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This book documents most of the events held in 2013 under the title of *100 Years of Clemson Architecture: Southern Roots + Global Reach* to celebrate the Clemson University School of Architecture’s Centennial. The celebration events started in March with a four-campus meeting to honor the fortieth anniversary of the Charles E. Daniel Center for Building Research and Urban Studies in Genoa, Italy, founded in 1973 (*The Villa at 40*) and the thirteenth anniversary of the Barcelona Architecture Center (Barcelona at 13). In May, the Clemson Architecture Center in Charleston (CACC) hosted sessions of the South Carolina American Institute of Architects (SCAIA) Annual Conference in honor of its twenty-fifth anniversary (*CACC at 25*). In August, events continued with the “2013 South Atlantic Region Architecture for Health Annual Conference and School of Architecture Centennial Symposia,” organized to celebrate the forty-fifth year of the Architecture and Health Program (*A+H at 45*). The Centennial Symposium of “The Architecture of Regionalism in the Age of Globalization” and Beaux-Arts Ball in October were the final events concluding the centennial celebrations of “Southern Roots + Global Reach.” Throughout the 2013–14 academic year, two exhibitions, “Southern Roots + Global Reach: 100 Years of Clemson Architecture” and “Grasroots,” and a series of lectures given by some accomplished alumni and former professors of the school accompanied these events.
FROM SOUTHERN ROOTS TO DISTANT HORIZONS*

Peter L. Laurence, PhD

Since its first year of instruction in 1913, architectural education at Clemson has been mindful of its geographies—its connections and relationships to both the state of South Carolina and to the wider world. Already looking beyond state borders, Rudolph E. Lee (1874–1959) established architectural education at Clemson to answer “an increasing demand in the South for men trained in architectural design, building construction and allied subjects.” Like this mission, Lee had Southern roots: born in nearby Anderson, South Carolina, he was an engineering graduate of Clemson’s first class of 1896. However, studies also took him to Cornell and the University of Pennsylvania. The combination of polytechnic and Beaux-Arts training and awareness of national developments in architectural education informed the development of degree programs and faculty hires during Lee’s tenure, which spanned from 1896 to 1948. During these years, faculty were trained at Clemson and Northeast schools, like Lee, and also in Europe. Similar to Lee’s description of his new engineering building (now Riggs Hall) in 1927, architecture at Clemson was primarily a “Southern product, largely of our own state materials.” However, the materials came together to create a building with global reach: the building’s inspirations, Lee noted, were “the villas of Rome and Florence, of sunny Italy.”

Riggs would be home for the Department of Architecture from 1933 until the opening of Lee Hall in 1958. Representing growth and disciplinary independence, the new building coincided with the establishment of the School of Architecture. Designed by Harlan E. McClure, who served as director and dean from 1955 to 1984, Lee Hall symbolized the modernization of the school, the college and the state. The move from Beaux-Arts Riggs Hall to modernist Lee Hall—a shift, in retrospect, from one international style to another—did not change the school’s geographic networks.

Born in Chattanooga, Tennessee, Harlan E. McClure (1916–2001) had Southern roots and a broad intellectual horizon. With degrees from George Washington University and MIT, McClure studied at the Royal Swedish Academy and taught at the Architectural Association in London before leaving the University of Minnesota for Clemson. As dean, he hired faculty educated at Clemson, across the U.S. and overseas. His creation of the Clemson Architectural Foundation advanced the similar mission of bringing distinguished thinkers to the school from around the world. In 1972, McClure would take the decisive step of establishing the Daniel Center (“the Villa”) in Genoa, Italy, the first satellite of the school’s “Fluid Campus.”

The decades following McClure’s direction have seen the continued growth of the school, in Clemson and beyond, under new leadership. The Clemson Architecture Center in Charleston, celebrating its twenty-fifth year, was established in 1988 by then-Dean James F. Barker, FAIA (’70). A decade later, Department Chair José R. Cabán (’67) established the school’s third urban center in Barcelona, Spain. Forty years since the first group of students occupied the Villa, thousands more have expanded their Clemson roots through the global reach of the Fluid Campus.

Today, a geographically diverse faculty and student body study architecture in great works of architecture, including the new and award-winning Lee III, on four fluidly connected campuses. As its faculty, students and buildings have in the past, Clemson’s School of Architecture draws in and reaches out to distant horizons from Southern roots.

* An earlier version of this text was published in Clemson University/Architecture Newsletter III, no. 1 (Spring 2013): 3.
TRENDS IN ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY*

Ufuk Ersoy, PhD

The 1913–14 Catalogue of the Clemson Agricultural College defines the first architecture program—the course of architectural engineering—as follows: “This course is established to comply with an increasing demand in the South for men trained in architectural design, building construction, and allied subjects […] Throughout the entire course special attention is paid to the engineering branch of the architect’s profession.”

A century later, the content of architectural education is still under question in respect to its wide syncretic scope and interdisciplinary character. Yet, there is no doubt that architecture is an autonomous profession studied and educated in universities. At the time Professor Rudolph E. Lee (1874–1959) founded the Clemson architecture program, however, architectural education was reasonably new to universities in the U.S. All over the country, there were fewer than thirty architecture programs and, in the South, fewer than five. The majority of these programs existed in polytechnic colleges that treated architecture as a mechanic art and categorized it as a branch of engineering. It was in 1912 that eight architecture scholars came together to establish the first and still existing educational organization, the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA). Despite outcry from some key figures in the profession, such as Louis Sullivan (1856–1924) and his apprentice Frank Lloyd Wright (1867–1959), who defended on-the-job training with reference to the model of the Arts and Crafts Guild, ACSA undertook the regulation of education standards.

Briefly, in the 1910s, architectural training in the U.S. took place mostly at ateliers or building sites but rarely in the drawing rooms of engineering schools which followed the pragmatic polytechnic approaches to education in Europe. Apparently, in architecture, reciprocity between professional and academic knowledge was not yet generally endorsed. In this context, the challenging task of Lee, who chaired a newly founded architecture program, was to institutionalize the profession in Clemson. He achieved this mission by both actively using his professional knowledge and by setting up the academic infrastructure that fed it. In less than two decades, Lee transformed the campus by designing a significant number of buildings including Sikes Hall (1904), Holtzendorff YMCA Hall (1916), Riggs Hall (1928) and Fike Field House (1939). And, by the time A Study of Architectural Schools (1932) appeared, which was the first general survey of American architectural education, the program that Lee initiated as a division of the engineering school had become an independent department in Riggs Hall offering the four-year Bachelor of Architecture degree.

Lee was a member of the first graduating class at Clemson University in 1896. After earning his BS in Engineering, he attended two schools operating under opposing education models derived from Europe: the University of Pennsylvania (Penn) and Cornell University. Many scholars at Penn who had studied at the Paris École des Beaux-Arts considered architecture to be a fine art. Accordingly, at Penn, the basic purpose of architectural education was to provide students with necessary artistic skills that would let them work on the expressive qualities of buildings. On the other hand, Cornell was known for its resistance to the prevailing Beaux-Arts system in favor of École-Polytechnique and Bauakademie examples in which architecture was approached in a more scientific way as an art of building. The polytechnic model followed by Cornell was based on the presumption that the modus operandi of the architect could be studied and taught in a methodical way as a rational technique—marche-à-suivre. Correspondingly, during their education, students of architecture were expected to spend more time on the technical aspects of buildings.

The 1913 curriculum in Clemson carried the traces of both models. While the first two years of the program were devoted to “technical subjects” closer to the field of engineering, the “essential courses” of the profession, drawing and design, were offered in junior and senior years. Lee handled architecture as an amalgam of science and art. Nevertheless, the increasing popularity of the Beaux-Arts approach did not allow Lee’s hybrid formula to last for very long. After the Beaux-Arts Institute of Design (BAID), founded in 1916, took on the national student competition system from the Society of Beaux-Arts Architects (1894) and enlarged its scope, Beaux-Arts pedagogy

* Two earlier versions of this text were published in Clemson University/Architecture Newsletter III, no. 1 (Spring 2013): 6-7, and Clemson University/Architecture Newsletter III, no. 2 (Fall 2013): 6-7.
Figure 1. Early freehand drawing class of cadets

Figure 2. Riggs Hall by R. Lee, circa 1928

Figure 3. Architecture studio in Riggs Hall, 1954
reached its peak in the collegiate architectural education by the early 1920s. In the 1922–23 curriculum at Clemson, although architecture was still defined to be both a fine art and a construction science, the change in the content of the program reflected the deeper impact of Beaux-Arts pedagogy on the department. “Descriptive Geometry” and “Elements of Architecture,” two courses recalling the theory of the French scholar Julien Guadet (1834–1908), became and remained for three decades the preliminary courses that introduced drawing techniques and the essential five orders to incoming students.5

Prof. Lee's retirement coincided with the Housing Act of 1949, which remarkably altered the perspective of architectural practice and research in the U.S. Harry Truman's guarantee of low-interest loans as a solution for the vast housing shortage stimulated the housing market and gave rise to numerous urban renewal projects.6 This political initiative led many architecture programs to focus on new housing technologies. In the wake of these changes, Lee was succeeded by John H. Gates (1902–1972), who had acted as a representative of the Federal Housing Authority and was involved in a series of housing projects at Clemson. Gates' pedagogic proposal was to revolutionize the program in a more realistic way. Young architects should be introduced to the problems of modern civilization and learn how to grapple with these complications in school. Yet, Gates' update did not bring about a complete divorce from Beaux-Arts traditions. In the early 1950s, Clemson students still took part in the design competitions organized by BAID and were listed among the awardees elected to visit Paris.

In 1955, Clemson recruited Harlan E. McClure (1916–2001) from the University of Minnesota to head the program. McClure's appointment generated a dramatic change in the intellectual orientation of the department. The year before McClure came to Clemson, in The Architect at Mid-Century, historian Turpin C. Bannister (1904–1982) openly declared that Bauhaus pedagogy—which had started to manifest itself in the U.S. after the immigration of its pioneers Walter Gropius (1883–1969), Mies van der Rohe (1886–1969) and Josef Albers (1888–1976)—had already wiped out the eclectivist Beaux-Arts approach.7 Unsurprisingly, in less than two years, the National Institute for Architectural Education took the place of BAID. An immediate reflection of this academic upheaval at Clemson was the substitution of "Basic Design" for "Elements of Architecture" as the new preliminary course. Similar to the foundation course, in Bauhaus—Vorkurs, the objective of "Basic Design" was to equip students with the basic principles and techniques of visual communication. The renewal of the preliminary course hinted at a more radical shift in the repertoire of elements used in the education system. Visual design elements and rules replaced the elements and orders inherited from the past.

Along with this pedagogical renovation, in 1958 the department changed to the status of school, and the embrace of modern architecture was crowned with a new modern building, Lee Hall. Concisely, McClure came to be the agent who brought the modern movement and Bauhaus pedagogy to Clemson. Even so, McClure's pedagogical view could not be compared to Gropius and his followers' doctrinaire strategies. In 1937, when Gropius was called to head Harvard, in his eyes Bauhaus still stood as a modern version of the arts and crafts school, and the design studio was the atelier where a master conveyed his knowledge and ideas to his apprentices. In consequence, to ensure the central position of the design studio and visual studies, Gropius did not hesitate to impose restrictions on other academic works, particularly on the courses of architectural history. For many scholars who advocated modernism, including Harvard's Dean Joseph Hudnut (1886–1968), Gropius' restrictive attitude gave rise to an inquietude that the Bauhaus system could easily turn out to be an aesthetic cult, which closed the eyes of architects to their social engagement and responsibilities.

McClure shared this doubt, and in an article he wrote right before coming to Clemson, he argued that "[w]ell organized courses in history and the humanities may be of far greater value to the young architect, who will be faced with the exciting problems of the future, than many of the hurdles in the average catalogue."8 In the footsteps of his professor Lawrence Anderson's (1906–94) liberal approach, McClure sought for a humanist edition of modern education that would make the architects of the future conscious of their "role as a servant of humanity" and "more responsible." Having completed the housing and planning program at the Royal Swedish Academy in 1939, McClure continued his graduate studies at MIT. In looking for an alternative to the Harvard model in the early 1940s, Prof. Anderson and his MIT colleagues turned to Scandinavian architecture and managed studio as an experimental laboratory where universal professional standards were questioned.9
Figure 4. Lee Hall by H. McClure, 1958

Figure 5. Lee Hall Courtyard, 1958

Figure 6. Architecture students including James Barker, 1968
Similarly, McClure supported a Socratic way of teaching. In his view, the school of architecture was the institute that experimented with professional ways of thinking and questioned the future of the profession. This outlook had two strong implications. First, it made clear that the interdependence between professional knowledge and academic research could not be denied. For that reason, while practicing architects should keep in touch with academic discourse, academicians ought to involve in practice and design. Second, the purpose of the studio was not to transfer knowledge but to question and regenerate it. To achieve this, it was necessary to keep scholarly inquiry productive by broadening the spectrum of courses in the curriculum in view of the continuing changes related to architecture and its adjacent disciplines. A comprehensive program that would bring architecture together with allied disciplines under the same roof was McClure’s ideal.

The Princeton Report, a survey of architectural education published in 1967 by Robert Geddes and Bernard Spring, affirmed McClure’s view. Geddes and Spring called attention to the expansion in the scope of architectural education and invited schools to reframe their programs in consideration of emerging social and environmental problems. There was another milestone in Clemson history in 1968. In response to The Princeton Report, Clemson was one of the first schools of architecture integrating liberal arts into the five-year Bachelor of Architecture program. In 1971, Clemson’s architecture school was united with related science and art programs and renamed the College of Architecture and Arts.

In the following decades, McClure’s Socratic ambition turned out to be an institutional quality that paved the way for the ongoing interdisciplinary and liberal education that distinguishes Clemson’s School of Architecture from others. In 1971, when Prof. McClure was elected president of ACSA, Clemson College of Architecture and Arts embodied four departments that offered an ample constellation of courses ranging from visual arts to health care. The expansion in the coverage of the curriculum, however, was not the only fruit of the Socratic ambition McClure brought to the school. More importantly, the meticulous revision of curricula in the 1960s forged a lasting academic tradition, a constant and penetrating search for both the center (focus) and setting (locus) of architectural education that let the school build a flexible pedagogy. In this tradition, the search for focus pursues the epistemological question: what is the place of the discipline of architecture in the network of sciences? Along the same line, the search for locus redefines the conceptual and physical boundaries of studio settings by carefully examining evolving changes in the role of architects and their horizon of imagination. The decade of the 1970s witnessed significant modifications in both fields of search.

The Civil Rights Act and feminist movement, like social and political actions of the late sixties, reinforced the increasing doubts about the authority and accuracy of modern architectural doctrines. Entrenched principles of “simplicity” and “clarity” were put into question in view of architecture’s “complexity and contradiction.” In a few years, these doubts grew into a severe disciplinary crisis of confidence and theory fragmentation. It was commonly agreed that tiny, well-protected, enclosed studios did not let architects properly see and understand the wide world. Architecture should no longer be discussed and judged simply in terms of its aesthetic aspects, but rather as a component of complex built social environment and ecological integrity. McClure’s pedagogic reaction was to integrate the creative insight of architects with analytical research from other sciences for the purpose of generating diverse, refined design methodologies responsive to environmental and social issues.

Correspondingly, studios of the period in Clemson were devoted to public service projects such as revitalization of urban fabric and efficient, low-cost health facilities that addressed contemporary community concerns. These public service studios were based on an active cooperation of a broad range of disciplines. McClure had no doubt that the comprehensive curriculum of the college, along with architecture students’ initial education in the liberal arts, provided the required infrastructure. Concisely, in Clemson, architectural studio ought to and could perform as a laboratory open to disciplines allied with architecture. As evidence, the Studio of Architecture and Health founded by George Means (1920-2005) in 1968 would come to be known as an outstanding example and would achieve a national reputation.

The idea of open studio challenged the introverted, parochial character of modern atelier and hinted at the proliferation of larger architectural offices working in collaboration with consultants from a variety of disciplines. The efforts to create a more open studio were accompanied by a recall of the peripatetic way of learning—learning by walking and traveling. Decidedly, off-campus studies were endorsed as a means to solidify and supplement the knowledge acquired in Lee Hall. Students of public service studios studying towns and institutions across the state were encouraged...
...to make field trips and spend time on the sites they were working. Site visits did not only engage students with communities and institutes, but also introduced them to a hands-on experience integrating intellectual and practical works. To further enhance students' linkage with off-campus practice and institutes, some distinguished professionals and scholars from out of state were invited to give lectures or act in studio reviews. Richard Neutra (1982–1970), Buckminster Fuller (1895–1983), Louis Kahn (1901–1974), Max Cetto (1903–1980) and Dan Kiley (1912–2004) were among the visitors who stopped by Clemson in the sixties and early seventies. But the most decisive and fruitful action that would offer students a broader spectrum and allow the faculty to overcome the isolation of the Clemson campus was the establishment of La Villa—the Charles E. Daniel Center for Building Research and Urban Studies in Genoa in 1973.

The seventies' increasing humanistic interest in the notion of place following the critiques of major American cities gave impetus to a trend of search for a study center abroad in the Old World of Europe, which had existed for millennia. Many schools of architecture in the U.S. opened foreign study programs in two historic centers of classical architecture, Florence and Rome. The choice of Clemson, however, was the seaport of Genoa, which culturally and physically differed from South Carolina cities but bore a resemblance in terms of the modern dilemma it was to face, becoming technologically innovated without ignoring its past and tradition. For McClure, the Villa in Genoa stood as a second open laboratory in an urban setting. During the ensuing forty years, students visiting Genoa have had the chance to immerse themselves in a different milieu and explore architecture's interrelationships with history, society and urban life. This foreign experience strengthened students' critical view by providing them with alternative paradigms they could use to question professional premises.

In the decade of the 1980s, when the discipline of architecture confused its direction in the middle of an intense "form, image and meaning" storm that postmodern discourse instigated, the new Dean, James F. Barker, who stepped up in 1986, kept walking in the same direction with McClure. Barker, an alumnus of Clemson in 1970, described the very nature of what architects do as "lead in collaboration." In his view, this mission demands architects both to demonstrate an intellectual awareness of subjects related to architecture and to "get out of [their] ateliers" to "engage the culture." In parallel, Barker maintained the idea of off-campus studies. In 1988, the Clemson Architecture Center at Charleston was set up as a teaching and learning environment where undergraduate students would assist local design teams and participate in local community projects. The following year, AIA's journal, Architecture, celebrated Clemson "as a school in balance [… ] where strong tradition co-exists with innovation; where campuses are both small town and urban."..
Today, under the leadership of Richard E. Goodstein, Dean, and Kate Schwennsen, FAIA, Chair, the geographically diverse faculty and student body of Clemson’s School of Architecture maintain the concept of the fluid campus. Schwennsen, leading the school since 2010, describes one of her goals as improving the number of learning environments provoking creative research while the renewed Lee Hall remains as the hub of these geographically dispersed learning environments. She explains that expanding the fluid campus will offer faculty and students the opportunity to study “the things that are not available at the intersection of the northern hemisphere and Western thought.” Nevertheless, as she underlines, this will be done without forgetting to pay “close attention to the tensions of the local and the global and the powerful poetry of place.” In Schwennsen’s own words: “The overarching outcome of the fluid campus is the theme of Clemson’s architecture centennial: Southern Roots + Global Reach, which produces an architect who is both a global citizen and regional expert, an architect who thinks globally but acts locally.”16
The Charles E. Daniel Center for Building Research and Urban Studies in Genoa celebrated its 40th anniversary with simultaneous events in Genoa, Clemson, Barcelona and Charleston on March 25, 2013. “Snapshots form a Professor in Residence,” by Rob Miller and “The Fluid Campus in the Twenty-First Century,” by Kate Schwennsen were presented during this celebration.

Figures 10, 11, 12 (clockwise). The celebration in Genoa, Clemson and Barcelona on March 25, 2013
Whatever we call it, studying away has meant something. “A man who has not been in Italy is always unconscious of an inferiority.”
—Samuel Johnson, 1776
Institutions, like glaciers, have a lifespan, magnitude, and a rate of change that are an order of magnitude beyond humanity’s. We are born into them and they structure our possibilities; though, like the air we breathe or the parents who gave us birth, they live largely outside our consciousness and often exist without our expressed appreciation. But we owe them a tremendous debt even as we owe it to ourselves to develop some perspective on their influence, which this occasion makes possible.

Although we assume that our cultural parentage has been essentially stable, and will remain so, institutions are in slow yet perpetual change. Take the institution of the architect: in one age, he is a tortured and misunderstood genius; in the next, she is the leader of a collaborative team (see fig. 13). And although for some time now one could recognize a real architect by dark apparel and distinctive eyewear, I lament that even this institution is up for grabs.

Architecture, too, is a cultural construct that is constantly in flux. We all think we know what architecture is, yet no one has produced a satisfactory and consensual definition of it. Ever. If the architect and even architecture are changing cultural constructs, how much more so architectural education? The way we educate differently-equipped generations for an ever-changing profession to produce a product we cannot even define has required continual metamorphosis, although, as I say, we seldom recognize this as so. Which brings us to the subject of this celebration, that component of architectural education for which we ship students to distant shores to acquire there what, apparently, they cannot get at home.

One clue to its cultural instability lies in our awkwardness with naming it. “Study Abroad” was an inelegant but adequate categorization, until we created study-abroad programs that were not actually abroad, programs like Auburn’s Rural Studio or Clemson’s center in Charleston. How do we classify those? Since a campus is any place where the buildings of a university are situated (such as Genoa and Charleston), off-campus has proven to be an inaccurate as well as a clumsy descriptor for such programs. The more that study away from the main campus has become integrated into American architectural curricula over the past thirty years, the less appropriate these monikers sounded. Around 1999, Clemson dealt with this problem by simply dropping the generic descriptor, study abroad, and began referring to its whole program, both off-campus and on, as the “Fluid Campus.” By so doing, it made central and dominant what had previously been marginal and supplementary.

Whatever we call it, studying away has meant something slightly different every time we have had a shift in how we think about architecture. Study abroad, like the institutions of the architect, architecture, and architectural education, has been in continual flux. But, let’s go right to the beginning.
SNAPSHOTS FROM A PROFESSOR IN RESIDENCE

We owe this all to Louis XIV and the Enlightenment’s unholy alliance of truth and absolutism. Before the French Enlightenment, the Italian academies of the sixteenth century had been organized from the bottom-up: they were loose associations of artists that made their own statutes and chose their own members. After all, the Italians (who did not even form a nation until after the Industrial Revolution was under full steam) were neither a hierarchy-loving nor a readily domesticated people. But in the seventeenth century, the French King ordained a new top-down system of academies under which the crown appointed members and dictated statutes.

The first was the Académie Française, established under Cardinal Richelieu in 1635, and charged with safeguarding and superintending the French language (a project that continues to this day, as in the campaign to prevail upon the French to say *courriel* in lieu of *email*). Subsequently, other academies were systematically founded to oversee all the humanities ending, of course, with the discipline that is perpetually late and last-minute: architecture.

In 1671, Jean-Baptiste Colbert finally brought forth the Académie Royale d’Architecture. It was charged with resolving architectural doctrine and, to do so, it met weekly to consider weighty matters, establish binding architectural doctrine, and then disseminate its rulings through public lectures that were delivered semi-weekly. At its very first meeting of 31 December 1671, and at the suggestion of its first Director, François Blondel, the Académie took up that most French of French issues, the question of *bon goût*. Although the members were unable to define good taste, they did make some progress in determining *how it works*. *Bon goût*, they decreed, was whatever pleased intelligent people. Trapped between conceding the subjectivity of taste and their royal mandate to establish normative criteria for good design, they took the only course open to them: they rationalized taste by pegging it to social hierarchy, “to the authority of personnes intelligentes.” And that is pretty much as far as the Académie Royale d’Architecture got on tackling the perplexing issues of beauty and taste in relation to cultural authority.

By so acting, the Académie Royale d’Architecture became the first Western institution to deliver systematic instruction in our discipline, and thus became the forerunner to all Western faculties of architecture. (Furthermore, the Académie’s inability to define, or even agree upon, the very first question put before it also seems to have set a performative standard for architectural faculties that, I believe, remains unbroken to this day.)

Académie Royale d’Architecture also set precedents. Although unable to define good taste, it concluded that intelligent people would know it when they saw it, and, being intelligent people themselves, the members found it—precisely where they had been trained to find it—in antiquity. Furthermore, there being a surfeit of measured documents on ancient buildings, it made good sense, as well as being in good taste, to send students to Rome where they could measure such...
ancient monuments as exhibited beauty after which they would return to Paris armed with both
good taste and measured drawings thereof.21

And so, from the very beginning, schools of architecture opened their pedagogical practice
with a scholarship to Rome—study abroad. As I say, we owe this all to Louis XIV, for had he not
wished to make reasoned and authoritative pronouncements on matters of culture, we might never
have had the Prix de Rome, or its cultural heir, the study-abroad program.22

To recapitulate: Western architectural education was founded on the proposition that travel
to exemplary works is the highest form of learning in our discipline. Although we have never
been able to define architecture, much less to rigorously explain what makes it great, we, like the
members of the French Académie, fancy that, being intelligent people, we know it when we see it.
So, because we are unable to explain ourselves to our students, we send them to other destinations
around the globe where we expect them to get it for themselves, for which privilege we charge them
both high tuition and program fees. After all, bon goût has never been cheap, and, for all we know,
it might just be something that rubs off on you.

Following the French, architectural academies were founded the world around, most with ver-
sions of the Prix de Rome. Sitting beside the lake while working on World’s Columbian Exposition
of 1893, Charles McKim and Daniel Burnham (along with artists John LaFarge, Francis Millet,
Augustus Saint-Gaudens, and Daniel Chester French) conceived what would become the Ameri-
can Academy in Rome, with its travel award, the Rome Prize.23 Like their French counterparts,
American students were enabled to study in Rome for three years where, by virtue of hired ladders
and a level of courage and commitment that can hardly be imagined today, they documented Ro-
man masterworks by making drawings based on their own, adeptly accessed and carefully derived,
field measurements.24

By 1912, quite a number of Americans were able to take up residence in the facility designed
by Charles McKim and financed by J.P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and Henry Clay Frick.25
To be sure, study abroad has always been a loss-leader, devouring more resources than can be either
coaxed or coerced from the pockets of mere architects. During my fellowship at the Academy in
1997, I resided on the top floor of McKim’s building, on axis with the entry gates and fountain,
from which prominence atop the Janiculum I observed the ancient city in the valley below me,
including a prominent view of the Pantheon. Although I never made field measurements, I never
again took bilateral symmetry or axial prominence as something below me. Should you happen
to see a similarity of intent and decorum, if not in scale, to another Italianate villa in the Emilia
Romagna, you will recall that this latter property came to Clemson as a result of connections made
by Harlan McClure when he was studying abroad at the Architectural Association, for it was there
that he became friends with Cesare Fera.

Yes, study abroad came right along with the founding and development of Western schools
of architecture, and it has been with us ever since. But, though we do not quite know what to call
it, what we have meant by study abroad has undergone perpetual adjustment. At least seven
different vectors, each with distinct missions and modes of operation, have sailed under the study-
abroad banner:
1. The Prix de Rome: From the reinvention of the classical language during the Renaissance through the early phase of the École des Beaux-Arts and the founding of its sister academies, such as the American Academy in Rome, the study-abroad project was concentrated on ancient Rome and the measurement and rediscovery of extant ancient works.

![Figure 14. The American Academy in Rome, 1914, and Pantheon being measured by students from the American Academy](image)

2. The Grand Tour: As the Prix de Rome merged into a wider societal pattern of finishing and deportment, the measurement of ancient fragments gave way to less rigorous, but more entertaining, encounters with a wider range of Eurocentric masters and their masterworks.

![Figure 15. Francis Basset, 1st Baron de Dunstanville and Basset, and Pantheon interior by Giovanni Paolo Panini, 1735](image)
3. The International Tour: With the arrival of Modernism, students abandoned the Old Guard and began roaming the Continent in search of the latest experiments in what later came to be called the International Style. It is telling that the name of this mode of practice invokes travel and the study-abroad project. In fact, Philip Johnson essentially made a study-abroad tour in the process of conceiving and acquiring the material for his famous MOMA exhibition and the subsequent book, written with Henry Russell Hitchcock, which together coined the name for this movement.

4. The Pilgrimage: Then came Robert Venturi’s memoir, conceived largely during his stay at the American Academy in Rome. From it we learned to see connections between buildings, previously conceived as irrevocably separated by time, but now appreciated as having common theoretical underpinnings. (Through illustrations, acquired in travel, Venturi showed that Michelangelo’s Porta Pia, the Merchants’ Bank by Louis Sullivan, and Sir Edwin Lutyens’s Liverpool Cathedral were siblings, with common design principles, that, while separated by distance and time, were all genetically “complex and contradictory.”)
5. The Embedded: When we finally sickened of globalization, yet accepted its inevitability, we again crossed the globe, pausing now for longer periods to embed ourselves in the few remaining and isolated pockets of authentic local culture in a sincere attempt to temper the homogenization of global capitalism with the quirky particularities of indigenous traditions.

Figure 18. Hal Foster, *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture*, exterior and interior of Jørn Utzon’s Bagsvaerd Church, 1973–79

6. The Trophy Hunt: Then came the Guggenheim Effect—build it and we will come. From the star-studded reconstruction of Berlin after reunification, to frigid runs down the indoor ski slope on the broiling sands of Dubai, to scavenger hunts for the increasingly-less-bad buildings deposited by Frank O. Gehry around the world—until he proved that he really was a genius—we have again embraced global travel, even as we blithely ignore the environmental consequences of so many jet-airline trips and the implications of raising a new generation of architects whose egos are matched only by their super-sized carbon footprints.

7. The Piece Corps: Finally and in a counter-reaction to the Trophy Hunt, architects collectively developed a social conscience that elevated humanitarian issues above aesthetic ones. We traveled again, sometimes to see exemplary works from this genre, but more often to get to places untouched by affluence or decimated by natural disasters where our sophisticated efforts at primitive building might seem, or be, less self-serving. Not only has our new consciousness changed both practice and education, it of course changed where our study-away programs are and what they do.

It is not that Study Away went through these phases in any kind of linear or systematic sense, although there are instances of particular programs being steeped in specific ideologies; rather, as an academy, we have collectively changed focus with corresponding alterations in our travel studies without simultaneously taking stock of our changing values. That we have not taken sufficient notice suggests that changes in study abroad may have been instigated by individuals, rather than collective pedagogical intent. In short, professors in residence have continually changed where we go, what we do, and what we think about in order to make study abroad perpetually relevant, and this, according to Frank Kermode, is what makes something canonical and timeless. Which leads to the flip side of the institution of study abroad: what it means to be a professor in residence.

Figure 20. Diébédo Francis Kéré, Secondary School, Dano, Burkina Faso, 2007; Diébédo Francis Kéré, Primary School, Gando, Burkina Faso, 2001; Rural Studio, Yancey Chapel, Sawerville, Hale County, Alabama, 1995; Rural Studio, The Butterfly House, Masons Bend, Alabama, 1996
While there may be many types of professors who work in residence, there are but two types of assignment: the Bivouac and the Bastion. Clemson’s programs in Genoa and Barcelona belong to the first.

In a Bivouac, the Professor assumes a similar footing with the students: both attend on temporary assignment; both travel to a foreign territory where they engage in pedagogy based on the culture and works of that place. The work is characterized by the professor in residence having to oversee not only a body of knowledge that may be new via delivery techniques that are limited by local conditions, but also the movement, supply, and well-being of the aspiring scholars themselves, for as tersely put a famous Frenchman who came after those previously referenced, “An army marches on its stomach.”

Along the way, the professor in residence starts figuring out how to make and deposit maps of the terrain, for at some point it dawns on even the most nearsighted of us that the Bivouac is all about wheel reinvention. This condition of perpetually figuring out what to do, then prepare for and deliver it, is both the true joy as well as the real liability in this educational mode. It forces the faculty member to maintain a level of deftness, invention, and spontaneity, for failure at this results in a lack of substance, spark, and focus. Resident professors may be born into the institution of study abroad, but we inherit our camp from the dude who just completed the previous tour of duty.

Over the first forty years in Genoa, thirty-two faculty members completed this tour. It is worth contemplating the magnitude of contribution given by these people who uprooted family and domestic harmony to take meals and share quarters at Fourteen via Privata Piaggio with twenty-or-so sometimes curious, always hungry, occasionally crapulent, and ever-adventuresome students who are always up for midnight laser tag, holding the personal effects of classmates for ransom, and other creative and occasionally troubling shenanigans.

Although the Bivouac is the traveling medicine show of architectural pedagogy, the Clemson version has always leveraged its quality on a devoted Italian staff and the architectural, not to mention historical, expertise of an exquisite Italian faculty—all of whom are named and honored elsewhere in this publication. At the risk of muddying the essential distinction I wish to draw between the Bivouac and the Bastion, and the attending implications for American architectural education, Genoa is actually a fortunate hybrid.

By comparison, Clemson’s Charleston Center belongs to the second type, which is characterized by the long-term assignment of faculty to a significant place. From an institutional perspective, the Bastion is probably no more permanent than the Bivouac but, from a personal view, its longer
tour of duty affords the professor in residence different opportunities and an entirely different mission. In the Bastion, you reside in place long enough to befriend the locals and become embedded in the community. You become one of them. This allows the resident professor to give back to the place from which the institution takes so much. Analogous to the practice of the architect-as-citizen, this program type lends itself to a pedagogy of ethics, service, and tradition. What better way to teach service-learning than by running a program that actually makes substantial contributions to the place in which it resides?

So far, only two of us have had the honor of directing the program in Charleston; the better of us has done it twice. But it takes many good people to make this work fruitful and, mirroring the program’s relationship to the community—the Bastion depends on a faculty, staff, partners, pro bono contributors, patrons, intern sponsors, and other benefactors who are carefully positioned—and an integral part of the context. They are more important, if less visible, than the resident professor. If working the Bivouac requires dexterous agility and spontaneous response, building a Bastion is the more patient job of weaving a fabric of relationships between the program and its community.

The Bivouac cultivates the “Architect as Scholar”; the Bastion fosters the “Activist Architect”. Clemson is fortunate to have both types in its Fluid Campus.

The Actual Job

On a study trip in 1998, I boarded one of those vintage Italian trains—the ones that still had actual wood paneling—armed with a hastily-grabbed street lunch. Sitting across from me as I spread out my fare, a wide-eyed co-ed exclaimed, “Boy, you must really like chocolate!” “Not particularly,” said I—to which she retorted, “Well, that’s the third candy bar you’ve had this week!”

All professors inhabit a culturally given role that bestows on the titleholder an influence and respect that is quite apart from anything we, personally, may have earned. Part of the job and one of the pitfalls of professorship is learning to wield, but respect, this mantle. Because of the proximity and the amount of contact requisite to being a professor in residence, even more intimacy is forced upon the student-teacher relationship than that enjoyed by our counterparts at home.

Back on campus, you never have to be wrong and you are rarely found out; but a professor in residence cannot escape being human. Ever on duty and always under scrutiny, the professor in residence has no choice about being a role model; but a role model, by definition, is someone who is perfectly—not entirely—human. You just do not get to be your everyday self.

On the road, the preferred role model is not a professor at all, but the model student: you yield the mask of authority and infallibility for one of endless inquisitiveness and exhaustive research. Tiring, perhaps, but achievable. It is due to this unavoidable intimacy that the Bivouac and the Bastion are more akin to the Ecole’s atelier than the campus studio can ever be.

In the Ecole’s atelier system, the patron taught the senior students, the seniors taught their juniors, and everyone performed services for those above them. Looking closely at atelier portraits, you can see the camaraderie engendered by a system of self-generative learning and mutual dependence. In the Atelier Pascal, gathered around a T-Square, we see young men enjoying a
level of mutual support and fraternity that was, and remains, a hallmark of the architectural education.

Today’s study-abroad students live and work in a relationship that is closely aligned in spirit, if not substance, to the atelier system. In a different though analogous way, they very much depend on each other for survival and success: catching trains, changing money, asking directions in foreign tongues, and getting the morning focaccia picked up and back to their fellows (while it is still hot and before the others wake up) are all activities that require teamwork in response to mutual dependence.

The affiliation that develops among compatriots makes possible the broader and more essential point of study abroad, which is not actually fraternal bonding; for whether we visit the Villa Capra, or the same travertine quarry from which Michelangelo selected his stone, or the latest project by Renzo Piano, we are not really there for those specific works. After all, what architecture is and how we make it constantly changes—so we are not really there for project specifics—not really.

Rather, we make pilgrimage to great works from all periods for the same reason we travel to touch the death mask of Brunelleschi and blow the dust from his very own worm-eaten models: if we professors in residence make such pilgrimage well, our students will discern that a torch from the past is being extended to them; a torch of passion for a discipline that, if not constant in substance and practice, is precisely similar in degree of commitment, level of aspiration, and excellence of execution. This is why the great architects in any period travel to the great works of every period: that they may have commerce with those upon whose shoulders they are fortunate enough to stand.

The Unanswerable Question
I will close with a question posed to me, not by François Blondel, but by my companion during the dozen years of study-away assignments for Clemson: Sharon O’Driscoll. It was a hot Roman summer when we arrived at the Pantheon—a repeat visit for me but the first with my wife. Because of the Genoa program, most Clemson graduates will know how this works.

First, you drop into the Café Sant’ Eustachio, just east of the Pantheon, to fortify yourself with what Romans regard as the city’s best espresso. Then you fight through the crowds and the glare, move past the street vendors and pickpockets, until finally you come under the shade of that magnificent portico—the portico that is a little shorter than designed, purportedly because the boat carrying the original columns that were fifty Roman-feet tall sunk on its way over from Egypt and, having to meet Hadrian’s deadline for the opening, the builders substituted the shorter forty-foot columns that just happened to be in stock—which (and it is rumored that the historic record backs me up on this) they deftly proffered to Hadrian as “Value Engineering.” Anyway, you move under this slightly squatty colonnade, through the shaded portico, up to those massive bronze doors, across the threshold…and there, opening in front of you, is the entire Universe.

Nothing has prepared you for this: the serenity, the tangibility of the light; or, should it be raining, a vision of parachuting droplets engaged in a swirling ballet, juxtaposed against, and backlit by, the circular oculus. I have been here during scorching Roman summers, amidst tumultuous thunderstorms, and in the dark solemnity of midnight mass, and I am never prepared when I walk in for what awaits. Never.

On this occasion, Sharon and I walked in just as a bench came open. We sat, quietly, for an hour. Eventually, we shuffled out, stupefied. Blinking as our pupils struggled against the radiant sun, Sharon, tossing a glance over her shoulder, murmured: “After that, why would you even bother?”

She meant architecture, of course. In the long shadow cast by such an astonishing work, how could I—how could any of us—have the audacity to aspire to be architects? How could we be so naive as to scratch out another architectural proposition? After the encapsulation of existence itself from the mere and broken bricks that comprise this amazing pile of rubble, which, while no longer having a proper function and leaking to such an extent that it mocks the trite joke regarding the difference between mere buildings and real architecture, how could any architect muster the courage, or the arrogance, to try it again? (Okay—she knew architects have plenty of arrogance, so let us revise that to “courage”…)

Like the Pantheon, Sharon’s question was a blow to my gut. I must be in good company, though, for like the members of the Académie Royale d’Architecture, I did not really have an
answer. And I still do not. But being at the Pantheon at all made the question possible, and being there is why architects invented study abroad in the first place. That, and bon goût.

So, to the many, many people who made possible and have kept alive the program in Genoa over forty years of sacrifice, contribution, and struggle, we owe our deepest thanks.

Not to mention, our extremely good taste.
It is abundantly clear [...] that we live in one small world in which all are neighbors, yet each of us carries separate inheritances: genes, handicaps, talents, aspirations, fears, private hobbies, and limitations. Every thinking person has come to realize that a societal system based on waste is inherently wrong, and our society has been conspicuously wasteful. Happily, in the last few years, a dormant collective conscience has been aroused.

This is the new world of the college student, and it is not surprising that the gulf that exists between real conditions and achievable ideals has caused some confusion and cynicism in the thinking of people of all ages.

In concert with the architects of South Carolina, our college has believed that order can be brought out of environmental chaos [...] by the wise use of resources and by prudent physical programming and design. The state of South Carolina has served as a laboratory for our educational programs, and the “real world” projects undertaken have had a catalytic effect.

We have also learned that we must deliberately compensate in our educational programs for some of the things that are not available for educators in Clemson or, indeed, in South Carolina. Among these are very important environmental lessons that can be learned in major cities, and particularly in the Old World where civilization has been continuous for millennia.28

With these words, in the fall of 1973, forty years ago, Dean Harlan E. McClure provided the rationale for the founding of the Charles E. Daniel Center for Building Research and Urban Studies in Genoa, and began Clemson’s Fluid Campus.

My job today is to talk about the future of the Fluid Campus, but I cannot do that without talking about the past and present, because the success of what we are and do today and tomorrow, springs from deep and wide historic foundations. Many of you can tell personal stories, but I will recall the recorded history of those foundations, and talk briefly about the results of this forty-year experiment, and then make some propositions for the future.

Beginnings

Dean McClure recognized the unmet need for Clemson's graduate students in architecture, planning, building construction, and visual design to learn lessons from an urban experience in a well-designed and well-lived city. The greatest contemporary environmental design problems lay in major cities, but there were no such metropolitan centers in 1973 in South Carolina. In the Spring 1973 edition of The Semester Review of the Clemson College of Architecture, Dean McClure states the problem and his proposed solution as follows: "[…] it is clear that at least a portion of each of our students’ professional studies should center in a major urban area before completing the terminal degree. As Clemson is a young and inland college town, the optimum location for such an educational experience would be in a strategically located, ancient, urban port within short travel distances of other significant places."29

Harlan went on to describe why Genoa was the perfect location for this new endeavor, because of its history, port location close to other important locations, local university, vibrant economy, and mayoral support. He also laid out what I will call his five principles for the program:

1. All students in the first graduate year will have a foreign experience.

2. Students in the program abroad would pay the same tuition and fees and receive the same academic credit as they would in Clemson, and subject to the same rules and regulations.

3. Except for travel expenses, costs to the students would be the same as at Clemson.
4. Faculty members would rotate on the same schedule as student groups.

5. This program should be structured as a part of each student's academic syllabus, and travel, study problems, and reports abroad would be produced on an intensive basis (in other words, it is not just a Grand Tour, there's work to be done).

Harlan understood that this program would have other benefits: it would help retain able students beyond the baccalaureate degree; it would attract students from other universities; it would have a positive effect on student and faculty morale; and most importantly, it would enrich and complete students' professional educations, leading to more effective graduates.

Building on Dean McClure's idea, the faculty of the school quickly understood the potential of the Charles E. Daniel Center for Building Research and Urban Studies a vibrant educational experience. The nature of the live/learn environment intensified the relationship between the professor-in-residence and the students in ways that would inform the environment for teaching and learning both overseas and back home. During the initial twenty-five-year period, only graduate students were invited to participate.

In 1987, then Dean James F. Barker, FAIA, established a second center for the study of architecture and urbanism in Charleston, this time for undergraduate students. The heart of the idea included, again, off-campus study that was neatly folded into the curriculum, and the program emerged as a model for teaching + learning. As this parallel educational experiment evolved, it became clear to the faculty that the school might offer an even richer experience if it allowed students the chance to learn in vertical settings, so in 1998, both programs in Genoa and Charleston welcomed undergraduate and graduate students, concurrently.

Expanding enrollments in all of architecture’s locations, with increasing numbers of students wanting to study in Europe, led to the establishment of the Barcelona program. José R. Cabán, Chair of the School of Architecture, and Barcelona colleagues Miguel Roldan and Xavier Costa in collaboration with the Foundation of the Polytechnic University in Barcelona, founded the Clemson Architecture Center in Barcelona in 2000.

Forty Years of Results

In 1973, when the first class of Clemson students and faculty came to Genoa, I doubt that anyone imagined that, in forty years, over 1,400 students would have experienced life in the Villa, or that Clemson's off-campus centers would be home to some fifty students every semester, a clear indicator of the leading position of the architecture program and university in preparing global citizen-architects.

Today, as the School of Architecture celebrates its centennial year, we take special pride in being a leader in architectural education. Our unique concept of the Fluid Campus is open to both undergraduate and graduate students and supported by generous financial assistance from numerous benefactors. Along with the centennial, the school celebrates the thirteenth anniversary of the Barcelona program, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Clemson Architecture Center in Charleston, and, of course, “The Villa at 40” for its original idea, for the strength of its potential and for the extent of its reach.

The Fluid Campus has shaped us, as evidenced in the school's mission statement, developed as part of the university's 2020 plan, which reads as follows:

Clemson’s School of Architecture is an interconnected, geographically distributed community of teachers and learners, dedicated to:

- Educating future architects, through rigorous and expansive design education, with local and global understandings of firmness, commodity and delight;

- Generating knowledge to address the great challenges of the time, like health care, ecology, and an increasingly digital society, through innovative, interdisciplinary research, practice and scholarship;

- Advocating for the improvement of built, natural and social environments, through design activism, public service and public education.
Figures 23, 24, 25, 26 (clockwise). The Villa in the 1970s; the interior of the Villa; Bill Pelham and Eric Holmberg read in the Villa in 1978; students in the Villa in 2007
Today, all architecture undergraduates are required to spend a semester off campus, and some of them spend two semesters off campus. Most of our graduate students participate, spending one or two semesters off campus. In both the undergraduate and graduate degree programs, off-campus semesters are seamlessly integrated with the curricula. We have clear evidence that Harlan was correct in almost all of his assumptions, including that our off-campus programs are a powerful recruiting tool.

The experiences of the three existing all-urban off-campus locations are different from, and complement each other, offering varied experiences for a diversity of students. Genoa provides the only all-inclusive live/earn/work environment, with a live-in resident professor, and highly knowledgeable staff. Barcelona provides a slightly different model, one in which there is no longer a resident professor; Clemson students study alongside students from Texas A&M and other institutions; the studio is separate from the housing; and the housing is a dormitory that houses international and Catalanian students. Charleston is yet a different model, one in which students live independently in the community, often are employed as interns in local firms, and almost always are engaged with local community projects and groups.

In all locations, local faculty expertise and guided experiences through great works of architecture and civic design have a profound influence on students’ study and into their careers. Living and studying, immersed in another culture, offers the sort of transformative experience that informs a more reflective, practice-oriented approach toward local action. What do students learn from these experiences? What is it about being somewhere else, and what goes beyond just the pleasures and delight of the locale? I would say there are three primary outcomes for Fluid Campus participants.

First, an informed worldview: the most important lesson of a university education is learning to view the world from multiple perspectives, and there is no better exposure than being immersed in another perspective. The world shrinks and becomes more comprehensible through off-campus experience. Empathy grows, as does the potential for wisdom. Second, an informed professional-view: our students develop a worldview of architecture and are exposed to the vast array of professional opportunities beyond their backyard, wherever that backyard may be. They learn the climatic, material, cultural, regulatory and technological variations of design and construction. They learn from buildings that teach, from Lee Hall, to the Villa, to the Robert Mills Marine Hospital in Charleston, to the studio a couple blocks off La Ramblas in Barcelona. Their view of architecture and its possibilities are immeasurably expanded. Third, an informed self-view: the most valuable contribution made by off-campus study to its participants may derive less from specific experiences of privileged sites than from the instructive effects of physical, cultural and intellectual displacement on familiar ways of thinking, and the self-confidence and intellectual independence that engenders. Alumni of these programs are resilient.

Clemson’s Fluid Campus has given its students a global reach that prepares them to provide design leadership in a flat world. The Fluid Campus contributes to our top twenty ranking; it contributes to the success of our alumni as global practitioners, and regional experts, who understand the importance of place, and who can make sense of cultural differences. The overarching outcome of the Fluid Campus frames the theme of our centennial: Southern Roots + Global Reach.

Change: 1973 to Now

The challenges and predicaments of architectural education remain very similar to forty years ago: in the broadest terms, how do we educate the designers of the built environment to make the world a better place? But, much has also changed between 1973 and today. Three major changes that deserve some review because of their influence on architectural education are a changing student population, a changing profession of architecture, and a changing world population.

First, the student population has changed, nationally and locally; today, there are more students and more schools. In 1973, 9,327 baccalaureate, masters and doctoral degrees in architecture and related professions were awarded in the U.S. Eighty-six percent of those degrees were earned by men. By 2010, the number of degrees had almost doubled to 17,541. Forty-four percent of those degrees were earned by women. The number of men who earned degrees in architecture and related professions in 2010 was only twenty percent more than the number in 1973. The number of women who earned degrees in architecture and related professions in 2010 was almost six times the number in 1973. The number of foreign students enrolled in institutions of higher education in the U.S. more than doubled between 1980
and 2010 to almost 700,000. Two-thirds of today’s international students in the U.S. are from Asia, with two-thirds of them from China. This was not true in 1973.

Clemson University and the School of Architecture have grown. In 1973, there were 9,461 students enrolled at Clemson. Today that number has more than doubled to 20,768. In Architecture in 1973 there were twenty-six degrees awarded (to all guys, I think, unless Chris Slater was female). In 2012, over four times as many students (111) received Clemson degrees in architecture. In Clemson’s School of Architecture this year, we have 360 total students enrolled in the major. Of this total, three-fourths are white U.S. citizens (which means that one-fourth are either not white or not U.S. citizens, or both). Almost ten percent are non-resident aliens; forty-eight percent are female, forty percent are out-of-state students, thirty percent are graduate students. Our 2013 student population is larger, older, more diverse, and has a more varied set of life experiences and educational needs and expectations than the student population of forty years ago.

Second, the profession of architecture has changed, locally, nationally and globally. In the past forty years, the number of architects in the U.S. has grown by 2.5 times to 105,000 (down from a high of 120,000 a few years ago). Architecture firms are getting bigger, offering more specialized services with more inter- and multidisciplinary teams, and those bigger firms are taking an ever-increasing share of total global business. International work by U.S. firms increased an average of fourteen percent per year between 1998 and now, meaning that the volume of international practice by U.S. architects today is six times what it was just fifteen years ago. The entire design and construction industry is becoming more global, transforming an industry that was once almost completely made up of small businesses to one in which corporate giants lead the way.

Third, the world has changed, as the powers of the digital era and globalization have democratized information, shifted populations, and realigned wealth and knowledge. Between 1970 and 2012, a little over forty years, the population of South Carolina grew by eighty percent, from 2,590,713 to 4,723,723. Experts are predicting that in the next twenty years, the population may increase by another twenty percent, with almost all of the growth in people over sixty-five years of age. Between 1970 and 2012, the population of the U.S. grew by fifty-four percent, from 203,302,031 to 313,914,040. The U.S. is projected to become a majority-minority nation for the first time in 2043. While the non-Hispanic white population will remain the largest single group, no group will make up a majority. The nation’s total population will cross the 400 million mark in 2051, less than forty years from now, meaning that the U.S. population in 2051 will be almost double what it was forty years ago. Between 1973 and 2013, the world population grew over eighty percent, from 3.9 million to 7.1 million after having passed the 7 billion mark in 2011. Developing countries accounted for ninety-seven percent of this growth because of the dual effects of high birth rates and young populations. Conversely, in the developed countries the annual number of births barely exceeds deaths because of low birth rates and much older populations. By 2025, it is likely that deaths will exceed births in the developed countries, the first time this will have happened in history. By 2050, less than forty years from now, it is projected that the world population will be thirty percent larger than it is today, at 9.3 billion, and 2.5 times what it was forty years ago.

The balance of global wealth has begun to shift from traditional western economies to the emerging markets. While the U.S. still has the greatest number of ultra-high-net-worth individuals, China, Russia and India have overtaken Western Europe in the number of billionaires they produce. This marks a fundamental shift in the social demographics of the world’s ultra-rich population. In terms of Gross Domestic Product per capita, Singapore already topped the list in 2010 and is expected to keep the top spot in 2050. It will be trailed by Hong Kong, Taiwan and South Korea, with the U.S. coming in fifth place, down from third in 2010. China will overtake the U.S. to become the world’s largest economy by 2020, which in turn will be overtaken by India in 2050. On the other side of the globe, Latin America is projected as the post-Asia location for growth and investment by a number of economists and investors. Goldman Sachs has forecast that by 2050 Brazil and Mexico will be permanent fixtures within the world’s six largest economies. That same Goldman Sachs research places Nigeria at thirteenth for world GDP levels in 2050, between Germany and Turkey.
The Fluid Campus in the Twenty-first Century

It is now 2013, forty years after the Clemson pioneers came to Genoa. Those pioneers have done well, and probably could not have foreseen how their experiences would prepare them for this new era of globalization. For our current students, can we try to think forty years ahead? What do our current students need to know, to change the world for the better, in forty years, in 2053? I want to remind you of a short Harlan quote from the beginning of my talk: “We have also learned that we must deliberately compensate in our educational programs for some of the things that are not available for educators in Clemson or, indeed, in South Carolina.”

Now, in 2013, there are some things that are not available in Clemson, South Carolina, the U.S., Europe; things that are not available at the intersection of the northern hemisphere and western thought. We know that if students of architecture want to experience wholly new cities and growing cities, or if they want to think seriously about issues of rapid urbanization and increasing density, they will not find it in the U.S. or Europe. They need to go to Asia and the Global South, South America and/or Africa. We also know that population and economic growth almost always bring challenges of resource utilization and sustainability, challenges of our time and the future with which our students need to engage.

We now compete globally for students and faculty; the choices for students and faculty are overwhelming; and the differences between those choices are diminishing. To continue to distinguish ourselves, we need to recall our roots and continue to reach. If we want our graduates to fulfill their promise and our vision as transformational design leaders, with a propensity to intervene in the issues of our times, we need to expand the Fluid Campus. But, we need to do so paying close attention to the tensions of the local and the global, and the poetry of place. Stan Allen, wise Princeton architectural educator, recently suggested: “What is required to comprehend globalism today is not tired generalizations, but close study of specific places, cities, and cultures. It is worth remembering that architecture remains rooted to place, even in an age celebrated for its global culture.”

What is next for Clemson’s Fluid Campus? I have four suggestions:

1. We need to expand the reach of our locations to the areas of the globe with the greatest growth, change, emerging markets, and development challenges. These are primarily Non-Western locations, including the Global South, Asia, Latin America, Russia, and Africa. Our students and faculty can learn much from these locations, while contributing toward a better-designed future.

2. We need to provide a wider range of models for off-campus study including summer programs; more exchanges of individual students; consortiums with other universities and programs; short-term, tactical insertions; and strategic partnerships with firms and/or institutions. Our existing model of semester-long residency may not be the most appropriate model for all locations, and a diversity of models may provide more opportunities for more students to participate in more places. In Asia or Africa we might start with a two-week studio exchange, including an exchange of faculty between locations. In our existing locations we might invite and insert more students and faculty from other programs and institutions, bringing diversity of experiences to us, rather than the reverse.

3. We need to increase connections between our current and expanded locations by building up a culture of sharing information and programs beyond the curricula. We need to celebrate the unique accomplishments of the individual pieces and their contributions to the whole. New certificates and collaborations will pragmatically bind locations, and direct their development.

4. Finally, we need to recall our roots. Clemson is a university that values intervening, that prioritizes service learning. This does not always translate so easily in fluid campus locations, but it needs to be a foundational goal. We need to increase the opportunities for multi- and interdisciplinary learning in the Fluid Campus. At a time when the design and construction industry is becoming far more integrated and collaborative, our academic disciplines could hardly be more segregated. We need to not forget to investigate, learn from, and intervene in the domestic and local landscape, from urban, exurban and rural. Surely there is more we can do to advocate for an improved built environment in all of our
back yards. And we need to recall Harlan’s intent that the off-campus centers should be places for faculty research and exchanges, and for alumni engagement. We can do better with both of these constituencies.

There are challenges to maintaining our current fluid campus, and there will be more challenges to expanding its reach. There are pragmatic issues. We should be careful not to overextend our capacity for “air-traffic control”; it is not easy for synchronous connections over multiple timezones. There are legal challenges, issues with visas, and taxes. But those challenges pale in the light of students reaching their potential as informed local and global citizen architects.

Conclusion
In that 1973 article that I quoted in the beginning, Dean McClure also said: “In every academic program, one should be able to learn from each episode and apply this experience to refining the offerings to the succeeding groups.”

We are learning and have learned much from the grand experiment that started in Genoa forty years ago. But, as Ray Huff said in the set piece at the beginning of this event: “We are still pioneering.” The grand experiment of a Fluid Campus with Southern Roots + Global Reach is not over yet. With your help, we have learned from each episode and are refining our offerings to continue to launch transformational design leaders, shaping the environment of the twenty-first century for a better future, and it started here, forty years ago.

Figure 27. The Villa in March 2013
The Clemson Architecture Center in Charleston (CACC) marked its first quarter century in the historic city with an evening reception at the GrowFood Carolina Warehouse on May 1, 2013. Following the reception, on May 3, 2013, CACC hosted sessions of the SCAIA Centennial Conference.

Figures 28, 29, 30, 31 (top-down). Director Ray Huff making remarks during the celebration in May 2013; the first location of the CACC at 12 Bull St.; the current location of CACC—the Old Marine Hospital at 20 Franklin St.; opening meeting of Fall 2014 in CACC.

Figures 32, 33, 34 (top-down). George Means—the founder of the health facilities, planning and design studio; alumni, students, professors of A+H Program; a view from SAR Architecture for Health Annual Conference in August 2013
GRASSROOTS EXHIBITION

On the bridge between Lee Hall 2 and 3, Fall 2013
Designed and built by Grassroots Team under the leadership of Daniel Harding

Architecture is an ever-present form of visual storytelling, displaying a history of the past, an identity for the present, and a story for the future. The built environment has the ability to capture the history of a place and to tell that story through space. The Grassroots Exhibit, celebrating the Clemson University School of Architecture’s Centennial, forms a visual, spatial link between the past, present, and future, becoming a point in the timeline of a unique place and its culture. In order for Grassroots to tell the appropriate stories, interactive architecture must be created; that is, architecture that engages with the history of a site, respects existing conditions of a place, relates to present needs, and provides the potential for future use and adaptation. Architectural installation is our primary instrument in relating us with space and time, and giving these dimensions a human measure. Ultimately, the goal was to create a new architecture to enhance the sense of being part of the Clemson story, and thus part of the past, present, and future.

Figure 35. Grassroots Exhibition, © Grassroots Team
The Grassroots exhibit seeks to engage those who defined the school’s unique history and simultaneously project that history to current faculty and students. The matrix of individuals who make up the whole of Clemson University’s School of Architecture resemble the seeds of its history. The Grassroots storylines reveal both the individual’s experience and then, when storylines amass, a larger context of various eras within the school’s history. A unique moment occurs for those participants whose paths have made numerous intersections with the School of Architecture. These individuals have received degrees, joined the faculty, and likewise made major contributions and played significant roles in shaping the ever-evolving history of Clemson architecture.

Figure 36. Grassroots Exhibition, © Grassroots Team
Figures 37, 38. Exhibition Manual
Figures 41, 42, 44, 45. Grassroots Exhibition Details, © Grassroots Team
Figures 46, 47, 48. Grassroots Exhibition Details, © Grassroots Team
One hundred years of history is always to be celebrated and, for the Clemson University School of Architecture, it marks not only a time of historical reflection but also a time of excitement about what is yet to come. Entitled “Southern Roots + Global Reach,” this exhibit recalls the school’s consciousness of what it means to be distinctly Southern, as well as to be acutely aware of events, trends and cultures around the world. Inspired by the most prominent mass communication device in the twentieth century, the newspaper, the exhibit utilizes advanced printing technology on a common architectural material, Tyvek®. Backlit with LED lighting strips, the translucent fabric exposes both its own fibrous nature and the opaque embossed printings. This lightweight structure is suspended above the gallery with a series of laser-cut steel beams mounted to the existing movable display wall system. In the exhibit, while the exterior surface contextualizes the history of the school in the form of a timeline, the interior surface features current student works and a series of follies calling attention to the most formative people and events in the history of the school. The historical reflection is tempered against a peek into the future. A frontispiece of the exhibition puts forth the goals, aspirations and programs the school plans to develop in the coming years.
Figure 50. Centennial Exhibition, © Annemarie Jacques

Figure 51. Centennial Exhibition, © Annemarie Jacques
Figures 52, 53, 54. Centennial Exhibition details, © Annemarie Jacques
Figures 55, 56, 57. Centennial Exhibition details, © Annemarie Jacques
1912: Degree in Architectural Engineering Established at Clemson by Rudolph E. Lee

1915: First Architecture Class graduates, with two students: Thomas E. Cleveland and Leon LeGrand...

1915: The American Institute of Architects is founded.

1915: First American school of architecture is founded at MIT.

1916: The entire Senior Class enrolls in WWI.

July 28, 1914: WWI Begins

November 11, 1918: WWI Ends

1933: Department of Architecture Created

Rudolph E. Lee Named Department Head

September 1, 1939: Germany attacks Poland and begins WWII

December 7, 1941: Japan bombs Pearl Harbor and the United States enters World War II.

August 15, 1945: Victory in the Pacific Day

December 7, 1945: More than 1,500 Clemson students and alumni served in WWII; 373 died

1942: Tiger Tail is introduced at Clemson.
The milestone of full accreditation having been assured, the Department was off to a strong start...

1955: Harlan McClure Comes to Clemson University as Architecture Professor

1955: Clemson Becomes a Coeducational Civilian College

1956: African American Students Declined Admission from School Based on Grounds of South Carolina Segregation Law.

1958: Lee Hall by Dean Harlan McClure

December 1, 1955: Rosa Parks Arrested in Montgomery, Alabama

1957: Margaret Marie Stidler Becomes First Woman Graduate of Clemson University
Figure 60. 1960s Exhibition Panel
Figure 61. 1970s Exhibition Panel
The result of this faculty/student dialogue is trust, not easily won from the skeptical young...

Figure 62. 1980s Exhibition Panel
The School of Architecture offers a unique and special place to foster and develop intellectual, creative, cultural and social awareness.
Not restricted by convention, burdened by preconception or existing with fixed boundaries - this is South.
Intellectual freedom, artistic values, academic excellence and social responsibility are just a few of the guiding values of the school and the architecture program.

Figure 65. 2010s Exhibition Panel

2010: Lee I was added to the National Register of Historic Places

2010: Ground Broken for Lee III

2010: BP Oil Spill

2010: Arab Spring Begins

2010: Earthquake and Tsunami in Japan

2011: The death of Osama bin Laden

2011: Global Population Reaches 7 Billion

2011: 5.0 Magnitude Earthquake

2012: Mayan Calendar Ends

2012: Aurora, Colorado Shooting

2012: Completion and Dedication of Lee III

2013: CAC Genoa 40th Anniversary

2013: Supreme Court Defends Gay Marriage

June 26, 2013: Supreme Court Defends Gay Marriage

April 20, 2010: BP Oil Spill
Southern Roots + Global Reach

Clemson’s School of Architecture’s future will extend from its 100-years of southern roots - global reach. Educating future architects, designers, innovators, global citizens, makers and doers. Generating knowledge to address the great challenges of the time. And providing transformational architectural leadership, making a difference, shaping the environment for an even better future.

Kate Schwenemen, FAIA
Chair, School of Architecture
The daylong symposium of “The Architecture of Regionalism in the Age of Globalization” took place on October 18, 2013 at Lee Hall and attracted more than 200 guests. The symposium started with an introduction by Peter Laurence, PhD. “Transmutations of Place” by Marlon Blackwell, FAIA, “Work+Work” by Merrill Elam, “Native Places” by Frank Harmon, FAIA, “Peaks and Valleys of the Flat World: Regionalism in the Age of Globalism” by Liane Lafaivre, PhD and Alexander Tzonis were the talks following the introduction. The symposium concluded with a panel discussion chaired by Lefaivre.
In 1950, the great British architectural critic J.M. Richards took up a challenge familiar to those engaged in centennial projects: he looked back fifty years, reviewing how architectural practice and thinking had developed since the turn of the century, and he looked ahead fifty years, into the century's second half, imagining in what direction modern architecture might go.

The historical context for Richards' speculations and his prescient conclusions are relevant to us today, both here at Clemson and as architects and scholars living in a highly connected world. Those years, like ours, were characterized by challenges requiring creative thought and solutions. One of these was that while modern architecture had achieved great public acceptance, Richards wrote, "[a]lthough modern architecture has come to stay, the way forward is not clear; the present is a moment of crisis, not any longer because we need modern architecture, but because we have got it." The "International Style" had become very popular, but neither the wholesale internationalization of modern architecture nor its stylization was desirable.

What Richards went on to propose as "the next step" for modern architecture was a refinement of its original mission—a "functionalism of the particular," which he explained as follows:

There is no call to abandon functionalism in the search for an architectural idiom capable of the full range of expression its human purposes require; only to understand functionalism itself, by its very nature, implies the reverse of what it is often allowed to imply: not reducing everything to broad generalizations—quality in architecture belongs to the exact, not the approximate—but relating it ever more closely to the essential particulars of time and place and purpose. That is the level on which humanity and science meet.43

Modern architecture, in other words, could be more than the form-follows-function slogan: it could include attention to place, people, history and even the neglected venustas (beauty) component of Vitruvius' essential conceptual triad as part of its charge. While this philosophy was a little too vague and a little too unconcerned with the architectural image to quickly replace modernist dogma, it captured the spirit of the time and the enduring spirit of modern architecture. And it included the spirit of what Richards also described as "a new empiricism," a regionalist approach to modern architecture.

J.M. Richards was not the only person to advocate a regionalist modernism. In The South in Architecture (1941), Lewis Mumford opposed the cultural and technological universalism of the International Style in favor of such an approach. Mumford wrote: "The forms of building that prevail in any region reflect the degree of social discovery and self-awareness that prevails there […] Our climate, even apart from our social needs, requires such flexible forms of construction: yet for lack of regional insight our mechanical ingenuity has gone into absurdities like our present air-conditioning systems, which, if they were widely adopted, would in most parts of the country make an impossible demand [on our resources]."44

Mumford's words remind us of Lee Hall 1 (originally not air-conditioned) and Lee Hall 3 (for its exemplarily low energy demands). However, the last fifty years of Clemson Architecture's history correspond quite neatly with Richards' view from 1950. As a whole, Lee Hall—named for founder Rudolph "Pop" Lee—reminds us of the school's Beaux-Arts era and the transition from that International Style to the modern one and the move from Riggs Hall to Lee. And although that shift took place in 1958—around the time that a new generation of modern architects declared CIAM (Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne) and old ways of thinking about modern architecture dead—McClure's Lee Hall, like Phifer's, transcended contemporary expectations by embracing a "functionalism of the particular" and the delicate balance between the regional and the global.

Modern architecture did not die in 1959, when CIAM was disbanded, or in 1972, when Charles Jencks declared that modern architecture was dead. Indeed, today some speak of a second modernism. But we should not wish for a repeat of the first. As Alexander Tzonis, Liane Lefaivre, Marlon Blackwell, Merrill Elam and Frank Harmon have shown us, modern architecture will not
and cannot die. Their work reminds us of Mumford’s and Richards’ manifestos for a modern architecture that transcends time: architecture that finds the difficult balance between the regional and the global, and the place where humanity and science meet. In Mumford’s words:

It takes generations before a regional product can be achieved. So it is with architectural forms. We are only beginning to know enough about ourselves and about our environment to create a regional architecture. Regionalism is not a matter of using the most available local material, or of copying some simple forms of construction that our ancestors used, for want of anything better, a century or two ago. Regional forms are those which most closely meet the actual conditions of life and which most fully succeed in making a people feel at home in their environment: they do not merely utilize the soil, but they reflect the current conditions of culture in the region."
Typically I like to start out with lots of stories. What a Southerner likes to do is to construct a winding narrative, but we do not have time for that. So I will show you images that, hopefully, will illustrate our story.

I am from Alabama, born into a military family and lived all over the country and in places like Germany and the Philippines. I wrestled a bear in high school; I lost (that is another story). I came from a modest background, so to put myself through school at Auburn University, I was a Bible salesman for five summers. I was a pretty good Bible salesman so I got to meet this fellow here, Ronald Reagan, to receive my top salesman award back in the seventies. By the way, I survived seventies fashion. From there on it is kind of downhill, a lot of mileage (Ha!). I now live in Northwest Arkansas, what we like to call the Land of Bill (Clinton) and a billion chickens. Here in the Ozarks, what I love about our chickens—our state bird, I like to call them—is the wonderful chicken houses, the beautiful structures anywhere from thirty to forty feet wide, two hundred to six hundred feet long. What I love about them is that when you are in the landscape you know where you are oriented; because they are almost always oriented east-west. The farmers knew that if they could minimize the east and west exposure on the chickens and control the sun on the south, the chickens would not cook before their time.

In 2005, Princeton Architectural Press was working on our monograph and asked us to provide an iconic image of our place. We thought the intersection of hills and valleys define the Ozarks; the city of Fayetteville—where I live and work—is built on hills. You can stand in the downtown and look out onto the countryside: we found a perfect setting for our photo. You will see a building up there; that is Old Main, our iconic building on the University of Arkansas campus. You will see a cow in the field below with her new calf; this is a place where agriculture and culture come together. But just as we took the shot, a Walmart truck drives right through the middle of the image; so yes, commerce and its pressures are also a part of our place. I live in a place of real natural beauty and simultaneously one of real constructed ugliness. Of course, I do not think that is limited to Arkansas; I saw a few not-so-beautiful structures on my way in from the airport here. Ironically, we are in the middle of nowhere but we are close to everywhere. Because of Walmart, we have more direct connections to major cities than any other small town in the country.

This is a place that can be considered aesthetically and culturally impoverished. Words like abandonment, erasure, exploitation, and nostalgia are all aspects of this place and are conditions that, I believe, are as authentic as its natural beauty and its local form. One thing I have realized is that the rural, urban and suburban constructs in which I live are no more real than each other. It is a land of disparate conditions that is not just a setting for our work but has really become part of
our work. Here, I do not see a negative. What I see is a deep source of possibilities in direct experience with the world as it is given to us. By choosing to stay and work in what we like to call the “Ozark Outback,” what we have been able to do over the last twenty years is to turn over the rock and discover the underbelly of our place—the visceral presences and expressive character that sustain our efforts here.

Now, I am working from a very simple conviction that “architecture is larger than the subject of architecture.” What we try to do is to look at the world with a wide-angled microscopic lens to generate ideas and actions from the concrete experiences of the everyday; between the ordinary and the extraordinary; between one’s own personal history and the history of our discipline.

Thorncrown Chapel by E. Fay Jones, a great friend and mentor of mine who won the AIA Gold Medal in 1990 and, so to speak, is the architect of the Ozarks, is listed as the fourth best building of the twentieth century in the United State. We have taken just about every architect who visits our school to this chapel; well-known figures such as Jacques Herzog, Peter Zumthor, Peter Eisenman, and others from all walks of life—and they are always deeply affected by this modest structure. It is truly architecture in the fullest sense of the word. On the other hand, just a few miles away in Eureka Springs, there is the tourist attraction, the Passion Play, where actors act out the life of Christ. They are surrounded by a facsimile of Jerusalem built as a ¾ plywood façade. And, then, they have this Jesus figure standing in the landscape that we affectionately call “Milk-Carton Jesus.” He was actually designed to be much, much taller than he is, but the problem was he was going to have to have a flashing blue light on his head because of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations. So rather than re-design him, they just cut him off at the knees and pushed him into the ground. So, he now has the proportions of a milk carton. I show these to you to illustrate the conditions in which we work: between the highs and the lows of culture. But again, we do not see this as a negative. Our job, our mission, is not to resolve one to the other, but in fact to find resonance between these conditions through the things we make.

Figures 72, 73. Thorncrown Chapel by Fay Jones and Christ of the Ozarks at Eureka Springs, Arkansas

This demands very careful observations of micro and macro conditions—biological, geological, and cultural—which form the basis for an inductive, bottom-up process that allows us to amplify the small things that manifest the large things. In that line of thinking, we can say in the words of the poet William Carlos Williams that there are “[n]o ideas but in things.” Leonardo da Vinci spoke directly about making from the experience of things when he said: “It should not be so hard for you to stop sometimes and look into the stains of walls or ashes of fire or clouds or mud or like places in which you may find really marvelous ideas.” So that is all we are doing, trying to find really marvelous ideas out of the muck of our own condition.

We work with architectural vernaculars but we do not do the vernacular. In fact, we work in many ways to transgress them. Architectural vernaculars at their best are like familiar faces in which we recognize a deep character and discover the essential qualities we value most in architecture.
for the environments we build and the places we make. What we are trying to do is to recreate strangeness, beautiful and sublime, to revive and intensify these places and what is familiar by complicating, defamiliarizing our relationship with them. We are drawing upon the specificities of local situations that allow for permutations of type and typologies that are resistant to the diminishments of the vernacular through the commodification, so evident in most commercial development.

For us, the use of typologies is essential and, I think, quite different from vernaculars. Fundamental to our work is envisioning typologies as evolutionary, dynamic, and adaptive. Typologies are not fixed! When they become fixed, they become about style. Ask the New Urbanists about that! Architecturally, they are not dealing with types, they are dealing with style. So we have looked at specific—traditional and emerging—typologies we observed in conditions nature-made and culture-made to understand how these might be selectively combined to generate new types, new figures, and new form. What emerges through the mixing and hybridization of typologies is a transmutation of place, a secular vernacular that in place becomes spiritual.

I think it is safe to say that most architecture is not very good and most good architecture is good enough for most days. But, there are some buildings that need to rise above the everyday. This necessarily challenges us to return to the significance of the everyday and to revalidate it through the things that we make. So we choose to stay and work between the motivating forces of the everyday in our place or in any place that we work, between the ideal and the improvised in our discipline. This has allowed us to develop a body of work that looks at the relationships between nature and culture—a multi-scalar architecture that is resolute at the scale of the hand, the scale of the building, as well as at the scale of the place. For us, architecture should be able to happen anywhere, at any scale, for just about any budget. That is what we are after. Our approach has yielded a variety of project types I will share with you.

The first project is for a beekeeper in Cashiers, North Carolina. For this structure, we looked at the genetic organizational tendencies of bees (the honeycomb) confined by the cartesian frames that make up the bee box. This analysis demonstrated the intersection of two different systems, and that allowed us to generate an idea for the structure’s single most prominent architectural element, a load-bearing steel-plate and faceted-glass wall, made primarily of voids, that is for the display and the storage of honey, but also acts as a brise-soleil. Similarly, a seven-story towerhouse in Fayetteville, Arkansas looks at the immediate site and its textures and patterns. We developed an analog with the striated bark of the white oak to create a lattice fin screen around the stairway courtyard that takes you up to the living areas in the house. But, then, looking at that other order in the landscape that exists above and beyond the trees, a landscape of industrial and vernacular agricultural buildings clad in white metal or concrete, we developed a thin, white metal skin for the upper tower that is generated from another order of the land that lies beyond. Together, the metal and wood system of articulation introduces a new formal and material logic for the place.
Another example, showing again how environment and culture shape typologies (and why it should not be fixed) is the Post-Katrina work we have done with Architecture for Humanity in the city of Biloxi, Mississippi: the only city on the Mississippi Gulf Coast that rejected the New Urbanist plan. In Biloxi, it was decided that not everybody wants to live in Grandma’s house with a geranium on the porch. So what we were asked to do was to deal directly with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulations that demand new structures to be built up to eleven feet above a category-four storm surge. What are the implications of this new requirement to the urban character of a place? With this question in mind, we started with the typology of the shotgun house. We raised it up above the storm surge but we kept the porch on the ground. The porch acts as a social interface between the private world and the public world, especially in the South. With its efficient stacked living program and concise plan, our metal-clad Porchdog House is an affordable prototype, an alternative to the status quo. We think that an adaptive typological approach helps us, through principles, to overcome circumstances of an environmentally Darwinian event.

The Blessings Golf Clubhouse in Fayetteville, Arkansas presents another strategy (see fig. 79). It is a new golf clubhouse that retains the traditions of the game but is not in the image of yet another plantation-house or hunting lodge type. In fact, it responds to its place and is decidedly part of the twenty-first century rather than the nineteenth century. The simple, singular volume is clad with local quarried stone and copper cladding—timeless materials. Using a kind of “big box” strategy, we built this structure for a third less than the average golf clubhouse in the country. While the building returns to sources in thought and craft, it clearly speaks to the particulars of its place and time.
The Visitors Center for the Indianapolis Museum of Arts is shaped by the often-volatile relationship between land and water. The Ruth Lilly Visitor’s Pavilion is within the Art & Nature Park, right on the edge of downtown Indianapolis. This one-hundred-acre park is located in an oxbow of the White River, which runs right through Indianapolis. The site was once a forest; in time, it became a field, then a quarry where they dug limestone, and, finally, it became a lake (an amenity for the city). It is now a place for site-specific art and nature trails. It floods a lot here. The river rises higher than the lake and breaches the lake. It has had three one-hundred-year floods in the last six years because of indiscriminate development upriver. To locate and to build this Visitors Center and the art works themselves, we had to negotiate the wet, fecund terrain and the careful placement of each work.

Our landscape architect, Ed Blake, a great landscape architect from Hattiesburg, Mississippi, took our initial organizational diagram and made a whole series of pathway journeys that pass through our site in the woodlands. Our building had to be five feet out of the forest floor, right at eye level. This was not a great situation. Blake came up with an idea of figured mounds that rise out of the forest floor—three-foot-high berms. Our building sits astride these mounds with two ADA ramps that continue the pathway journeys and at the same time make our building an extension of the park (see fig. 82). The structure sits just above the mounds, positioned lightly upon the earth. The building envelope was developed as an analog with things found in nature, such as the light structure of a butterfly wing and a leaf. We looked at leaves, found on the site, which had been eaten away by insects. The surface was very porous, yet the structure was still very prominent. Light and water could come through it. I was reminded of the porosity of the canopy of the forest—could our structure allow light and moisture to filter through it? Thus, the deck-wall canopy is made of a perforated surface of IPE wood slats which forms a semi-transparent envelope. The floor, the wall and the canopy of the pavilion are all one material with essentially one articulation system. The same surface, like a tortilla, wraps around the program. This dynamic material surface is what you experience most directly (see fig. 83). It constantly changes as the sun and clouds move. The structure, a steel-frame exoskeleton, is only felt through the presence of the shadows that are cast and imprinted through it. This is a structure that pulsates with the rhythms of the day. In fact, what we were after is what Wright has described as an “architecture imbued with the order of change.”
Another project we finished about a year ago is a museum store for the Crystal Bridges Museum of American Art in Bentonville, Arkansas, that was designed by Moshe Safdie. This is the newest and most significant American art museum since the Whitney Museum in New York. I encourage everybody to visit it; it has a fantastic collection and has been very successful with the public. We were asked to design and construct the Museum Store while Mr. Safdie’s building was still under construction. So we did not know what the museum truly looked like. Crystal Bridges sits along and across a creek that is near the downtown Bentonville Square. The space for the store was an empty curved room of raw concrete with west-facing light. I am sure Mr. Safdie did not really consider the retail aspect of this space, but we had to deal with it. The desire was for the retail experience to be an extension of the museum experience.

We began to think about our material culture and local raw materials like our hardwood forests. Thinking back, again, to how Fay Jones used simple materials and dimensions through repetition to instill a stored energy in buildings, to make space dynamic, proposed a simple strategy: units (ribs) multiplied along a path to generate form and surface that refigures the space. A hung carapace made of a series of parallel plywood ribs wraps a visitor in the warmth of cherry (see fig. 84). The profile of the carapace is extruded along the curved space. Display vitrines are elevated above the cherry floor along with walnut gondolas and display cases. This strategy came about from looking at the local artists to be featured in the museum store; one in particular was Leon Niehues, a great basket maker from Huntsville, Arkansas. We went to his studio and discovered that he draws each basket with charcoal in profile. He extends that profile along a curved path, and as the path begins to close in on itself he creates a kind of flourish at the end and gives the basket its character. Using an operation of profile and path in the initial sketch, we tried to resolve some
of the challenges of the space to knock down forty percent of the western sun, to begin to screen the sprinklers, mechanical ducts, lighting, and provide space to embed merchandise. The simple profile extruded along the path of the existing shell evolved into a series of ribs, 285 ribs cut out of 485 sheets of plywood. Every rib is different and pieced together of different components. This is all made through a CNC digital fabrication process that is very economical.

Figures 84, 85. Crystal Bridges Museum Store, Bentonville, Arkansas, © Timothy Hursley

Figure 86. Sketch

In our firm, we are great at post-rationalization. Somebody in our office said: “Hey, this looks like lamella (the underside of a mushroom)!?” I said: “Yeah, that makes sense,” and so we made plan diagrams of a mushroom to explain some differences in kind between natural and manmade logics that affected our design. The organization of the ribs is not on a radial because those ribs would have splayed about two feet apart at the back wall. Instead, we worked across the curve with a grain of parallel lines to maintain a very consistent spacing between the ribs. The spacing provided a gentle filtered light that comes in through the carapace in the late afternoon. What I think the owner really liked about our design was that it paid for itself in four months. So we were able to demonstrate to the museum that good design can be good business, as well.

I am now going to shift gears and show three projects that address the issue of “sustainability.” I really dislike this word—or at least, the resultant greenwashing of our profession. I think sustainability as a strategy is best illustrated through the repurposing of what we already have. Why not
take the DNA of existing building fabric and extend it to provide the past with a future? Many of our projects are about adaptive reuse; generating the new from the old.

William J. Fulbright was a well-known senator from Arkansas. His family lumber mill was in Fayetteville. The mill made farm products such as plowshares and wagon wheels from local oak. After the Second World War, there was less of a demand for these implements. There was another well-known person from Fayetteville in town at the time designing a fine arts complex in 1951 on the University of Arkansas’s campus; this was the modernist architect, Edward Durell Stone. In conversation with his friend, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Stone came up with an idea: why don’t we take these farm implements and repurpose them to make an international line of furniture? We can use it for the new building, and then we can market it. That is exactly what happened; wagon wheels, plowshares, and ax handles produced by the mill were modified to incorporate the local craft of basket making and weaving. The results were both beautiful and useful.

With this spirit in mind, I take you to a small place in Gentry, Arkansas. This is a town of 2,500 persons. The only thing in the town is a Little Debbie snack food plant and a Wild Country Safari Zoo where you drive through the landscape where emus chase you and monkeys jump on your car. In this town there was a desire for a public library. They had a small one, but public funds were so short that it was privately funded. What they wanted was a new public library and a community room, a place for genealogy and a place to exhibit artifacts from the city’s history. They had come into possession of a hundred-year-old mercantile building that had long been a hardware store, and they wished to convert this dilapidated structure into an 11,000 square foot public library and community space.

All the windows of the old building were blown out and boarded up. It is in Tornado Alley so storms had hit it and blown off areas of brick cladding and its brick parapet. They just patched up the walls with whatever brick they had on hand. The structure had accrued a lot of ticks and wrinkles over a hundred years. My first response: “Let’s tear it down, let’s get rid of it. We can start over, it is cheaper.” Of course, they were appalled by that; the town was quite sentimental about this building. The Library Board president said: “Our socioeconomic center was right here for nearly one hundred years.” The Mayor piped in and said: “Yeah, I used to eat barbecued beaver here when
I was a kid.” I did not know you could do that; it is a really tough town. The Mayor, Wes Hogue, owns a tattoo parlor, but he is one of the best politicians I have ever met. He got us through all of the small-town politics (we know about that here in South Carolina, do we not?). You know what it takes to build something, I am from Fayetteville but I got called “that guy from New York City” because some council member read that I taught at Syracuse University once.

We were asked not to design the building a false history, which is what we all too often do as a profession, a pastiche Disneyfication, a history that never was. So, we tried to respond to the building on its own terms and think of it as an artifact in itself, worth dignifying by the way that aspects of it could be reframed and re-presented. To achieve this, rather than changing the form, we changed the syntax—the elements: doors, windows, columns; a new language that would provide it a new identity. All the new components we designed were made of custom steel plates and glass. Simple diagrams helped communicate this strategy as a kit of parts like a Chilton car manual. At $108 per square foot, it is still the least expensive public library built in the state of Arkansas to date.

The existing pressed-tin ceiling of the new library was restored. The mayor employed County prisoners to take it all down and put it back up. We did not puncture the restored ceiling with lights or ducts. We replaced all the columns. We wrapped each of the new columns in glass and books and put light in the bottom to provide uplighting, so that light hits the ceiling and bounces down and creates the reflective lighting we need for reading. Simple elements like steel-box windows inserted into the existing second-floor window openings capture the north light and allow,
perhaps, a dimension of the spiritual to be brought into the prosaic condition of a library. Little things like this, small victories, begin to add up.

The building has a presence, day and night. Its facade is very transparent; it is almost a shrink-wrapped membrane between the street and the interior. Books and journals are displayed on the north-facing shelves that are bracing for the load-bearing fins. The glass vitrine windows are used for exhibits; the institution is effectively turned inside out onto the street. This new language of elements renews the expressive character of the existing building. This building won a national AIA library award, the first for Arkansas. But what we really feel proudest about as a team is that when we started, the library cardholders numbered three hundred in this town of twenty-five hundred. Today, the number of library cardholders is twenty-three hundred out of twenty-five hundred. It goes to show that architecture has the power, if not to transform our institutions, then at least to strengthen them.

A project along this same line of thinking is the St. Nicholas Antiochian Christian Church in Springdale, Arkansas. This is a transformation through form rather than through elements. As an Orthodox Christian Church, the congregation used to meet in a run-down office building in downtown Springdale. They bought some property along Interstate 49, surrounded by an array of megachurches there. After buying the property, they had a very modest sum left over to build their own sanctuary and fellowship hall. They brought us on board and they said they had only $100 per square foot for the building construction. We thought: “Well, okay, maybe we could try to do it for that amount.” But here was the wrinkle: we had to start with an existing welding shop on the site (see fig. 93). First, we thought we were going to tear it down but they said no. Our hearts sank. Our challenge was to provide a utilitarian structure for the very traditional, aesthetic form of worship.
that is the Orthodox Christian Church, with all the icons, the symbols, the iconostasis, the dome, and the narthex. So, to initiate the design, we went back to the origins of the church and looked at proportioning systems that were endemic to Greek churches and began to try to use this system to generate a twenty-first century church.

In addition to using the golden system of proportion to shape the new west-facing front façade, we next transformed the existing building by re-skinning it. We put a new metal skin over the existing one. We added ten feet to the front on the east-west axis so we could have a narthex running north to south, which is very important for the sanctuary. The church is very simple; its sacred façade faces the interstate highway. It is a billboard for the faith. We took an off-the-shelf box-rib metal panel system and we customized the trim work so that we could make very precise, well-crafted transitions. This kind of negotiation between the pre-manufactured realm and one of customization helps us arrive at a condition of abstraction. All the windows and doors and building profiles are coursed out seamlessly with the box ribs. There is precision in thought and execution.
TRANSMUTATIONS OF PLACE

The façade is lit up at night; it has its own presence along the highway. A big problem we had was getting a dome for the church. Particularly, getting it on top of the building, because we would have had to cut through the primary structure. So we decided to put it in the ceiling of the sanctuary. The church did not have the money for a real dome. We could not figure out how to make one that would look good, but our contractor had a great idea. He said: “For two cases of beer, I can get us a satellite dish.” So we went and made the trade and brought it to the construction site. It had its own natural lath, so we skim-coated it with plaster and then jacked it up into place. So now the church has its dome—how’s that for repurposing? I told Father John: “Now you’ve got a direct connection to God.” He said: “Yeah, but it’s pointed in the wrong direction.” Oh, well.

The church won the National AIA Honor Award in 2013. When they called us to tell us about the award, we were informed that this was the least expensive building to ever win a National AIA Honor Award in the history of the awards program—once again demonstrating that architecture can happen anywhere, at any scale, at any budget.

The last project I want to share with you is our just-completed Fay Jones School of Architecture at the University of Arkansas. Your new building by Tom Phifer is stunning, absolutely beautiful! I am so glad I got to see it. I saw Tom in Monterey a few weeks ago, and I was telling him how excited I was to be coming to Clemson. As a school, we have been in our same building for over forty years, but we have never had our school all together—landscape, interior design, and architecture—under one roof. We were asked to transform this 65,000 square foot Beaux-Arts building (a former library, built in 1937), and add a 35,000 square foot new structure to it. Again, this project was a question of contrast and comparison; we find ways to extend the DNA of the old into the new, but always operating in the twenty-first century. A new building, emerging from the old but with its own logic, in its own time, in resonance with and respect for the existing structure. We were seeking a productive tension between the new and old.
The first thing we had to do was open up the axis on campus that goes from Arkansas Avenue through Old Main; then our building; then the new library, and the Student Union; and, finally, all the way to the football stadium. The axis has never been fully utilized because our building was a library; there were low floors for book storage, centered on the axis; you always had to go around and then get back on axis.

Our first strategy was to blow out the middle and re-format it programatically for people rather than books. We restored the existing east-facing Neoclassical detailing and added a new, west-facing four-story wing of program in the same width and length as the existing east-facing Neoclassical wing, but with its own identity. The new building is post-tensioned concrete with limestone rain-screen panels, made of the same type of limestone that clads the existing building; in fact, the quarry it comes from is only fifty miles from the original quarry in Indiana (see fig. 102). Now, the axis invites university students through our building, which had never happened before. People now see what we do and where we are. Along the axis, there is a new exhibit gallery, a student-organization office, a student lounge, all the administration offices, new studios, and vitrines and displays. Now there really is a true interface with the rest of the university community.
Two one-hundred-year-old oaks on the site were taken down for the new structure. We milled those carefully and turned them into raw lumber, two inches by two foot thick. Fletcher Cox, a great woodworker from Jackson, Mississippi, turned this into a 25-foot by 5½-foot tableaux, carefully placed along the center axis of the entry hall. Though students hang out on it, you also can use the tableaux to teach them about wood: end grain, long grain, face grain—the idea is that this whole intervention and renovation is a didactic moment for the students to learn about how we build, how we unite space, material, and form across timelines. Looking at how to control the 200-foot, west-facing façade, we designed a fritted glass-fin *brise-soleil* attached to a locally-fabricated custom steel and glass curtain wall system. Essentially, we made one window for the west elevation, instead of a façade of many windows. It works great as a passive system to control the heat and the sun and brings natural, balanced light into the studios themselves. To get our design past the university review board, we again reiterated that the existing and new building could act as a teaching tool for
our students. In the old way, the building (the mass) was more of the ground, and the windows (the fenestration) was more of the figure. With new technology and spatial thinking, we could reverse the figure/ground relationship; now we can make the new building as the figure, and we make the new fenestration the ground. Our students can learn from these two forms of expression and language.

We are fortunate to have spaces we did not have before, such as a secure exhibit gallery that allows for traveling exhibits. Of course, the first exhibit was of Fay Jones. Social spaces throughout the building sensitively connect the new to the old, which we considered very carefully. We kept the old double-height reference room with its neoclassical detailing, but added studios on top. To correct issues with lighting and acoustics, we provided a twenty-five-hundred-square-foot, all-fabric ceiling with backlighting and a red oculus to the sky. This is an eight by twenty-foot uninterrupted piece of glass that connects you with the sky and the clouds. The renovated space is now the central great room—the heart, the nerve center of the School—where we do all our studio reviews and multiple-purpose activities. Upstairs you can look into the red glass vitrine that frames the oculus. If you have been up for three nights, it is a real psychedelic experience. Two major places

Figures 105, 106, 107, 108. Fay Jones School of Architecture, © Timothy Hursley
for learning are the two hundred-seat auditorium and our covered, outdoor classroom. The covered outdoor classroom is on the landscaped top level with views of the Boston Mountains to the south: like the school, a place of refuge and prospect.

Figures 109, 110. Fay Jones School of Architecture, © Timothy Hursley

Hopefully, I have demonstrated that architecture can happen anywhere, that there is humor and dignity in the world as it is given to us. Looking carefully, listening quietly, we may act boldly to enrich our experience of form and place through the things we make.

Thank you very much!
Congratulations to Clemson on 100 years! It is really a pleasure to be here today with these two architects, Frank Harmon and Marlon Blackwell, whom I admire enormously and learn from on a continuing basis.

So, Work and Work. Recently, both in the work of our practice and in the work of the academy, we have been exploring the implications of video and the moving image as a medium for design. The presentation today includes some of this work from both areas. Origins are a powerful force in architecture. The work of the project of architecture, across all borders and boundaries, is the transformation. With transformation, it is the strangely familiar that holds our attention and raises our curiosity. We drag our origins with us and we understand, by the comparative method, the world through the lens of our origins.

I will begin here with Mack [Scogin]’s voice in “The Carniful,” a piece we wrote for TAR magazine. The second part will be my voice. But, for “The Carniful,” please pretend you are hearing Mack.

The Carniful
I grew up in an exact square, one mile by one mile. A city planned in 1929 as a replica of a mythic English village, complete with half-timbered Tudor-style homes, a pond, a half-timbered Tudor-style community center, a park and a swimming pool with a half-timbered Tudor-style clubhouse. There were streets with cobblestone shoulders and names like Clarendon, Dartmouth, and Stratford. Ours was Fairfield. It was a middle-class community with zero ethnic and racial diversity, five miles east of Atlanta—the Atlanta of Sherman’s March to the Sea, Margaret Mitchell’s Gone with the Wind (1936), Martin Luther King’s Ebenezer Baptist Church, and the land of the secret formula, Coca-Cola.

I was raised in a Southern Baptist household. We went to church services twice every Sunday and prayer meetings every Wednesday. My father made things for interior decorators and my mother was a bank teller who continuously redecorated our house. She had a complete set of commemorative china for every holiday or festive occasion, including George Washington’s birthday.

I was a city kid, but the city was Avondale Estates. At the time, “the country” was anything outside the city limits. There was a cow pasture adjacent to our high school. If you were a student, you were in “the city.” If you were a cow, you were in “the country.” Almost every Saturday, from about age nine to seventeen, my buddies and I told our parents we were going to the Saturday children’s movies in the classic theatres in downtown Atlanta. We would catch the bus, transfer to the trolley and shuttle up and down Peachtree Street on the Shopper’s Special. Of course, we did not always make it to the movies. Once a year we took a clandestine trip to the Southeastern Fairgrounds, sneaked under the fence and entered a forbidden world of exotica: the county fair. Unlike my buddies, I never really liked the rides. For me, everything from the Ferris wheel to the carousel to the roller coaster was a cheap thrill. Just looking at the rides you knew exactly what was going to happen to you. No matter how many flashing lights and ornate decorations, the apparatus was a machine for one purpose: to move you up, down, around, or any combination thereof. No sense of wonder, just fabricated fear and physical pain.

What I went to the fair for were the carnies, the belly dancers, the gypsy people, the exotic fortune tellers, the sword swallowers, the snake charmers, Gorilla Girl, the Bearded Lady, cotton candy, the two-headed donkey and the six-legged pig. I can still smell the green saw dust that covered the midway. One year, I saw a calf being born, after which I did not sleep for days because every time I closed my eyes, there was this bloody, slimy thing with legs, at first oozing and then exploding from some unimaginable hole in the back of Bessie. I can still see it today.

I was mesmerized by the toothless hawkers chewing unlit cigars and barking out promises of once in-a-lifetime sights of the freakish and weird. There were the “little people” holding leashes connected to little curly-tailed hissing monkeys that would snatch your bag of popcorn or peanuts if you got too close. There was always this one guy on stilts, dressed like Uncle Sam, plodding aimlessly around the midway. You could see him in the distance and you knew at his feet were your comrades peering, pointing and occasionally mocking, waiting for the Uncle to stumble. I can
remember trying to imagine what he would look like with his pants off. And there were carnies with liquor bottles in their back pockets!

All too soon, the county fair folded, as “the country” became “the city.” Visits to the fair were not encounters with the extreme. They were profound life-changing exchanges that transcended the momentary high of the radical. These sustaining, humane engagements with social and spatial difference, strange but familiar, were the origins of a lifetime of curiosity—generative experiences that continue to inform the imagination.46

The lecture continues with three movie segments and a slide show:

Segment 1—An episode from Giuseppe Patroni Griffi’s *The Driver’s Seat* (1974) in which Elizabeth Taylor makes up her eyes in a dressing room.

Segment 2—An episode from Francis Ford Coppola’s *Apocalypse Now* (1979) in which Marlon Brando discusses what real freedoms mean while washing his head.

Slide Show—A series of images juxtaposing vernacular with ancient and contemporary canonical buildings and art works is accompanied by the song “I Feel Pretty” from J. Robins & R. Wise’s *West Side Story* (1961).

Segment 3—Björk’s *All is Full of Love* (1999) music video directed by Chris Cunningham is shown next to an episode from Park Chan-wook’s *Oldboy* (2003). In the music video, after being assembled a robot kisses another robot. In the movie episode, Choi Min-sik, who eats a live octopus in a sushi restaurant, attracts the restaurant’s young chef (Kang Hye-jung).

*The Uglyful*

UG’LY·FUL, [adj. most often used in reference to architectural aesthetic] full of the strangely familiar; having qualities of the strangely familiar; questioning origins; expressive of genial innocence; sophisticatedly radical; embodying the instinct of the child.

Architects rarely produce the strange. We prefer to define our world in the declarative terms of the pretty, the banal, the grotesque, the ugly, the idiosyncratic, the beautiful or the sublime—terms arguably more readily theorized, conceptualized and commercialized. The strange demands multiple readings, where judgment is suspended and instinct is privileged. As children we were fascinated by those things that we were not quite able to resolve. Those forces took us outside of ourselves and drew us to the other. I remember Jinx. Jinx was an albino. She made wildly delicious ice cream sodas and tolerated us. We would steal glances and never get tired of speculating on her origins.

In the realm of the strangely familiar, a consciously rogue aesthetic can be understood to mean not simply a theory of beauty, but also a quality of feelings. This rogue aesthetic is more commonly found in the history, theory and practice of the fine arts. It is rooted in the critique and the provocation and often involves paradox, contradiction, and contrast.

Louise Lawler’s *Monogram* arranged by Mr. and Mrs. Burton Tremaine, New York City (1984); Francis Bacon, *The Pope* (1953); *The Velvet Underground’s Peel Slowly and See* (1995); Louise Bourgeois’ *Destruction of the Father* (1974); Yvonne Rainer’s *Trio A* (1978); Donald Judd’s 100 Untitled Works in Mill Aluminum (1982-86); Mark Rothko’s *No. 18* (1951); Franz Kafka’s *The Trial* (1925); Samuel Beckett’s *Happy Days* (1961); Marina Abramović’s *The Artist is Present* (2010); Elvis; Michelangelo Antonioni’s *Blow Up* (1966); John Cage’s 4’33’’ (1952); Trisha Brown’s *Spanish Dance* (1973); Marcel Duchamp’s *Fountain* (1917).

These artists and their work share a fundamental principle. The artists draw from their personal origins and their work questions origins. This is a principle fulfilled by the artists’ ability to maintain their innocence, get in touch with their instincts, and ensure their personal authorship. Coincidentally, all are fundamental dispositions of the realm of the strangely familiar and, ironically, have come to be considered more liabilities than assets in the highly mediated practice of architecture today.

Occasionally, however, within the discipline of architecture, the strangely familiar emerges as a sophisticated radicalism—the Uglyful, which gets to the heart and soul of things rather than affecting the extremes, as can be seen in the works of Julio Romano, Michelangelo, Borromini, Le Corbusier, Hans Scharoun and Jørn Utzon, Enric Miralles, and Sigurd Lewerentz.
The Uglyful is a radicalism that invokes the familiar, makes us uncomfortable, and pulls us toward the humane. It is this humanity that moves the project of architecture toward the space of the critique or the provocation and allows people to collectively engage differences with a common curiosity.

For architects to operate within this realm, we must connect to and question origins with the same principled innocence and disciplinary rigor as the artists. The distinguishing source of inspiration for the virtuous architect operating within the Uglyful is the constructed and social vernacular. In the vernacular landscape, over and over again, there is the bizarre juxtaposition, the random shift in scale, the unexpected combination of materials, the unconventional function, the iconographic image, the astounding moment brought about by the untrained hand, the disruption of the ordinary, the awkwardness of the contradictory moment—all common characteristics of the Uglyful that transport us out of the ingrained and habitual, while stimulating interaction spatially, environmentally and socially.

Those architects whose work has been distinguished by the genial quality of the Uglyful have done so without compromising any of their intellectual and creative integrity. They have shown that the maintenance of a childlike innocence and the wisdom of the everyday are at the heart and soul of architecture.47

The lecture continues with three movie segments:

Segment 1: A black and white animation of two dancing cartoon characters


Segment 3: In Peter Glushanok’s A Dancer’s World (1957), Martha Graham explains the importance of makeup for dance:

A theatre dressing room is a very special place. It is where the act of theatre begins. And makeup is a magic, it is a ritual, the means by which you transform yourself into the character you hope to play. You make up your face as you think she might have looked, you dress your hair as you think she might have dressed hers. I am wearing my hair tonight as Jocasta, or at least as I hope she wore it. And then, there comes a moment when she looks at you in the mirror, and you realize that she is looking at you and recognizing you as herself. It is through you that her love, her hope, her fear, her terror, is to be expressed. And there is a moment of fear on your own part, dread, a sense of hazard, the feeling that perhaps you have not done quite enough work, perhaps you should have gone back to the studio and worked again, because that which you do not want to do is to fail in either clarity or in passion. You give all your life to doing this one thing; it sounds grim, it sounds frightening. It is not. It has a great gaiety at times and a great wonder. But at the same time, there is that need to go back to the studio. Dance is communication and the great desire to speak clearly and beautifully and with inevitability.

Mack scratched out this chart as a result of a symposium on the subject of beauty. Of course, he talked about how the Uglyful can weave these all back together (see fig. 111). What he is saying here is that it takes at least forty-seven years or so to reach the beautiful, and he knows that for a fact because we have been practicing for forty-two and we still have not made it. But he says that you have your origins, you start with your origins and there are some false cues you can take, where you might dart off here to the pretty. Pretty is a real dead end but it is really quick. You can get there in a few months, maybe a few years. You might meander down into the instrumental or banal, and there, you can get back out via the idiosyncratic, the avant garde, or the grotesque. There is always a way back. If you look at Ronchamp, your first take on it is not the beautiful but it is something else that is transformational. The same may be said of the great Gothic cathedrals. Mack is asking us to not be too afraid of the Uglyful and not get ourselves in a bind with the pretty along the way.

Thank you very much!
Figure 111. Mack Scogin's chart
Thank you for inviting me here and especially for allowing me to follow Marlon and Merrill because I can bring all of this to a quiet close. They have said all the important things you need to hear.

I am very interested in the region where you and I live. Walking through your studios today, I was delighted to see that someone had placed a map on the wall of North and South Carolina’s six ecological zones. I have that same map. It reminds us that even though we live in a place where the same McDonald’s appears from the mountains to the seacoast, as do middle schools and the same tedious apartments with small balconies, we also live in a region of grand ecological variety.

I am here to talk about architecture and writing. Recently, I became very interested in the way architects use words and I have started a series that I call *Native Places*. In this series, I attach a sketch, which takes me about 10 minutes to draw, to a text of 200 words, which takes me about four hours to write. It is quite a challenge to be able to say something in only 200 words. For example, I was at the University of Virginia in May and I made a sketch of the Lawn. The great thing about sketching is that it allows you to observe a place closely. In making this sketch, I realized something important about this university, one of the major universities in our country: Its most significant architectural feature is not a building but a patch of grass. Known as the Lawn, this field of grass is the glue that holds the university together—a wonderful thought, like Walt Whitman’s *Leaves of Grass*. That realization became the text that accompanied the sketch.

I am going to talk to you today about the virtues of sketching to look at the place where you live and how to write about what you have learned through that sketch. Of course, Le Corbusier is one of our great role models. Every August he went to a little cabin he designed in the south of France. It was seven feet, five inches square and seven feet, five inches high, and there he stayed during the days of August, sketching and writing. In this sketch that he made of the view outside his cabin you notice that he was not trying to make a beautiful drawing. He was trying to capture his impression of the place.
Another thing I have always loved about this sketch of Le Corbusier is that he is alone. All he has is a pencil and a piece of paper. Although we now live now in a digital age with massive technological resources, ultimately our designs begin with a pen or pencil and a piece of paper—alone, by ourselves. We will probably have a trash basket nearby, as Le Corbusier did, because if you have 20 ideas, 19 of them will not be very good.

Why was writing also important to Le Corbusier? Look at what he wrote for L’Esprit Nouveau in 1921: “Architecture is the masterly, correct, and magnificent play of forms brought together in light.” Notice that he wrote that in 1921. Nine years later, he built the Villa Savoye. In 1921 he had not designed a building with Villa Savoye’s clarity and purpose. Writing helped him clarify and inform the way that he thought about a design. Sketching helped him draw an observational bead on the places where he lived.

I recently read that Tadao Ando learned about the world through travel. He never attended university to study architecture and he supported himself as a professional boxer. To learn about architecture, he bought the books of Le Corbusier. Using tracing paper, he traced every building Le Corbusier designed, over and over again. Ando said that by the time he was through, the book was black with carbon because he had traced the drawings of the Villa Savoye, the Unité d’Habitation, and other buildings so many times.

I believe that sketching allows us to absorb the lessons of the place where we are. As Marlon said, when we look at the vernacular, we do not look at it to borrow forms; we look at it to gather wisdom that has been accumulated about that place. Throughout my career, I have kept a sketchbook in my pocket. I learned that from Le Corbusier.

Some of my favorite subjects are old agricultural buildings, which were usually designed and built with great skill and appropriateness to place. Louis Kahn used to say that whenever he got stuck and he could not figure out how to design something, he would say to himself: “How would a farmer do it?” Why? Because a farmer had very few resources. He was very stingy out of necessity. He could not run down to the local building supply and buy what he needed. He made do with what was at hand. He also had to preserve the land because the land was his life source. I wish that today we could build buildings with a farmer’s innocence. We cannot, of course. We live in a much more self-conscious time. But I think it is worth trying. One of the things I like to do as I travel around the country is to make sketches of old barns.

Sketching continues to be an important part of my work. In my office, we almost always start our designs (a) by sitting down with a landscape architect because landscape will become part of the building, and (b) by sketching.
This is the Low Country house I designed in Mount Pleasant, near Charleston, South Carolina. It has a great view to the west. But west-facing glass is a very difficult exposure: If you want your view to face west and you have windows 12 feet high, how do you shelter the glass from the sun? To control the sunlight coming from the western view, I invented a shading device. It is a series of screens, quite simply made. Each one weighs 700 pounds but you can move them with a finger because they are carefully balanced. In the summer, we close the screens like shutters to shelter the house. But beginning in the fall and all the way through to the spring, they are held open. The shutters are also closed when there is an approaching hurricane. These screens, or “shutters,” were very simply thought out and carefully constructed to give the house this wonderful quality of belonging to its place.

Now, like Marlon says, it is wonderful how we as architects can post-rationalize. After we had done this, we started looking at some of the buildings in Charleston and Savannah and realized that they had shutters used in that way, too. I like to think of our design as a contemporary example of an age-old solution.

That is the sort of thing I like to write about. I like to look at buildings that have weathered storms. “Building in the Face of Danger” is the title of an article I wrote about some oceanfront houses in North Carolina that are 200 years old now. These wooden houses have weathered countless hurricanes because they are sensibly built. Of course, we do not want to build houses that look like these today but we can learn from their basic principles. They were built where sand dunes and live oak trees provide shelter. They are oriented to take advantage of the summer breezes. And they turn their backs to the harsh northern winds in the winter. These principles are as valid today as they were 200 years ago, whether you are designing a school of architecture or a small cabin.
As a native Southerner, I have always been a fan of William Faulkner, Tennessee Williams, and Eudora Welty. A characteristic of their work is that, although they are universally appreciated, their writing deals with very specifically Southern things, such as the day a camellia bloomed, or a night lamp that was left burning in the parlor window to light the way for a Civil War soldier who was walking home after the defeat of Appomattox. These are very simple and particular things.

Another house I designed is the Taylor House in the Bahamas in a place they call Hurricane Alley. The owners wanted a house in which they would feel safe, but that would also be open to the Bahamas’ environmental benefits. As a result, I located the living room on the top level to provide a panoramic view under a roof shaped like an inverted umbrella. You see, there is no fresh water in the Bahamas. Even if you drilled a well, you would get salt water. The roof collects rainwater and funnels it into a huge cistern. The owners use this fresh water for washing, bathing, cooking and drinking. I made that a major feature of the house. And, because the threat of hurricanes is very severe in the Bahamas, every opening in the house has a very particular type of enclosure.

The Taylor House is based on a simple foursquare plan. The powers of simple forms and of the structure’s direct relationship to natural forces are two lessons learned from studying old tobacco barns. We are not recreating a tobacco barn, but we are using the wisdom of those principles.
Figure 120. Taylor House, Bahmas

Now I want to say a little bit about writing. I know many of you are students, many of you have been students, and as such you have probably come across *The Elements of Style* by Strunk and White. Coleman recently reissued it with wonderful illustrations. This book emphasizes the need to deal with particular, concrete things. As we do in architecture, so should we do in writing. In fact, I found this little quote in the *New York Times* in August. It says: “The greatest writers, according to Strunk and White, are effective largely because they deal in particulars.” Not the great themes but the particulars. Rappers get it. Why brag about your fancy car when you can specify, as the rapper Rich Boy did, a red Cadillac convertible with gator-skin seats? Why threaten vague violence when you can imagine “smacking babies at they christening” (Notorious BIG)? If only we as architects could think so clearly and use such particular language.

I was on a design awards jury recently. Let’s face it, folks, as architects we write the most turgid and, at times, pretentious prose. We have to in order to get tenure and things like that. It continues through life! In an entry for the design awards, a very well known firm wrote: “A range of interior finish textures and colors reinforce a strong corporate image and a commitment to design excellence.” When you think about it that is as bland as you can get. There is nothing specific in it. So I rewrote it: “We used reclaimed oak three inches thick in the elevator lobby.” That says everything the firm said, but it grabs you because it is specific—just like Marlon’s building has a great specificity and Merrill’s buildings draw from the particulars of a place. In the same awards program, a dormitory building at Tulane by another well-known firm received an honor award. We rewarded this firm for the building’s design, certainly not the text. The text said: “Articulated courtyard spaces respond to solar orientation and air movement, and a preserved live oak acts as a defining courtyard element providing significant scale.” I bet you never thought of a magnificent live oak as a “defining courtyard element.” Anyway, I rewrote that to read, “An oak tree shades the entrance,” which I think says everything they said.

Figure 121. Entry for design awards
Figure 122. Dormitory building at Tulane

If you are an architect, the value of specific language is very important when, for example, you are writing a letter to the state construction office contesting a proposed change. If you use clear prose and keep it to one page, you are likely to be more effective. A church project that took me
three years to complete is a good example. The project was for a Presbyterian church in Raleigh, North Carolina. The congregation adored their old church sanctuary but it had become shabby and it was very bland. About a third of the congregation wanted a new, progressive sanctuary, another third did not want to change a thing, and the rest could have gone either way.

So with the building committee, we developed four very simple, cogent principles around the things that we wanted to do with this project: (1) We wanted to create a spiritual oasis, a sense of purpose and occasion, a place to offer our best selves in music, architecture and worship; (2) we wanted to establish a well-connected and unified campus, offering clarity of arrangement and clear paths from one place to another; (3) we wanted to offer a third place that would nurture community and pleasant encounters, and that provide friendly and cozy spaces; and (4) we wanted to produce a design that is respectful of where we have been while looking forward to where we are going. Those principles carried us through three years of controversy and objections until we reached a consensus.

In the state archives, I found a 100-year-old photograph of the church. In 1905, the church had magnificent arches with big roll-up glass doors expanding the sanctuary into a big fellowship hall. None of those things existed in 2010. They were covered by a 1954 renovation. Because we had written clear and straightforward design principles, we were emboldened to uncover history and incorporate it into the new church. We also rediscovered a 1900 fellowship hall that was concealed by an eight-foot-high ceiling for seventy-five years. We uncovered that fellowship hall and it is now the most popular space in the church.

A few years ago, Steve Dumez, a very fine architect in New Orleans, told me about a place called Oak Alley in Louisiana. He said: “You have to see it. It is about the shadows.” I went to see it and he was right. The shadows of these two-hundred-fifty year-old live oak trees are phenomenal.
Recently, I was asked to design a building for an arboretum in North Carolina. This project depended on shadows: It is a lath house that protects young plants from the hot sun. I wanted the lath house to have some of the qualities I sketched at Oak Alley. Thus, our building is a thin screen. It is also one of the cheapest buildings I have ever done—even cheaper than Marlon’s church. It cost only $120,000. Yet it has received more design awards over the past couple of years than anything else we have done. It is constructed almost entirely of two-by-twos, so it has a veil-like quality that changes with the light and it creates a beautiful set of patterns and shadows in the landscape.

Living in the South, we know that shade is our friend. Thomas Jefferson actually said that the most important element in the Southern landscape is shade. As I travel around I like to sketch things that provide shade. For example: the Greensboro Cracked Diesel Block Repair Company, a shed-like building. To shade the southern side, the owner built a shed-like metal roof and turned it down on the front-facing southern elevation. He built three big doors so that the entire interior can be opened to the outdoors. To me, this building captures the essence of vernacular architecture in North Carolina and, by extension, South Carolina and Georgia. It is very down to earth, it is very practical, it is very effective, and people understand it.

When we designed our competition entry for the North Carolina AIA headquarters—this is the first AIA headquarters in the country that is built from the ground up—we thought to start with the roof and the landscape. We worked on it with landscape architect Gregg Bleam of Charlottesville, Virginia. In fact, Gregg was there the first day we started designing. I thought his first question as a landscape architect was going to be about how many cars we had to park on the site. Instead, he wanted to know what materials we were going to use. Instinctively, I said it would be made of stone and concrete with a metal roof. I wanted this building to belong to North Carolina—to seem as if it could not be built in any other place.
I also wanted the roof profile to be a very important element. It was not going to be the Greensboro Cracked Diesel Block Repair Company’s roof, but it was going to be a significant roof made of metal, a familiar material that has been used to cover tobacco barns and to form the steeples atop Southern churches. A lot of people look at this building and see it as a sort of isolated object when, in fact, it is in a rather scrappy area on the edge of Raleigh, in the middle of railroad tracks, truck routes, and a tangle of power lines. It is also close to the North Carolina Department of the Environment. Ironically, the lights of that tall building are never off. In contrast, our building enjoys natural day-lighting and natural cross ventilation, it has geothermal wells, and it sits there very quietly with its lights off at night.

Figure 128. Harmon’s sketch for AIA Headquarters

Figure 129. North Carolina AIA Headquarters

I continue to look at the places where I live and visit. That is where I get my inspiration. Yet I never know what this might lead to. For example, in May, I was hiking on the Appalachian Trail and came upon a clearing in the forest where I found a graveyard surrounded by a little wall made of stones. I learned that Lemmuel Fox and his sons collected those stones in the fields as they were plowing the mountainside to plant corn, sometime around 1860. Today Lemmuel and his sons lie
buried there. It was very touching. You know, few of us will be buried in a place that is as closely related to where we live as Lemmuel Fox. And I do not know what this implies at the moment. But I suspect that the next time I get to design a building with some religious quality, I will probably think about this sketch.

Also in May of this year, I was in London visiting my son Will. It was a Friday afternoon so we went to a pub. I immediately noticed that huge crowds of people surrounded all the downtown pubs. As I sketched the scene, I asked Will what was going on. He told me that the last Friday of the month is payday in London; so naturally everybody goes to the pub to celebrate. They buy rounds of drinks for everybody and they prefer to stand outside, not inside. We went into a nearby pub and easily found seats because everybody else was outside. I started to think about it and realized why that is possible in London. It is because the city has a traffic congestion zone and to drive into London at any time of the day you have to pay seven pounds, around $12. There are taxis and buses but very little automobile traffic, which allows people to occupy the streets. So from making a sketch, I learned an important truth about city planning.

I will conclude with Le Corbusier, where I began. He once wrote: “I prefer drawing to talking. Drawing is faster and it leaves less room for lies.”

Thank you all very much!
Tzonis opens the lecture:

I love birthdays. They are wonderful events and I am very happy to be invited to an important one, such as the Clemson Centennial. Yet, it is not an easy task to give a talk following the talks by three brilliant practitioners, people who produce artifacts that change our lives. As a theoretician and historian, I will argue that we also produce constructs, as designers do; these are mental constructs contributing positively or negatively to the world, as buildings do.

Our subject is complicated, because the notion of regionalism has had a chameleonic, constantly changing nature. This has been extremely hard for architectural criticism and debates trying to suggest a future direction for architecture. I will take a historical approach to clarify issues. This is much more natural than a logical approach dividing things into right and left. I will talk in general terms about what a region is, what regionalism is and the beginnings of this debate. I will bring the discussion to our time, to the emergence of the so-called critical regionalism, the regionalism that becomes part of a critical approach to culture. Then, Liane will talk about the most important moments in the twentieth century that shaped this whole attitude. And, finally, I will present concluding remarks.

Regions are parts of the earth characterized by a certain dominant characteristic that is either natural like climate, or cultural such as the way people relate to each other. Both natural and cultural characteristics of the region are interwoven. The tendency to maintain the unique characteristics of a region stands against homogenization, universalization and globalization.

Historically, this polarization is not a debate of the last few years. Its roots go all the way back to an ancient culture, Rome. Rome was the first major attempt to globalize the world as an empire producing a common law, a common money, and universalizing almost every aspect of daily life. It was a great project which developed slowly and became a major force with Augustus, at the time of Christ, and our great ancestor of Western architectural theory, Vitruvius. Vitruvius was one of the Roman intellectuals who tried to construct a new world order for the architecture and engineering of the empire by writing what today we might call a universal handbook of architecture. Many people read its pages handling temples or engineering structures. But most readers skipped the page where Vitruvius compared the architectures of two regions different from the dominant Greco-Roman architecture: the architecture of the North and the architecture of the South. Their climates dictate the differences between those two types of architecture.

However, like the other Roman authors, Vitruvius was concerned about politics and the new global order. He wrote that, as the architecture of the North is special, so are the people of the North; similarly, as the architecture of the South is peculiar, so are its people. Because of the cold weather, the people of the North cannot think much; their brains are frozen. The people of the South do not think much either, because they are so overactive with their blood boiling from the heat. But the people of the Middle are the ones who can think and judge; therefore they have the right to rule the world. That is a very interesting argument because for the first time architecture, globalism, the regions, and politics are brought together.

From where did this kind of Greco-Roman architecture come? According to most nineteenth century histories, the Greeks, a genius people who had very unique minds, created it themselves. But contemporary archaeologists say that this claim is not correct. As a matter of fact, the Greek genius was to discover and put together many diverse, pre-existing elements from different regions of the Mediterranean world. Thus, without the existing diversity of highly advanced architecture in regions, the genius of Greeks would not have been able to create a new architecture that would eventually become world architecture.

Eventually, as we all know, the “global” Roman Empire collapsed, not because of the barbarians, as it is often claimed, but from its own internal exhaustion and the growing inadequacy to maintain its global order. A re-regionalization of the world followed. Ironically, in this world, by the eleventh century, Rome was no more the center of the empire. It was just a peripheral region. An aspiring new empire resided there, that of the Pope. The locals were treated as peripherals in
this context, a fact that they did not like. They tried to liberate themselves and architecture played a role in this effort. To demonstrate these aspirations, one of the political leaders of this emancipation movement, Nicolaus Crescenzi, built what seems to us a bizarre structure, Casa dei Crescenzi. The building stands close to the Temple of Fortuna Virilis and you can still visit it today. It looks like a ruin. In fact, it was a new structure designed in a kind of post-modern collage manner out of real and fake Roman fragments. The inscription on the building says roughly that Crescenzi resurrected this building for the glory that was Rome. By Rome, he did not mean the empire but the region, its ancient republic and its community fighting for liberation. The end of the story is sad. The regionalist movement was defeated by the Holy Roman Emperor, Otto III, in the name of the Pope, and the Roman community remained subjugated for centuries to come.

The rest of the autonomous regions that emerged with the collapse of the Roman Empire became dominated once more to new globalizing forces competing with each other to become the new Old Roman Empire, again uniting the world under one global order—political, economic, judiciary, and cultural. Architecture was used once more as a vehicle in support of these efforts of globalization, producing artifacts that looked like authentic imperial Roman ones, suggesting that in a similar manner the new global political order resembled the old imperial one.

One of the most used artifacts recruited toward this goal was the garden. The Vitruvian Classical abstract canon applied to buildings was translated into rules for constructing a landscape ignoring the particularity of local conditions, of the site conditions, and of the particular regional ones in which it was embedded. The result was the formal French garden; a better term is the Classical landscape.

However, history took another turn. In the beginning of the eighteenth century, a British political and cultural writer, Addison, dedicated one of his articles to the stock exchange. The article juxtaposed the top-down absolutist imperial order of France and Spain to the freedom and informality of the British stock exchange where people used their regional languages, wore their regional clothes, and created a world of wealth. The same argument was used to describe the superiority of the bottom-up decision-making process of British Parliament as opposed to the top-down approach of absolutist regimes. Interestingly, the same Addison promoted an architectural movement using the same values of authenticity, naturalness and liberty. It was compared to the Classical garden and the top-down tabula rasa globalizing approach ignoring the diversity and individuality of regions.

But history kept moving very fast, and in surprising ways. Instead of becoming a genuine expression of particularity, naturalness, and bottom-up emergent order, the English landscape was taken over by the courts of Europe and became a form of court entertainment, called “Picturesque.” It was not an expression of a new way of living or a new world order, but, simply a new style; a diversion in a flat landscape and without respect for peaks and valleys of a diverse world of regions. A revolt broke out against the absolutist regimes and with a new drive for a world of regions—or with a new name, a world of nations.

One of the fathers of this new kind of nationalist regionalism was the great German poet, Wolfgang von Goethe, and the vehicle of the argument was once more a building, the Cathedral of Strasbourg. Like all expressions of German culture, it was seen by cultivated Europeans as uncivilized, barbarian, not beautiful, not well-ordered. But in a wonderful essay in dialogue with a building, young Goethe declared the cathedral as equal in cultural importance to Italian and French buildings. Nobody had a right, not even Vitruvius, to say that a regional artifact was inferior to a classical one. What Goethe expressed was a sentiment emerging as a result of the Napoleonic wars and the drive to create a new global order that gave the opportunity to the Germans, divided into many “micro-regions” at that time, to declare the natural right of constructing a new emancipated region of regions with a distinct cultural and consequently political identity: Germany. Once more architecture played the most important role in this development.

Which architecture? When Goethe wrote his first text, a whole generation of young people turned their eyes to what they imagined to be an authentic type of German artifact, the German Cathedrals, in order to discover or rather construct an identity. But it was more a fiction than history, although it was supported by many German intellectuals at that time, including Goethe. As it was shown scientifically by the middle of the first half of the nineteenth century, the so-called Gothic architecture was not a creation of the Germans but of the French.

Another important building is of interest in this political-cultural nationalist debate besides the cathedral in Strasbourg; the Cathedral of Cologne. At that time, the Cathedral of Cologne was a huge ruin. The young people rallied with the idea of reconstructing the Cathedral as a symbol
of the new reconstructed unity of Germany. It was a youth movement that the Prussians would soon appropriate. The students realized it little by little, but it was too late. A young German poet, Heine, who praised and wrote poems about the necessity to reconstruct this Gothic cathedral, which he thought was the highest expression of German regionalism, realized that politics were taking a different direction. He wrote an extremely interesting text in which this cathedral would be a huge structure out of metal that would imprison all the Germans. It was a prophetic vision of how regionalism was transformed from an emancipation movement into a nationalist, chauvinist movement that finally became an accessory to an imperialist drive.

By contrast, the writings of John Ruskin, known for his indifference to classical Greco Roman culture, emphasized the need to develop an architecture rooted in the region but free from any nationalist ambitions. He asked for an architecture whose morphology was in congruence with the morphogenetic forces of nature in a region. In addition, Ruskin introduced an ecological, or what today we call a sustainable point of view. Natural science in the United Kingdom was blooming at that time. Finally, Ruskin also introduced a social-moral point of view. There is a wonderful passage in which he talked about the beauty of his desk, the craftsmanship of its details, the excellence of its ornaments and structure. In the same passage, he also points to the people who produced this object: their expectations, sufferings, and life, about which he was ignorant; and he noticed that by accepting an object, he reinforced or perpetuated an order which was not moral.

The writings of Ruskin became extremely influential in the United Kingdom and led to the emergence of the so-called “Arts and Crafts” movement. Like the “Picturesque,” “Arts and Crafts” is not a good term since it does not refer to the broader, basic concerns of the architects of the period. Most importantly, it does not talk about the basic idea of the movement, that a single building isolated from the socio-cultural, biological-ecological, and economic reality of a region is not enough to create a way of life and environmental quality in the long term.

Soon, these ideas crossed the Atlantic and arrived in the United States in the early twentieth century, leading to the founding of the Regional Planning Association of America with friends such as Eleanor Roosevelt and a young advocate, Lewis Mumford.

Thank you!

Lefaivre continues:

Before I start, I would like to thank Kate and Peter for inviting us to celebrate your one hundredth birthday. It is really an extraordinary event—surely the only architectural symposium where practitioners have mentioned Brent McKay, Fay Jones, Eudora Welty and William Faulkner, and presented images of Walt Whitman, Mark Twain and Billie Holiday. It is a pleasure to discuss critical regionalism in this context.

I am going to begin with the antithesis to regionalism, and that is the Museum of Modern Art (MOMA). We all know that MOMA was the epicenter of the opposite of regionalism. It has been strongly imprinted in our minds that MOMA is, above all, the bastion of the International Style. This is incorrect, however. Indeed, there was a ten-year period during which MOMA became the epicenter, or one of the epicenters in the United States, of regionalism in one form or another. There were a lot of them—one was the University of North Carolina, and another one was Harvard, as we have written in our book published by Routledge in 2012, Architecture of Regionalism in an Age of Globalization.

Why is it that we tend to take for granted that MOMA was always associated with the International Style? Because Philip Johnson was a genius of public relations, and for seventy years never stopped hammering home the message that the most important show that had ever been at MOMA had been the one in 1932 that led to the publication by Johnson and Hitchcock on the International Style.

However, Johnson left MOMA two years after the show in 1934 for thirteen years; that is, until 1947. For three years, under the stewardship of Henry-Russell Hitchcock, International Style shows continued. But something happened in 1937; and, for ten years, between 1937 and 1947, no fewer than twelve architectural exhibitions put forth a regionalist message. Remarkably, they were a resounding success, attracting a much greater public than the international style show had, and without resorting to sensationalist controversy.

Lest we forget, the International Style exhibition had opened to street protests. It had had only fourteen showings outside the museum. However, in 1938, MOMA presented a show on Frank Lloyd Wright’s Falling Water. We all remember that Frank Lloyd Wright had been excluded from the International Style show. This new exhibition on Wright had eighteen showings outside
the museum. The exhibition on *Falling Water* was followed by another show that was even better received in 1938, and that was on Alvar Aalto. It had fifteen showings outside the museum. An exhibition on Swedish regionalism called *Stockholm Builds*, with photos by E. Kidder Smith in 1941, had 20 showings outside the museum. As for the exhibition called *The Wooden House in America*—obviously a regionalist exhibition—it had thirty-nine showings outside the museum. The exhibition entitled *TVA Architecture and Design*, prepared by the Tennessee Valley Authority in collaboration with the Department of Architecture, disappointingly had only five showings. But *Regional Building in America*, organized by Elizabeth Mock, in 1941, had fifteen showings.

There were three or four curators who took over, after Johnson’s departure, between 1937 and 1947. The most important one was Elizabeth Mock, who had begun as a curatorial assistant but who worked herself up to the head of the department. Elizabeth Mock was a regionalist, and she was the sister of Katherine Bower, who was also a regionalist. She organized all the exhibitions I have just mentioned. In addition, she organized two blockbusters in 1944. One was called *America Builds*. Its subject was home-grown American architecture, and it could not have been more polemically opposed to the International Style show. She overtly criticized that show as, “badly assimilated modern architecture.” Critical of the narrow definition of modern architecture in the International Style show, she expanded the notion of modern architecture to encompass all the concerns of regional architecture. As a result of the first blockbuster, she published a catalog that circulated all over the world, and it was called *Built in the USA*. This was a resounding success.

She was much closer to the best European avant-garde architects of the 1920s and 1930s, many of whom had been included in the International Style show—Loos, Pagano, Taut, Aalto, Gropius, Oud, May, Rudolfsky, Sert, Neutra and Le Corbusier. Like them, she saw no contradiction between being modern and being concerned with issues of building technology, social issues, formal experiments, and embracing regional traditions. She was a regionalist but she did not constrain her concerns to American issues. Her second big blockbuster was called *Brazil Builds*. Such was the success of *Brazil Builds* with its presentation of the highly sensual architecture of Oscar Niemeyer that, in 1953, when the time came to appoint a new dean of arguably the most influential architecture school in the United States—the Graduate School of Design at Harvard—Niemeyer was the first choice. The trouble with this appointment was that first, he was allergic to flying and could not fly. Second, he was a communist; this disqualified him during the McCarthy era.

By 1947, it looked like the future of architecture in the United States was regionalist. But something else happened that year. Philip Johnson returned to MOMA, and with his reentry into that institution, there began a full-blooded war against regionalism. The first event that was organized at MOMA under Philip Johnson’s renewed stewardship was an exhibition called *What Is Happening to Modern Architecture?* It was organized in response to an article that Lewis Mumford had written in his newly reinstituted column in *The New Yorker*, where he had compared, positively, the Bay Region School to the United Nations Headquarters building, the most prestigious project of the time, that he badly criticized. This struck a chord and made Philip Johnson as mad as a hornet. It is the only way to explain the overarching reaction of MOMA to this article.

Johnson and Alfred Barr organized a meeting, which brought together the whole East Coast post-CIAM establishment, and they attacked Lewis Mumford as a folkloristic lover of Gemütlichkeit, somehow even insinuating that he might have something in common with fascist or Nazi pre-war Heimat architecture. In addition, they made Lewis Mumford the chair of the whole event, so he could not stand up and defend himself. The battle raged on, because MOMA meant business. Indeed, the stakes were high in 1947. Among other things, the commission for the United Nations headquarters hung in the balance. Niemeyer had been one of the competitors and posed a serious threat to the International Style architecture firm Harrison and Abramovitz, which was unsurprisingly the first choice of MOMA, and of Harrison’s brother-in-law, Nelson Rockefeller, the head of MOMA.

But even after the commission was awarded to the first choice, MOMA remained on the offensive. It spent the next decade in relentless pursuit of its anti-regionalist campaign. In 1951, Hitchcock took advantage of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his and Johnson’s exhibition, entitled *The International Style 20 Years Later*, to once again attack Lewis Mumford’s *New Yorker* article of 1947, taking aim at Mumford’s fellow regionalist, William Wurster. He wrote: “The architecture of the San Francisco Bay region, whom some critics have wished to build up as the protagonist of a more humanistic school, opposed to the international style, have also frequently followed its principles almost down to a point of parody, although admittedly not in the best and most characteristic country house work.”
In 1952, the campaign was still going strong. Back at headquarters, Hitchcock and Arthur Drexler, the new curator of the architectural exhibitions, organized a new exhibition. They actually hijacked the title that Mock had used six years earlier, *Built in the USA*. It was as if Elizabeth Mock had not existed. They wiped her out, and they also enlisted Philip Johnson to preface the catalog. In a ringing paean to both himself and Hitchcock, Johnson boasted: “The battle of modern architecture has long been won. Twenty years ago MOMA was in the thick of the fight, but now our exhibitions and catalogs take part in an unending campaign described as simply the continuous, conscientious, resolute distinction of quality from mediocrity. To make this proclamation from time to time is the prime function of the department of architecture and design.”

According to him, there was nothing but the International Style in American architecture. “If we should think back twenty years to the 1932 exhibition, the change is striking,” he declared. “The International Style has been absorbed by a wide stream of historical progress. Every building in this book would look different if it had not been for the International Style.” In Hitchcock’s contribution to the catalogue, he wrote, “[t]oday, there is no further need to underline the obvious fact that what used to be called traditional architecture is dead if not buried.”

But, in spite of their ringing triumphalism, things were not going all that well for the International Style. In fact, when the United Nations building went up, it was a public relations fiasco. It was condemned across the board by younger people like Paul Rudolph. Lewis Mumford had really struck a chord and reflected the feelings of the younger generation. So the “old boys,” the post-CIAM, East Coast establishment, gradually felt that they had to start changing their tune to be in tune with the younger generation.

Pietro Belluschi was given the task to appoint architects to build a whole generation of new American embassies around the world by the Department of State. Although he had been part of the International Style show with his Prudential Life Building by the time he was given the commission, he had also changed, and he wrote about how wonderful regionalist architecture was. He started pedaling backwards and gave commissions to Edward Durrell Stone, for instance, to build the embassy in Delhi. This building, according to Stone, was a spitting image of the Taj Mahal. Its dysfunctionality has been documented. Its canopy was not long enough to shade the façade, and the glass wall behind the concrete front wall increased the great heat inside the building.

In his embassy building in Ireland, John Johansen tried to incorporate the weave of the knitting pattern in an Irish sweater. At the time, another major building program besides the American embassies was the International Hilton hotels. For instance, the one in Istanbul designed by Gordon Bunshaft and the Turkish architect Sedad Hakki Eldem really tried, in a superficial way, to mimic the traditional architecture. Another “old boy” on a grand building project for Iraq was Walter Gropius. He was commissioned to build the University of Baghdad, and tried to incorporate the most beautiful mosque in Baghdad as a kind of gathering area at the University. This design, by the way, had been initially part of his design for a never-constructed university in the south of the United States, and it was just accidentally resurrected for this project because it coincided with something that he felt might be local.

The fact is that the old boys did not understand Mumford’s view of regionalism. The kind of regionalism that Lewis Mumford had in mind was something very different. It was more than just surface. It was more than just kitsch. It was more than just cartoon-like mimicking of traditional forms. Some architects, on the other hand, did understand.

Buckminster Fuller’s cotton plant project was an example of what the new regionalism of the South should look like. It was designed with the students from North Carolina as a rational industrial building. There was another kind of regionalism that did not try to mimic old barn houses but did try to fit into the site in a Wrightian way like Charles Moore’s Sea Ranch in California. There was Hamilton Harris’s house, the Bay Region School. In Florida, Paul Rudolph’s Cocoon House was high-tech. It was based on the Saran Wrap technology he found when he was in the Navy in the Second World War.

Another kind of regionalism by Neutra responded to the landscape in a way that did not mimic the traditional architecture of the past. A project by Dimitris Pikionis created a space inside a concrete jungle in Athens of the 1950s around the Acropolis. There was an arts school in Havana, Cuba by Ricardo Porro in the 1960s. Maison Tropicale by Jean Prouvé was an excellent example of tropical architecture. We can discuss what is tropical, what is regionalist about it. Two projects by Giancarlo de Carlo are interesting; one is a housing project for the south of Italy, the other is a regionalist highrise, very urban. He was the first who tried to incorporate the ideas of regionalism in the center of a city through an urban building type.
Of all the buildings in this short lecture, I would like to briefly single out Charles Correa’s Hindustan Lever Pavilion, designed for an industrial fair in early 1961. It is a randomly “folded” reinforced concrete sprayed under pressure in situ. What makes it regionalist is the toplit “cannon” openings which are used as “wind scoops,” typical of Indian vernacular architecture, to set up air convection currents. Incidentally, Correa’s Tube House or Ramkrishna House in Ahmedabad 1962–64 also uses the same principle, as does his famous Kanchanjunga highrise in Mumbai (1964) and his Previ low-cost houses sponsored by the government of Peru and the United Nations in 1969. The plan of the Hindustan Pavilion is set up with load bearing walls punctuated by interior courts and natural top-light spaces. The roof is sloping, which, in conjunction with the adjustable louvers in the window on the façade, results in a continual convection current naturally ventilating the dwelling. The NNW-SSE orientation allows prevailing winds to travel along the axis of each spine. As the breezes pass through the houses they are drawn up into the houses by a louvered air scoop over a double height which is six meters high. The reason to dwell upon this project is that it is regionalist in a deeper sense than the pseudo-regionalist, pastiche embassy building by Stone.

I could have gone into detail about those buildings, which are covered in our book, but, because of the time constraints, I am going to skip through to what this new post-war critical regionalism represented, according to its most articulate spokesman, Lewis Mumford. Of course,
Mumford’s own regionalism went through different phases. His criticism of the Columbian World’s Fair had been regionalist. He had been opposed to the International Style of the time, which was Beaux-Arts classical architecture. In the post-war period, he recruited regionalism in order to criticize the mistakes of post-war planning or the insensitivity of the International Style. In order to define what was new about this second, other kind of regionalism that the old boys just did not get, let’s look at Lewis Mumford. His importance has been eclipsed for the past four decades. But from the 1920s to the late 1960s, he was the most well-known architecture critic in the U.S. and internationally. If he has fallen out of favor, it is because his writings concerned with sustainability and community and the role of planning in assuring both have gone against the tide of the last thirty years or so, especially in architecture schools (except for this one).

But he, like so many of the architects, landscape architects, planners and critics of his time, sensed that a renewed regionalism was required in order to meet the demands of the fevered modernization that accompanied the unprecedented globalization of the post-World War II period. The reason we chose to focus on Mumford, particularly, is that no one formulated this approach in a more systemic and multidisciplinary way or advocated it more forcefully than he did. Why did we term this new kind of regionalism critical? Is not regionalism always critical? As Alex has shown in the first half of the historical overview of the evolution of regionalism since Vitruvius, no matter what its political associations are, it has always been grounded in the critical attitude toward an outside power, wishing to impose itself in an international globalizing, universalizing, flattening architecture, against a particular local identity, whether that identity is architectural, urban, or related to the land, or sustainability. Critical regionalism, however, is also critical in a second sense. It is critical not only of globalization, but it is critical of regionalism itself. For the first time, we witness a break with centuries-old regionalist topoi. What makes critical regionalism critical in this second sense is its break with the tendency of regionalism to see itself as categorically and absolutely opposed to the universal.

I will go over Mumford’s ideas. First, Mumford rejected the whole idea that regionalism has anything to do with identity. Why? He was in a country that was multicultural. To focus on one identity was antithetical to a multicultural. To focus on one identity was antithetical to a multicultural country.

Second, he was beyond historicism. He defined regionalism as something that was beyond historicism. He broke with the regionalist commonplace—namely, the attachment to perpetuating the architecture of bygone eras. He called that architecture of the masked ball.

Third, he was beyond technophobia, which was also knee-jerk reaction of regionalist architecture before that. He was preoccupied with place, the earth, the land as a home, and juxtaposed these to a machine-ridden civilization and technology. But as opposed to Heidegger, for instance, who really wanted to send everybody back to the Stone Age or the Middle Ages where everybody was the same as everybody else and built things with their hands in low-tech ways, and was basically an anti-modernist, Mumford believed that regionalism was synonymous with the modern. He was for the most advanced technology of the day, as long as it was functionally optimal from the point of view of sustainability.

Fourth, he was beyond pastoral ruralism and for sustainable planning. Another mainstay of traditional regionalism that Mumford broke with was picturesqueness—purely aesthetic and spiritual enjoyment of the landscape for its own sake or for the sake of partaking in the cult of some genius loci. For him, regionalism stood for something else besides a sentimental place for the personal touch. It was not that he did not like landscape, but he thought the issues were something much more tied to deeper issues of ecology and, in his last book, he proposed strategies for sustainable growth.

Another keystone, older form of regionalism that Mumford turned his back on was the abandonment of the city for the country. As a regionalist, he was basically concerned with ecological impact of urban expansion. Basically, he was against sprawl. It is obvious in his planning work for Honolulu.

Finally, Mumford did not see an opposition between what he called the local and the universal—between what we refer to today as the regional versus the global. He had different words for it. In The South in Architecture, he prefaced his exposition on Richardson by saying it would be useful if we formed the habit of never using the word regional without mentally adding to it the idea of the universal, remembering the constant contact and interchange between the local scene and the wide world that lies beyond it, because the problem of regionalism is ultimately how to live in a world of particular interests without ceasing to sustain mankind as a whole. And this is why Mumfordian critical regionalism is a regionalism that is adapted and maybe even necessary to
a rational globalization that does not flatten the world but that allows its distinct characteristics to survive and flourish.

Thank you!

Tzonis concludes the lecture:

To conclude, I will briefly talk about the efforts of European and American reformist architects between 1955 and the end of the 1960s. The reformists, for instance, the Team X in Europe or early Edward Barnes, even early Paul Rudolph, and many other regionalist US architects in California and North Carolina: these architects’ efforts to develop a second phase of modern architecture in recognition of the urban and environmental crisis emerging as a result of post-WWII globalization tendencies, and the mistakes made by the post-WWII reconstruction and urban renewal programs, are very much forgotten today. Despite their efforts the economic growth of cities slowed down; their promised new economy never arrived. With the agitation of the environmental movements and the economic crises all over the world, the idea of a more humane regionalist architecture, an architecture that respected local values, social associations, ecological characteristics, and—last but not least—the importance of maintaining diversity in the world, was seen as an obstacle to the much desired financial benefits of globalization. Without public welfare state participation, this idea of reformist architecture was not possible.

What followed was a void filled in by a strange “old” new architecture commonly known as post-modernism. Briefly, what post-modernism tried to say was that architecture should stop being preoccupied by technological, social, and ecological reforms and become autonomous, focusing only on architectural values. This was a narcissistic monologue of architecture that completely wiped out regionalist issues.

In the meantime, there is money developed and growing in an unprecedented way all over the world. The people who own this money are desperate to invest it, because every hour that passes without investment, it is diminishing.

The simplest way of investing is building. So we have this new revival in building. It does not come out of ecological concerns. It does not come out of technological ideas or innovation. And certainly it is not related to regional or ecological anxieties. We build, not for the sake of architecture itself, but for the sake of putting the money somewhere safe. The result is that thirty percent of the built volume of the last decade and a half is not occupied. But nobody worries about the people who invested the money because they are, by definition, highly optimistic people, and they all believe that wonderful days will come. Not only are the buildings going to be completed and occupied, but occupation will create money much faster than the money which is created now.

In the period after the crisis of the 1960s and 1970s, we entered into a very paradoxical period during which architecture had unprecedented means of construction and technological innovation, and license to overcome any kind of “old-fashioned” idea of controls, including aspects of controls that had to do with sustainability, ecology, and also social and cultural quality.

The most typical approach of this kind of architecture was the so-called “star architecture.” There is nothing wrong with stars. We all like to watch stars. And there is nothing wrong with star architecture. The fundamental problem is that, in most cases, star architecture suppressed ecological, cultural, and social contexts. In addition, it did not fulfill its promise to act as a locomotive to drive economic development and completely disrupted the social, economic, cultural, and ecological harmony of the environment.

Soon after, we saw this same star architecture trying to react to the increasing public unhappiness with the growing environmental and urban crisis by adopting a “green dress” exterior appearance to create the illusion of sustainable environment by spreading and hanging green on balconies and on every possible cantilevered projection of a structure or of any kind of building type including towers. Is this universal greening of structures and towers overcoming our present environmental crisis and leading to a high quality environment?

Is this not a good turn for architecture to take? I am sorry to say, “No.” Because applying green stuff narrowly on every building spot might occasionally have a negative environmental impact; it might obliterate diversity or social continuities promoting social harmony, and it might destroy rare natural resources much more significant than the small patch of an individual green. And this happens because the panacea of mobilized green does not take into account the overall environment, the region.

Let me explain: It is absolutely impossible to improve our environment through isolated masterpieces, even if those isolated masterpieces are not just formalistic escapades but also highly
studied scientific projects, because the more we create and build those perfect buildings, the more the overall environment is getting worse. And you simply have to read The Economist and the Financial Times and you will see that the environmental critique—cultural, social, and certainly ecological—is not anymore a question of radical students protesting but a concern of everybody, including bankers who look at the long-term quality of our environmental future.

In my conclusion, I would like to refer not only to star architecture, as an expression of power and of total economic and social irresponsibility and irrationality, but also to examples of current buildings or building proposals that come from extremely serious architectural engineering firms like Arup Associates. In these cases, designers lost any reference to a regionalist framework. Buildings as isolated objects, even when they are masterpieces of sustainable singular autonomous environments, cannot amount to generate an overall sustainable environment.

Let us look now at an approach to architecture contributing to a regionalist harmonious environment. I would like to end with a very strange project to completely shift the focus of our debate, which was to show how the regionalist argument was transformed—assuming nationalist, chauvinist and critical aspects—and finally came to the state it is today, which argues for a more global, holistic picture of the environment, where the role of the individual being is redefined.

I would like to show you the Quaker temple that is fundamentally the work of the sculptor James Turrell. It is a modest regional building like the buildings we saw. It is very simple, anonymous, and fits into the local environment. In this building, Turrell did his typical thing: he opened a hole in the roof. The hole, like any hole, points to something. In this case it is not like the great perspectives of the Renaissance looking toward the horizon of a landscape. It opens simply to the sky. Gazing at the sky or actually meditating upon the sky, you become, I believe, increasingly aware of the fragility, the rarity, the uniqueness and the particularity of this sky as well as the importance and preciousness of its recognition and preservation. I think at least one of the things that architecture can do in addition to those big pictures of systemic transformation is simply to remind, or in the lingo of the new philosophers, to make us critically aware of our relationship to the region.

The archaic era of closed, “purified” regions is definitely over. People, buildings and cities, as well as natural and human-made environments, have been, in most parts of the world, irreversibly globalized. The regression to a regionalism that erects new barriers to communication between regions, obstructing global exchanges or recalling illusionary bygone regions through cosmetic or nostalgic design reconstructions, is not only hopeless but, as we have seen in the case of nationalist regionalism of the twentieth century, can be very harmful. To prevent this, we need a critical regionalism: a regionalism that is critically construed and constructed and which maintains regions as incubators of diversity and as resources of creativity. The prospect of a world poor in ecological, social and cultural diversity, while at the same time affluent and flat, is unsustainable and ultimately a deadening desert.

Thank you very much!
Lefaire: Marlon, it would appear from your presentation of your architectural projects just now, that you have a deep understanding of the local realities of Arkansas, that this knowledge—of the vernacular architecture and culture, of the way in which the current economic downturn has affected clients—shapes your architecture. My question is what would happen if somebody asked you to build in China?

Blackwell: Well, we have been asked to build or collaborate in China. But I do not think we are interested. We are anal retentive in our office, we like the most fun and exhilarating part of the design process, which is construction, the execution. I have heard from colleagues who designed there that, by law you can only do conceptual, schematic plans. You are not allowed to go any further; you have to associate with local architects. I have talked to Glenn Murcutt and I know why he does not build outside of Australia. He told me: “If I do not understand anything but my own place I choose not to build.”

I do not know if that would be the case if we were asked to do something in Mexico. It might be very different there, although it seems too far away. On the other hand, it seems to me that, hopefully, the future for China is to generate their own professionals. The investors and the drivers do not have to feel validated through foreign architects and they can have confidence in their own talent at home. I think Wang-Shu represents this change and I think that is fantastic. So, I personally would not want to contribute to that.

We had folks from Korea who liked our golf club house and flew out to take a look at it. They visited our office and there were only five of us. They asked, “Where is the rest of the office?” We said, “This is it!” There was a disappointment and we lost the project. We immediately felt somewhat “zip-code challenged” because if we had been in New York or Los Angeles, this would not have been an issue. But it was an issue. I feel much more comfortable either working nearby within driving distance, or within a few hours flying distance.

Lefaire: You must have very good relationships with your clients. Clients are very important.

Blackwell: They become friends. You want to work and repeat business with them. Again, our mission is to contribute to the fundamental civil dignity in our place, where it is absent of the economic will like in many of the places in the U.S.

Lefaire: Does Arkansas have special people or clients who are concerned with quality more than profit, or is profit their main incentive?

Blackwell: We try to place purpose before profit. We seek clients that feel that way, too. But there is nothing wrong with the two coming together, by any means. We are working on all ranges. We just finished a free health clinic and we are now working on a house for the Walton family. There is a range there and a sensibility, at least where I live. We try to stay away from the machine that Alex described as driving the star architects and development. This is not something peculiar to China. In my hometown, a kind of carnivorous form of development commodifies anything that might make a buck. We tend to stay away from those folks. Most of them are all bankrupt anyway now, since the recession.

Lefaire: Your reference to the current recession and how it has affected architectural practice leads me to my next question to Merrill which is this: Can you survive as what you call an “uglyful” architect in a context dominated by bankers, that is as a non-conformist architect?

Elam: I think of the last time a banker called me. Actually we are working with two developers right now, which is a first for us. Our résumés do not include any developer work and never have, even in theory. So it is interesting to have that connection right now.

Lefaire: How open are you with your vision of what architecture should be when discussing your projects with developers?
Elam: It is not hidden. We do not hide our portfolio from anyone. Both developers that we are working for are art collectors. One of them lived in Atlanta for a very long time and had a very successful building; the other one is New York-based. We began working with that developer first in New York. They bought portfolio buildings in Atlanta. We are now working with them in Atlanta. It is nice to be working in Atlanta because a lot of our work is in other places.

But you asked me about bankers. Well, the bottom of it is that not every architect is right for every client, and that shakes out over time. Frank is going to get his clients and other architects are going to get theirs.

Lefaivre: Are developers interested in uglyful architecture? Are they interested in other issues? Do they make life easy for you; do they make life hard for you?

Elam: They are very good clients. Our conversations are often around art and too abstract. We have two very special developers and that may very well be the case. I think they exist.

Blackwell: Yes, they do. In building the public library that we redeveloped, we worked with some very good developers that wanted to preserve this 1960s library when the city was going to tear it down, so they had a track record.

Lefaivre: And, the Waltons, how are they as clients?

Blackwell: They are golden. We have good clients. We just do not have enough of them. It could be the demographics of where we are. When you decide that there are certain things you will do and certain things you will not do, the word gets around and people do not approach you. In my area, the big thing now is student and multi-family housing. It is pretty bad. Some young architects try to take that on and resolve all the urbanism through the façade. It becomes like a tar pit, because they are not equal partners in driving the project. There are certain kinds of quotas and performers that are driving everything. Circumstance overrides them. Primarily, they have not developed the principles that would allow them to overcome the circumstance.

Elam: It is also interesting that you see developers performing their set of needs as part of the puzzle you have to eventually figure out. This becomes a challenge that turns into an opportunity if you can get it going in that direction.

Lefaivre: Turning to more poetic issues, Frank, why are you so interested in light?

Harmon: I think we are all interested in light. We habitually live in light and it affects us in profound ways. For much of my early career, I moved between North America and England. The first thing that would hit me when I got off the plane or the boat in England was the different angle of the light. We also know instinctively because it affects the climate, the plants in that area, and the way buildings are built. Buildings in London, for example, have a strong vertical characteristic because the light is so often coming in at a low angle. Buildings in the deep South typically have a horizontal characteristic because we are trying to shield ourselves from the light. So I think we are profoundly affected by it.

I was recently in the South of France where Van Gogh, Cezanne, and Gaugin painted, and believe me, the quality of light at all times of day in the South of France is so tangible that you can see it reflected in their paintings. It is actually rather tragic that their paintings are not there anymore. You have to go to Paris or Russia or New York to see their paintings, but you cannot miss their light.

While I was there, I visited the town where Albert Camus lived. Camus grew up in Algeria and he wrote so eloquently about the quality of light, the central nature of that climate that he contrasts with the brevity of life. On the one hand, there is the great sensual pleasure of this place and, on the other hand is the knowledge that our lives are short and book-ended. One of the goals that all three of us share as architects is to bring the quality of light and the place that it celebrates into our buildings.

Lefaivre: Indeed, light is an extraordinary feature of Southern architecture. Marlon’s buildings deal with light in a particular way. Marlon, may I ask what made you turn the light well red in the university hall you designed? It is most curious. It does not seem to express a regionalist’s sense of place, but I may be wrong.

Blackwell: It is the school color! It is Razorback Red! No, the truth is that my partner is really excellent with color. We try to use color sparingly. Of course, this is the Fay Jones School of Architecture, a student of Wright and the Bauhaus. We thought that red is timeless; from the red robe to Malevich’s Red Square. It is something that has warmth to it and it is dynamic. When it goes through light,
it becomes purple and pink. That is exactly what happens in this space and that was part of the idea to insert this for the students to see how light and color interact in a direct way. So that is why it is red and it happened to be the school color as well. It went over great with our Chancellor.

Lefaivre: But in the Greek Orthodox Church…

Blackwell: The red there is the blood of Christ.

Lefaivre: There is some blue there too, right? It looks a little Dutch, actually…

Blackwell: Every color has some meaning in the Orthodox Church. We needed some color and we picked color from laminated glass. Then, the blue we put over the baptistery represents the idea of the water, and yellow was the warmth of the sun. All got woven together. Light for us is not scientific. I find Turrell’s light very scientific. It is researched and tested. There is precision to how that is presented in space. Whereas what we are doing is more of a desire. We know the importance of it, so we try to calculate. It is mostly about light that changes through the forces of nature. Nature imprints that experience of light upon you and everything has its own duration; like the way clouds move. The way light changes and moves—that is something you can count on but you do not know how it will come out. You could go to the next level precisely as Turrell does. An experience with a Turrell, especially the ones with the artificial light, is very similar every time. We have one at Bentonville at Crystal Bridges. I love going there because I love the high of it but the experience is very similar each time.

Elam: We are having a maddening experience right now. We are doing the restoration and modification to a house in Wilton, Connecticut. It is a circular house that sits up on a mushroom-like stalk, and it rotates in both directions at three speeds that can be controlled. It was built in 1968 by the architect Richard T. Foster. Foster worked in Phillip Johnson’s office for most of his career. He built this house for his family. It is so maddening about the light because every time you start to think about from where the light is going to be coming into the house, you have to reregister your whole thought pattern, knowing that you are not going to know.

Lefaivre: It sounds like a high tech sunflower! But I sense something is lost in this environment, if you are a Southern architect and particularly sensitive to the shifts in light during the day. In the south, there are times when you want to create a shield to it for most of the year. Climate responsive architecture is different depending on the region one is in.

Elam: Yes, it has really been an interesting exercise.

Lefaivre: Perhaps we should ask the audience if anyone has any question for any of the architects?

Peter Laurence: I would actually like to repeat your first question for Frank or Merrill. The question was: “Will we build in China?” We could put that country in brackets, as any foreign place where there is the opportunity to build. So Merrill, have you done work in China?

Elam: Yes, we have. We have done four small villas which were part of a bigger development for single family houses, and which is fairly unusual in China. I think we were one of the last developments that was permitted outside of Shanghai. I would say there is the frustration that Marlon mentioned about not seeing the construction through, although we did visit it several times. You have to relax about that a bit if you are going to take this on. Out of the four that we built, the one that I had the most satisfaction with was the house with which we dug deepest into the Chinese typology. We looked closely at the gardens that gave us a structure. Ultimately, the house felt like it could not be anywhere else. I think, like lots of architects, I have a wanderlust that would make me interested in trying to work in other places and trying to get in touch with other conditions. You know of where you are on the face of the earth and what the air is like. Not that you would know it inherently like you know your own place. You drag your origins with you and you understand everything by comparative analysis. Frank understood London differently than he understood the South; he registered that light with something he already knew.

Frank: I am quite happy working where I am. I feel like I know it best. I have built in London and in the Caribbean but not without a great deal of study and thought. I have nothing against people who build in those places even though they are not from that place. I think that is their interest and they can bring new thoughts. There is a possibility of cross-fertilizing once there, but I am basically quite happy where I am. To me, it is interesting that Alvaro Siza, when he started out, could not
get a lot of work in Portugal so he built in Berlin. He himself said that was a mistake. He is happiest working in Portugal. That is not to say that his work is not important to a lot of us and to the rest of the world. We look at his work and we understand it and that is because it is in Portugal.

My favorite publication right now is *The Architect’s Journal*. It is a British publication. They only publish buildings in Britain on purpose. They want the journal to be about a particular place. They not only publish a building, they give you its site plan, photographs, plans and sections; they show you the details and talk about how it was built and how all of that is rooted in a particular place.

**Elam:** I would love to visit Siza’s new building in Argentina, the gallery.

**Harmon:** That looks fantastic!

**Elam:** I know he must have some comfort level with Argentina.

**Blackwell:** That is what I am saying: you can have a cultural connection like Mexico. I have been there about a hundred times. We have a program in Mexico City. I think that I get the place a little bit and I feel more comfortable. Or, in the case of the golf club house in Korea, it was a building we had some familiarity with. We felt like most of the golf courses are artificial, so there is a transference there. I guess it is situational; there is a level of comfort of being where you are and understanding how things work.

**Lefaivre:** There is an interesting case or counter-case. Roberto Burle Marx became a tropical landscape architect in Berlin where he had gone to study. He went to the Botany Museum where there was a section on tropical plants, and it was an eye-opening experience for him. He realized for the first time how different and beautiful all the plants were, even though he came from a tropical country. That experience changed his life and he went back to Brazil and became the Roberto Burle Marx we all know.

And, speaking of light, we all know Louis Kahn was asked in the 1950s in the Embassy program that I mentioned, to design the embassy in Luanda, and it was never finished. His project was very beautiful. The life in Luanda was the aspect that most interested him and as a result, he designed an additional layer of wall. He observed that: “…when people worked in the sun—and many of them did—[they] usually faced the wall and not the open country or the open street. Indoors they would turn their chair toward the wall and do whatever they were doing by getting the light indirectly from the wall.” It was such a harsh light. This observation led Kahn to consider making walls whose primary purpose was to receive daylight to diffuse and redistribute it. He recalled: “That gave me the thought of a wall a small distance in front of every window…One does not feel like having the view cut away, so I thought of placing openings in the wall.” He put grill work and a lot of complex layering of devices including a sun roof. In his words:

In the shape of a trellis, textured parasol suspended above the rain roof the real roof structure, the resulting interception of the direct sun by the sun roof and the air passing through the interstitial space is not only functioning, it would have filled the interior of the consolate buildings to affectively avoid substantial amount of heat, of course; but behind the design would also have been a sense of respect to the local culture and the real attempt to communicate nurtured by the time it takes to observe and learn… I felt in bringing the rain roof and the sun roof away from each other. I was telling the man on the street his way of life. I was explaining the atmospheric conditions of wind, the conditions of light, the conditions of sun and glare. If I used a device—a clever kind of device—it would only seem like a design to him, something pretty. I didn't want anything pretty. I wanted a clear statement of a way of life.

So it goes to prove that you do not have to be part of the region to empathize with it.

**Blackwell:** Not at all! But the question was not if you can do it but do you want to. We were in Mali and Dogon and imagining what we might build in Bamako or in the desert. The question is a preference, and my preference is that I would love to do more in our region. Because the built environment where we are is pretty impoverished.

**Burak Erdim (An Audience Member):** There is an assumption that we can know where we live better than where we do not live, but there are ethnic demographic divisions that might exclude us from knowing certain things about the place where we live. How do we deal with the issues that we
are excluded from or things and experiences that we do not know in a place where we live? How do we serve those clients? I think China or some places here in Clemson could be just as alienating in some ways.

Blackwell: The design process, if it is conducted properly, should allow for immersion, and immersion in a particular situation allows for empathy. Again, I think that from a cultural standpoint, we might not be part of that culture. We are working on a center of equality in northwest Arkansas for mostly gay, lesbian, or bisexual communities. We begin to develop empathy through contacts, and discussions. The problem I was referring to in China is that I am conflicted about the process. You know—the legalistic, the construction works, the kinds of things that I am not familiar with and I do not have the patience to deal with, relative to going down to my local city planning office and getting a permit within a week instead of a year. But I do agree that every opportunity is a situational one and you have to be very agile on how you respond to that. It is your responsibility to make that connection through the process of design.

Harmon: I want to respond to Burak. One of my favorite writers is V. S. Naipaul, who is a displaced person from the Caribbean. He has lived all his life in England and has traveled to places like India and Africa. What he writes has a strong resonance with me—that we are all, in a sense, displaced people in the twenty-first century; that none of us has very strong roots or we have roots that may be ripped out from under us at any time either through economic or other reasons. In a sense, we all live as displaced people—it is hard to know where we are. To me that is also an argument about being very particular about where I am if I am constructing something to make it feel like it belongs to that place. We live in this world of Instagram and Twitter where we are in touch with everybody but in a way we are not in touch with anybody. Therefore, the importance of a particular place as we live our transient lives seems very important to me. I just left this room and walked out into that courtyard and I thought what a wonderful thing that I am here in Clemson under this particular sky at this time of day. That is a gift that McClure gave to us fifty years ago that I am very proud of. But, of course, many of us in this room came from somewhere else. For those of us who studied here, we probably practice somewhere else, but I think nevertheless it is important to recognize the significance of the place where we are.

Blackwell: The other aspect of it is how people respond to things. After experiencing your work—through materials and through space—people do not have to analyze or talk about it with the jargon that we do. It is an architecture that is felt as much as it is understood.

We recently won a small award for a free health clinic. It was a pro-bono job that we do once a year. Right after design, we help them write a grant—maybe they get it and maybe they can build it. This is service for the under-served in our community for health care. It was done in a very dilapidated, old downtown building. It was awful; the services were there but the facilities were not. Using local woods, we did another building for fifty bucks a square foot. After we received the award, a trustee said to me: “I want you to know that in our old building, every day we lost at least one roll of toilet paper and a bar of soap, but since we moved in this past spring, we have not lost anything.” I asked: “What is that about?” And he responded: “Respect! The people, the patients and the folks that come here, they respect this place. That is something we have never had before.”

Harmon: That is because the place respects them.

Blackwell: That is right! So no matter what walk of life you come from, no matter what economic strata you come from, it is a worthy goal to demonstrate that you care, and I think that kind of care is returned to you. Sometimes I worry about whether what you do is so particular to one group or one thing that you lose the sight of overarching aspects that are fundamental, no matter who you are or where you are.

Another Audience Member: Marlon was speaking about the importance of immersion in creating empathy and I think perhaps Frank started to touch on this. My question: Is there a counter to that? Perhaps distance can provide a bit of clarity, particularly in light of Clemson’s Fluid Campuses and the different possibilities to study around the globe.

Lefaivre: Speaking of clarity, a Viennese architect more or less invented southern Californian domestic architecture, regionalism.

Harmon: Schindler.
Lefaivre: Neutra and Schindler, both. That came with some distance. People from the outside have eyes that see more in a different way and sometimes in a beneficial way.

Harmon: If you are saying that there is a great deal to be gained by looking at the place you are in, there is also a great deal to be gained from the knowledge of other places. Merrill and Marlon are very sophisticated people. Marlon knows all the things going on in architecture but at the same time he is very connected and immersed in the place where he is. I do not want this talk about regionalism to ever forget the fact that we live in a universal world too. There is so much to be gained by listening to the ideas of others. I would never want the idea of regionalism to be seen as something as parochial or closed.

Blackwell: Insular!

Harmon: Yes, insular, because that inevitably leads to serious social problems.

Blackwell: If I could follow that up from an educational standpoint, as an educator, I am trying to underscore to my students that architects must have some command of a more universal language of architecture because if they are only pursuing the local, they are destined to repeat it in a very debased way. I think it is the mixing of the local and the global that flows through architecture and you have to master that in some ways. You have to understand how to make a connection or how to make a façade or understand that there is a language to contemporary or modern architecture as there is a language to classical architecture. There is a syntax and if you are going to pursue it, you need to make it part of the deal. You are not going to master it in five years. You have to continue to make it a pursuit.

I like what Wright said about architecture: “What is wrong with architecture is architects.” And what I like about that is that I do not know of any architect that I have ever met who has had a client asking: “Could you design me a really awful, ill-proportioned, ill-considered structure and I will pay you for it?” So I ask myself why do we not go outside to look around—we see flotsam and jetsam that our profession produces as a result. I have to put that responsibility—not on the clients and the bankers—but squarely in the lap of the architects who have quit the pursuit of meaning in the making of what we do, and gone the other way with the golden handcuffs.

Lefaivre: Are architecture schools pushing architects in that direction?

Blackwell: Well, they have to provide our students with armor. We need to develop students who are resilient and can think and work quickly. Talent works quickly and does not defer. It can work at multiple scales and, in fact, embraces that opportunity. The thing I hate hearing from students is that they really do not want to design-build or that they are not interested in urbanism. You have to embrace all these opportunities because the world outside presents some strange stuff that you need to take on and you have to be willing to take it on.

Elam: I think for the distance of clarity, the story of Burle Marx was right on. Sometimes it is actually visceral—when you go away you see something different. You come back to your place and all of a sudden you notice something that you had not noticed before, something that is different to you.

Blackwell: That is why we have all these study abroad programs.

Harmon: Clemson has three.

Blackwell: Yes, and to me it is not just about going to Genoa to study what Franco Albini did. The greatest architectural epiphany I had was in Potsdam in a Schinkel building where I actually saw, for the first time, tangible space. It is not in my world and it is not something I am going back to reproduce, but he was working with something spatially that I could connect with. I had that clarity at that moment when all else is behind me and it is just me and Schinkel. That one moment, something happened and I got it. That is what is missing from what I am doing and I have to go back and employ that in my operations.

Lefaivre: Is that where you get the big box idea?

Blackwell: The big box? I live in a world of big boxes and I do not live in the world of crazy money. I do not live in the desert; I do not live in California. I live in a world where the four richest people of the United States live and you can work for them. They are as pragmatic as any farmer you will meet. We build boxes because nobody in my area is going to build a Bilbao.
Lefaivre: There is something regional about the big box, isn’t there?
Blackwell: Sure, there is the big chicken house and the big barn, singular iconic things.
Harmon: I would almost be willing to argue that you cannot be a regionalist until you travel somewhere else.
Blackwell: I agree with that one hundred percent.
Harmon: I mean Thomas Jefferson—he went off to France and he said that he really had to do that to appreciate Virginia.
Blackwell: Absolutely! There are worlds within worlds that we have to open up because the power of architecture has been oppressed. You get into other places like Mali and Yemen which offer the most visceral experience that is not just visual, but also stems from smells and textures. When you come back to where you are and everything is intensified in a way.
Keith Green (An Audience Member): So you cannot be a regionalist unless you are looking for something.
Blackwell: What do you mean?
Green: I do not think it is a matter of being place-bound, I think it is a matter of finding yourself maybe under those clouds and discovering something there or traveling to Berlin and finding the flora of your home. You have to be looking for something. I think regionalism is about seeking something. In a way, you have to be open to discovering something outside and making a discovery there when that place and that moment come together in some profound way.
Blackwell: Walker Percy said it so well. The search is what everyone would be involved with but because of the distractions of everyday life, they cannot be or they are not. To be in the search is to be on to something, and not to be on to something is to be in despair. To be pursuing something is lifelong and that gets back to what I was saying earlier about a certain aspect of the profession. The pursuit does not end when you get the diploma.
Lefaivre: Speaking of diplomas, should we let the Valedictorian have the last word?
Tzonis: I have one more story to tell in this sequence of stories. In the beginning of the 1960s when the crisis of the environments of the cities was emerging, a new generation of architects started experimenting with new ways of building; they were interested in buildings that could contribute to the overall environment. One of the groups was the famous Team X, but one of the most interesting efforts was the proposal for the center of Frankfurt by Candilis, Josic, Woods and Scheidhelm, which was never built and is now forgotten. That was a time when the well-known exhibition with the misleading title of “Architecture Without Architects” was on. As a matter of fact, the exhibition referred to the architecture that contributed to the environment instead of being just a star architecture. In this milieu, Le Corbusier was the biggest star. But, the younger generation did not recognize him anymore as a leader. He was asked to design a hospital for Venice and his anxiety was how to design in the context of Venice. He had fired his most talented, best collaborators including Wood, Candilis, and Josic, because, as Soltan told me, his doctor told him that to keep things young, every seven years he had to change his environment. The easiest way to change his environment was to fire his employees. Anyhow, Josic and Woods, who just finished the project of Frankfurt, brought it to the maître for his opinion. Le Corbusier said: “Leave it with me and in a couple of days I will let you know and we will have a meeting.” Le Corbusier looked at the building. He did not go back home but spent the whole night studying it. The next morning when Julian de la Fuente, a Chilean architect who was the head of the office at that time, arrived, Le Corbusier took the drawings of Josic and Woods, gave them to Julian and said: “Well, here is your hospital in Venice.” What is interesting about this story (which I know from Shadrach Woods) is the fact that Le Corbusier, a “super-star” architect by then renowned for the super-expressive profiles of his buildings recognized the importance of the protesting voices and the critical condition of the environment violated by the spreading star-architecture oblivious to regional values. Thus, he proceeded to propose a low-profile building in harmony with the urban fabric of Venice. In this sense he produced a genuine critical regionalist scheme.
The project remained unfinished. Le Corbusier died having produced the first generation of architectural drawings and Julian developed a second one without any significant changes.

The complete set of these blueprints are part of the Tzonis-Lefaivre Archive. So, we thought that Clemson, having traveled one hundred years of a very interesting and creative past and with a challenging future ahead, deserves to have as a present for its birthday—dedicated to the question of regionalism in our time—these seventeen blueprints of the 1960s critical regionalist building by Le Corbusier.*

* The seventeen blueprints granted to Clemson School of Architecture by Liane Lefaivre and Alexander Tzonis are stored in the rare book room of Emery A. Gunnin Architecture Library.
On October 18, 2013, a formal reception in Lee 3, the new Thomas Phifer addition to Lee Hall, followed the Centennial Symposium.

Figures 136, 137, 138. Views from the Beaux-Arts Ball; top two photos © Annemarie Jacques, last photo © Todd Shoaf
I knew before I registered that there was something special and different about this place and that going to school here would be a positive, life-changing experience.” These were the words of the Clemson alumnus Harvey Gantt who visited the School of Architecture on April 19, 2013 and gave his lecture in Lee Hall 2-111. All lectures in 2013 were given by individuals who have a connection to Clemson—alumni, former teachers and friends:

February 8, 2013: CAF/Architecture 100 Lecture
HANS HERRMANN (Clemson MArch 2003)

February 22, 2013: CAF/Architecture 100 Lecture
SETH MCDOWELL (Clemson BSArch 2003)

March 8, 2013: CAF/Architecture 100 Lecture
XAVIER COSTA, PhD (Clemson Mickel Visiting Professor 1998)

April 5, 2013: CAF/Architecture 100 Lecture
PATRICIO DEL REAL (Clemson Assistant Professor, 1999–2003)

April 19, 2013: CAF/Architecture 100 Lecture
HARVEY B. GANTT, FAIA (Clemson BArch 1965 with honors)

September 20, 2013: CAF/Architecture 100 Lecture
BETSY BEAMAN & KIMBERLY SEARS (Clemson MArch 1982 & Clemson MArch 1982)

October 4, 2013: CAF/Architecture 100 Lecture
MARK CARROLL (Clemson BArch 1978)

November 8, 2013: CAF/Architecture 100 Lecture
T. SCOTT RAWLINGS (Clemson BArch & MArch 1991)

November 8, 2013: CAF/Architecture 100 Lecture
ANDREW PAYNE (Clemson BSArch 2002)

Figure 139. Students, including Harvey Gantt, work on a small house project, 1965
NOTES


20. Ibid., p. 128.
21. Ibid.
22. The establishment of study-travel to Rome was more complicated than here depicted, although my overall characterization is valid. The Grand Prix de Rome was actually established by the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture for their students in 1663; the Prize began in the Académie Royale d’Architecture in 1720 (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prix_de_Rome). However, before the founding of the Académie d’Architecture, Colbert sent for accurate measurements to Provence in 1669 and just after the founding, in 1674, he dispatched the young architect, Antoine Desgodets, along with the Prix de Rome winners from the other academies to Rome to make measured drawings of antiquities. Kruft reports that the Académie awarded an annual Rome Scholarship (p. 128), though this was not officially a Prix de Rome. Thus the pattern of research travel arose with the creation of the Académie d’Architecture. In 1795 the Académie d’Architecture was merged into the Académie des Beaux-Arts (founded 1648), which was made independent of the government by Napoleon III in 1863 and renamed L’Ecole des Beaux-Arts. See Kruft, A History of Architectural Theory from Vitruvius to the Present, 136.
26. “The canonical work […] must be assumed to have permanent value and, which is really the same thing, perpetual modernity.” Frank Kermode, Forms of Attention (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 62.
27. Attributed to Napoleon.
45. Mumford, The South in Architecture, 30.
47. Ibid., 86-89.
Marlon Blackwell is a practicing architect in Fayetteville, Arkansas, and serves as distinguished professor and department head in the Fay Jones School of Architecture at the University of Arkansas. Working outside the architectural mainstream, his architecture is based in design strategies that draw upon vernaculars and the contradictions of place, strategies that seek to transgress conventional boundaries for architecture. Work produced in his professional office has received recognition with numerous national and international design awards and significant publication in books, architectural journals and magazines.

Merrill Elam is principal in the firm of Mack Scogin Merrill Elam Architects, Atlanta, Georgia. With Mack Scogin she received the 2012 Cooper-Hewitt National Design Award for Architecture, the 2011 Arnold W. Brunner Memorial Prize in Architecture from the American Academy of Arts and Letters, the 1995 Academy Award in Architecture from the American Academy of Arts and Letters, the 1996 Chrysler Award for Innovation in Design and a 2008 Honorary Fellowship in the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA).

Ufuk Ersoy, PhD, teaches history, theory, and architecture design at Clemson School of Architecture. Ersoy completed his Master of Architecture (1996), Master of Science in Architectural History and Theory (2002), and PhD in Architectural History and Theory (2008) degrees at the University of Pennsylvania. His publications include "To See Daydreams: The Glass Utopia of Paul Scheerbart and Bruno Taut" in Imagining and Making the World: Reconsidering Architecture and Utopia (Peter Lang, 2011) and “Glass, as Light as Air, as Deep as Water,” in Material Imagination: Reveries on Architecture and Matter (Ashgate, 2015).

Frank Harmon, FAIA, is principal of Frank Harmon Architect PA in Raleigh, North Carolina, and Professor in Practice at North Carolina State University's College of Design. He is a nationally recognized leader in modern, sustainable, regionally appropriate design. Harmon's work ranges from small sheds to large corporate headquarters. His work has won awards and recognition from the AIA, Business Week, Architectural Record, Custom Home, Residential Architect, and Architect magazines, and has been exhibited at the National Building Museum. You can follow Harmon's sketch and essay series at NativePlaces.org.

Peter L. Laurence, PhD, is Director of Graduate Studies at Clemson University School of Architecture, where he teaches architectural and urban history and theory, and architecture and urban design. He holds a Master of Architecture from Harvard Graduate School of Design (1999) and Master of Science (2004) and PhD in Architectural History and Theory from University of Pennsylvania (2009). His recent publications include “Modern (or Contemporary) Architecture c. 1959” in A Critical History of Contemporary Architecture, 1960–2010 (Ashgate, 2014); “Jane Jacobs, the Townscape Movement, and Critical Urban Design” in Alternative Visions of Postwar Reconstruction: Creating the Modern Townscape (Routledge, 2014), and “The Unknown Jane Jacobs” in Reconsidering Jane Jacobs (Planners Press, 2011). His two books, Becoming Jane Jacobs and The Routledge Reader’s Guide to The Death and Life of Great American Cities are forthcoming from Penn Press and Taylor and Francis.

Robert Miller, AIA, is the director of the School of Architecture at the University of Arizona. Holding a BA in Architecture from Clemson (1976) and an MArch with a Certificate in Urban Design from Rice (1979), Miller worked for several firms in the south before starting his own practice in 1986. An adjunct at the Georgia Institute of Technology and Emory University, he taught at Clemson University from 1990–2010, serving as Professor-in-Residence at the Daniel Center in Genoa, Italy (1997–1999) and Director of the Clemson Architecture Center in Charleston (2000–2010). Miller's pedagogical focus has been hybrid learning: merging educational content with professional practices. Most of his published scholarship, appearing in Europe, South America, and the United States, explores this territory.

Kate Schwennsen, FAIA, is the Director of the School of Architecture, Clemson University. She is a recognized leader in bridging architectural education and practice, with expertise on issues of design leadership, diversity, and evolving models of practice and education in architecture. Recent publications/presentations include: “Architectural Practice: A Critical View, Revisited,” “You Can't Just Add Women and Stir,” “Sustainable Education Sustainable Profession,” and “The Architect at Mid-(21st) Century.” Schwennsen has held many leadership positions in professional organizations, and is currently the Co-Chair of the Education Commission of the International Union of Architects (UIA), and Co-Reporter for the UNESCO/UIA Validation Council. Schwennsen was also 2006 President of the American Institute of Architects.
All images used in “Snapshots from a Professor in Residence” by Robert Miller are composed by the author by distorting photos or figures taken from other sources which are credited below:

Fig. 13 Richard Morris Hunt, 1883, from Dana Cuff, *Architecture: The Story of Practice* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press), 27.

Fig. 13 Gary Cooper as Howard Roark in *The Fountainhead*, from Andrew Saint, *The Image of the Architect* (New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press, 1983), xii.

Fig. 14 McKim, Mead & White, *The American Academy in Rome*, 1914, from https://sofaarome.wordpress.com/2011/02/14/anniversary-of-an-experiment-celebrating-a-consolidated-academy-1911-2011/

Fig. 14 Pantheon being measured by students from the American Academy in Rome, 1917, from Elizabeth Meredith Dowling, *American Classicist: The Architecture of Philip Trammel Shute* (New York, NY: Rizzoli, 1989), 18.

Fig. 15 Francis Basset, 1st Baron de Dunstanville and Basset, from http://www.aparences.net/wp-content/uploads/batoni-francis-basset.jpg

Fig. 15 Pantheon interior by Giovanni Paolo Panini, 1735, from http://niefeli.lib.teicrete.gr/browse/stef/mhx/2014/KoukouvitakisAndreas/attached-document-1405586048-878296-187771/KoukouvitakisAndreas2014.pdf

Fig. 16 The cover of Henry-Russell Hitchcock, Jr. and Philip Johnson, *The International Style: Architecture Since 1922* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 1966), cover.

Fig. 16 Nicolaiev & Fissenko, electro-physical laboratory, Lefortovo, Moscow, 1927, from Hitchcock and Johnson, *The International Style*, 234.


Fig. 17 Rudolf Wittkower, *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism* (London: Warburg Institute, University of London, 1949), cover.

Fig. 18 Hal Foster, ed., *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture* (Seattle, WA: Bay Press, 1983), cover.


Fig. 19 Ski Dubai, 2005, an indoor ski resort with 22,500 square meters of indoor ski area, part of the Mall of the Emirates, developed by Majid Al Futtaim Properties, from http://sto.depplus.vn/NewsMedia/assets/image_20141210/93501_20141210122803.jpg

Fig. 19 Interior of Guggenheim Museum Bilbao by Frank O. Gehry, and Nationale-Nederlanden building, Prague, Czech Republic by Frank O. Gehry and Vladimir Milunic; photographs by the author.

Fig. 19 “10 Tallest Building In The World 2012-2013,” from https://i1.wp.com/exploredia.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/111.jpg


Fig. 20 Rural Studio, Yancey Chapel, Sawyerville, Hale County, Ala., 1995, from http://archrecord.construction.com/features/images/0406sm-08_sm.jpg

Fig. 20 Rural Studio, The Butterfly House, Masons Bend, AL, 1996, from http://media.tumblr.com/tumblr_lifwteZ7Cm1qbi4w.jpg

Fig. 21 Image of École Nationale des Beaux-Arts, Architecture Atelier Pascal, 1905, from Cuff, *Architecture*, 29.

Fig. 22 Daniels Center students with visiting students and Professor Karl Maier from Czech Technical University in Prague, at the *Cattedrale di San Lorenzo*, Genova, Fall 1997; photograph by the author.

Fig. 134 Edward Durrellston, U.S. Embassy, New Delhi, is taken from *Forum*, June 1955, 115.
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