annonces
- 11 Interview
Interview
- 22 Articles
Articles
- 27 Reports
Rapports
- 28 Varia
Divers
- 31 EAAE Council Information
Information du conseil AEEA
- 32 Calendar
Calendrier

Editor/Editrice

Anne Elisabeth Toft
Dtp
Jacob Ingvarsen

- **Elisabeth Hermann, Jimmy Richter and Steen Palsbøll**, Denmark
Maximum Minimization
Grant 2000 EUR
- **Rachel Sara**, United Kingdom
The Pink Book
Grant 2000 EUR
- **Aysen Ciravoglu, Osmaniye Mah, Gömec Sok, Pinar Sitesi**, Turkey
On the Formal and Informal Studies on Architectural Design Education
Mention
- **Adriano Magliocco**, Italy
University Role into Architectural-Environmental Education: Parallel Experiences of Didactic Workshop
Mention
- **Sylvain De Bleekere, Roger Liberloo**, Belgium
The Thread of Ariadne – Design Meaning
Mention
- **Ann Heylighen**, Belgium
A Maintenance Contract for the Architect's Degree
Mention
- **Marc Bourdier**, France
Formation à la pédagogie
Mention
- **Xavier Bonnaud**, France
Quelques réflexions sur l'évolution actuelle du lien à l'espace dans l'enseignement de l'architecture
Mention

The jury received a project, which did not meet the demands of the competition re. full anonymity. They found, however, that the project should be accentuated with the following justification:

“The project gives an interesting and rich way of distant (geography, culture, educational contexts) collaboration and how the gaps were filled, by using new communication tools. Comprehensively

and clearly laid out. A very timely educational initiative in view of the incorporation of certain Eastern European countries within the EU.”

- The project was originally submitted by **Johan Verbeke**, Belgium, but at the workshop it was represented by a selection of the authors: **Charlotte Geldorf**, Belgium, **Marc Godts**, Belgium and **Roman Selyuk**, the Ukraine.
Special prize 5000 EUR

The complete **Jury's Report** can be seen at **EAAE's** homepage: www.eaae.be

All the presented papers together with the **Jury's Report** will be published by the **EAAE** during the spring of 2003, and all member schools will receive a number of free copies.

Already now it can be announced that the **EAAE Prize 2003-2005** will be presented in September in Chania, and that **VELUX** will again sponsor the prize. ■

Editorial

News Sheet Editor - Anne Elisabeth Toft

Dear Reader

One of the most exciting EAAE events arranged in 2002 was the **EAAE Prize Competition**.

The prize, sponsored by **Velux**, was awarded in Copenhagen, Denmark, on Saturday, 23 November 2002. This took place in connection with the EAAE workshop: **Writings in Architectural Education: Research and results from research and/or new ideas implemented in architectural education**.

The members of the EAAE Council are happy to announce the names of all the winners of the **EAAE Prize 2001/2002** in this issue of the EAAE News Sheet. The winners were selected by a jury consisting of **Jean-Francois Mabardi** (chairman), **Michael Hays**, **Neil Leach**, **Jean-Claude Ludi** and **Carsten Thau**.

A shared 1st prize was awarded to **Rosie Parnell**, Sheffield School of Architecture, University of Sheffield (UK) and **Jörg Rainer Noennig**, University of Technology, Dresden (Germany).

On page 22 you can read a short summary of **Rosie Parnell's** paper entitled **Knowledge Skills and Arrogance: Educating for Collaborative Practice**, and on page 24 you will also find a short summary of **Jörg Rainer Noennig's** paper **Adventures of Complexity: Towards a System Approach in Architectural Education**.

EAAE Project Leader **Ebbe Harder** (Denmark) reports on pages 1 and 2 from the EAAE workshop, which was hosted by the **Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, School of Architecture**.

In the EAAE News Sheet # 64 EAAE President **Herman Neuckermans** (Belgium) announced that in 2003 the **EAAE** will join the **ACSA** in their annual conference abroad. The conference: **Contribution and Confusion: Architecture and the Influence of Other Fields of Inquiry** will take place in Helsinki, Finland, from **27 to 30 July 2003**. The preliminary outline of the conference was

Cher lecteur,

*Un de nos projets les plus passionnants de l'année écoulée fut la célébration du **Concours de l'AEEA**.*

*La remise du prix sponsorisé par **Velux** se déroula à Copenhague, au Danemark, le samedi 23 novembre 2002, à l'occasion de l'atelier organisé par l'AEEA : **Ecrits sur l'enseignement de l'Architecture, Recherche et résultats des travaux de recherche et/ou nouvelles idées appliquées à l'enseignement de l'architecture**.*

*Les membres du Conseil de l'AEEA sont heureux de vous communiquer dans le présent Bulletin les noms de l'ensemble des gagnants du **Prix 2001/2002 de l'AEEA**. La sélection a été confiée à un jury composé par **Jean-Francois Mabardi** (Président), **Michael Hays**, **Neil Leach**, **Jean-Claude Ludi** et **Carsten Thau**.*

*Un premier prix partagé récompense les travaux de **Rosie Parnell**, Ecole d'Architecture de Sheffield, Université de Sheffield (UK) et de **Jörg Rainer Noennig**, Université de Technologie de Dresde (Allemagne).*

*Vous lirez en page 22 un bref résumé du rapport de **Rosie Parnell** intitulé **Knowledge Skills and Arrogance: Educating for Collaborative Practice**, et en page 24 le bref compte-rendu du rapport de **Jörg Rainer Noennig**, **Adventures of Complexity: Towards a System Approach in Architectural Education***

*Le Chef de projet, **Ebbe Harder** (Danemark) rapporte dans les pages 1-2 le déroulement de l'atelier de l'AEEA tenu à l'**Ecole d'Architecture de Copenhague**, au sein de l'**Académie royale des Beaux-Arts**.*

*Notre Président, **Herman Neuckermans** (Belgique), annonçait dans le Bulletin 64 que l'AEEA se joindrait en 2003 à l'**ACSA** dans leur conférence annuelle à l'étranger. Cette conférence, **Contribution and Confusion: Architecture and the Influence of Other Fields of Inquiry** (Contribution et Confusion : L'Architecture et l'Influence d'autres domaines) se tiendra à Helsinki, Finlande, du **27 au***



already published in EAAE News Sheet # 64. In this issue of the magazine you can, however, obtain new information about the conference on page 8.

On page 6 the **Nordic Academy of Architecture** re-announces the **20th EAAE Conference: Four Faces of Architecture**. This conference has previously been announced in the EAAE News Sheet # 63 and EAAE News Sheet # 64. The conference, which will take place from **8 to 11 May 2003**, is organized by Kungliga Tekniska Högskolan, School of Architecture, Stockholm, Sweden.

The **5th EAAE Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture** entitled **Towards a Common European Higher Education Space in Architecture** took place in Chania, Greece between 4 and 7 September 2002.

This meeting was the continuation of the previous meeting with greater emphasis on points that led to important decisions and commitments made in the **Chania Statement 2001**: the importance and the role that the European cultural polyphony has to play towards the creation of an integrated area of architectural education in Europe; the necessity to preserve the five-year duration of the architectural education; the importance of ECTS towards the creation of an integrated area of architectural education in Europe; the necessity of development of a European system of 'academic' evaluation; and the assurance of quality of European programmes in the academic community¹.

Approximately 80 European schools of architecture were represented at this meeting from which the Proceedings Publication is now available. The Proceedings Publication, which is edited by EAAE Project Leader Constantin Spiridonidis (Greece) and EAAE Thematic Coordinator Maria Voyatzaki (Greece), is announced on page 27.

Last but not least, I am very happy to present an exclusive interview with **Phyllis Lambert** (Canada). Phyllis Lambert is not only famous for her commitment and work as the founding director and chair of the **Canadian Centre for Architecture** (CCA), her writings on architecture

30 juillet 2003. La première présentation de la conférence dans le Bulletin 64 est ici complétée par plus d'informations en page 8.

En page 6, l'**Académie Nordique d'Architecture** annonce à nouveau la **20e Conférence de l'AEEA : Quatre Faces de l'Architecture**. Cette Conférence, déjà signalée dans les Bulletins 63 et 64 de l'AEEA, se tiendra célébrée du **8 au 11 mai 2003**, sous la houlette de l'Ecole d'Architecture de Stockholm, Suède, au sein de la Kungliga Tekniska Högskolan.

La **5e Conférence des Directeurs des Ecoles d'Architecture européennes** s'est tenue à Chania, en Grèce, du 4 au 7 septembre 2002, sous le titre **Vers un espace européen commun pour l'Enseignement supérieur de l'Architecture**.

Cette Conférence s'inscrivait dans le prolongement de la précédente avec une spéciale attention envers les points qui ont conduit aux importantes décisions et engagements pris dans la **Résolution 2001 de Chania**: importance et rôle que doit jouer la polyphonie culturelle européenne dans la création d'un domaine intégré pour l'enseignement de l'Architecture en Europe, nécessité de préserver les cinq ans d'études d'architecte, importance de l'ECTS dans la création d'un domaine intégré pour l'enseignement de l'architecture en Europe, nécessité du développement d'un système européen d'évaluation 'académique' et assurance de la qualité des programmes européens au sein de la communauté académique.¹

Quelque 80 Ecoles d'Architecture européennes étaient représentées à cette Conférence conclue par la publication d'un compte-rendu des débats. Ce compte-rendu rédigé par deux de nos membres, le Chef de Projet Constantin Spiridonidis (Grèce) et la Coordinatrice thématique, Maria Voyatzaki (Grèce), figure en page 27.

Enfin, j'ai la grande joie de pouvoir vous présenter en exclusivité une interview de **Phyllis Lambert** (Canada). Phyllis Lambert n'est pas seulement célèbre pour son engagement et ses efforts en tant que Directrice fondatrice et Présidente du **Centre canadien d'Architecture** (CCA), ses écrits sur l'architect-

and architectural matters; she has also recently made her mark internationally in connection with the unique and much commented architectural exhibition **Mies in America**².

The interview with Phyllis Lambert, which can be read on page 11, takes its starting point in this exhibition.

Yours sincerely

Anne Elisabeth Toft

*ture et tout ce qui s'y rapporte, mais elle s'est aussi récemment signalée à travers l'exceptionnelle exposition d'architecture, largement appréciée sur le forum international: **Mies in America**².*

Vous lirez en page 11 l'interview qui prend son point de départ dans l'exposition de Phyllis Lambert.

Sincèrement

Anne Elisabeth Toft

Notes and References

1. Spiridonidis, Constantin: Report. In: EAAE News Sheet # 64, October 2001, p. 43.

2. The exhibition was shown at:

- Whitney Museum of American Art, New York (21 June to 23 September 2001).
- Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal (17 October 2001 to 20 January 2002).
- Museum of Contemporary Art, Chicago (16 February to 26 May 2002).

Notes et Références

1. Spiridonidis, Constantin : Rapport. Bulletin 64 de l'AEAA, octobre 2001, p. 43.

2. L'exposition a été présentée au:

- *Musée d'Art américain de Whitney, New York (du 21 juin au 23 septembre 2001)*
- *Centre canadien d'Architecture, Montréal (du 17 octobre 2001 au 20 janvier 2002),*
- *Musée d'Art contemporain de Chicago (du 16 février au 26 mai 2002).*

20th EAAE Conference

Stockholm, Sweden and Helsinki, Finland 8 - 11 May 2003

Four Faces

The Dynamics of Architectural Knowledge

Revised program

Future demands on architectural education and research must continuously be analysed and put in comparison with contemporary conditions in practice and theory. There is a challenge to develop strategies that allow focusing on the specific in architectural knowledge, but also open up broader viewpoints on architecture.

The Four Faces conference wants to place architecture in dialogue and opposition to bigger knowledge areas to highlight its relations to society. Four main knowledge fields could be read as fundamental: architecture and human sciences, architecture and natural sciences, architecture and social sciences, architecture and the arts. Hence, the aim of the conference is to discuss and make visible how the production of knowledge within these four fields are correlated and intertwined.

Call for papers

Papers that discuss the dynamics of architectural knowledge in relation to future demands in education and/or research are invited. Papers should be maximum 2000 words, including a short abstract of 250 words. They should be written in English and sent to:

fourfaces@arch.kth.se

All the accepted papers will be available in advance. After the conference selected papers will be published in a book. The authors will have the opportunity to revise their texts before publication.

Conference

Inspiring speakers from different fields of knowledge are invited to enrich the Four Faces discussion. The conference program is planned to encourage the participants to exchange experiences and ideas.

Lectures, workshops and plenary discussions will be held at different locations in Stockholm, Helsinki and on the ferry between. There will be opportunities to visit famous buildings in Stockholm and Helsinki designed by important architects.

The Stockholm Conference is arranged as a joint Nordic venture, hosted by the Nordic Academy of Architecture. The Conference is administrated by the KTH School of Architecture, Stockholm.

For latest updates and registration:

www.fourfaces.info

Deadlines

- Papers before Friday 14 March
- Notifications sent by Thursday 10 April
- Revised papers to be published before Wednesday 11 June

Preliminary Programme**Thursday, May 8, 2003 (Stockholm)**

	17:00	Departure for Helsinki
--	--------------	-------------------------------

13:00-15:00	Stockholm Town Hall (by Östberg)	17:30-19:00	Keynote lecture
--------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------	-----------------

	Registration and reception		Parallel Workshops
--	----------------------------	--	--------------------

15:30-16:30	City Library (by Asplund)	19:00-20:30	Plenary discussions
--------------------	---------------------------	--------------------	---------------------

	Guided tour	21:00	Dinner
--	-------------	--------------	--------

17:00-18:00	Skandia Cinema (by Asplund)		
--------------------	-----------------------------	--	--

	Lecture: Asplund-Lewerentz-Celsing		
--	------------------------------------	--	--

19:00-20:00	Cultural Centre, Sergels Torg (by Celsing)	09:30	Arrival in Helsinki
--------------------	--	--------------	---------------------

	Keynote lecture	10:00-11:30	Guided tour in Helsinki
--	-----------------	--------------------	-------------------------

20:30-23:00	Cultural Centre, Sergels Torg	12:00-14:00	Lunch, Museum of Contemporary Art (by Holl)
--------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------	---

	Dinner	14:00-16:00	Finlandia House (by Aalto)
--	--------	--------------------	----------------------------

Friday, May 9, 2003

			Guided tour
			Keynote lecture

09:30-11:00	Woodland Cemetery (by Asplund/Lewerentz)	16:30	Check-in on board the ferry to Stockholm
--------------------	--	--------------	--

	Guided tour	17:00-18:30	Lecture
--	-------------	--------------------	---------

	Keynote lecture		Parallel Workshops
--	-----------------	--	--------------------

11:30-13:00	St Marks (by Lewerentz)	18:30-20:00	Plenary discussions
--------------------	-------------------------	--------------------	---------------------

	Guided tour	20:00-21:00	Conclusion and closing session
--	-------------	--------------------	--------------------------------

	Keynote lecture	21:00	Dinner
--	-----------------	--------------	--------

13:00-15:00	Lunch		
--------------------	-------	--	--

15:00-16:00	Check-in and leisure time on board the ferry to Helsinki	Sunday, May 11, 2003	
--------------------	--	-----------------------------	--

9:30	Arrival in Stockholm
-------------	----------------------

2003 ACSA International Conference

Helsinki, Finland, 27-30 July 2003

Contribution and Confusion: Architecture and the Influence of Other Fields of Inquiry

Throughout the twentieth century architects have attempted to translate ideas that have originated in other fields into works of architecture.

It would be difficult, for example, to explain the profusion of novel forms that emerged in the early years of this century without reference to particular movements in art.

But have ideas, formed in art and various other fields such as science, philosophy, engineering, linguistics, sociology and psychology advanced the art of building?

If so, in what ways have features, acquired from investigations in other fields, resolved questions or clarified situations essential to the specific nature of architecture and its intrinsic tasks?

Or, in contrast, have appropriated ideas and the desire for novelty marginalized fundamental aspects of the discipline of architecture?

The timing of the **ACSA International Conference** has been coordinated with the **9th International Alvaro Aalto Symposium**, which will be held in **Finland, August 1-3, 2003**. There will be a substantial reduction in symposium registration fees offered to ACSA participants as well as the possibility of participating in tours following the symposium

Conference Co-Chairs:

- Associate Professor
Pia Sarpaneva, Virginia Tech
- Associate Professor
Scott Poole, Virginia Tech

Plenary Session Speakers

- Diane Lewis, USA
Architect, educator (Cooper Union).
Internationally published award projects from residences to civic spaces. Former winner of the Rome Prize in Architecture
- Mikko Heikkinen, Finland
Partner in the firm Heikkinen + Komonen Architects, architects of the Finnish Embassy in Washington D.C., (Recent Awards: The Aga Khan Award for Architecture 2001, Recent project: The Max Planck Institute, Dresden 2001)
- Juhani Pallasmaa, Finland
Architect, educator, writer (recent awards: The Finland Award 2000, the Jean Tschumi Award of the International Union of Architects for Architectural Criticism (1999), The Fritz Schumacher Prize (1997), The Russian Federation Architecture Award (1996))
- James Carpenter, USA
(not yet confirmed)
Designer, artist, educator
- Toshiko Mori, USA
(not yet confirmed)
Chair, GSD Harvard, architect, educator.

For further information and registration:

www.acsa-arch.org

Topic Sessions

Thought, Language and Making

Lily Chi

USA, Cornell University

Xavier Costa

Spain, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya,
Barcelona

- Translating Knowledge from Other Fields of Inquiry
- The Limits of Language: What Can Be Said About Architecture?
- The Thinking Hand: Art and The Process of Making

The Material Cause

Jorgé Rigau

USA, Polytechnic of Puerto Rico

Kirsi Leiman

Finland, Helsinki University of Technology

- Material, Memory and Imagination in Art and Architecture
- The Resistance of Matter in Art and Architecture
- Applications of New Materials in Architectural Practice

Nature

Joe Mashburn

USA, University of Houston

Steven Neille

Australia, Curtin University of Technology

- Ecological Design and Architectural Practice
- Questions of Topology: Building in Landscape and Landscape in Building
- How Would Nature Do It?: Biomimetics in Design

Pedagogy

Peter MacKeith

USA, Washington University in St. Louis

Pentti Kareoja

Finland, University of Arts and Design

- The Influence of the Computer in Design Studio: The Question of the Image and Material Resolution
- Literary Discourse, Narrative and the Education of the Architect
- Adopting Concerns from other Disciplines: The Influence of Sociological, Economical, Political and Environmental Questions on the Design Studio

Avant-Garde

Nichole Wiedemann

USA, University of Texas at Austin

Thomas Wiesner

Denmark, The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts

- The Influence of Other Disciplines on the Architectural Avant-Garde: A Search for Depth or a Crisis of Confidence
- Bold New Architecture: Pushing the Limit or Overlooking the Boundary
- Other Avant-Gardes

The City as a Work of Art

Graham Livesey

Canada, University of Calgary

Mark Dorrian

Scotland, University of Edinburgh

- The Public Function of Art and the Contemporary City
- Arrivals and Departures
- Urban Interiors: The Public Living Room

Questioning Disciplinary Boundaries

Leslie Van Duzer

USA, Arizona State University

Helen Welling

Denmark, The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts

- Conceptual Art and Architecture
- Minimal Art and Architecture
- Land Art and Architecture

Image

Marco Frascari

USA, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Bruno Queysanne

France, University of Grenoble

- The Image in Art and Architecture
- Research in Cognitive Science and the Image
- Theories of Vision and Architectural Imagery

Interactions with the Other Arts

Sandra Iliescu

USA, University of Virginia

Beate Hølmebakk

Norway, Oslo School of Architecture

- Architecture and Painting
- Architecture and Cinema
- Architecture and Photography

Crossovers and Collaborations

Felecia Davis

USA, Cornell University

Lisbeth Funck

Norway, Oslo School of Architecture

- Aging Research and Contemporary Architecture
- Technological Innovation and Architectural Practice
- Architecture and Industrial Design

The Lived World

Peter Waldman

USA, University of Virginia

Esa Laaksonen

Finland, Alvar Aalto Academy

- The Question of Duration: Making Time Present in Art and Architecture
- Existential Space in Art and Architecture

Philosophy

Frank Weiner

USA, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Andrew Ballantyne (not yet confirmed)

England, University of Newcastle

- The Philosophical Scope of the Tectonic
- The Ethical Task of Architecture
- Contemporary Philosophy and Architecture

Doctoral Works in Progress Relating to the General Topic

Open Sessions Relating to the General Topic

Open Discussions with Invited Speakers

- The Finnish Architectural Policy
- Architectural Competitions in Finland
- Architectural Education in Finland
- New Technology in Elevator Design (Kone)

Mies in America - To Exhibit

Interview with the Canadian architect, Phyllis Lambert, 21 May 2002

Constantly reshaped by artists/architects and curators, the exhibition has become a prominent and diverse part of contemporary culture, and it has become perhaps the medium through which most art becomes known. Exhibitions are recognised as an important place of exchange in the political economy of art where signification is constantly constructed, maintained or deconstructed. Yet, despite the growing importance of exhibitions, their histories, structures and socio-political implications are only seldom discussed, written about or theorized.

Phyllis Lambert is not only famous for her commitment and work as the founding director and chair of the *Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA)*, her writings on architecture and architectural matters, but she has also recently made her mark internationally in connection with the unique and much commented architectural exhibition: *Mies in America*.¹

EAAE News Sheet Editor, *Anne Elisabeth Toft* visited *Phyllis Lambert* at the *Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA)* - an institution that is internationally renowned not only for its many architectural exhibitions and publications, but also for its archives and its quite unique collection of architectural drawings and early architectural photography.²

The interview below takes its starting point in the exhibition *Mies in America*, and all questions in the interview refer to this architectural exhibition. At a general level, however, the discussions revolve around the communication and propagation of architecture through representations and mass media - especially exhibitions, photography, and film. The interview illustrates the power of imagery, and it also debates the curator's role - i.e., the curator as author, writer of history, as *Phyllis Lambert* gives us insight into some of the many considerations she made in connection with the planning and execution of the exhibition and the exhibition catalogue *Mies in America*.

A general feature of our time is that the text is disappearing from the pictures. Where text used to be the context of pictures, we are now to an increasing degree experiencing that pictures become the context of pictures. By this I mean that we are more and more decoding and understanding pictures based on our understanding of other pictures. Pictures generate pictures - and not least do the pictures and signs circulated by the mass media constitute meaning and become mythopoetic to us. In many ways, our culture is an increasingly visual one. You curated the exhibition *Mies in America*. You were also the editor of the voluminous (791 pages) catalogue *Mies in America*.³ The exhibition and the catalogue are essential contributions to the study of *Mies van der Rohe*, his architecture, as well as modern American architecture and culture in the 20th century.

What is the contextual relationship between the exhibition *Mies in America* and the textually heavy catalogue *Mies in America*? Is the exhibition the context of the catalogue or is the catalogue the context of the exhibition?

Initially the *CCA* planned an exhibition on 'Mies and his colleagues', in which I was only marginally involved. However, in talking with architects, it became clear that Mies's work and his way of

working were not well enough known: he had simply become a mythic figure. I realized that it was absolutely essential to bring about a real understanding of his work. This necessitated close reading of the sketches and drawings, which could properly be done only by an architect. But *if* there was to be an exhibition, *what* was the exhibition to say? To answer this question required extensive research, and this in turn implied that a book would be produced. Essentially, the book generated the exhibition.

I worked on the book for almost five years. It became so voluminous because I set out with the desire to understand Mies's working method and how it evolved over the years. I wanted to pursue his sources of inspiration and to understand how he made the leaps that he made. My ambition was to study and illustrate the circumstances of the development that Mies's architecture underwent as he made the move from Europe to North America. I felt it was important to take account of his confrontation with American building practices. First and foremost, I wanted to understand how Mies made the connection to American technology for which he is so famous. I titled my essay *Mies Immersion*, because it was an immersion into Mies's process.⁴ I hope that the book expresses and reflects this.

The ideas that Mies had already formulated in Europe before World War II of course underlay his work in North America. However, he had never been able to fully unfold his architectural intentions in Europe. His theory was always well ahead of his work and the existing technological possibilities, especially in Europe at that time. *Werner Oechslin*, for one, points out in his essay that from 1921 until Mies left for America, he was in fact at the forefront of an architectural discourse that would later shape his American work.⁵

This discourse was not just about Mies's ideas regarding structure and materials, transparency and spatial freedom through the displacement of walls; it also prefigured his sense of movement and universal space as he would later develop them.

Mies's process indeed unfolded step by step, and I thought it very important to be able to convey that. The conventional account of his work in North America portrays him as a creative genius who sprang fully formed into his new environment. This was not at all the case. I therefore wanted the book to give the reader multi-faceted insight into Mies's development, his creative process, his reading as an autodidact - in science, philosophy, theology, history - his presence in the Berlin avant-garde, his involvement with art, artists, and his many discoveries related to technology in the United States. A number of authors - among them *Werner Oechslin* - contributed essays to the book which in different ways explore these involvements from the perspective of his work as an architect.

The exhibition *Mies in America* is above all a vehicle for presenting the complexity of Mies's ideas and methodology. Documentation, the justification of theoretical positions, and the analysis of historians are the function of the book. An exhibition is much more direct. It can quickly synthesize, summarize, and make palpable the major ideas. So, the book about Mies came first, and then, as a result of that, we conceived the exhibition.

What is the relationship between the pictures (drawings and photos) and the text of the catalogue/book?

In the book you will notice that the designer, *Lorraine Wild*, very carefully tied the images to the text. At the same time, I wanted the captions to carry the story, and wrote them in such a way that they expressed location and basic information. Mies's sketches and the office drawings provide the keys for understanding what he was doing as an architect. You see, Mies said very little about his work apart from his aphoristic writings, and those

were for the most part written in Germany. These and his reading notes give important access to his thought. As *Oechslin* points out, Mies was not trained to talk or write about architecture - his own or that of others. But in my opinion, he also nourished a basic desire to keep these disciplines separate - hence his proclamation: *Don't speak architect - just do!* And certainly in America, he remained silent! Perhaps learning English at the age of fifty had something to do with this.

Mies used to refer to architecture as 'building art' (*Baukunst*), and he undoubtedly considered that to be his medium, his primary mode of expression. His final statement on his own account from 1963 only confirms this: *My main work has been the planning of buildings. I have never written or spoken much.*⁶

I actually started the book project by investigating Mies's drawings. For each of his projects I photocopied the drawings published in the *Garland* volumes of his archives and pinned them to the wall in order to compare and sequence the sketches and hard-line drawings. I found that it was only through the many sketches and drawings that I could really trace his ideas and understand the propositions he rejected as well as the reasons for his pursuit of others. It was an iterative process: Mies tried everything. He said that if you have an idea, put it down; if you have two, put them down, and so forth; and then, pin them all on the wall and chose among them, and then try again, try different ideas as you work. To assign dates to Mies's drawings was a monumental effort, but it was the only way to follow his reiterative, step-by-step process. To do so, it was of course essential to have access to the office correspondence, the files, and other written sources, a largely unread collection held by *MOMA*. But the crucial evidence was always Mies's own drawings.

It was also through Mies's drawings that I came to understand his exquisite sense of body and movement. Mies's built work, as is well known, almost always consists of a constellation or displacement of buildings. The transitions between context and building, exterior and interior are interchangeable and circular. In order to fully comprehend the architecture and to experience the many spatial exchanges, it is therefore essential to move through and around the buildings. The metal and glass high-rise buildings with their projecting mullions seem to change - visually transforming from reflective to transparent and solid enclosures - as you (the subject) shift positions while moving through space. The encounter between the subject and the architecture unfolds in time and the architecture is perceived haptically as well as optically.

That Mies deeply understood this phenomenon was revealed to me while I was examining a group of quick, fluid, sketches he made to study the *IIT* campus - drawings held in the *CCA* collection. In these sketches, Mies circum-perambulates the ten-acre site in which he has placed a series of buildings and open spaces that flow into one another. I made a drawing in which I plotted the imagined positions from which he drew each perspective in order to reveal the way in which Mies's approach implied a continually changing point of view. This extraordinary method of design is not known to have been used by other architects. Yes, comparative views of facades or perspectival views, alternate sections, and so on exist, but never with a continually changing point of view. Mies's campus drawings of the 1940s are laid out in sequence for the book, as they were in the exhibition.

Movement in architecture was fundamental to Mies: the same approach to exploring shifting points of view is seen in his early collages and photomontages made in Germany from 1910 to 1938, where he looks at the insertion of a building on a given site, from upstream and downstream, or by shifting his virtual position from right to left and then dollying in closer like a cinematographer.

I commissioned films for the exhibition, which were projected on large screens (some of which were suspended from the ceiling) so that the visitor could be exposed to and sense the experience of movement almost as if he or she were in the picture. The artist *Inigo Manglano-Ovalle* was commissioned to make time-based images which he made in collaboration with the cinematographer *Allan Siegel*.⁷ I also thought it very important to present photographs of Mies's buildings as they look today, and thus new photography by *Guido Guidi* and *Richard Pare* was also commissioned in order to visually describe or intimate the spatial qualities of the plazas and the buildings and their particular character in urban and rural landscapes. I separated the commissioned photographs from the narratives of the exhibition and book, placing them in discrete sections, because they speak a different language. These images reveal changes in the urban conditions, things that did not exist at the time the buildings were erected. The language of photography is different today in relation to earlier, more documentary approaches to Mies's work. Contemporary photographs are more interpretive, episodic, fragmentary.

The commissioned photographs were made with the intention to approach the material sensibilities and the 'inner aptitude' of Mies's building art, and both *Guidi* and *Pare* were guided by long-standing inquiry into the phenomenological potential of buildings and landscape.⁸ These pictures bring

Mies's buildings into the present and situate them in a contemporary context. However, they also cause us to reflect on how Mies's buildings were photographed earlier. Mies was very sensitive to the visual reception of his work, and he cared a great deal about how they were depicted photographically. He was insistent on the point of view, and demanded of the photographer the same perceptual sensibility he pursued in his own drawings. Thus, he wished all views of his buildings to be taken from the perspective of the pedestrian. Only photographs that were contemporaneous with construction, those that Mies had approved of, were presented in the exhibition in conjunction with Mies's drawings, in order not to change the 'voice', the mood, the original Miesian time-frame. I made a strong point of observing this in the book as well as in the exhibition.

As a curator I think that it is very important to maintain the 'voice' of the artist, so to speak. In this connection I must confess that I often find it very disturbing to visit exhibitions where material - be it text or images - that is not by the artist is presented with authorial materials, only because I find that juxtaposition with extraneous material interrupts the coherence of the artist's ideas. Even explicative text can be disturbing in this regard.

In my opinion there should be more debate about the use of various media, especially film and computer-generated images, their expression and function. A curator must give an account of why and how she/he has chosen to use each one in a given situation and context. It is also important that the reader or the public be informed about the structure and thematic focus of the book or the exhibition. This naturally leads to a discussion of exhibition materials, including the curator's reflections on their selection and construction, and also of the connections between exhibition and exhibition catalogue. An exhibition is not a book on a wall.

The exhibition *Mies in America* is a temporary event - attached to three different exhibition venues and to some extent also the Internet. The catalogue *Mies in America* will, however, be a document circulating also in the future. What kind of document did you want to create with the catalogue *Mies in America*?

It was my main wish to create a document that would present a many-faceted Mies, a document that would illustrate Mies's process as an architect, his relationship with his colleagues (based on extensive interviews commissioned by the *CCA*), as well as his thoughts, and the impact of his ideas.

I called upon several historians from other generations and disciplines to reflect on these matters and contribute essays. Together with archival material that has been brought to light, the book opens up new perspectives and discussion about Mies and his work, and I think it lays out many issues to be followed up.

The book contains nine texts or essays. These fall into three groups. The first group focuses on Mies before he settled permanently in Chicago. The texts, among these *Werner Oechslin's*, draw a picture of Mies's Berlin context in the 1920s and 1930s, and examine his interests and activities at that time. *Vivian Barnett*, for instance, analyses Mies's activity as an art collector with links to important art circles in Europe and subsequently in North America. Not only was Mies in contact with *Bauhaus* artists, but he also had a keen interest in works by members of the Berlin *Dada* movement, the *Novembergruppe*, and the German *Expressionists*. Initially *Oechslin* was going to write about Mies and Catholic Germany, but in the end he preferred to focus on Mies and the development of architectural modernism in Berlin. *Cammie McAtee's* essay is concerned with the circumstances of Mies's emigration and early professional opportunities in America.

The second group of essays analyzes Mies's American practice and the evolution of his building art. Essays by *Detlef Mertins*, *Sarah Whiting*, and myself are included here. This section begins with my essay, in which I set out to uncover Mies's discovery of the rolled-steel section, the 'I' beam as the architectural expression of steel technology, much as the flying buttress was the expression of audacious stone technology in the Middle Ages. I also set out to discover how Mies developed the column-free clear span structure, the spatiality of buildings in the city and as mentioned earlier, and how he introduced movement into his work - movement that he had explored in the photomontages and collages he constructed for his projects in the 1920s. *Detlef Mertins* analyses Mies's urban space as it relates to his reading in philosophy, science, aesthetics and history. The two had not been connected hitherto. Mies read in order to understand the nature of his time, which, he concluded, was one of technological and economic imperatives. *Mertins* raises Mies's concern that technology be mediated by spiritual matters, that is, by higher values. In this essay *Mertins* also evinces Mies's interest in the organic and the contemporary, non-traditional city that goes on and on like a jungle. These ideas are revealing: organic is usually thought of in terms of curvilinear form, associated with *Mendelsohn* and *Arp*, but not with Mies. For Mies, organic architecture was

in many ways something different than it was for *Hugo Häring*, *Hans Scharoun*, or *Frank Lloyd Wright*, for instance.⁹ *Sarah Whiting's* essay extends the urban form of Mies's *Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT)* campus to a larger context, the Near South Side of Chicago and the public/private taking of land according to Keynesian economics, showing how this set the stage for urban renewal in the United States.

The third and final group of essays contains texts by *K. Michael Hays*, *Peter Eisenman* and *Rem Koolhaas*, respectively. The thematic 'frame' to which these essays in various ways are related is the *IIT Student Center Competition* arranged and held in 1997-98. *K. Michael Hays* was a keynote speaker at the symposium *After Mies*, organised by the *IIT* to initiate the competition, while both *Peter Eisenman* and *Rem Koolhaas* participated in the competition. *Peter Eisenman's* text, by the way, was developed as background for the project he submitted to the competition.

In his article *Exhibition Rhetorics: Material Speech and Utter Sense*, Bruce W. Ferguson says (and I quote): Exhibitions are publicly sanctioned representations of identity, principally but not exclusively, of the institutions that represent them. They are narratives that use art objects as elements in institutionalized stories that are promoted to an audience. Exhibitions act as visible encounters with a public that receives and acknowledges their import and projected status as important signs of important signs. The 'voices' heard within exhibitions - the number and kind of dead artists, the number and kind of women, the kind and number of media, etc. - constitute a highly observable politics, with representations as their currency and their measure of equality in a democratic process.¹⁰ What was your ambition with this exhibition and what was your exhibition 'model' or concept when you curated *Mies in America*?

Well, my spontaneous reaction to what *Ferguson* wrote is that it invokes the by-now somewhat banal rhetoric of institutional critique without contributing anything new to the debate about the medium of the exhibition. I think exhibitions must engage a problematic - whether that be an aesthetic or a political problematic. Without that, there isn't any point - certainly not to 'represent' an institution in the abstract. In connection with the exhibition *Mies in America*, the problematic was, as I have already explained, to see and understand how Mies made the leaps he made. It included some challenging elements for people who are not able to read architectural drawings. I quite recognize that.

However, because of the quality of the drawings and their great diversity of scale and purpose - the same problem drawn in a small sketch and at full scale, or a series of drawings exploring one idea, or a complete scheme carefully rendered and then abandoned - the visitor can sense what it took for Mies to develop his architectural vocabulary and observe the progression of his ideas.

At the CCA, our exhibitions focus on issues or problematics, whether they treat individual architects, individual buildings, a time in the life of a town, or abstract ideas like 'the American lawn'.¹¹ CCA exhibitions are deeply researched, developed over a period of four or five years. The materials are usually accompanied by expanded labels and wall texts (as was *Mies in America*), and our public appreciates the CCA as a locus of research. Other institutions that have emerged since we opened in 1989 have followed our lead in encouraging informed public awareness of architecture. On the other hand, the British architect *Cedric Price* curated an exhibition on 'time' at the CCA, and in this case, there were no labels. *Price* accompanied the objects with symbols only, eleven symbols representing categories of time. The viewer was forced to ponder, to question, to compare. I loved the exhibition because it made the viewer observe closely.

There are, of course, many ways of presenting ideas, but exhibitions whose purpose is to represent and promote institutions, I think are really 'dead' and should never be done. Policy about what one puts on the walls is complex, institutions are complex, and cannot be reduced to signs of signs.

Exhibitions and exhibition catalogues are two different genres. The book *Mies in America* contains material not presented in the exhibition of the same name, and vice versa. I have already mentioned the films that were commissioned for the exhibition. Also commissioned were three comparative models that showed the major stages in the development of Mies's enclosure for high-rise buildings. All were painted grey - glass, metal, and concrete were not differentiated - so that the surface relief was clearly articulated - from infill concrete frame, to the metal held tight to the structure like skin to bones, and finally the cantilevered skin assembly that emphasized the rhythm of the projecting mullions. In the book, these differences were presented in a series of nine detailed drawings prepared by students in a special class at IIT. Reading these drawings in the exhibition would have been tedious; on the other hand, in the book, photographs of the models would not have conveyed enough information. There are

obvious differences, the difference between two dimensions and the texture and relief of the object itself, the absence and presence of scale, and the multiple interrelationships of objects in an exhibition, in contrast to the linear sequence of pages in a book. In the extreme, exhibitions are show business; books are finely drawn discursive arguments.

I must tell you that I never saw the exhibition *Mies in America*. I only had access to the catalogue and the Internet presentation. A number of my friends and colleagues, who have seen the exhibition, have told me about it, however. This makes me think of the fact that I have never been in very many of *Mies van der Rohe's* buildings either. I know them solely from representations and exposure in the mass media.

I rather like the consciousness of the asymmetric relationship existing between you and me as we are discussing *Mies in America*, however, because in a way this emphasises exactly the power of imagery and the ability of the pictures to generate new pictures, stories and myths in the world.

As curator and editor you are in the cases mentioned contributing to staging the 'story' or 'myth' about *Mies van der Rohe*, his architecture and late modernism in American culture. Which considerations are you making about your role as a 'historian'? Which multicoloured and manifold context do you enter your name in, and which 'lines' do you in this connection wish to add to the preceding 'historiography' about *Mies*?

Well, when I was working on the *Seagram Building* I only had one ambition and one idea, and that was to make sure that Mies built the building he wanted to build.¹² With the book *Mies in America*, I more or less also had only one ambition and one idea, and that was to study and discover how Mies came to his ideas.

The considerations of one's role as a historian are as follows:

Whenever you draw or photograph something it is an interpretation of your own. Likewise, when you put ideas together that is also an interpretation of your own. However, the question is how well informed is that interpretation and on what do you base it?! I try to base my interpretations on evidence. In this case, the evidence was predominantly archival material such as Mies's drawings. There are, however, distinct differences in positions. As is well known, some historians take quite a different starting point. They see something - they snap an idea - and then they fit or read everything into that idea. Of course you can take that position, but then I think you are in a way writing

fiction, and that, I must say, is not my idea of how history should be written.

Talking about these points of view, but also the various media and their disparate meanings, as we all know, there is great difference between reading a book with illustrations and one without - whether the illustrations are drawings or photographs. Likewise, there is great difference between reading a book and watching a film adapted from the book, in which, for instance, actors, and specific buildings, enter the equation. In the latter case, of course a totally new medium is introduced, but when you see the film you also 'read' the director's and the actors' interpretation of the book and its characters. As a viewer of the film, you are removed from the text, the original source. The book is discursive and you can make your own connections and interpretations in ways that you cannot when you are watching a film. Watching a film is another, in some ways more confining, experience.

Exhibition and exhibition catalogue are also two different things. An exhibition is a mythopoetic situation and works as such. An exhibition is also discursive, but visitors normally spend a relatively short time at an exhibition - perhaps they only see part of the exhibition - and often they only visit it once. They are not likely to explore in detail everything shown at the exhibition - which means they are always missing something. The exhibition can introduce the visitor to issues, and it might help them to see things, but it is still going to offer a very strict, limited and defined idea of what they are looking at.

However, I think that one of the more interesting things exhibitions can do is to leave enough room for people to see and understand at different levels. Architectural exhibitions present a tremendous range of media - from the conceptual drawing that is an object in its own right but projects the idea of another object, to the photographic image that is both an object and an interpretation of another object. The image carries the memory of the experience of the object depicted or creates an experience, but its aim is to add other levels of experience, including dislocation in time, space, and reality.

Mies van der Rohe's buildings today stand as architectural icons. Mies himself is an icon. How, and to what extent, did Mies stage or construct the 'myth' about himself and his architecture? Which effects did he use for this, and what did the architectural photography mean in connection with this staging or construction?

Various people have discussed some of these points, and I also to some extent discuss them in my essay in *Mies in America*. Talking about Mies and his use of the photographic image, *Beatriz Colomina* wrote quite an interesting essay for *The Presence of Mies*, a book edited by *Detlef Mertins* in 1994.¹³

Indeed, *Colomina* argues that *Mies* was a person who really understood the power of media. She claims that he knew very well how to exploit it. As a matter of fact, she says that *Mies's* work, and not least the early work, became known almost exclusively through photography and the printed media.¹⁴ Thus, one could claim that the 'architecture' of *Mies van der Rohe* was/is also produced within the discursive space of exhibitions, catalogues, books, photographs, advertisements, conferences, etc.

That is correct. As I mentioned earlier, Mies cared a great deal about photography - be it photographs of his buildings or photographs of his models. Buildings should 'look good', and their image - that is, their photographic image - counted very much. Mies believed that it was ultimately the aesthetics of an object or a building that would convince people of its qualities. He used to say to me: *You have to punch through the clouds!* - that was exactly what he was doing with his images and photographs. He saw them as very powerful instruments through which he could make his work known to other architects and artists and the general public.

His situation was very different in Germany, though, than it was in America. In Germany, he first of all had to make himself known, and his very conscious way of using images and mass media clearly shows this. When Mies settled in Chicago, he was already a well-known architect. Work came to him; he did not have to promote himself. At the same time, the environment and artistic 'language' in America was different from that of Germany. The two cultures had different ways of using and understanding images. In America, with the exception of the early presentation of the *AIT* and *ITT* campus schemes and buildings, Mies's office produced conceptual collages rather than renderings, and later primarily models to study and present Mies's ideas to clients.

From his years in Berlin - actually as early as in 1910 - Mies had used collage and photomontage in addition to drawings and models to convey his architectural ideas. These were, among others, the representational modes through which he studied and visualized buildings in space. The technique of

montage proved to be of such value that it was deployed by Mies strategically in the presentation of several competition entries in the 1920s. He used collage and photomontage to evoke cinematographic movement or montage as a device for studying projects as they might be seen by an imaginary subject from a range of viewpoints. They point to Mies's strong sense of sequential movement as well as his early interest in subjective positional shifts.

I find it interesting that this exploitation of cinematographic sequentiality in Mies's work occurred during the time that *Sergei Eisenstein* produced his first films using the technique of montage: *Strike* in 1924, *Potemkin* in 1925, and *October* in 1927. There is clear evidence that *Eisenstein*, who was initially trained as an architect, knew of *Mies van der Rohe* and his projects. I am not sure, however, whether Mies was aware of *Eisenstein's* investigations or not, but, deductively, he must have!

The appearance of new techniques of representation through history has had a crucial effect on the work of the architect, and thereby also on the built domain. It is obvious - not least from what you have been saying - that *Mies van der Rohe*, from as early as the 1910s, used the photograph, the collage, and the photomontage as analytical and generative tools in the design process and as communicative media in situations where ideas needed to be promoted. Did *Mies* also refer to, discuss and use photographs, collages and photomontages in his teaching at the *IIT*, and what was his design process like in his office in America?

For Mies, the idea was the thing! In America, at least after 1950, Mies would always begin a project by having a site model made. He would then study the model very carefully, and when he understood the site and had decided where to place the building or buildings using models, he would then begin develop the articulation of the building. He studied spatial questions through models - all kinds of models and at all scales. There are photographs that show Mies completely absorbed, looking at a model. The models were always produced in the office, and until his departure in 1965, the highly inventive *Edward Duckett* made most of them.

Models of full-scale sections sometimes replaced drawings or were used alongside full-scale drawings. This was so through the 1940s, the 1950s, and the 1960s. When Mies was working on the great two-way clear-span roof for the *New National Gallery* in Berlin at the end of his life, it was through one-fifth scale models that he carefully

studied the column, the pin joint, and the details of the edge beam, as well as its whole length.¹⁵ Mies worked with models as he worked with drawings, asking his office colleagues to try at least three different solutions.

I do not think that Mies ever used photography in his teaching at *IIT*. However he certainly used photography to great effect in his collages, which were conceptual, not realistic, works.

In photographs made of his models he incorporated photographs of people as scale figures and of landscape and sky to establish atmospheric effects. He wanted these representations to be as realistic as possible.

You have already explained a little about the video images by artist *Inigo Manglano-Ovalle* and why you wanted to use video and film works in the exhibition *Mies in America*. However, how do this medium and its particular visual staging affect our understanding of and expectation to phenomena such as for instance space, time, and distance in architecture?

It allows people to feel haptically, to feel and see aspects of the architecture that they would not be able to see or understand through other modes of representation - aspects like spatial and temporal movement, the relationship of buildings to their context, the everyday life of the city and the people in the city, how people use the buildings and their surroundings, light as it changes and redefines the character of buildings and materials - inside as well as outside. A film or video can to some extent give an idea of the impact that a building has on the body - and vice versa, inducing the dislocation in time, space, and reality.

This was potent in *Inigo Manglano-Ovalle's Alltagszeit (In Ordinary Time)*, a film shot in the *New National Gallery* in Berlin. Shot both in real time and pixilated, compressed time, it was therefore abstract, that is, everything but the building was abstract. The building was solid, eternal, real; the people and surrounding trees shimmered with their movements. The image was very large, so that the viewer could identify with the people in the film, and as it unfolded slowly from dawn to dusk in a mere fifteen minutes, the viewer was mesmerized into the sensation of being there. With the sonorous tone and rhythm of *Jeremy Boyle's* ambient electronic soundtrack, it was deeply moving. It was theatre.

The use of films, or, if you like, time-based imagery, imparted an emotional and sensual quality to the rigorous intellectual quality of Mies's architectural sensibility, and in this way truly evoked Mies.

Most discussions of the meaning of exhibitions of contemporary art/architecture minimize the importance of the location and the type of architectural space in which the exhibition is held. Nevertheless, it is also the context, the 'frame' of the communication - for instance an exhibition building, a site or a catalogue - that mediates the architectural message, and not only the architectural representations (drawings, models, photos, films, etc.) in the context. What are your reflections on the above-mentioned?

First of all, I would claim that you cannot create an exhibition without considering the space in which it will be shown! The physical context is of course of the utmost importance. You are, however, right in what you are saying: many curators - and perhaps especially curators who are not trained as architects - tend to minimize the importance of the location and the architectural space. That is a pity, for in my mind an exhibition is a work of art in and of itself. It is a dramatic event, a staged production. I myself, therefore, always try to work very consciously with the exhibition space and its architectural potential. I care a great deal about things like colour, light, materials, and exhibition furniture, in addition to the use of media.

The Mies exhibition was different in each of its three venues. It was designed for the *CCA*, a space that I know intimately, and its basic components adjusted to the other venues - the *Whitney* in New York and *MOCA* in Chicago. Each venue had special strengths. For example, the part of the exhibition that dealt with the I-beam was especially compelling in Chicago, as was the scale of the gallery, especially its height; on the other hand, the first part introducing Mies's intellectual and spiritual life - the books he read and the art he collected - and the last section, in which *Inigo's Alltagszeit* was presented, were cramped and less successful.

However both of these parts of the exhibition, the introduction and the 'climax' were poetic in the more intimate scale of the galleries at the *CCA*, whereas *Marcel Breuer's* gridded ceiling at the *Whitney* was redolent of Mies's clear-span structures. The high-rise building section where the spatiality and materiality of *Seagram* and the *Federal Center* and their very different sites were contrasted on two large suspended screens, with music composed using street noises, was equally powerful everywhere.

Which possibilities do you see in Net-art and exhibitions on the Internet, and how does this new exhibition context change curatorial practices?

This is something that we have actually discussed quite a lot at the *CCA*. Exhibitions with the aura and presence of original works and a strong spatial organization, on the one hand, and the presentation of ideas on a flat screen, on the other hand: these are two very different creatures, just as a building and a photograph of a building are different. In essence, an exhibition is very much a spatial affair, and like architecture, it embraces almost all of our senses. Like architecture, exhibitions also create meeting-places for people, they construct an important social and cultural space in which people talk to each other and interact. If you want to present art on the Internet, it is not enough to simulate other modes of presentation; you must invent something new. And it is important to remember that visual media are never 'transparent'. The photographic image involves more than merely 'taking' a photograph; rather, it consists in 'making' a photograph. There are so many possibilities, but to simply produce a virtual simulation of an exhibition presented in a gallery or a museum makes no sense. For this reason, my colleagues at the *CCA* and I used to think that we would never present exhibitions on the Internet. However, there are other means of developing and presenting ideas for this medium that we will surely investigate.

Talking about the various media - what do you think about the writing of architectural history of today, where we are more than ever confronted with and reading architecture exclusively through the mass media, including the many popular 'style magazines' which are not written for architects but rather for a general audience? Which expectations will in this connection be established to architecture and the built works?

Architectural ideas have been circulated in printed books since the Renaissance, and even before printing, they were transmitted through manuscript copies. Publishing has increased in a manifold way. There are more primary monographs published today than the sum total of those printed since the fifteenth century, and this has been augmented by a vast array analytical and critical texts.

The revolutionary journal *Oppositions*, published by the *Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies* from the mid-1970s to the mid-1980s, instigated and promulgated by *Peter Eisenman* and finely designed by *Massimo Vignelli*, profoundly altered the discourse on architecture in the United States and then worldwide. A journal of ideas and criticism in architecture, *Oppositions* placed the acts of design and building at the centre of cultural thought. One could say that what Mies had been reading, thinking and committing to his notebooks

and lecture notes before World War II flourished discursively after his death.

Most architectural magazines today, particularly in the United States, have become consumer products, commodities that cater to the commercial in a commercializing world. Relying heavily on images accompanied by meagre text, these publications are vehicles for selling products – and that includes architects, their clients, and all forms of industrially-produced design. It is not that this connection between architecture and the marketplace is new. On the contrary, trade catalogues of the eighteenth century were useful and informative but also usually quite beautiful; likewise, the quality of advertising in the extraordinary 1930s Dutch architecture journal *Wasmuth* conformed to the journal's own exquisite graphic design. The trouble is that the visual quality of periodical publications has diminished tremendously. Though we are inevitably affected by the mass media and its messages.

All too often effects are transmitted to the built works of architects rather than ideas. Still, I believe that any intelligent architect or student of architecture will be able to distinguish banal ideas from intelligent discourse.

***Mies van der Rohe* has always meant a lot to you – professionally as well as privately. What is the reason that it is not until now that you have chosen to curate this exhibition? What would you have done or emphasized differently, if you had arranged the exhibition 10 or 20 years ago?**

Indeed, Mies has always meant a lot to me. He was my mentor. I was also his client. I date the beginning of my life to 1954, the year the *Seagram* project began. *Why* did I not do an exhibition about Mies twenty years ago? Well, twenty years ago I was in the process of founding the CCA, and I could not possibly have worked on an exhibition on Mies at that point. All my thought and energy was going into the creation of the institution.

As early as in the 1980s, I first thought about a Mies exhibition, though. The CCA was at that time in discussions with the *Museum of Modern Art* in New York about an exhibition or exhibitions in connection with Mies's 100-year birthday, 27 March 1986. I remember that at the time, I also considered mounting an exhibition on Mies and his colleagues at the *MvdR* office. However, in the 1980s, modernism was completely rejected; everyone was interested in postmodernism. Especially in the case of Mies. Already in the 1960s, interest in his architecture was on the wane, even though *Le Corbusier* was revered. Mies was criticized, among other things, for being too cold and square. No, in the 1980s, there was simply no interest in Mies's work

- it was not the right time to do an exhibition on him. It is only now that people are reviewing the gains of modernism and understanding to different degrees and at different levels the potential within it.

How did this criticism affect *Mies*?

He wondered what had gone wrong. When Mies died in 1969, he was in a way bored with architecture, and thought that he had done it long enough. It was marvelous, though, that before he died he was finally able to build in his native country - the *New National Gallery* in Berlin that opened in 1968. Mies was deeply involved in this project, and everything about it mattered very much to him. He also worked on the *Toronto-Dominion Centre* in Canada, on the composition of the buildings - two towers of different size and a clear-span banking pavilion interwoven with the open space of the five and a half acre site. The architectural language of the *Toronto-Dominion Centre* is very much the same one Mies used in his *Federal Center for Chicago*, which was begun five years earlier than *Toronto*, but completed in the same year, the year of Mies's death.

You mentioned that modernism was very much rejected in the 1980s. Today we 're-read' it, however. What can we learn from *Mies* today?

I think we can learn many, many things from Mies and his architecture. Although the aesthetics are different today - each period has its own expression - we can study Mies's buildings and projects to great advantage. Of course there is the important issue of Mies's fine sense of how the parts relate to the whole and how buildings relate to their context.

His sense of proportion and his rectitude are persuasive. By 'reading' Mies's buildings as well as his projects, we can enhance and develop our understanding of space, movement and transition, proportions, materials, and texture, and we can learn a great deal about how architecture is perceived and experienced. Another thing we can learn is respect for what we are doing as architects and respect for others. Mies was extraordinary in that regard. He always saw things in the context of the bigger picture. He had a holistic view of life, and was genuinely interested in people and the civilization for which he built. These interests were a strong force behind everything that he did.

In sum, Mies was interested in *how* we perceive architecture and *how* architecture constitutes meaning! ■

Notes and References

1. The exhibition was shown at
 - *Whitney Museum of American Art*, New York (21 June to 23 September 2001)
 - *Canadian Centre for Architecture*, Montréal (17 October 2001 to 20 January 2002)
 - *Museum of Contemporary Art*, Chicago (16 February to 26 May 2002).

For further information please consult:
<http://cca.qc.ca>

2. *Centre Canadien d'Architecture*
(Canadian Center for Architecture)
 1920 Baile Street,
 Montréal, Québec, Canada H3H 2S6.

The CCA is a museum and a study centre devoted to the art of architecture past and present. It is founded on the conviction that architecture, as part of the social and natural environment, is a public concern. The CCA's activities are local, national and international in scope. They are based on a unique collection of works of art and documentation from cultures throughout the world and from all disciplines that create and intervene in the built environment - including architecture, urban planning, and landscape design.

The CCA interprets its collections for the public through exhibitions, publications, and public programs. The resources of the CCA's library and its collections of prints and drawings, photographs, and archives offer scholars and specialists a wealth of primary and secondary material for advanced research in the history, theory, and practice of architecture.

The CCA occupies a building designed by Peter Rose, with Phyllis Lambert, consulting architect, and Erol Argun, associate architect. Built in 1989, the 130,000 square-foot building has received numerous awards in America and Europe. The CCA building houses exhibition galleries, the *Paul Desmarais Theatre*, and the *CCA Bookstore*, as well as the library, curatorial offices, state-of-the-art conservation and collection storage facilities, and the *Study Centre* in the *Alcan Wing*.

The new building is integrated with the *Shaughnessy House*, built in 1874 to the design of W.T. Thomas and classified a historic monument by the governments of Québec and Canada. The conservation and restoration of the 20,000-square-foot *Shaughnessy House* were under the supervision of Denis Saint-Louis. It is one of the rare nineteenth-century

Montréal houses open to the public. The upper floors of the *Shaughnessy House* contain the administrative offices of the CCA. (Source: <http://cca.qc.ca>)

3. Lambert, Phyllis (Ed.): *Mies in America*. Montréal, Canadian Centre for Architecture and New York, Whitney Museum of Art, 2001.
4. Lambert, Phyllis: Mies Immersion. In: *Mies in America*. Montréal, Canadian Centre for Architecture and New York, Whitney Museum of Art, 2001, pp. 192 - 589. (Edited by: Lambert, Phyllis)
5. Oechslin, Werner: "Not from an aesthetising, but from a general cultural point of view". Mies's Steady Resistance to Formalism and Determinism: A Plea for Value-Criteria in Architecture. In: *Mies in America*. Montréal, Canadian Centre for Architecture and New York, Whitney Museum of Art, 2001. (Edited by: Lambert, Phyllis)
6. Oechslin, Werner: "Not from an aesthetising, but from a general cultural point of view" Mies's Steady Resistance to Formalism and Determinism: A Plea for Value-Criteria in Architecture. In: *Mies in America*. Montréal, Canadian Centre for Architecture and New York, Whitney Museum of Art, 2001 p. 80. (Edited by: Lambert, Phyllis)
7. In addition to designing the installation artist Inigo Mangano-Ovalle has created several video and film works on the *Farnsworth House*, the *Seagram Building*, the *Chicago Federal Centre*, and the *New National Gallery*, Berlin, Germany.
8. Lambert, Phyllis. Photographic Portfolio; Guido Guidi and Richard Pare. In: *Mies in America*. Montréal, Canadian Centre for Architecture and New York, Whitney Museum of Art, 2001, p. 522 (Edited by: Lambert, Phyllis)
9. Mertins, Detlef: Living in a Jungle: Mies, Organic Architecture, and the Art of City Building. In: *Mies in America*. Montréal, Canadian Centre for Architecture and New York, Whitney Museum of Art, 2001, p. 597. (Edited by: Lambert, Phyllis)

10. Ferguson, Bruce W.: Exhibition Rhetorics. Material speech and utter sense. In: *Thinking about Exhibitions*. London, Routledge, 1996. (Edited by: Ferguson, Bruce W.; Greenberg, Reesa; Nairne, Sandy)
11. *The American Lawn*. Exhibition held at the CCA, Montréal 1998. Teyssot, Georges (Ed.): *The American Lawn*. New York, Princeton Architectural Press, 1999.
12. *Phyllis Lambert* was the client for *Mies van der Rohe's* New York masterpiece, the *Seagram Building* (1954-58). *Phyllis Lambert* was instrumental in the realisation of Mies's vision. Source: *Mies in America*. Montréal, Canadian Centre for Architecture and New York, Whitney Museum of Art, 2001, p. 8. (Edited by: Lambert, Phyllis)
13. Mertins, Detlef (Ed.): *The Presence of Mies*. New York, Princeton Architectural Press, 1994.
14. Colomina, Beatriz: Mies Not. In: *The Presence of Mies*. New York, Princeton Architectural Press, 1994, p. 213.
15. Lambert, Phyllis: Mies Immersion. In: *Mies in America*. Montréal, Canadian Centre for Architecture and New York, Whitney Museum of Art, 2001, pp. 215-217. (Edited by: Lambert, Phyllis)

Biography

Phyllis Lambert is Chair of the Board of Trustees at the Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA), Montréal, of which she was founding Director, 1977-99. *Phyllis Lambert* was appointed Director of Planning for the *Seagram Building*, New York, 1954 -58, and worked briefly in *Mies van der Rohe's* office in 1960. She received a M.Sc., Arch. from the *Illinois Institute of Technology*, Chicago, 1963, remaining in close contact with Mies and his office until his death in 1969. Designer of the *Saidye Bronfman Centre*, Montréal, which opened in 1967, she worked as architect/developer with *Gene Summers* on the renovation of the *Biltmore Hotel*, Los Angeles, 1976-78.

Phyllis Lambert has edited and contributed to major publications including *Fortifications and the Synagogue: The Fortress of Babylon and the Ben Ezra Synagogue, Cairo* (1994), *Opening the Gates of Eighteenth-Century Montréal* (1992), *Photography and Architecture: 1839-1939* (1992), and *Court House: A Photographic Document* (1978). She has published essays on *Mies* in the journal *Any Magazine* as well as in *The Presence of Mies* (1994), edited by *Detlef Mertins*.

(Source: Lambert, Phyllis, ed., *Mies in America* Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture and New York: Whitney Museum of American Art, 2001), p. 749.)

The EAAE Prize 2001/2002

Knowledge Skills and Arrogance (summary)

Rosie Parnell, Sheffield School of Architecture, University of Sheffield, United Kingdom

Collaboration, teamworking and communication skills are not, apparently, strengths of the architecture profession (RIBA, 1993; Lawson and Pilling, 1996; Egan report, 1998). But, perhaps of greatest concern is evidence of a perception, held by the public, that architects are arrogant. According to Sara (2001), 'architects are described as arrogant, poor listeners, and their education is seen to be to blame.' The truth of this assertion is not of primary concern here: that it is believed is sufficient to warrant investigation. An atmosphere in which one party sees another as arrogant simply cannot be conducive to successful (and respectful) collaboration and teamworking; both of which are key to contemporary professional practice.

There are signs that the UK's social and political climate is moving towards increasingly participatory democratic processes. The pressure exerted by this movement is being felt in Architecture (in the profession and in education), which has traditionally isolated itself from its context. However, engaging the public has long been the mission of *Design Participation* – a movement traditionally on the fringes of Architecture. Central to Participation is the belief that lay knowledge and experience are valuable: a belief reflected in more inclusive practices.

There is insufficient space in this article to explain each of the areas of the paper. However, the paper draws on participation literature and education theory to create a dialogue between those educational and professional practices which might potentially support collaboration and inclusion. In particular, the paper focuses on the role of architecture education in the development of the attitudes of future architects toward clients and users. The concepts of values and citizenship education are discussed, areas which are rarely explicitly addressed in Architecture education. The paper concludes that alternative pedagogies are required to challenge the traditional modes of education and practice. It is suggested that clients and users play a key role in the education of architects and that alternative assessment strategies be introduced.

A number of key texts from the Participation literature were analysed to identify the common characteristics of participatory practices which challenge traditional practice. The findings are summarised below.

What Does Participation Have to Say?

According to Sanoff (2000), the purposes of participation have been defined to include information exchange, conflict resolution and supplementation of planning and design. He identifies four essential characteristics of participation – characteristics which reflect the value position adopted by participation proponents toward client/users and their knowledge and experience:

- Participation is inherently good.
- It is a source of wisdom and information about local conditions, needs and attitudes, and thus improves the effectiveness of decision-making.
- It is an inclusive and pluralistic approach by which fundamental human needs are fulfilled and user values reflected.
- It is a means of defending the interests of groups of people and of individuals, and a tool for satisfying their needs that are often ignored...

It is clear that these characteristics are driven by an attitude that values the knowledge and experience of the client/user. Indeed, no designer could operate in a truly participatory mode of practice unless she adopted this attitude. This mode of practice might be described as a democratic approach to design.

Comerio (1984), distinguishes community design from traditional practice in the following ways:

- A focus on client-type rather than building-type
- Requires a variety of tasks to solve problems because the end product is not clearly defined the outset
- Design problems are generated by a grassroots or bottom-up process.
- Combines principles of [client/user] empowerment with enabling products.

Again, these characteristics clearly reflect an attitude which values the knowledge and experience of the client/user. Each of the distinguishing characteristics of community design can be interpreted within the framework of architecture education.

This has further implications for architecture education if it is to support a participatory mode of practice. Some of the key characteristics of this type of education are suggested as follows:

- Architecture education would accord greater value to the understanding of client/users than to the study of building precedents.
- Architecture education would encourage a multiplicity of approaches to design to raise awareness among students of the variety of skills that might be needed in the real-world design process.
- The design brief would be developed by students with client/users, rather than being imposed by educators in its complete form.
- Students would be encouraged to develop and use methods and techniques to enable client/user involvement and empowerment in the design process.

This new type of education would demand new modes of assessment to ensure that both staff and students value the above characteristics. New focus areas for assessment (paralleling the above characteristics) are suggested below:

- The assessment process should include assessment of the student's understanding of the client/user. In some projects the client/user might be relatively abstract. In other cases, where the client/user is actually represented by a specific person or group, there is a strong case for giving these people a role in the assessment of student understanding, since they are the experts with regard to their own needs, desires and aspirations.
- Assessment should give equal status to the design process as to the product if students are to appreciate the value in pursuing a variety of design routes.
- Brief development should become part of the assessment process, essentially focusing on the skills of the student in communicating with and understanding the client/user.
- The participation methods developed by students, along with the skills used in implementing them, should both be assessed with regard to their effectiveness in eliciting client/user views and encouraging active client/user involvement.

The outlined proposals for an alternative pedagogy point towards the development of a listening approach. Characteristics such as empathy and co-operation and activities such as brief development, client/user involvement and client/user understanding, demand that the student architect learns

to listen. This is not just a skill, but also an attitude. Listening to find value in what others are saying is the only truly listening process. It is acknowledged that the implementation of the above proposals may prove difficult due to the inherent resistance presented by the existing educational structure and its enforcers.

While modern Higher Education would claim to espouse the values of democratic education, there is much in the established University system that continues to support a conservative individual approach. This system is likely to present a barrier to change with regard to the introduction of more collaborative and perhaps exploratory approaches. Further research is needed to identify where the greatest barriers lie and to suggest how they might be overcome. ■

References:

- RIBA (1993) *Phase 2 of the Strategic Study of the Profession, Clients and Architects*. London: RIBA Publications.
- Lawson, B and Pilling, S (1996) *The Cost and Value of Design*. Architectural Research Quarterly, 1 (4).
- Egan, Sir J (1998) *Rethinking Construction: The report of the Construction Task Force*, London: Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions.
- Sanoff, (2000) *Community participation methods in design and planning*. New York: Wiley
- Sara (2001) *Feminising Architectural Education? A review of current trends in the UK architecture studio*. Architectural Education Exchange, 2001 website: <http://cebe.cf.ac.uk/aee/> (last visited 19.3.02)
- Comerio, M. (1984) *Community design: idealism and entrepreneurship*. In (1990) H. Sanoff (ed.) *Participatory Design: Theory and Techniques*. pp. 21-37, North Carolina State University.

The EAAE Prize 2001/2002

Adventures of Complexity (summary)

Jörg Rainer Noennig, University of Technology, Dresden, Germany

Today we sense a growing demand for strategies of complexity processing in architecture. We are faced with design tasks that are exceedingly complex as they involve huge numbers of requirements and parameters as well as extensive functional and spatial programmes. For these tasks, conventional design approaches do not lead to appropriate solutions anymore.

From the perspective of architectural education, *Adventures of Complexity* investigates adequate design technologies for complexity in architecture. Two problematic aspects of such an investigation are already implied in the title of the article. Firstly, there is one notion of 'Adventure' as a kind of exploration - a risky though exciting experience. Secondly, there is one meaning of 'Adventure' which refers to 'advent' - as the 'appearance', or 'emergence' of complex phenomena.

Not only in architecture are we currently confronted with steadily increasing complexity at all levels. The evolution of our environments, cultures, sciences, social and political systems proceeds in only one direction: structures constantly grow more complex and diversified. We face only two possible scenarios: 1) a complexity path that continues infinitely but constantly turns steeper, or 2) the arrival at a critical mass of complexification that eventually leads to ultimate collapse and disintegration.

There is a number of phenomena manifesting continuous complexifications in architecture and urbanism. A major aspect is certainly the rapid extension of cities and metropolises on the one hand, and their enormous dis-urbanisation on the other. The growth of global mega-cities as well as the shrinkage of western towns became issues beyond planning. Insufficiently equipped with adequate planning methodology, architects and urbanists cannot but refrain from shaping the accelerated developments of contemporary city-scapes.

While cities rapidly change their extension, there is similarly swift change of their 'internal' dimensions going on. Too many diverse stakeholder parties as well as social, political and technological powers are involved in the built environments, and bring about an intense hybridisation of interests and programmes. Any design decision inevitably causes

reverberations to other systems. All kinds of organisms, machines, material and informational structures are to be coordinated and integrated in a design scheme from now. Within such hybrid contexts, different formalisms and utilisation concepts steadily criss-cross each other. Then, clear-cut architectural design policies turn fictitious - designing architecture only remains wishful thinking.

Another increase in complex dimensions proceeds 'Quick'n Big'. Sounding absurd though, the larger the scale of investment and impact of many projects is, the faster they have to be carried out. In other words: the more difficult certain architectural jobs are, the quicker you have to proceed them. This regards especially projects in the entertainment industries, research & development facilities, new town developments, or high-tech industries - those fields in architecture where money and m^2 get really shifted.

One more aspect out of many architectural complexifications might go by the catchphrase 'Intelligence'. Even though the developments in practically any other life-sector are breathtaking, it seems architecture alone stays indifferent to the fact that our environments turn more responsive and smarter all the time. Our organismic body, electromechanical devices, as well as all kinds of environmental systems get ever more tightly linked and interconnected - they recognise each other and develop specific behaviour and personal communication. Already now, many parts of such intelligent environments are architectural components - kitchens, facades, climate devices, etc. - hence, the design of their intelligent cooperation is becoming a task for architects as well.

Summing up, we now realise the character of the currently emerging 'complexity issue'. Now, we shall investigate the means available for tackling our problem: how is the state of art in complexity processing in architecture?

Sorry, the answer is negative: there are no appropriate means. And here we arrive at the second meaning of 'adventure' - adventure as an exploration, a journey in the unknown. In fact, we do not know how to approach issues like the before-mentioned. There are no established algorithms, no certain procedures, and no conventions as to

how to organise them. There is only uncertainty and question marks.

Especially dramatic for architects is when there are no typological references to draw from history. Complexity issues like 'growth', 'intelligence', or 'hybridity' are basically new and unprecedented. Employing old types and typologies for such current problems appears like applying bulky and out-fashioned instruments for a much too delicate surgery.

If we cannot fall back on design history in order to recycle previous sample solutions, it seems we should rather rely on our own sense of inspiration and inventiveness. Wrong! In the face of overwhelming complexity even our rational and creative capacities quickly reach their limits. Culture theorists like *Michel Foucault* or economists like *Herbert Simon* have clearly identified the boundaries of our rationality: in complexity, our mind is indeed very helpless when it comes to conceiving proper responses. In complexity panic we solve too complicated issues by random choice, or rule-of-thumb.

We find ourselves in a sort of gridlock. On the one hand, the complexities of today's architectural dimensions demand efforts never seen before in planning – but on the other we are not able to grasp the problems by the limited means we usually proceeded our designs with (i.e. typology, inventiveness, creativity, rationality, etc). There is an obvious need for a complex and integrated planning approach that can channel the diversity of aspects and requirements into effective scheming.

In architecture - certainly one of the most complex disciplines imaginable – there is nothing yet like a complexity or systems approach, surprisingly enough. Even though there have been attempts by *Christopher Alexander*, *Nicholas Negroponte*, or *Bill Hillier*, somehow they all lost track of the issue. The demand itself, nonetheless, is more crucial than ever: as long as architects do not come up with more appropriate means for complexity processing, their role and impact will steadily get marginalized and occupied by city managers, project developers, and general contractors from one edge, and by strategy consultants, system engineers, and neuro-scientists from the other.

As this should appear to be a substantial threat to any self-confident architect professional, the *Process Architecture Studio* at *Dresden University of Technology* eventually endeavoured to research instruments for tackling complexity in architecture.

At the centre of the studio's approach is an idea that is familiar from school mathematics: finding a proper solution for some given data equals finding the most appropriate and lucid description of it. The contents themselves, the given, do not change; they only have to be re-formulated until the problem becomes clear and transparent. The point of argument is that many complex architectural problems can be solved through similar methods of re-formulation. By way of repeatedly presenting the problematic issue (= Re-Presentation), certain types of order and organisation will automatically emerge. This is because any re-presentation cannot but impose some kind of order on the things described. Utilising this descriptive auto-mechanism, skilful re-presentations through manifold architectural media and formats may lead to appropriate solutions in the end. Hence, the design of complex issues turns into an art of re-presentation and organisation.

As there are only few adequate descriptive tools in architectural design theory for re-presenting, processing and organising complexity, the search naturally goes into extra-architectural fields. Very fertile grounds can be found in those so-called 'System-' or 'Complexity Sciences'. The recent research at the *Process Architecture Studio* in Dresden investigates areas such as *System Theory*, *Cybernetics*, *Fuzzy Logic*, and even *Neurocomputing* in order to dig out models and methods that can be put together as a set of architectural *Think Tools*. Applied in design, they are used as instruments for surveying, visualising and shaping complex programmes.

Application of these tools must consequently be semi-scientific. The issues dealt with are commonly hybrid tasks; they demand 'split brains' – something like, say, 30% of common sense, intuition and creativity for the representational part of it; and perhaps 70% of systematic procedure, which forms the scientific part.

The tools basically translate properties of relatedness, connectivity, and intelligence into adequate

configurational schemes - which in turn inform basic spatial proximities and communicative relations. As raw data, they are used as in-put for forthcoming design developments. These in turn are preceded by series of diagrammatic, or: 'intelligent' picturing. Realised either by software-tools or physical modelling/rapid prototyping technology, the former primarily sorts out hierarchies and priority classes within a building programme, whereas the latter depicts building areas and volumetric dimensions in a more tangible and physical fashion.

For projects that involve a large number of processes and data, programming a neuronc network has proven an effective decision-making tool. For selecting appropriate configurational schemes, such a network tool will automatically arrive at certain functional layouts that, if the job had to be done by a designer's hand, would otherwise involve some hundred or thousand trial-and-error schemes.

Despite all sophistication in software or modelling tools, the most essential skill is a competence in dealing with the variety of tools. This regards 1) the skill of effectively searching new tools, as well as the development of certain tools for specific tasks - the ability of 'toolmaking'; and 2) a proper knowledge for the handling of existing tools, i.e. how to apply each tool for certain processing steps.

In analogy to the mathematical example explained before, the set of tools is to be employed in a similar fashion as a re-presentational device. In order to compute adequate organisational solutions, common structural denominators, shared properties, and interfaces between each of the tools must be recognised. All diagrams and modelling techniques are to relate and translate into each other, forming thus a linked 'intelligence' structure. What is processed in one tool is to be inserted into another by a specific grammar of diagrammatic transformations.

All schematic tools, however, re-present and organise only internal processes of an architectural task; the inner context of a project. Still, all manipulations cannot infer appropriate form, or shape. The derived schemes are totally functionalist or programmatic in a sense, - even though they might

be effectively organised they are nothing more than built diagrams yet.

We embark on an idea of individual shape as we conceive the internal context as being correlated by its external environment, which is another given. Where the inner context is commonly a task architects can fully impact, shape, and organise, the outer context can be re-arranged only in parts, or not at all. Nonetheless, whether an architectural shape appears appropriate or not depends on the fit of its internal organismic set-up with this outer environment. As we cannot impact the latter as we might wish to do, we are nevertheless urged to adapt our schemes to it nevertheless.

Biologist *D'Arcy Thompson* claimed 'Form as a diagram of forces.' That remark wants us to view the outer context of any organism or shape as a sum of form-giving forces. The environment is seen as a sort of mould - a formwork that can bring the internally organised processes and structures into shape. In order to derive form and shape through such an environmental mould, we shall represent the exterior context in a similar sophisticated fashion as we organise internal contexts through diagrammatic-organisational tools.

The Process Architecture Studio at Dresden University is currently investigating various methods of how to score down contexts and translate them into diagrams, and further into built shape. One technique, for example, is based on translating environmental maps and patterns as 'Origami'-sheets into a variety of architectural skins and surfaces.

As it comes to complexity issues, there will always be a certain moment of tension, of incompleteness and affluence at the same time. In fact, these tensions are part of the phenomenon of complexity - and one of its essential qualities as well. One has to stand these tensions just as one has to stand the heat in a sauna - that is the point everything is about. Viewing architecture as an 'Adventure of Organising Complexity' we might come to grips with some of the new uncanny in our environments. If we succeed in this, the complexifications around us will certainly loose their scary aspects of things running out of scale, or out of control.

In turn, simplicity will be more than just the inability of thinking in complexity. Simplicity will turn into a form of luxury. ■

Towards a Common European Higher Architectural Education Area

Transactions on architectural education No 13

In the last decade a great number of schools of Architecture in Europe reconsidered and reformed the structure of their curricula. In the context of these reforms, a radical re-allocation of teaching time took place, a number of new subject areas were added, the importance of some other subject areas was diminished, and new forms of specialization were introduced to architectural education.

These changes could be attributed to a general tendency, which becomes increasingly apparent in the last few years, of an overall re-definition of the profile of the architect in contemporary society, but also of the educational strategies that will ensure this profile. The reforms were dictated by a number of factors, three of which appear to be the most crucial:

- The first factor concerns changes in architectural practice. The rapid changes in the social and financial dynamics of the past few years had a great impact on the environment in which architectural inventions occur both in the private as well as the public domain. New types of work organization, new construction materials and methods, new tools and media put, through professional bodies, pressure on schools of architecture, for a new synthesis of a general as well as a specialized education.
- The second factor concerns the new attestations and views on architecture. In any given point in time, architecture is perceived through the particularities that characterize the cultural, social and economic context in which this architecture emerges. In the contemporary epoch of information technology, speed, image, networks, and of the personalization of new tools for design and representation, the way in which we comprehend, feel and contemplate architecture changes radically. Contemporary *avant garde* architecture is accompanied by a different phenomenon which gradually dominates and therefore influences greatly the broader domain of architectural thinking. Publications and the mass media pressurize schools of architecture to encapsulate the new values and principles of *avant garde* architecture and to adjust accordingly their curricula.

- Finally, the third factor concerns the new EU policies towards a cohesive European area of higher education. Exchange Programmes, interdisciplinary collaborations, instructions and agreements towards comparability and alignment of the content, the teaching time and the degrees awarded by the schools, function as catalysts to the initiatives taken by schools to redefine the system and content of the education they offer.

(From: *Preface* by *Constantin Spiridonidis*).



Keynote Speakers

Antonakakis, Dimitris
Antonakakis, Souzana
Fatouros, Dimitris
Hanganu, Dan

Editors

Spiridonidis, Constantin
Voyatzaki, Maria

Proceedings

343 p. 15 Euro

Secretariat AEEA-EAAE

Kasteel van Arenberg
B-3001 Leuven/Belgique
tel ++32/(0) 16.32 1694
fax ++32/(0) 16. 321962
aeea@eaae.be

Shell and Spatial Structures from Models to Realization

Montpellier, France

The International Association for Shell and Spatial Structures organizes an international student competition related to the 2004 IASS Symposium "Shell and Spatial Structures from Models to Realization", to be held in Montpellier, France. The aim is to promote interest in lightweight structural creativity among future designers, "Bridging Architecture, Engineering and the Arts", and a better knowledge of IASS activities.

Each team has to be composed of at least :

- one student from an Architecture/Landscape School
- one student from a Civil Engineering School
- one student from a Fine Arts School

Teams of competitors from different countries are accepted. One competitor must belong to only one team.

You can get more details by consulting the site www.iass2004.org

L'association IASS organise un concours international sur un ensemble architectural et paysager à réaliser à Montpellier et comprenant notamment une passerelle.

Les Grands Ateliers sont partenaires de ce concours original qui prévoit des équipes interdisciplinaires d'étudiants comprenant obligatoirement:

- architecte
- ingénieur
- artiste

un workshop organisé en septembre 2003 aux Grands Ateliers pour permettre à 4 équipes lauréates de réaliser un prototype de leur projet.

Toutes les informations sur ce concours peuvent être consultées sur le site www.iass2004.org

For further information, please contact:

Denis Grèzes
Coordinateur scientifique et pédagogique
Grands Ateliers de l'Isle d'Abeau
BP 43, 38092 Villefontaine Cedex
denis.grezes@lesgrandsateliers.fr
Tel 04.7496.8870
Fax 04.7496.8871

The 2nd International Architectural Forum: Preserving the World's Great Cities

Saint Petersburg, Russia

03 - 08 May 2003

The 2nd International Architectural Forum is designed to mark the tercentenary of St. Petersburg, which is recognized as one of the most beautiful cities in the world and an architectural memorial in the open.

Each city has its own history. And that is a history of its every citizen and the history of the city itself told through the architecture, avenues, parks and alleys, through its myths, phantoms and tyrants, its power brokers. The city's history has a grandeur and excitement of a big theater.

But what happens if a city's soul is corrupt with greediness, political ambitions and despair? And when its architectural character is flattened, rebuilt and forgotten?

Getting ready to celebrate the 300th anniversary of St. Petersburg we understand that we share similar problems

with many other famed cities across the globe. The 2nd International Architectural Forum entitled Preserving the World's Great Cities is devoted to the issues and ethics of saving historical heritage of our cities. We welcome everybody who cares about these problems to join in.

We hope that the 2nd International Architectural Forum - which unites experts from many countries - will become a venue to talk yet once again about the experience of saving urbane historical heritage in the cities especially appreciated for their beauty created over the centuries and about those who struggle to preserve it.

Working Languages of the Forum are Russian and English

Conference Fee

\$ 600 per participant
Guests coming with delegates
\$ 250 per guest/spouse

Deadline for registration

20 February 2003.

Forum Organizers:

- St Petersburg Committee on Architecture and City Planning
- St. Petersburg Regional Architectural and Artistic Fund
- St. Petersburg Union of Architects
- CENTAUR Co Ltd

For further information, please contact:

Forum program director
Alevtina Telisheva,
Tel./fax +7(812) 380 1973
e-mail: centaur@archi-tector.org
www.archi-tector.org

CAAD Futures 2003

28 - 30 April 2003

National Cheng Kung University,
Department of Architecture
No. 1 University Road, Tainan, Taiwan

The Tenth International Conference on Computer Aided Architectural Design Futures.

CAAD Futures is a bi-annual conference that promotes the advancement of Computer Aided Architectural Design in the service of those concerned with the quality of the built environment. The conferences are organized under the auspices of the CAAD Futures Foundation.

For further information:

<http://www.arch.ncku.edu.tw/cf2003>

Digital Design - 22nd International eCAADe Conference

Austria, Graz - University of Technology, September 2003

Conference Theme

There is no question any longer whether the computer can be used as an effective tool in creating and producing architecture. However, drafting and visualisation are still the dominant applications in architecture. The power of the computer as a design tool and as a design stimulator has still to be fully exploited. Experiences within research communities show that the implication of computer applications in an early stage of the architectural design process still seems to be limited. In times where architectural curricula are responding to contemporary education needs, the question of positioning computer related subjects demands a well-founded approach; an approach based on informed research,

knowledge of education and issues that impinge on how computers are involved in the design process.

Topic of interest for the 2003 eCAADe-conference include but are not limited to:

- CAAD curriculum
- City modeling
- Collaborative design
- Design creativity
- Digital design education
- Design pedagogies
- Design process
- Generative design
- Human-computer interaction
- Research, Education & Practice
- Innovation
- Precedence and prototypes
- Prediction and evaluation

- Shape studies
- Virtual architecture
- Virtual reality
- Web-based design

Conference Venue

Graz University of Technology
Faculty of Architecture
Rechbauerstrasse 12
A-8010 Graz
Austria
www.tugraz.at

Conference Chair

Dr. Wolfgang Dokonal
Graz University of Technology
dokonal@stdb.tu-graz.ac.at
www.tu-graz.ac.at

Conference Organization

bco
Blindengasse 46a
A-1080 Vienna
Tel: ++43 1 40 32 820
Fax: ++43 1 40 32 820 20
www.bco.co.at

Important Dates

Call for papers:

October 1, 2002

Deadline for abstracts:

February 1, 2003

Notification of acceptance:

April 1, 2003

Deadline for full papers:

June 1, 2003

ISUF International Conference The Planned City?

July 3-6, 2003

Castello Svevo – Trani (Bari) - Italy

Conference Theme

Debates on the contemporary city all point to the fragmentation of the traditional urban organism. The city's former unity appears now gone, with current forms and structures considered irrevocably dispersed. Changes in urban form parallel the transformation (and redeployment) of the disciplines that have historically been charged to interpret and design the urban environment. The theme of this conference, The Planned City, is intended to question a possible return to the unified city while addressing the full complexity of the urban phenomena. The concept of the planned city opposes plans and projects (as unified rules) to gradual city building where life introduces infinite exceptions, variations, and transformations to the unavoidable rigidity contained in plans.

The structure of the conference includes the following thematic sections:

The planned city and its territory in history

- The Ancient city
- The Medieval city: Founded cities of the Renaissance
- The city of the Enlightenment
- Modern cities in theory and in practice

The cultural geography of the planned city

- Cities of North America
- Colonial cities of South America
- Cities of Northern Europe
- The planned city of the Mediterranean
- Cities of Islam

The theory of the New City

- The ideal city in ancient philosophies
- The city of God

- The contemporary city in architecture and in planning
- The contemporary metropolis: globalization and survival
- The future city: fragmentation and new organicity

Important Dates

Deadline for abstracts (300 words) and CVs:

December 30, 2002

Notification of acceptance:

February 15, 2003

Deadline for full papers:

May 01, 2003

Organizing Committee and

Conference Conveners:

Attilio Petruccioli, Conference Director
Michele Stella, Conference Director

Scientific Committee

- Antonio Castorani
- Michael Conzen
- Claudio D'Amato
- Mauro Mezzina
- Giuseppe Strappa
- Anne Vernez Moudon
- Jeremy Whitehand

Conference Venue

The conference will be held at the medieval castle in Trani, placed on the Adriatic coast, 40 Km north of the city of Bari, Italy.

Registration fee is 180 Euro

For further information, please contact:

Attilio Petruccioli
Petruccioli@yahoo.com

ECLAS Conference 2003

Lisbon, Portugal,

23-26 October 2003

Subject

Landscape Architecture and Modernism: Exploring the Heritage and Learning the Lessons.

The objective of the conference is to discuss the content and meaning of the performance and achievements of our profession in Europe between the 1930s and the 1970s. This time period only recently started to be explored within the European context. The recognition of the contribution of the acting landscape architects as a whole is not yet understood.

Presenters are invited to bring out the achievements in the different countries and the impact on today's practice of landscape architecture in Europe.

For organizational purposes we propose that the conference addresses three themes:

- Gardens
- Urban Design
- Landscape Planning

Conference Venue

Host Institutions High Institute of Agronomy, Lisbon Technical University Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, Lisbon, Portugal

Contact Person

Luis Ribiro, Assistant Professor
Tel: ++351 21 362 17 35
Fax: ++351 21 362 17 35

First International Architecture Biennial

Rotterdam, The Netherlands

7 May - 7 July, 2003

Mobility

This large-scale event will be held every two years in the Dutch port city of Rotterdam, itself recognized worldwide as an architectural trendsetter. The first architecture biennial focuses entirely on the theme of mobility, examining the issue of modern-day mobility and the consequences for architecture and urban development. Architects, civil engineers, urban planners, traffic experts, landscape architects, students, filmmakers and photographers from around the world will spend two months presenting plans and exchanging ideas in the form of exhibitions, lectures, publications, debates, films and excursions. The curator is Francine Houben, partner in the Mecanoo architecture firm and professor at the Delft University of Technology.

Conference Venue

- Las Palmas (Kop van Zuid)
- Nederlands Architectuurinstituut
- Natuurmuseum Rotterdam
- V2_
- Nederlands Fotomuseum

For further information, please contact:

www.1ab.nl

(theorising) History in Architecture and Design

Nordic Association of Architectural Research Conference, Oslo, Norway

25-27 April 2003

Call for Papers

Researchers, writers and PhD students in the fields of architecture and design (urban design and landscape included) are invited to participate in:

(theorising) History in Architecture and Design

The aim of the conference is to take a broad look at historical and critical studies of man made objects and environments and their relations both to the formation of theory and to praxis.

Although the focus of the conference will be on contemporary historical discourses and their effect on practice, critical historical perspectives that shed light on

the origins and development of these discourses are considered essential. The theme of the conference is based on the belief that architecture and design have a strong social component that make them part of a wide cultural discourse. Thus every historical study, most often implicitly, is constructed on a paradigm and a philosophy of history. As cultural, philosophical and epistemological positions change so does our understanding of the past.

The conference will explore the relations between paradigms, philosophies of history, historiographies, and historical validation within architectural and design practice. What paradigms underpin contemporary historiographies, how do these affect architect's and designer's conceptions of history, and, in turn, what are the relations between these historical

conceptions and the role of history in the practice of architecture and design. We have invited a series of internationally renowned academics who will address the main themes of the conference and lead the discussion groups.

Send your 400 words abstract, in English or any Scandinavian language, and / or preliminary registration to na@mail.aho.no by 15 February 2003.

Deadline for final papers of max. 3000 words:
31 March 2003

The conference panel will referee all abstracts and papers submitted, and the conference proceedings will be published in a special edition of the Nordic Journal of Architectural Research.

Conference fees:

members NOK 800/107 Euros,
non-members NOK 1300/174 Euros
PhD students NOK 500/67 Euros.

Programme coordinator:

Elisabeth Tostrup
Oslo School of Architecture,
Elisabeth.Tostrup@aho.no

For further information, please contact:

www.aho.no
arkitekturforskning.nu

Project Leaders/*Chargés de Mission*

VAN DUIN, Leen
(Guide and Meta-university)
Delft University of Technology
Faculty of Architecture
Berlageweg 1
2628 CR Delft/THE NETHERLANDS
tel ++31/15.2 785957
fax ++31/15.2 781028
l.vanduin@bk.tudelft.nl

HARDER, Ebbe
(EAAE Prize)
Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts
School of Architecture
Holmen
1433 Copenhagen/DENMARK
tel ++45/32.686000
fax ++45/32.686111

MABARDI, Jean-François
(Summer School)
Université Catholique Louvain
Unité d'Architecture
Place du Levant 1
B-1348 Louvain-La-Neuve/BELGIOUE
tel ++32/10.234949
fax ++32/10.234949
Jeanfranc.mabardi@skynet.be

SPIRIDONIDIS, Constantin
(Heads' Meetings; ENHSA)
Université Aristotélieenne de Thessaloniki
Ecole d'Architecture
Bte. Universitaire 491
GR-54006 Thessaloniki/GREECE
tel ++30/310.995589
fax ++30/310.458660
spirido@arch.auth.gr

TOFT, Anne Elisabeth
(News Sheet)

Council Members/*Membres du Conseil*

FJELD, Per Olaf
Olso School of Architecture
Postboks 6768
St. Olavs Plass
N-0139 Olso/NORWAY
tel ++47/22.997070
fax ++47/22.99719071
pof@mail.aho.no

HANROT, Stephane
Ecole d'Architecture de Marseille Luminy
184 av. de Luminy
F-13288 Marseille/FRANCE
tel ++33/4.91625235
fax ++33/4.91957744
stephane@hanrot-et-rault.fr

HORAN, James
(EAAE/AEEA Vice-President)
Dublin Institute of Technology
School of Architecture
Bolton Street 1
Dublin /IRELAND
tel ++353/1.4023690
fax ++353/1.4023989
james.horan@dit.ie

MICHIALINO, Paola
UCL
Unité d'Architecture
Place du Levant 1
B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve/BELGIOUE
tel ++32/10.472421
fax ++32/10.474544
michialino@urba.ucl.ac.be

NEUCKERMANS, Herman
(EAAE/AEEA President)
KUL-Dpt. of Architecture
Kasteel van Arenberg
B-3001 Leuven/BELGIOUE
tel ++32/16.321361
fax ++32/16.321984
herman.neuckermans@
asro.kuleuven.ac.be

POPESCU, Emil Barbu
(Treasurer)
Head of Department
Institute of Architecture Ion Mincu
Str. Academiei 18-20
Sector 1
70109 Bucarest/ROUMANIE
tel ++40/1.3139565
++40/1.3155482
fax ++40/1.3123954

TOFT, Anne Elisabeth
Aarhus School of Architecture
Noerreport 20
DK-8000 Aarhus C/DENMARK
tel ++45/89.360287
fax ++45/86.130645
anne.elisabeth.toft@a-aarhus.dk

VOYATZAKI, Maria
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
School of Architecture
GR-54006 Thessaloniki/GREECE
tel ++30/310.995544
fax ++30/310.458660
mvoyat@arch.auth.gr

Thematic Coordinators

HANROT, Stephane
(Research)

MICHIALINO, Paola
(Urban Issues)

VOYATZAKI, Maria
(Construction)

Secrétariat permanent

EAAE/AEEA Secretary

SCHOL, Lou
Kasteel van Arenberg
B-3001 Leuven/BELGIOUE
tel ++32/(0)16.321694
fax ++32/(0)16.321962
aeea@aeeae.be
<http://www.eaae.be>

EAAE Calendar
AEEA Calendrier

2003		
15 03	EAAE Council Meeting Paris/France	Réunion du conseil de l'AEEA Paris/France
08 - 11 05	Four Faces of Architecture Stockholm/Sweden	Quatre faces de l'architecture Stockholm/Suède
27 - 30 07	Contribution and Confusion Helsinki/Finland	Contribution et Confusion Helsinki/Finlande
03 - 06 09	6th Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture Chania/Greece	6^o Conférence des Directeurs des Écoles d'Architecture en Europe Chania/Grèce

EAAE News Sheet

Aarhus School of Architecture
Noerreport 20
DK-8000 Aarhus C

Editor's Office

Anne Elisabeth Toft
Ph.D.-Student
The Aarhus School of Architecture
Noerreport 20
DK-8000 Aarhus C
tel ++45/89.360287
fax ++45/86.130645
anne.elisabeth.toft@a-aarhus.dk

EAAE interactive
www.eaae.be

NEWS SHEET deadlines

#66 (B2/2003), Apr./Apr. 03/03
#67 (B3/2003), Sept./Sept. 03/03

Contributions to EAAE News Sheet
Contributions AEEA News Sheet

Contributions to the News Sheet are always welcome, and should be sent to the editor, who reserves the right to select material for publication. Contributions might include conference reports, notice of future events, job announcements and other relevant items of news or content. The text should be available in French and English, unformatted, on either disk or as an email enclosure. Deadlines are announced in the News Sheets. ■

Secretariat AEEA-EAAE

Lou Schol

Kasteel van Arenberg

B-3001 Leuven/BELGIOUE

Les contributions au News Sheet sont toujours bienvenues. Elles doivent être envoyées à l'éditeur, qui décidera de leur publication. Contributions d'intérêt: rapports de conférences, événements à venir, postes mis au concours, et d'autres nouvelles en bref sur la formation architecturale. Les critères à suivre sont: Les textes doivent être en Français et en Anglais, en forme d'un document de texte non formaté, qui peut être attaché à un e-mail ou être envoyé en forme d'une disquette. Les dates limites sont publiées dans chaque bulletin. ■

tel ++32/(0)16.321694

fax ++32/(0)16.321962

aaea@eaae.be

http://www.eaae.be

british architect sir david chipperfield told us about his work, his thoughts on globalized architecture and much more. DC: far to many too mention people like nicholas hawksmoor, mies van der rohe, louis kahn DB: and those still working today? DC: again, there are many alvaro siza, rafael moneo, luigi snozzi, norman foster, richard rogers, rem koolhaas, herzog and de meuron, kazuyo sejima and ryue nishizawa. the issue for architects is that there's no single formula that works for every project. once you get into discussions about sustainability and recyclable materials there's a lot of subjectivity, so you just have to be sensible with how you approach each project. Phyllis Lambert has been called "Joan of Architecture" both for her fierce advocacy of architecture and for her work to preserve historically important architecture in Canada and internationally. She founded Heritage Montreal, the Soci t  d'Ampliation Milton-Parc (SAMP), and the internationally renowned Canadian Centre for Architecture. A significant architectural publication that Lambert authored, *Mies in America* (2001), came out of an exhibition at the Whitney Museum of American Art and the Museum of Modern Art, New York. The text brings to light the leadership required to create contextual and relevant architecture. In 1998, Lambert announced the International Federation for the CCA Prize, a \$100,000 international prize to encourage new contributions in urban design. Phyllis Lambert is the doyenne of Canadian architecture and the "minence gris" behind so many important buildings of the twentieth century, starting with Mies's Seagram Building in New York (completed in 1958). That masterpiece of The International Style was designed as the headquarters for the Canadian distillers Joseph E. Seagram & Sons. Lambert, the daughter of Samuel Bronfman (Seagram's CEO), convinced her father that Mies was the right architect for the headquarters. Mies van der Rohe and Phyllis Lambert with a maquette of the Seagram Building. Maquette of the Seagram Building. The Seagram Building: the final product. Too bad, because it was a fascinating interview, one in which the interviewer and interviewee were truly equal. dK. . . .