

Chapter 14

Architecture



Learning Objectives

- 14.1 Describe the relationship between architecture and its environment.
- 14.2 Outline the architectural technologies that predate the modern era.
- 14.3 Describe the technological advances that have contributed to modern and contemporary architecture.
- 14.4 Describe how the idea of community serves as a driving force in architecture.

In the early 1980s, the president of France, François Mitterrand, embarked on a program of *Grands Projets* designed to transform and revitalize the French capital, Paris. Among the most important of these was a plan to expand the Louvre Museum by creating a central entryway, in the middle of the Cour Napoléon, the courtyard contained by the Old Louvre palace, to the east, and two later wings, the Richelieu wing to the north, and the Denon wing to the south, the latter completed by Louis XIII in the early seventeenth century but begun by Catherine de Medici in 1550. American architect I. M. Pei was awarded the commission. His plan was simple but elegant. The entire Cour Napoléon and the Place du Carrousel to its west were excavated, creating a vast underground visitor's center with entries on three sides into the collections and surmounted, at the center of the Cour Napoléon, by Pei's today iconic shimmering glass pyramid (Fig. 14-1). Pei's pyramid is distinctly contemporary, but it adds just one more historical layer to a building that originated in the thirteenth century as a defensive fortress and was subsequently enlarged by major additions that incorporated, in succession, Renaissance, Baroque, and Neoclassical styles.

In this chapter, we will consider how our built environment has developed in ways comparable to the

Louvre itself—how we have traveled, in effect, from the fortresses of the past to skyscrapers and postmodernist designs. We will see that the “look” of our buildings and our communities depends on two different factors and their interrelation—environment, or the distinct landscape characteristics of the local site, including its climatic features, and **technology**, the materials and methods available to a given culture. The site has had a considerable influence on the design. In Pei's case at the Louvre, he had to find a way to respond to its very history. Thus, the key to understanding and appreciating architecture always involves both technology and environment. We will consider environment first.

Environment

How does the environment affect architecture?

The built environment reflects the natural world and the conception of its inhabitants of their place within the natural scheme of things. A building's form might echo the world around it, or it might contrast with it. It also might respond to the climate of the place. In each case,



Fig. 14-1 I. M. Pei, Glass Pyramid, Cour Napoléon, Louvre, Paris, 1983–89; in front of the 17th-century Denon wing of the museum. Pyramid height 69 ft., width 108 ft.

© Tibor Bogнар/Corbis.



Fig. 14-2 Pyramids of Menkaure (ca. 2470 BCE), Khafre (ca. 2500 BCE), and Khufu (ca. 2530 BCE). Original height of Pyramid of Khufu 480 ft., length of each side at base 755 ft.
© Free Agents Limited/CORBIS. Photo: Dallas and John Heaton.

the choices builders make reveal their attitudes toward the world around them.

The architecture of the vast majority of early civilizations was designed to imitate natural forms. The significance of the pyramids of Egypt (Fig. 14-2) is the subject of much debate, but their form may well derive from the image of the god Re, who in ancient Egypt was symbolized by the rays of the sun descending to earth. A text in one pyramid reads: “I have trodden these rays as ramps under my feet.” As one approached the mammoth pyramids, covered in limestone to reflect the light of the sun, the eye was carried skyward to Re, the Sun itself, who was, in the desert, the central fact of life.

The Impact of Climate

The designs of many buildings, in fact, reflect the climatic conditions of environments. When African slaves arrived in the Americas in the eighteenth century, they found themselves living in a climate very much like that they had left in Africa. A late eighteenth-/early nineteenth-century painting of the Mulberry Plantation in South Carolina (Fig. 14-3) depicts slave houses with steeply pitched roofs similar to the thatched-roof houses of the same era found in West Africa. The roof comprises over half the height of the house, allowing warm air to rise in the interior and trap cooler air beneath it—a distinct advantage in the hot and humid climates of both Africa and the Carolinas.

The Anasazi cliff dwelling known as Spruce Tree House (Fig. 14-4) at Mesa Verde National Park in southwestern Colorado reflects a similar relation between humans and their environment. The Anasazi lived in

these cliffside caves for hundreds, perhaps thousands, of years. The cave provided security, but to live there was also to be closer to the people’s origin and, therefore, to the source of their strength. For unknown reasons, the Anasazi abandoned their cliff dwellings in about 1300 CE. One possible cause was a severe drought that lasted from 1276 to 1299. It is also possible that disease, a shortened growing season, or war with Apache and Shoshone tribes caused the Anasazi to leave the highland mesas and migrate south into Arizona and New Mexico.

At the heart of the Anasazi culture was the *kiva*, a round, covered hole in the center of the communal plaza in which all ceremonial life took place. The roofs of two underground kivas on the north end of the ruin have been restored. They are constructed of horizontally



Fig. 14-3 Thomas Coram, *View of Mulberry House and Street*, ca. 1800. Oil on paper. Gibbes Museum of Art, Charleston, South Carolina.

Carolina Art Association, 1968.18.0001. © Image courtesy of the Gibbes Museum of Art/Carolina Art Association.



Fig. 14-4 Spruce Tree House, Mesa Verde, ca. 1200–1300 CE. Courtyard formed by restoration of the roofs over two underground kivas.
Photo: John Deeks/Photo Researchers, Inc.




Fig. 14-5 Cribbed roof construction of a kiva.

laid logs built up to form a dome with an access hole (Fig. 14-5). The people utilized these roofs as a common area. Down below, in the enclosed kiva floor, was a *sipapu*, a small, round hole symbolic of the Anasazi creation myth, which told of the emergence of the Anasazi's ancestors from the depths of the earth. In the parched Southwestern desert country it is equally true that water, like life itself, also seeps out of small fissures in the

earth. Thus, it is as if the entire Anasazi community, and everything necessary to its survival, emerges from Mother Earth.

“Green” Architecture

Both the slave houses at Mulberry Plantation and the cliff dwellings at Mesa Verde are attempts to allay, in some measure, the heat of their environments. In the face of climate change, architects have been challenged to engage in a different, more environmentally friendly and sustainable, practice—so-called **green architecture**.

One of the masterpieces of green architecture is Renzo Piano's Jean-Marie Tjibaou Cultural Center in New Caledonia. As Piano's design suggests, green architecture is characterized by a number of different principles, but usually only

some of these principles are realized in a given project:

- 1) *Smaller buildings.* This represents an attitude that is the very opposite of the Dubai model (see Fig. 14-49), and it is no accident that residential architecture, such as the 2,800-square-foot Brunsell Residence designed by Obie Bowman at Sea Ranch, California (Fig. 14-6), has led the way in the development of sustainable, green architecture.
- 2) *Integration and compatibility with the natural environment.* Although only portions of Bowman's structure are 4 feet underground, he has created a rooftop meadow of the same grass species as the surrounding headlands, thus creating the feeling that the structure is almost entirely buried in the earth. As Bowman explains: “The places we make emphasize their connectedness to the character and quality of the setting and are designed as part of the landscape



Fig. 14-6 Obie Bowman, Brunsell Residence, Sea Ranch, California, 1987.
© Obie Bowman Architect.

- rather than as isolated objects placed down upon it.”
- 3) *Energy efficiency and solar orientation.* The rooftop meadow on the Sea Ranch house helps to stabilize interior temperatures. In addition, solar collectors capture the sunlight to heat the residence’s water, and the architect sited the house specifically to protect it from the prevailing winds. A south-facing solarium provides winter warmth.
 - 4) *Use of recycled, reusable, and sustainable materials.* Brockholes Visitor Center, near Preston, Lancashire, in the United Kingdom, designed by architect Adam Kahn (Fig. 14-7), is clad in oak shake tiles formed out of tree stumps, which would otherwise be burned as waste. Insulation in the walls of the building consists of recycled newspapers. Set in the middle of a low-lying wildlife refuge, the building floats (thereby foregoing the need for concrete foundations). Beds of reeds have been planted around the steep-pitched roofs so that, in time, the roofs will appear to emerge from them.

These principles are, of course, more difficult to implement in densely populated urban environments. But faced with the prospect of climate change, in 2010 the Museum of Modern Art in New York sponsored a workshop-exhibition, *Rising Currents: Projects for New York’s Waterfront*, that brought together five architectural

teams tasked with reinventing New York’s urban infrastructure in the light of rising sea levels—as much as 6 feet by 2100—the prospect of which threatens the very habitability of the city (when Hurricane Sandy struck in October 2012, the exhibition turned out to be remarkably prescient).

The team of Eric Bunge and Mimi Hoang, of nARCHITECTS, proposed a project entitled *New Aqueous City* (Fig. 14-8), which introduces, in their words, “a novel urban paradigm: a city that can control and absorb rising sea levels even as it accommodates an expected spike in population over the next century.” To that end, in areas less than 20 feet above sea level—that is, areas subject to flooding during a Category 3 storm—buildings constructed of lightweight materials are hung from bridges that rise on vertical support structures. The buildings, in fact, are accessed from above, and the bridges themselves not only serve as “streets” but as safe evacuation pathways during storms. At the same time, waterways extend into the city in a network of infiltration basins, swales, and culverts designed to absorb storm surge. As this project makes clear, as the environment—that is to say, nature itself—increasingly impinges upon the urban infrastructure, new solutions and innovative approaches to architecture will be required.



Fig. 14-7 Adam Kahn, Brockholes Visitor Center, Lancashire Wildlife Trust reserve, Preston, U.K., 2011.

© Ashley Cooper/Corbis.




Fig. 14-8 Eric Bunge and Mimi Hoang, nARCHITECTS, *New Aqueous City*, 2010. From *Rising Currents: Projects for New York's Waterfront*, a workshop-exhibition sponsored by the Museum of Modern Art, New York, March 24–October 11, 2010. Courtesy of nARCHITECTS.

Early Architectural Technologies

What are the architectural technologies that predate the modern era?

Green architecture of necessity requires architects to pursue new technologies as they seek to solve problems heretofore largely unanticipated. But the basic technological challenge faced by architecture since the earliest times is to construct upright walls and put a roof over the empty space they enclose. Walls may employ one of two basic structural systems: the **shell system**, in which one basic material provides both the structural support and the outside covering of the building, and the **skeleton-and-skin system**, which consists of a basic interior frame, the skeleton, that supports the more fragile outer covering, the skin.

In a building that is several stories tall, the walls or frame of the lower floors must also support the weight of the upper floors. The ability of a given building material to support weight is thus a determining factor in how high the building can be. The walls or frame also support the roof. The span between the elements of the supporting structure—between, for instance, stone walls, columns, or steel beams—is determined by the tensile strength of the roof material. **Tensile strength** is the ability of a building material to span horizontal distances without support and without buckling in the middle: The greater the tensile strength of a material, the wider its potential span. Almost all technological advances in the history of architecture depend on either the invention of new ways to distribute weight or the discovery of new materials with greater tensile strength. We begin our survey with the most basic technology and move forward to the most advanced.

Load-Bearing Construction

The simplest method of making a building is to make the walls **load-bearing**—make the walls themselves bear the weight of the roof. One does this by piling and stacking any material—stones, bricks, mud, and straw—right up to roof level. Many load-bearing structures, such as the Egyptian pyramids, are solid almost all the way through, with only small open chambers inside them.

Although the Anasazi cliff dwelling contains more livable space than a pyramid, it too is a load-bearing construction. The kiva is built of **adobe** bricks—bricks made of dried clay—piled on top of one another, and the roof is built of wood. The complex roof of the kiva spans a greater circumference than would be possible with just wood, and it supports the weight of the community in the plaza above. This is achieved by the downward pressure exerted on the wooden beams by the stones and fill on top of them above the outside wall, which counters the tendency of the roof to buckle.

Post-and-Lintel Construction

The walls surrounding the Lion Gate at Mycenae in Greece (Fig. 14-9) are of load-bearing construction. But the gate itself represents another form of construction: post-and-lintel. **Post-and-lintel construction** consists of a horizontal beam supported at each end by a verti-

cal post or a wall. In essence, the downward force of the horizontal bridge holds the vertical posts in an upright position, and, conversely, the posts support the stone above in a give-and-take of directional force and balance. So large are the stones used to build this gate—both the length of the lintel and the total height of the post-and-lintel structure are roughly 13 feet—that later Greeks believed it could only have been built by the mythological race of one-eyed giants, the Cyclopes.

Post-and-lintel construction is fundamental to all Greek architecture. As can be seen in the First Temple of Hera, at Paestum, Italy (Fig. 14-10), the columns, or posts, supporting the structure were placed relatively close together. This was done for a practical reason: If stone lintels, especially of marble, were required to span too great a distance, they were likely to crack and eventually collapse. Each of the columns in the temple is made of several pieces of stone, called **drums**. Grooves carved in the stone, called **fluting**, run the length of the column and unite the individual drums into a single unit. Each column tapers dramatically toward the top and slightly toward the bottom, an architectural feature known as **entasis**. Entasis deceives the eye and makes the column look absolutely vertical. It also gives the column a sense of almost human musculature and strength. The columns suggest the bodies of human beings, holding up the roof like miniature versions of the giant Atlas, who carried the world on his shoulders.



Fig. 14-9 Lion Gate, Mycenae, Greece, 1250 BCE.

© Konstantinos Kontos/Photostock.




Fig. 14-10 First Temple of Hera, Paestum, Italy, ca. 550 BCE.

Canali Photobank, Milan, Italy.

The values of the Greek city-state were embodied in its temples. The temple was usually situated on an elevated site above the city—an **acropolis**, from *akros*, meaning “top,” of the *polis*, “city”—and was conceived as the center of civic life. Its **colonnade**, or row of columns set at regular intervals around the building and

supporting the base of the roof, was constructed according to the rules of geometry and embodied cultural values of equality and proportion. So consistent were the Greeks in developing a generalized architectural type for their temples that it is possible to speak of them in terms of three distinct architectural types—the Doric, the Ionic,




Fig. 14-11 The Greek orders, from James Stuart, *The Antiquities of Athens*, London, 1794.

Courtesy of Library of Congress.

and the Corinthian, the last of which was rarely used by the Greeks themselves but later became the standard order in Roman architecture (Fig. 14-11). In ancient times, the heavier Doric order was considered masculine, and the more graceful Ionic order feminine. It is true that the Ionic order is slimmer and much lighter in feeling than the Doric.

The vertical design, or **elevation**, of the Greek temple is composed of three elements—the **platform**, the **column**, and the **entablature**. The relationship among these three units is referred to as its **order**. The Doric, the earliest and plainest of the three, is used in the temple at Paestum. The Ionic is later, more elaborate, and organic, while the Corinthian is more organic and decorative still. The elevation of each order begins with its floor, the **stylobate**, or the top step of the platform on which the building rests. The column in the Doric order consists of two parts, the **shaft** and the **capital**, to which both the Ionic and Corinthian orders add a base. The orders are most quickly distinguished by their capitals. The Doric capital is plain, marked only by a subtle outward curve. The Ionic capital is much more elaborate and is distinguished by its scroll. The Corinthian capital is decorated with stylized acanthus leaves. The entablature consists of three parts: the **architrave**, or weight-bearing and weight-distributing element; the **frieze**, the

horizontal band just above the architrave that is generally decorated with relief sculptural elements; and the **cornice**, the horizontal molded projection that crowns or completes the wall.

Arches, Vaults, and Domes

The geometrical order of the Greek temple suggests a conscious desire to control the natural world. So strong was this impulse that Greek architecture seems defiant in its belief that the intellect is superior to the irrational forces of nature. We can read this same




Fig. 14-12 Round arch.



Fig. 14-13 Pont du Gard, near Nîmes, France, late 1st century BCE–early 1st century CE. Height 164 ft.

© Walter Bibikow/Getty Images.

impulse in Roman architecture—the will to dominate the site. Though the Romans made considerable use of colonnades—rows of columns—they also perfected the use of the **round arch** (Fig. 14-12), an innovation that revolutionized the built environment. The Romans recognized that the arch would allow them to make structures with a much larger span than was possible with post-and-lintel construction. Made of wedge-shaped stones, called **vousoirs**, each cut to fit into the semicircular form, an arch is not stable until the **keystone**, the stone at the very top, has been put into place. At this point, equal pressure is exerted by each stone on its neighbors, and the scaffolding that is necessary to support the arch while it is under construction can be removed. The arch supports itself,

with the weight of the whole transferred downward to the posts. A series of arches could be made to span a wide canyon with relative ease. One of the most successful Roman structures is the Pont du Gard (Fig. 14-13), an aqueduct used to carry water from the distant hills to the Roman compound in Nîmes, France. Still intact today, it is an engineering feat remarkable not only for its durability, but also, like most examples of Roman architecture, for its incredible size.

With the development of the **barrel vault**, or **tunnel vault** (Fig. 14-14, left), which is essentially an extension in depth of the single arch by lining up one arch behind another, the Romans were able to create large, uninterrupted interior spaces. The strength of the vaulting structure of the Roman Colosseum




Fig. 14-14 Barrel vault (left) and groin vault (right).



Fig. 14-15 Barrel-vaulted gallery, ground floor of the Colosseum, Rome, 72–80 CE.

© 2015. Photo Scala, Florence - courtesy of the Ministero Beni e Att. Culturali.

(Figs. 14-15 and 14-16) allowed more than 50,000 spectators to be seated in it. The Colosseum is an example of an **amphitheater** (literally meaning a “double theater”), in which two semicircular theaters are brought face to face, a building type invented by the Romans to accommodate large crowds. Built for gladiatorial games and other “sporting” events, including mock naval battles and fights to the death between humans and animals, the Colosseum is constructed both with barrel vaults and with **groin vaults** (Fig. 14-14, right), the latter created when two barrel vaults are made to meet at right angles. These vaults were made possible by the Roman invention of concrete. The Romans discovered that if they added volcanic aggregate, such as that found near Naples and Pompeii, to the concrete mixture, it would both set faster and be stronger. The Colosseum is constructed of these concrete blocks, held together by metal cramps and dowels. They were originally covered with stone and elaborate stucco decorations.

The Romans were also the first to perfect the **dome**, which takes the shape of a hemisphere, sometimes defined as a continuous arch rotated 360 degrees on its axis. Conceived as a temple to celebrate all their gods,



Fig. 14-16 Aerial view, Colosseum, Rome, 72–80 CE.

© Guido Alberto Rossi/age Fotostock.



Fig. 14-17 Interior, Pantheon, Rome, 117–25 CE.

Photo: Hemera Technologies.

the Roman Pantheon (**Fig. 14-17**)—from the Greek words *pan* (“every”) and *theos* (“god”)—consists of a 142-foot-high dome set on a cylindrical wall 140 feet in diameter. Every interior dimension appears equal and proportionate, even as its scale overwhelms the viewer. The dome is concrete, which was poured in sections over a huge mold supported by a complex scaffolding. Over 20 feet thick where it meets the walls—the **springing**, or the point where an arch or dome rises from its support—the dome thins to only 6 feet at the circular opening, 30 feet in diameter, at its top. Through this **oculus** (Latin for “eye”), the building’s only source of illumination, worshippers could make contact with the heavens. As the sun shone through it, casting a round spotlight into the interior, it seemed as if the eye of Jupiter, king of the gods, shone upon the Pantheon walls. Seen from the street (**Fig. 14-18**), where it was originally approached between parallel colonnades that culminated in a podium now lost to the rise of the area’s street level, its interior space could only be intuited. Instead, the viewer was confronted by a portico composed of eight mammoth Corinthian columns made of polished granite rising to a pediment some 121 feet wide.

Even though their use of concrete was forgotten, the architectural inventions of the Romans provided the basis for building construction in the Western world for nearly 2,000 years. The idealism, even mysticism, of the Pantheon’s vast interior space, with its evocation of the



Fig. 14-18 Exterior, Pantheon, Rome, 117–25 CE.

© Vincenzo Pirozzi, Rome.



Fig. 14-19 Nave, St. Sernin, Toulouse, France, ca. 1080–1120.
© Bildarchiv Mondheim GmbH/Alamy.

symbolic presence of Jupiter, found its way into churches as the Christian religion came to dominate the West. Large congregations could gather beneath the high barrel vaults of churches, which were constructed on Roman architectural principles. Vault construction in stone was employed especially in Romanesque architecture—so called because it used so many Roman methods and architectural forms.

The barrel vault at St. Sernin, in Toulouse, France (**Fig. 14-19**), is a magnificent example of Romanesque architecture. The plan of this church is one of great symmetry and geometric simplicity (**Fig. 14-20**). It reflects the Romanesque preference for rational order and logical development. Every measurement is based on the central square at the **crossing**, where the two **transepts**, or side wings, cross the length of the **nave**, the central aisle of the church used by the congregation, and the **apse**, the semi-circular projection at the end of the church that is topped by a Roman half-dome. Each square in the aisles, for instance, is one-quarter the size of the crossing square. Each transept extends two full squares from the center. The tower that rises over the crossing, incidentally, was completed in later times and is taller than it was originally intended to be.

The immense interior space of the great Gothic cathedrals, which arose throughout Europe beginning in about 1150 CE, is the culmination of this direction in




Fig. 14-20 Plan, St. Sernin, Toulouse, France, ca. 1080–1120.




Fig. 14-21 Amiens Cathedral, begun 1220.
© Bednorz-images, Cologne.

architecture. A building such as the Pantheon, with a 30-foot hole in its roof, was simply impractical in the severe climates of northern Europe. As if in response to the dark and dreary climate outside, the interior of the Gothic cathedral rises to an incredible height, lit by stained-glass windows that transform a dull day with a warm and richly radiant light. The enormous interior space of Amiens Cathedral (**Fig. 14-21**), with an interior height of 142 feet and a total interior surface of more than 26,000 square feet, leaves any viewer in awe. At the




Fig. 14-22 Pointed arch.

center of the nave is a complex maze, laid down in 1288, praising the three master masons who built the complex, Robert de Luzarches, and Thomas and Renaud de Cormont, who succeeded in creating the largest Gothic cathedral ever built in northern Europe.

The great height of the Gothic cathedral's interior space is achieved by means of a system of pointed,




Fig. 14-23 Flying buttresses, Cathedral of Notre-Dame, Paris, 1211–90.

© Bednorz-images, Cologne.

rather than round, arches. The height of a rounded arch is determined by its width, but the height of a **pointed arch** (Fig. 14-22) can readily be extended by straightening the curve of the sides upward to a point, the weight descending much more directly down the wall. By using the pointed arch in a scheme of groin vaults, the almost ethereal space of the Gothic cathedral, soaring upward as if toward God, is realized.

All arches tend to spread outward, creating a risk of collapse; early on, the Romans learned to support the sides of the arch to counteract this lateral thrust. In the great French cathedrals, the support was provided by building a series of arches on the outside whose thrusts would counteract the outward force of the interior arches. Extending inward from a series of columns or piers, these **flying buttresses** (Figs. 14-23 and 14-24), so named because they lend to the massive stone archi-

tecture a sense of lightness and flight, are an aesthetic response to a practical problem. Together with the stunning height of the nave allowed by the pointed arch, the flying buttresses reveal the desire of the builder to elevate the cathedral above humdrum daily life in the medieval world. The cathedral became a symbol not only of the divine, but also of the human ability to exceed, in art and in imagination, our own limitations and circumstances.




Fig. 14-24 Flying buttress. Diagram (after Acland).

Modern and Contemporary Architectural Technologies

What technological advances have contributed to modern and contemporary architecture?

Until the nineteenth century, the history of architecture was determined by innovations in the ways the same materials—mostly stone—could be employed. In the nineteenth century, iron, a material that had been known for thousands of years, but never employed in architecture, absolutely transformed the built environment.

Cast-Iron Construction

Wrought iron was soft and flexible, and, when heated, it could be easily turned and twisted into a variety of forms. But engineers discovered that, by adding carbon to iron, they could create a much more rigid and strong material—**cast iron**. The French engineer Gustave Eiffel



Fig. 14-25 Gustave Eiffel, Eiffel Tower, 1887–89. Seen from the Champ de Mars. Height of tower 1,051 ft. Alain Evrard/Globe Press. Photo Researchers, Inc.

used cast iron in his new lattice-beam construction technique, which produces structures of the maximum rigidity with the minimum weight by exploiting the way in which girders can be used to brace one another in three dimensions.

The most influential result was the Eiffel Tower (**Fig. 14-25**), designed as a monument to industry and the centerpiece of the international Paris Exposition of 1889. Over 1,000 feet high, and at that time by far the tallest structure in the world, the tower posed a particular problem—how to build a structure of such a height, yet one that could resist the wind. Eiffel’s solution was simple but brilliant: Construct a skeleton, an open lattice-beam framework that would allow the wind to pass through it. Though it served for many years as a radio tower—on July 1, 1913, the first signal transmitted around the world was broadcast from its top, inaugurating the global electronic network—the tower was essentially useless, nothing more than a monument. Many Parisians hated it at first, feeling that it was a

blight on the skyline. Newspapers jokingly held contests to “clothe” it. The French writer Guy de Maupassant often took his lunch at the restaurant in the tower, despite the fact that the food was not particularly appealing: “It’s the only place in Paris,” he said, “where I don’t have to see it.” But by the early years of the twentieth century the tower had become the symbol of Paris itself, probably the most famous structure in the world. Most important, it demonstrated the possibility of building to very great heights without load-bearing walls. The tower gave birth to the skeleton-and-skin system of building. And the idea of designing “clothes” to cover such a structure soon became a reality.

Frame Construction

The role of iron and steel in changing the course of architecture in the nineteenth century cannot be overestimated—and we will consider steel in even more detail in a moment—but two more humble technological innovations had almost as significant an impact, determining the look of our built environment down to the present day. The mass production of the common nail, together with improved methods and standardization in the process of milling lumber, led to a revolution in home-building techniques.

Lumber cannot easily support structures of great height, but it is perfect for domestic architecture. In 1833, in Chicago, the common **wood-frame** construction (**Fig. 14-26**), a true




Fig. 14-26 Wood-frame construction.




Fig. 14-28 Truss.

skeleton-and-skin building method, was introduced. Sometimes called **balloon-frame** construction, because early skeptics believed houses built in this manner would explode like balloons, the method is both inexpensive and relatively easy. A framework skeleton of, generally, 2×4 -inch beams is nailed together. Windows and doors are placed in the wall using basic post-and-lintel design principles, and the whole is sheathed with planks, clapboard, shingles, or any other suitable material. The roof is somewhat more complex, but as early as the construction of Old St. Peter's Basilica in Rome in the fourth century CE (Fig. 14-27), the basic

principles were in use. The walls of St. Peter's were composed of columns and arches made of stone and brick, but the roof was wood. And notice the angled beams supporting the roof over the aisles. These are elementary forms of the **truss**, prefabricated versions of which most home-builders today use for the roofs of houses. One of the most rigid structural forms in architecture, the truss (Fig. 14-28) is a triangular framework that, because of its rigidity, can span much wider areas than a single wooden beam.

Wood-frame construction is, of course, the foundation of American domestic architecture, and it is




Fig. 14-27 Reconstruction drawing of Old St. Peter's Basilica, Rome, ca. 320–27.



Fig. 14-29 Charles Bulfinch, Harrison Gray Otis House, Boston, Massachusetts, 1795–96.

Photo courtesy of Historic New England.

versatile enough to accommodate a variety of styles. Compare, for instance, two residences built near the end of the eighteenth century, the Harrison Gray Otis House in Boston, Massachusetts (**Fig. 14-29**), and the Parlange Mansion, built on an indigo plantation north of Baton Rouge, Louisiana (**Fig. 14-30**). The Otis House was designed by Charles Bulfinch, America's

first native-born professional architect, and its simple, clearly articulated exterior brick-clad facade with its five window bays set a stylistic standard for the city. Brick was chosen to cover the wood-frame construction beneath to provide insulation and protection against New England's severe winter weather. The Parlange Mansion likewise uses brick, made in this case by the plantation's slaves. The upper floor rests above a half-buried brick basement with brick pillars supporting the open-air gallery which surrounds the second story. The walls, both inside and out, are plastered with a mixture of mud, sand, Spanish moss, and deer hair, and are painted white, providing cooling insulation in the hot and humid Louisiana summers. The upper level contains the main living quarters. Each room in the house, on both the upper and lower levels, opens onto the surrounding galleries, which serve as hallways for the house, protecting the inner rooms from direct sunlight.

Early in the twentieth century, wood-frame construction formed the basis of a widespread "bungalow" style of architecture, which has enjoyed a revival in the last decade and which is characterized by a gabled roof, overhanging eaves, exposed rafters and decorative brackets under the eaves, and a covered porch or veranda fronting the house (**Fig. 14-31**). It became popular when furniture designer Gustav Stickley



Fig. 14-30 Architect unknown, Mansion at Parlange Plantation, New Roads, Louisiana. ca. 1785–95.

© Philip Gould/Corbis.



Fig. 14-31 Christian Gladu, The Bungalow Company, *The Birch*, North Town Woods, Bainbridge Island, Washington, 1998.

Photo courtesy of Bungalow Company.

began publishing bungalow designs in his magazine *The Craftsman*. From the beginning, the bungalow was conceived as a form of domestic architecture available to everyone. Like Stickley's furniture, which he thought of as "made" for bungalows, it was democratic. It embodied, from Stickley's point of view, "that plainness which is beauty." The hand-hewn local materials—stone and shingles—employed in the construction tied the home to its natural environment. And so did its porches, which tied the interior to the world outside, and which, with their sturdy, wide-set pillars, bespoke functional solidity. By the late 1920s, as many as 100,000 stock plans had been sold by both national architectural companies and local lumber and building firms, and, across America, bungalows popped up everywhere. In the popular imagination, the word "bungalow" was synonymous with "quality."

Steel-and-Reinforced-Concrete Construction

It was in Chicago that frame construction began, and it was Chicago that most impressed C. R. Ashbee, a representative of the British National Trust, when he visited America in 1900: "Chicago is the only American city I have seen where something absolutely distinctive in the aesthetic handling of material has been

evolved out of the Industrial system." A young architect named Frank Lloyd Wright impressed him most, but it was Wright's mentor, Louis Sullivan, who was perhaps most responsible for the sense of vitality to which Ashbee was responding.

For Sullivan, the foremost problem that the modern architect had to address was how the building might transcend the "sinister" urban conditions out of which, of necessity, it had to rise. The development of steel construction techniques, combined with what Sullivan called "a system of ornament," offered him a way to mitigate the urban malaise. A fireproof steel skeletal frame, suggested by wood-frame construction, freed the wall of load-bearing duties and opened it both to ornament and to large numbers of exterior windows. The vertical emphasis of the building's exterior lines echoed the upward sweep of the steel skeleton. As a result, the exterior of the tall building no longer seemed massive; rather, it might rise with an almost organic lightness into the skies.

The building's real identity depended on the ornamentation that could now be freely distributed across its facade. Ornament was, according to Sullivan, "spirit." The inorganic, rigid, and geometric lines of the steel frame would flow, through the ornamental detail that covered it, into "graceful curves," and angularities would "disappear in a mystical blending of surface." Thus, at the top



Fig. 14-32 Louis H. Sullivan, Bayard-Condict Building, New York, 1897–98.

© Angelo Hornak/Corbis.



Fig. 14-33 Louis H. Sullivan, Bayard-Condict Building (detail), New York, 1897–98.

© Nathan Benn/Ottochrome/CORBIS.

of Sullivan's Bayard Building (Figs. 14-32 and 14-33)—a New York, rather than a Chicago, building—the vertical columns that rise between the windows blossom in an explosion of floral decoration.

Such ornamentation might seem to contradict completely the dictum for which Sullivan is most famous—"Form follows function." If the function of the urban building is to provide a well-lit and ventilated place in which to work, then the steel-frame structure and the abundance of windows on the building's facade make sense. But what about the ornamentation? How does it follow from the structure's function? Isn't it simply an example of purposeless excess?

Down through the twentieth century, Sullivan's original meaning has largely been forgotten. He was not promoting a notion of design akin to the sense of practical utility that can be discovered in, for instance, a Model T Ford. For Sullivan, "The function of all functions is the Infinite Creative Spirit," and this spirit could be revealed in the rhythm of growth and decay that we find in nature. Thus, the elaborate, organic forms that cover his buildings were intended to evoke the Infinite. For Sullivan, the primary function of a building was to elevate the spirit of those who worked in it.

Almost all of Sullivan's ornamental exuberance seems to have disappeared in the architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright, whom many consider the first truly modern architect. But from 1888 to 1893, Wright worked as chief draftsman in Sullivan's Chicago firm, and Sullivan's belief in the unity of design and nature can still be understood as instrumental in Wright's work. In an article written for the *Architectural Record* in 1908, Wright emphasized that "a sense of the organic is indispensable to an architect," and, as early as the 1890s, he was routinely "translating" the natural and the organic into what he called "the terms of building stone."

The ultimate expression of Wright's intentions is the so-called Prairie House, the most notable example of which is the Robie House in Chicago, designed in 1906 and built in 1909 (Figs. 14-34 and 14-35). Although the house is contemporary in feeling—with its wide overhanging roof extending out into space, its fluid, open interiors, and its rigidly geometric lines—it was, from Wright's point of view, purely "organic" in conception.



Fig. 14-34 Frank Lloyd Wright, Robie House, South Woodlawn, Chicago, Illinois, 1909.

Photo: Hedrich Blessing Photographers/Chicago Historical Society/ UIG via Getty Images.

Wright spoke of the Prairie House as being “of” the land, not “on” it, and the horizontal sweep of the roof and the open interior space reflect the flat expanses of the Midwestern prairie landscape. Alternatively, in a different environment, a house might reflect the cliffs of a Pennsylvania ravine (see *The Creative Process*, pp. 348–49). The **cantilever**, a horizontal form supported on one end and jutting out into space on the other, was made possible by newly invented steel-and-reinforced-concrete construction techniques. Under a cantilevered roof, one could be simultaneously outside and protected.

The roof thus ties together the interior space of the house and the natural world outside. Furthermore, the house itself was built of materials—brick, stone, and wood, especially oak—native to its surroundings.

The architectural innovations of Wright’s teacher, Louis Sullivan, led directly to the skyscraper. It is the sheer strength of steel that makes the modern skyscraper a reality. Structures with stone walls require thicker walls on the ground floor as they rise higher. A 16-story building, for instance, would require ground-floor walls approximately 6 feet thick. But the




Fig. 14-35 Frank Lloyd Wright, Plan of the Robie House, South Woodlawn, Chicago, Illinois, 1909.

The Creative Process

Thinking through Architecture: Frank Lloyd Wright's *Fallingwater*

Fallingwater (**Fig. 14-37**), Frank Lloyd Wright's name for the house he designed for Edgar and Lillian Kaufmann in 1935, is arguably the most famous modern house in the world. Edgar Kaufmann was owner of Kaufmann's Store in Pittsburgh, the largest readymade men's clothing store in the country, and his son had begun to study with Wright in 1934. In November of that year, Wright first visited the site. There are no known design drawings until the following September. Writing a few years before about his own design process, Wright stated that the architect should

conceive the building in the imagination, not on paper but in the mind, thoroughly—before touching paper. Let it live there—gradually taking more definite form before committing it to the draughting board. When the thing lives for you, start to plan it with tools. Not before. . . . It is best to cultivate the imagination to construct and complete the building before working on it with T-square and triangle.

The first drawings were done in two hours when Kaufmann made a surprise call to Wright and told him he was in the neighborhood and would like to see something. Using a different colored pencil for each of the house's three floors on the site plan, Wright completed not only a floor plan, but also a north-south cross-section and a view of the exterior from across the stream (**Fig. 14-36**). The drawings were remarkably close to the final house.

Wright thought of the house as entirely consistent with his earlier Prairie Houses. It was, like them, wedded to its site, only the site was markedly different. The reinforced-concrete cantilevers mirrored the natural cliffs of the hillside down and over which the stream, Bear Run, cascades. By the end of 1935, Wright had opened a quarry on the site to extract local stone for the house's construction.

Meanwhile, the radical style of the house had made Kaufmann nervous. He hired engineers to review Wright's plan, and they were doubtful that reinforced concrete could sustain




Fig. 14-36 Frank Lloyd Wright, Drawing for *Fallingwater*, Kaufmann House, Bear Run, Pennsylvania, 1936. Color pencil on tracing paper, 15 $\frac{3}{8}$ × 27 $\frac{1}{4}$ in. The Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation, Scottsdale, Arizona. Inv. 36.004. © 2015 Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation, Scottsdale, AZ//Artists Rights Society (ARS), New York.

the 18-foot cantilevers that Wright proposed. When Kaufmann sent the engineers' reports to Wright, Wright told him to return the plans to him "since he did not deserve the house." Kaufmann apologized for his lack of faith, and work on the house proceeded.

Still, the contractor and engineer didn't trust Wright's plans for reinforcing the concrete for the cantilevers, and before the first slab was poured, they put in nearly twice as much steel as Wright had called for. As a result, the main cantilever droops to this day. Wright was incensed that no one trusted his

calculations. After the first slab was set, but still heavily braced with wooden framing, Wright walked under the house and kicked a number of the wooden braces out.

The house, finally, is in complete harmony with its site. "I began to see a building," Wright wrote in 1936, as the house was nearing completion, "primarily . . . as a broad shelter in the open, related to vista; vista without and vista within. You may see in these various feelings, all taking the same direction, that I was born an American, child of the ground and of space."



Fig. 14-37 Frank Lloyd Wright, *Fallingwater*, Kaufmann House, Bear Run, Pennsylvania, 1936.

© 2015. Photo Art Resource/Scala, Florence.




Fig. 14-38 Le Corbusier, **Perspective drawing for the Domino Housing Project, 1914.** French Embassy.

© 2015 F.L.C./ADAGP, Paris/Artists Rights Society (ARS), New York.

steel cage, connected by floors made of **reinforced concrete**—concrete in which steel reinforcement bars, or **rebars**, are placed to both strengthen and make concrete less brittle—overcomes this necessity. The simplicity of the resulting structure can be seen clearly in French architect Le Corbusier’s 1914 drawing for the Domino Housing Project (**Fig. 14-38**). The design is almost infinitely expandable, both sideways and upward. Any combination of windows and walls can be hung on the frame. Internal divisions can be freely designed in an endless variety of ways, or, indeed, the space can be left entirely open. Even the stairwell can be moved to any location within the structural frame.

In 1932, Alfred H. Barr, Jr., a young curator at the Museum of Modern Art in New York City, who would later become one of the most influential historians of modern art, identified Le Corbusier as one of the founders of a new “International Style.” In the catalogue for the exhibition *Modern Architecture*, Barr wrote:

Slender steel posts and beams, and concrete reinforced by steel have made possible structures of skeleton-like strength and lightness. The modern architect working in the new style conceives of his building . . . as a skeleton enclosed by a thin light shell. He thinks in terms of volume—of space enclosed by planes and surfaces—as opposed to mass and solidity. This principle of volume leads him to make his walls seem thin flat surfaces by eliminating moldings and by making his windows and doors flush with the surface.

Taking advantage of the strength of concrete-and-steel construction, Le Corbusier lifted his houses on stilts (**Fig. 14-39**), thus creating, out of the heaviest of materials, a sense of lightness, even flight. The entire structure is composed of primary forms (that is, rectangles, circles, and so on). Writing in his first book, *Towards a New Architecture*, translated into English in 1925, Le Corbusier put it this way: “Primary forms are beautiful forms because they can be clearly appreciated.” “A house,” he said, “is a machine for living in!”—functional and precise, with no redundant parts.



Fig. 14-39 Le Corbusier and Pierre Jeanneret, **Villa Savoye, Poissy-sur-Seine, France, 1928–30.**

© 2015. White Images/Scala, Florence. Le Corbusier: © 2015 F.L.C./ADAGP, Paris/Artists Rights Society (ARS), New York. Pierre Jeanneret: © 2015 Artists Rights Society (ARS), New York/ADAGP, Paris.



Fig. 14-40 Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Farnsworth House, Fox River, Plano, Illinois, 1950.
akg-image/VIEW Pictures/Grant Smith.

For Barr, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe was the other great innovator of the International Style. His Farnsworth House (Fig. 14-40), which was built in 1950, opens itself to its surroundings. An homage to Le Corbusier's Villa Savoye, the house is virtually transparent—both opening itself out into the environment and inviting it in.

But the culmination of Le Corbusier's steel-and-reinforced-concrete Domino plan is the so-called International Style skyscraper, the most notable example of which is the Seagram Building in New York City (Fig. 14-41), a collaboration between Mies van der Rohe and Philip Johnson. In 1932, Johnson had written the foreword to Barr's *Modern Architecture* catalogue. The **International Style** is marked by its austere geometric simplicity, and the design solution presented by the Seagram Building is extremely elegant. The exposed structural I-beams (that is, steel beams that, seen in cross-section, look like the capital letter "I") are finished in bronze to match the amber-tinted glass sheath. At the base, these exterior beams drop, unsheathed, to the courtyard, creating an open-air steel colonnade around a recessed glass lobby. New York law requires that buildings must conform to a "setback" restriction: Buildings that at ground level occupy an entire site must stagger-step inward as they rise in order to avoid "walling-in" the city's inhabitants. But the Seagram Building occupies less than one-half its site; as a result, it is free to rise vertically out of the plaza at its base. At night, the lighted windows activate the building's exterior, and by day, the surface of the opaque glass reflects the changing world around the building.



Fig. 14-41 Ludwig Mies van der Rohe and Philip Johnson, Seagram Building, New York City, 1958.
© Andrew Gam.



Fig. 14-42 Eero Saarinen, TWA Terminal, John F. Kennedy International Airport, New York, 1962.

© 2011 Karen Johnson. All rights reserved.

Rejecting the International Style's emphasis on primary geometric forms, the architecture of Eero Saarinen demonstrates how steel-and-reinforced-concrete construction can be utilized in other ways. One of his most successful buildings is the TWA Terminal at Kennedy International Airport in New York (Figs. 14-42 and 14-43), designed in 1956 and completed after his death in 1961. It



Fig. 14-43 Eero Saarinen, TWA Terminal, John F. Kennedy International Airport, interior, New York, 1962.

© Angelo Hornak/Corbis.

is defined by a contrast between the openness provided by the broad expanses of window and the sculptural mass of the reinforced-concrete walls and roof. What results is a constant play of light and shadow throughout the space. The exterior—two huge concrete wings that appear to hover above the runways—is a symbolic rendering of flight.

Increasingly, contemporary architecture has largely become a question of creating distinctive buildings that stand out in the vast sameness of the “world metropolis,” the massive interconnected fabric of places where people “do business,” and among which they travel, the hubs (all served by airports) of today’s mobile society. It is also a question of creating buildings of distinction—contemporary architecture is highly competitive. Most major commissions are competitions, and most cities compete for the best, most distinctive architects.

The Asian city is particularly intriguing to post-modern architects because, much more than the American city, where, by and large, people don’t live where they work, Asian cities possess a much greater “mix” of functions and scales, tall buildings that rise in the midst of jumbled smaller structures that seem to change rapidly, almost from one day to the next. One of the most intriguing new projects in Asia is the work of the Rotterdam-based Office for Metropolitan Architecture (OMA), headed by Rem Koolhaas. Since 1995, Koolhaas has been a professor at Harvard University, where he is



Fig. 14-44 Rem Koolhaas and Ole Scheeren, OMA, New Headquarters, Central Chinese Television (CCTV), Beijing, China, 2008.

© Keren Su/Corbis. Photo courtesy of OMA/Ole Scheeren and Rem Koolhaas.

leading a series of research projects for Harvard's "Project on the City," a student-based research group whose recent projects include a study of five cities in the Pearl River Delta of China, and "Shopping," an analysis of the role of retail consumption in the contemporary city. His OMA firm's most recent work includes the new Museum of Modern Art extension in New York, the new Seattle Public Library, and Central China Television's headquarters (Fig. 14-44), completed for the Beijing Olympics in 2008. The CCTV tower is 750 feet high, an icon for the Olympics themselves. But, perhaps in keeping with the international spirit of the Games, it possesses many identities. As Koolhaas explained to an interviewer in 2008, just as the tower was coming to completion: "It looks different from every angle, no matter where you stand. Foreground and background are constantly shifting. We didn't create a single identity, but 400 identities. That was what we wanted: To create ambiguity and complexity, so as to escape the constraints of the explicit."

Probably no two countries in the world, however, have defined themselves more as centers of international architectural experimentation than Spain and the United Arab Emirates. Drawing on the talents of architects from around the world—to say nothing of the possibilities for design offered these architects by computer technologies—Spain has capitalized on the momentum

generated by the 1992 Olympics in Barcelona, which required a massive building effort, and the excitement generated by Frank Gehry's computer-designed Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao (see *The Creative Process*, pp. 354–55), completed in 1997. Jean Nouvel's Torre Agbar (Fig. 14-45), completed in 2005 in Barcelona, is just one example of the new innovative architecture that is erupting across the country. Thirty-one stories high, the bullet-shaped building is the centerpiece of a new commercial district planned by the city. The reinforced-concrete structure, crowned by a glass-and-steel dome, has a multicolored facade of aluminum panels, behind glass louvers, in 25 different colors. There are 4,400 windows and 56,619 transparent and translucent glass plates. The louvers are tilted at different angles calculated to deflect the direct sunlight. At night, 4,500 yellow, blue, pink, and red lights, placed over the facade, illuminate the entire tower.



Fig. 14-45 Ateliers Jean Nouvel with b720 Arquitectos, Torre Agbar, Barcelona, 2005. Lighting design by Yann Kersalé.

Photo: Roland Halbe.

The Creative Process

Discovering Where to Go: Frank Gehry's Guggenheim Museum Bilbao

Just as I. M. Pei's expansion of the Louvre, with its glass pyramid, was designed to revitalize the French capital itself, in the 1990s American architect Frank Gehry's design for the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao (**Fig. 14-47**) was a project conceived as part of a plan to reinvigorate the Basque fishing port and industrial city of Bilbao in northern Spain. Set along the riverfront, at the site of an old dock and warehouse, it is linked to the downtown historic district across the river (itself largely a pedestrian zone) by a footbridge designed by Santiago Calatrava (see Fig. 14-55), completed the same year




Fig. 14-46 Frank Gehry, Guggenheim Museum Bilbao, North Elevation, October 1991. Sketch by Frank Gehry.
© Gehry Partners, LLP.

as the museum, and known as the Zubizuri (Basque for “white bridge”). The museum itself is enormous—260,000 square feet, including 19 gallery spaces connected by ramps and metal bridges. It is covered in titanium, a material chosen because it reflects light with stunning clarity. Thus, at night it seems gilded in gold, by day it is silvery, and at noon virtually translucent.

Gehry's early drawings of the north, riverfront facade for the museum (**Fig. 14-46**), executed only three months after he had won the competition to design the building in 1991, reveal his process of searching for the form his buildings eventually take. “I start drawing sometimes,” Gehry has said,

not knowing where it is going. I use familiar strokes that evolve into the building. Sometimes it seems directionless, not going anywhere for sure. It's like feeling your way along in the dark, anticipating that something will come out usually. I become voyeur of my own thoughts as they develop, and wander about them. Sometimes I say “boy, here it is, here it is, it's coming.” I understand it, I get all excited.

His semi-automatic “doodles,” then, result in explorations that are surprisingly close to Gehry's finished building. They anticipate the fluidity of its lines, the flowing movement of the building along the riverfront space.



Fig. 14-47 Frank Gehry, Guggenheim Museum Bilbao, 1997.
© Jose Fusta Raga/Corbis.

Gehry moves quickly from such sketches to actual scale models. The models, for Gehry, are like sculpture: “You forget about it as architecture, because you’re focused on this sculpting process.” The models, finally, are transformed into actual buildings by means of CATIA, a computer program originally developed for the French aerospace industry (**Fig. 14-48**). And it turns out that the digital design models produced by the CATIA program were not only useful for envisioning the shapes of “sculpted” buildings. The data produced by such

computerized designs was also critical in estimating construction costs and budgets. The program demonstrated to builders, contractors—and the client—that Gehry’s plan was not only buildable, but affordably so.

Gehry’s design for the Guggenheim in Bilbao was stunningly successful, drawing rave reviews, massive numbers of visitors, and even the critical reservation that the architecture was so noteworthy that it overshadowed the art within the structure.




Fig. 14-48 Frank Gehry, Guggenheim Museum Bilbao, ca. 1994.
© Gehry Partners, LLP.

Dubai, in the United Arab Emirates, is the most rapidly growing city in the world, so much so that, in 2008, Rem Koolhaas was commissioned by a Dubai-based developer to propose a 1.5-billion-square-foot Waterfront City that would approximate the density of Manhattan on an artificial island surrounded by water from the Persian Gulf channeled into canals dug out of the desert. Koolhaas has conceived of the island as a perfect square, with the tallest towers concentrated along its southern edge to shield the interior blocks from the hot desert sun.

Koolhaas’s extravagant project is in keeping with the architectural ambitions of Dubai itself. As of 2012 the city boasted 911 completed high-rise buildings, 18 of which top out at over 984 feet (300 meters), more than any other city in the world. The tallest of these—indeed, the tallest freestanding structure in the world at 2,684 feet (more than twice as high as the Empire State Building)—is the Burj Khalifa (**Fig. 14-49**). *Burj* is Arabic for “tower,” and this tower is the centerpiece of yet another real-estate



Fig. 14-49 Adrian Smith, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, Burj Khalifa, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, 2010.

© Blaine Harrington III/Corbis.



Fig. 14-50 Tom Wills-Wright, Burj Al-Arab, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, 1999.

© Tim Griffith/Arcaid/Corbis.

development that will include 30,000 homes, 9 hotels, over 7 acres of parkland, at least 19 residential towers, the Dubai Mall, and a 30-acre manmade lake. Designed by Adrian Smith of the New York architecture firm Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, the structure opened in January 2010.

But perhaps the gem of Dubai is the Burj Al-Arab (**Fig. 14-50**), a luxury hotel perched on its own island like some enormous wind-filled sail in the blue waters of the Persian Gulf. Designed by British architect Tom Wills-Wright, the hotel rises some 1,053 feet over the Gulf. Its main lobby rises over 500 feet, high enough to accommodate the Statue of Liberty. Essentially a glass tower, its windows are covered by a double-knit Teflon fabric that reflects over 70 percent of the light and heat from the outside. A round cantilevered helipad, which also serves as the world's highest tennis court, extends off the front of the building from the twenty-eighth floor.

Community Life

How does the idea of community serve as a driving force in architecture?

However much we might respect a building like Mies van der Rohe and Philip Johnson's Seagram Building (see Fig. 14-41), the dark uniformity of its gridlike facade, in the hands of less skillful architects, came to represent,

for many, the impersonality and anonymity of urban life. The skyscraper became, by the 1960s, the embodiment of conformity and mediocrity in the modern world. Rather than a symbol of community, it became a symbol of human anonymity and loneliness.

Nevertheless, the idea of community remains a driving impulse in American architecture and design. Richard Meier's Atheneum (**Fig. 14-51**), in New Harmony, Indiana, is a tribute to this spirit. New Harmony is the site of two of America's great utopian communities. The first, Harmony on the Wabash (1814–24), was founded by the Harmony Society, a group of Separatists from the German Lutheran Church. In 1825, Robert Owen, a Welsh-born industrialist and social philosopher, bought their Indiana town and the surrounding lands for his own utopian experiment. Owen's ambition was to create a more perfect society through free education and the abolition of social classes and personal wealth. World-renowned scientists and educators settled in New Harmony. With the help of William Maclure, the Scottish geologist and businessman, they introduced vocational education, kindergarten, and other educational reforms.

Meier's Atheneum serves as the Visitors Center and introduction to historic New Harmony. It is a building oriented, on the one hand, to the orderly grid of New Harmony itself, and, on the other, to the Wabash River, which swings at an angle to the city. Thus, the angular wall that the visitor sees on first approaching the building points to the river, and the uncontrollable forces of nature. The glass walls and the vistas they provide serve to connect the visitor to the surrounding landscape. But overall, the building's formal structure recalls Le Corbusier's Villa Savoye (see Fig. 14-39) and the International Style as a whole. It is this tension between man and nature upon which all "harmony" depends.

Since the middle of the nineteenth century, there have been numerous attempts to incorporate the natural world into the urban context. New York's Central Park (**Fig. 14-52**), designed by Frederick Law Olmsted and Calvert Vaux after the city of New York acquired the 840-acre tract of land in 1856, is an attempt to put city-dwelling humans back in touch with their roots in nature. Olmsted developed a system of paths, fields, and wooded areas modeled after the eighteenth-century gardens of English country estates. These estate gardens appeared wholly natural, but they were in actuality extremely artificial, with manmade lakes, carefully planted forests, landscaped meadows, meandering paths, and fake Greek ruins.

Olmsted favored a park similarly conceived, with, in his words, "gracefully curved lines, generous spaces, and the absence of sharp corners, the idea being to suggest and imply leisure, contemplativeness and happy tranquility." In such places, the rational eighteenth-century



Fig. 14-51 Richard Meier, Atheneum, New Harmony, Indiana, 1979.
Digital imaging project.
Photo © Mary Ann Sullivan.



Fig. 14-52 Frederick Law Olmsted and Calvert Vaux, Central Park, New York City, 1857–87.
© Ball Miwako/Alamy.

mind had sought refuge from the trials of daily life. Likewise, in Central Park, Olmsted imagined the city dweller escaping the rush of urban life. “At every center of commerce,” he wrote, “more and more business tends to come under each roof, and, in the progress of building, walls are carried higher and higher, and deeper and deeper, so that now ‘vertical railways’ [elevators] are coming in vogue.” For Olmsted, both the city itself and Neoclassical Greek and Roman architectural features in the English garden offer geometries—emblems of reason and practicality—to which the “gracefully curved” lines of the park and garden stand in counterpoint.

Suburbia

So successful was Olmsted’s plan for Central Park that he was subsequently commissioned to design many other parks, including South Park in Chicago and the parkway system of the City of Boston, Mont Royal in Montreal, and the grounds at Stanford University and the University of California at Berkeley. But he perhaps showed the most foresight in his belief that the increasing density of the city demanded the growth of what would later become known as the suburb, a residential community lying outside but within commuting distance of the city. “When not engaged in business,” Olmsted wrote, the worker

has no occasion to be near his working place, but demands arrangements of a wholly different character. Families require to settle in certain localities which minister to their social and other wants, and yet are not willing to accept the conditions of town-life . . . but demand as much of the luxuries of free air, space, and abundant vegetation as, without loss of town-privileges, they can be enabled to secure.

As early as 1869, Olmsted laid out a general plan for the city of Riverside, Illinois, one of the first suburbs of Chicago (Fig. 14-53), which was situated along the Des Plaines River. The plan incorporated the railroad as the principal form of transportation into the city. Olmsted strived to create a communal spirit by subdividing the site into small “village” areas linked by drives and walks, all situated near common areas that were intended to have “the character of informal village greens, commons, and playgrounds.”

Together with Forest Hills in New York, Llewellyn Park in New Jersey, and Lake Forest, also outside of Chicago, Olmsted’s design for Riverside set the standard

for suburban development in America. The pace of that development was steady but slow until the 1920s, when suburbia exploded. During that decade, the suburbs grew twice as fast as the central cities. Beverly Hills in Los Angeles grew by 2,500 percent, and Shaker Heights outside of Cleveland by 1,000 percent. The Great Depression and World War II slowed growth temporarily, but, by 1950, the suburbs were growing at a rate ten times faster than the cities. Between 1950 and 1960, American cities grew by 6 million people or 11.6 percent. In that same decade, the suburban population grew by 19 million, a rate of 45.6 percent. And, for the first time, some cities actually began to lose population: The populations of both Boston and St. Louis declined by 13 percent.

There were two great consequences of this suburban emigration: First, the development of the highway system, aided as well by the rise of the automobile as the primary means of transportation; and, second, the collapse of the financial base of the urban center itself. As early as 1930, there were 800,000 automobiles in Los Angeles—two for every five people—and the city quite consciously decided not to spend public monies on mass transit but to support instead a giant freeway system (Fig. 14-54). The freeways essentially overlaid the rectilinear grid of the city’s streets with continuous, streamlined ribbons of highway. Similarly, in 1940, Pennsylvania opened a turnpike that ran the length of the state. Public enthusiasm was enormous, and traffic volume far exceeded expectations. That same year, the first stretches of the Pasadena Freeway opened. Today




Fig. 14-53 Olmsted, Vaux & Co., General plan of Riverside, Illinois, 1869.

Courtesy of United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Frederick Law Olmsted National Historic Site.



Fig. 14-54 Los Angeles Freeway Interchange.

© Chad Ehlers/Alamy.

it is estimated that roads and parking spaces for cars occupy between 60 and 70 percent of the total land area of Los Angeles.

Infrastructure

However, not only automobiles but also money—the wealth of the middle class—drove down these highways, out of the core city and into the burgeoning suburbs. The cities were faced with discouraging and destructive urban decline. Most discouraging of all was the demise of the **infrastructure**, the systems that deliver services to people—water supply and waste removal, energy, transportation, and communications. The infrastructure is what determines the quality of city life. If we think about many of the works of art we have studied in this chapter, we can recognize that they were initially conceived as part of the infrastructure of their communities. For example, the Pont du Gard (see Fig. 14-13) is a water-supply aqueduct. Public buildings such as temples, churches, and cathedrals provide places for people to congregate. Even skyscrapers are integral parts of the urban infrastructure, providing centralized places for people to work. As the infrastructure collapses, businesses close down, industries relocate, the built environment deteriorates rapidly, and even social upheaval can follow. To this day, downtown Detroit has never recovered from the 1967 riots and the subsequent loss of jobs in

the auto industry in the mid-1970s. Block after block of buildings that once housed thriving businesses lie decayed and unused.

Perhaps one of the most devastating assaults on a city's infrastructure occurred on September 11, 2001, when terrorists brought down the twin towers of the World Trade Center in New York City. Almost immediately after the tragedy, plans were put in place to rebuild the site at Ground Zero, highlighted by an architectural competition. Problems of urban planning were paramount. Transportation issues involving the city's street and subway systems vied with retail, office, and other commercial interests for consideration. But all designs had to address the heavy weight of the site's symbolic significance—the memory of the World Trade Center itself and the people who had worked there.

One of the most successful designs submitted for the site is by Spanish architect Santiago Calatrava. His plan for the Port Authority Trans Hudson (PATH) train station (**Fig. 14-55**) is based on a sketch that he drew of a child's hands releasing a bird into the air. Calatrava said that the goal of his design was to “use light as a construction material.” At ground level, the station's steel, concrete, and glass canopy functions as a skylight that allows daylight to penetrate 60 feet to the tracks below. On nice days, the canopy's roof retracts to create a dome of sky above the station. A total of 14 subway lines will be accessible from the station, and it will also connect to ferry services and airport transportation. The Port Authority sees it as the centerpiece of a new regional transportation infrastructure designed to rejuvenate lower Manhattan.



Fig. 14-55 Santiago Calatrava, Port Authority Trans Hudson (PATH) station, World Trade Center site, 2004. Digital three-dimensional model.

© 2015 Santiago Calatrava / Artists Rights Society (ARS), New York/VEGAP, Madrid.

THE CRITICAL PROCESS

Thinking about Architecture




Fig. 14-56 Multistory apartment block, Taos Pueblo, New Mexico, originally built 1000–1450.

© Karl Weatherly/Corbis.

Perhaps because developments in architecture are so closely tied to advances in technology, this chapter is exceptionally historical in emphasis, moving as it does from rudimentary post-and-lintel construction to advanced architectural accomplishments made possible by both computer technologies and the ability of architects themselves to move physically and communicate virtually on a global scale.

That said, it must be admitted, as the saying goes, that the more things change, the more things stay the same. The need of humans to dwell in suitable habitats and their desire to congregate in livable communities are timeless impulses. Consider, for instance, a kind of dwelling that has survived from prehistoric times to the present, the apartment block. By 7000 BCE, across the Middle East, houses consisting of mud brick and timber stood side by side with abutting walls, often terraced in ways that probably resembled the Native American pueblos of the American Southwest. The main parts

of the Taos Pueblo (**Fig. 14-56**) were most likely constructed between 1000 and 1450, and look today much as they did when Spanish explorers and missionaries first arrived in the area in the sixteenth century. The Pueblo is divided into two apartment blocks, which rise on either side of a vast dance plaza bisected by a stream. The Pueblo's walls, which are several feet thick, are made of adobe, a mixture of earth, water, and straw formed into sun-dried mud bricks. The roofs are supported by large wooden beams which are topped by smaller pieces of wood, and the whole roof is then covered with packed dirt.

Each of the five stories is set back from the one below, thus forming terraces that serve as patios and viewing areas for ceremonial activities in the dance plaza below.

Taos Pueblo has much in common with Israeli architect Moshe Safdie's Habitat (**Fig. 14-57**), designed as an experimental housing project for Expo 67, the Montreal World's Fair, but today still serving a community of content residents,



Fig. 14-57 Moshe Safdie, Habitat, Montreal, Canada, 1967.

© Michael Harding/Arcaid/Corbis.

most of whom think of themselves as living in Montreal's "most prestigious apartment building." Safdie's design is based on modular prefabricated concrete blocks stacked in what Safdie called "confused order" and connected by internal steel cables. Safdie used 354 uniform blocks to make up 158 apartments of from one to four bedrooms. Each apartment has an outdoor living space, generally on the roof of

the apartment directly below. The stacks are arranged to maximize privacy, access to views of the St. Lawrence River, and protection from the weather.

In what ways does Safdie's design evoke Southwest Native American pueblos? How does it differ? In what ways is Safdie's design reminiscent of Le Corbusier's Domino Housing Project (see Fig. 14-38)? How does it differ?

Thinking Back

14.1 Describe the relationship between architecture and its environment.

The designs of many buildings reflect the climatic conditions of their environments. Why did the houses of Mulberry Plantation have steeply pitched roofs? How do Anasazi cliff dwellings reflect the Anasazi culture?

Environmental concerns have provoked a new "green" architecture. Green architecture is defined by its environmentally friendly and sustainable approach to building. Its principles include smaller buildings, integration and compatibility with the natural environment, energy efficiency, and the employment of recycled, reusable, and sustainable materials. How is the prospect of climate change affecting urban architecture?

14.2 Outline the architectural technologies that predate the modern era.

The simplest method of making a building is to make the walls load-bearing by stacking any material—stones, bricks, mud, and straw—right up to roof level. Just a step more sophisticated is post-and-lintel construction, which is fundamental to all Greek architecture. Why are the columns—or posts—in Greek temples placed so closely together?

The relationship between the units of a Greek temple is known as its order. Columns in the Doric order are the plainest, while those of the Ionic order have a distinctive scroll, and those in the Corinthian order are decorated with stylized acanthus leaves. What is an elevation? What is entasis?

The ancient Romans developed the arch, an innovation in which wedge-shaped voussoirs were cut to fit into a semicircular form, which was locked by a keystone at the top. The arch revolutionized the built environment, allowing the Romans to span much larger spaces than post-and-lintel construction would allow. What is a barrel vault, or tunnel vault? How are groin vaults created?

14.3 Describe the technological advances that have contributed to modern and contemporary architecture.

The sheer strength of steel was a major enabling factor in skyscraper construction, as it dispensed with the need for the thick walls required in the lower levels of stone buildings. Reinforced concrete (concrete with steel bars embedded) significantly promoted strength in skyscrapers. What is a cantilever? What characterizes the International Style?

14.4 Describe how the idea of community serves as a driving force in architecture.

The idea of community has spawned such utopian communities as New Harmony, Indiana. How does Richard Meier's Atheneum reflect that spirit? What was the driving force behind New York's Central Park, and how is that park related to the rise of the suburb? How has the idea of community been affected by the decline of the urban infrastructure?