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On Paper, It All Makes Sense

The National Building Museum’s latest exhibition, *David Macaulay: The Art of Drawing Architecture*, is the springboard for the theme of this issue of *Blueprints*. Macaulay has consistently used drawing as a tool for telling stories—not just about the history and technology of buildings themselves, but also about the people who create and use those buildings. As the major features in this issue demonstrate, there is often much more to architectural drawings than meets the eye.

From the Executive Director

Adding to Your Collection

In 2001, in conjunction with an exhibition on the work of Cesar Pelli, the National Building Museum invited the architect to create a special drawing of our historic structure to be reproduced in limited numbers and sold through the Museum Shop. Cesar graciously accepted the invitation, and soon created a colorful and distinctive rendering of the building’s main façade. The high-quality prints made from this original were a big hit, and sold out very quickly.

Given the success of Cesar’s drawing, I thought, why not turn this idea into a new tradition?

Toward that end, I am pleased to announce that Antoine Predock, recipient of the AIA Gold Medal for 2006, has created the second of what we expect will become an ongoing series of original drawings commissioned by the Museum. Antoine has spoken at the National Building Museum several times, and his work has been featured in our exhibitions. He draws beautifully and evocatively, and I immediately thought of him as an ideal choice to produce a new drawing for us—and for you, the Museum’s members and friends.

As expected, Antoine’s finished drawing, showing a view of the Great Hall, is stunning. We expect limited-edition prints of the drawing to go on sale in the Museum Shop on [DATE?]. Check our website or visit the shop for more information as that date approaches.

Our sincere thanks to both Antoine Predock and Dale Chihuly for their generosity!

Sincerely,

Chase W. Rynd
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Drawing of the Great Hall. © Antoine Predock.
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In another development, famed glass artist Dale Chihuly has offered to donate one of his signature sculptures to the Museum for the purpose of raffling it off to raise funds for the exhibition *David Macaulay: The Art of Drawing Architecture*. Dale was inspired to make the donation because he and David are both graduates of the Rhode Island School of Design. The piece is valued at $20,000 and raffle tickets are available for $100 each. For more information, contact Melissa Slaughter at 202.272.2448, ext. 3200 or mslaughter@nbm.org.

Our sincere thanks to both Antoine Predock and Dale Chihuly for their generosity!
The Art of Drawing Architecture
In an interview with guest curator Kathleen Franz, David Macaulay talks about the accidental genesis of his fabled career as an architectural illustrator and explains the process behind his popular books.

The Tell-Tale Drawing
Architect and scholar Marco Frascari discusses the sometimes hidden meanings of drawings and what they reveal about those who drew them.

Seeing by Drawing: A Pictorial Essay
Most architectural drawings are intended as straightforward depictions of existing or proposed buildings. Others, however, serve primarily as vehicles for visual analysis and the exploration of imaginary environments. This pictorial essay offers a sampling of historic and contemporary drawings that go well beyond direct representation.

Collections Corner
Drawings from the Northwestern Terra Cotta Collection hold the “key.”

Museum News: Creative Partnerships
Reports on a few of the exciting Museum programs and initiatives made possible by strategic collaboration with other organizations.

Museum Support
• Profile of a loyal donor.
• List of recent donors—with thanks!

Mystery Building
“Clock Watch.”

The Way Things Work Game.
Why do things work the way they do?

Why does a car move faster when going down a steep hill? How do machines move heavy loads? With The Way Things Work, a game based on David Macaulay’s best-selling book of the same title, children, 10 and up, learn to solve these and other mechanical problems as they play. Featuring hands-on activities and chock full of engaging materials for curious kids, this game of science and engineering combines physical experimentation with a board game, allowing children to discover the workings of gears, levers, fulcrums, ramps, scales, and other simple machines.

$22.50 Museum members / $25.00 nonmembers. Visit the Museum Shop during Museum hours or call 202.272.7706.

The National Building Museum explores the world we build for ourselves—from our homes, skyscrapers, and public buildings to our parks, bridges, and cities. Through exhibitions, education programs, and publications, the Museum seeks to educate the public about achievements in architecture, design, engineering, urban planning, and construction.

The Museum is supported by contributions from individuals, corporations, foundations, associations, and public agencies.
An Interview with David Macaulay

by Kathleen Franz

Kathleen Franz is guest curator of David Macaulay: The Art of Drawing Architecture. She is assistant professor and director of public history in the Department of History at American University.

Since 1973, David Macaulay has delighted readers with his accessible and often humorous illustrated stories of architecture and engineering history. Author of more than 20 books, Macaulay has won numerous awards for his unique visual narratives, including a Caldecott Medal for Black and White (1991). In 2006, he was awarded the prestigious MacArthur Fellowship for his “exceptional creativity.”

Macaulay’s work defies simple classification, occupying the creative intersections between illustration and architecture, history and archeology, storytelling and criticism. His most recent architecture book, Mosque (2003), treats readers to unexpected and often breathtaking views of a fictional sixteenth-century landmark. Macaulay not only explains the construction of a classical Ottoman mosque, but also engages the reader through a historical narrative and stunning illustrations.

Dedicated to pen and ink, rather than computer programs, Macaulay argues that hand drawing is a tool for enhancing visual literacy, promoting careful observation, curiosity, and recognition of the complexity of everyday things. He uses drawing to deconstruct buildings and other large-scale structures, to render city streets transparent, to take readers below the surface of things, and to explain the invisible workings of the built world.

The National Building Museum’s current exhibition, David Macaulay: The Art of Drawing Architecture [on view through January 21, 2008], examines the artist’s creative process as a form of visual archeology—a metaphor for excavating past architectural practice through drawing. Featuring a substantial number of sketches, sketchbooks, and finished drawings, the exhibition explores Macaulay’s use of drawing as an integral part of his process for researching, recording, and explaining architecture.

In conjunction with the exhibition, I recently discussed Macaulay’s work with him.
Kathleen Franz: You describe yourself as an explainer of things. How so?

David Macaulay: Well, it’s what I ended up doing. I don’t think it was my intent from the beginning at all. But as I was steered into architecture books, I realized that I was making architecture—old and new—accessible through drawings. To make architecture accessible, you have to offer a fairly full explanation of how things come about, why things end up looking the way they do, why we feel the way we do about certain pieces of architecture. It meant figuring out how to [identify] those things that really needed to be explained, that were essential to understanding the process and the finished form, and then making the buildings come alive somehow. So, yes, as a teacher either in book form or in the classroom, I’m always explaining.

Franz: How were you steered into doing architecture books?

Macaulay: I realized after graduating from architecture school that I wanted to illustrate books. . . but [not] about architecture. I had a quite different direction planned—a much more playful, fantastic career of purely imaginative picture books. And the first idea that had any kind of merit was a story about gargoyles set in the Middle Ages. It looked to me like people in the children’s book world were having a good time. I thought I wanted to be part of that group, but I didn’t know much about anything other than what I had learned in architecture school. So, there was a natural tendency for me to move towards something that I felt some kind of kinship with.

Franz: So your work marries architecture to storytelling?

Macaulay: Right. In retrospect it doesn’t seem surprising. I set a story in a medieval town where a cathedral was being built so I would have these background images and it would [provide] a reason for gargoyles to be carved. So, what my editor, Walter Lorraine [at Houghton Mifflin], did was very adroitly suggest that I forget the gargoyles and concentrate on the building because what he saw in those background scenes was something that he had not seen anyone trying to do. And he thought it would be much more interesting to have a children’s story about architecture than one about gargoyles.

Franz: What drew you to architecture school in the first place?

Macaulay: When you’re a junior in high school and know almost nothing and they tell you that pretty soon you’re going to have to go somewhere else and, in theory, you should be thinking about the rest of your life, your career…. I was in Cumberland, Rhode Island, 20 minutes from the Rhode Island School of Design. So I thought, as someone who had always drawn and was curious about how things were made, it seemed sensible to study architecture. I got accepted and I went off to study architecture, [but] by my fourth year I knew I didn’t want to be an architect.

Franz: Why not?

Macaulay: Well, there was a formal apprenticeship that followed graduation; you worked in an office with a bunch of people. How frequently you actually got a chance to work on something really interesting would be the big issue. I decided I wanted to work on some-
thing more personal. So once I graduated, I did a bunch of stuff: I taught art in public school and I did some freelance illustration work and began to think more about this book idea. And then there I was, three years later in 1973, with the publication of the book Cathedral, coming back to architecture.

Franz: When you draw, you are rebuilding the building on the page.

Macaulay: Absolutely. From the very first presentation I made, when I was sidetracked by what I knew would be a classic story of gargoyles, the first thing I did was go back and start re-reading some of my architecture books. Then I made a set of drawings on tracing paper that started with nothing—just a site. In fact, I started with a story of a town, with an old church that had burned down. Then I drew as if I was recording a process that was actually happening out my window.

It’s sort of like stop-motion photography. The thing that makes it interesting and engaging is that you don’t always put the camera in the same place. The reader is being shown what it feels like to be part of the process of putting the building together.
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create a kind of phony art history book and I drew them pompously and I did all the cross-hatching and all that sort of stuff to give them a sort of integrity, but underneath it all was just total nonsense. I really love working those two things together, make it look serious, with plate numbers, sketch numbers, notes at the back—I mean, really turn it on its head and making the images themselves undercut the seriousness of the overall appearance.

Franz: Was Great Moments a pastiche of the 18th-century draftsman Giovanni Battista Piranesi?

Macauly: Oh yes, absolutely. The space and the volume and whatnot in Piranesi’s images is so fantastic and part of my desire in making those drawings with all the pen and ink and the cross etching was to do some of that kind of Piranesi stuff, and create some big spaces and turn relatively modest structures into imposing ruins.

Franz: A strong archeological thread runs through all of your work. Is this just fun for you, or is it also a way to critique architecture?

Macauly: I think it’s mostly fun. [For example, the book called] Unbuilding was a way of presenting architecture that was a little different. I didn’t want to build another building from the ground up. So I thought, well, just take it apart. It’s the first [of my subjects] that was a real building. It’s the first time I actually did have to pay attention to people’s names and dates and things of that nature. But with the archeology, I just always thought that was really fun—discovering things, and then having to figure out what the connection is between them because there’s no one there to tell you anymore. [In Motel of the Mysteries], I just thought it would be kind of playful to take something that we could look at now, and then seeing how somebody at some distant time might misinterpret and misrepresent it.

We take all that stuff for granted and once things are presented to us in so-called history books written by scholars, we assume this must be the truth. And I think it’s always wise to be a little skeptical and be willing to ask questions. How did they know that? Why did they decide that? Why did they call it sacred?

Franz: After drawing for some 30 years are there still challenges for you?

Macauly: Oh man, that doesn’t change. I mean the books take me longer now than ever because I think I’m more demanding—I have higher expectations. On the good side I think I’m getting better at it but I’m not getting faster. So the projects take longer and longer. It’s supposed to work the other way, isn’t it?

Franz: Your next book is on the human body. Will it be similar to the architecture books?

Macauly: Well it is bound to be similar in certain ways. But in the end it’s about how we work. We start with cells and then move into circulation and respiration and then digestion and then into the brain, which is a long section. I started it because I felt completely ignorant of the subject. I’m getting older and things will start breaking down. I’m going to start feeling a little more pain here or there. But where is it coming from? And why? And how? So I was sort of driven by my realization of my own happy ignorance.

It has been the hardest thing I’ve ever done. The level of complexity here is way beyond anything I’ve tackled in the past. Now maybe that’s why the books are taking longer because I’m open to those kinds of things now.

Franz: Will you write a book on your own creative process?

Macauly: I think it has to be done by somebody else if there is to be one, but every one of my books is about my creative process in a way.

Franz: But now you can rest on your laurels ….

Macauly: I can’t find my laurels.

Franz: What about the MacArthur award?

Macauly: Well the interesting thing about the MacArthur is that it gives you a chance to do something that you’ve always wanted to. I can’t think of anything I would rather do than what I’m doing. The MacArthur has allowed me to relax a little bit on the body book, not have to crank it out to meet some kind of artificial deadline. That’s what the MacArthur has done for me, which is an extraordinary gift.

David Macaulay: The Art of Drawing Architecture is made possible by American Society of Civil Engineers; Skidmore, Owings & Merrill LLP; Dale Chihuly; Lamy writing instruments; Beyer Blinder Belle Architects & Planners, LLP; Edward W. Rose III Family Fund of The Dallas Foundation; STUDIOS Architecture; Turner Construction Company; Blick Art Materials; Sunrise Foundation; The American Architectural Foundation; and other generous contributors.
Martin Moeller: How did you become interested in the theoretical implications of architectural drawing?

Marco Frascari: It started when I was working with Carlo Scarpa and seeing how he used drawing as a form of communication with both students and outsiders. His drawings were performances.

Scarpa probably had synesthesia [an unusual condition in which normally distinct senses or perceptions overlap—e.g., the association of a particular flavor with a specific color, or of a certain sound with an abstract shape]. For him, the purpose of a drawing was not just to depict what any human could see, but somehow to convey the totality of what we feel. Students in his class would make drawings in which, of course, the trees were green and the bricks were red, and so on. But Scarpa did not like this. He was not interested in a drawing as a representation of a real building; for him, the drawing should express some essence—some perceptual presence of an architectural idea—rather than just pretending to be a photographic substitute.
I did not understand all this at the time. Later, when I discovered synesthesia and its implications for design, I learned that all children are synesthetic, but we lose it just by growing up. Consequently, architects have to rediscover these child-like qualities and, by using drawing, have to perceive all dimensions, because we design buildings for totality—acoustics, smells, and so on are all part of the architectural design. What a drawing can do, by color or by manipulation of ink, is to achieve for the architect not only a visual rendering, but also an understanding of other perceptions that you don’t visualize.

Moeller: Did such complex drawing techniques carry through to Scarpa’s actual construction documents?

Frascari: You had to produce some credible drawings in order to bill the client. Scarpa would sometimes start a project by saying, “I have to have a door like this,” even before deciding on the basic design of the building. Well, if you have a client who is expecting a house, you can’t just show a sketch of a beautiful door and expect to get paid. Scarpa often did not bill until the end of the project, because it was not until then that he actually had something real to show.

Moeller: How did your study of architectural drawing proceed beyond Scarpa?

Frascari: I became interested in understanding the full potential of drawing. There was one amazing set of drawings that captured my eye early. It was done in 1590, in Venice, by Giovanni Antonio Rusconi. He created unique drawings showing the process of construction of a particular building in different phases and at different moments. The idea was borrowed from Vessalius’s famous anatomical drawings of that period. Rusconi gives the viewer a very peculiar understanding of the structure because he can show what is not visible in the finished building.

There was also Mario Ridolfi, who was a very good friend of Scarpa. He did many drawings on tracing paper, but he used both sides of the paper. Unlike Scarpa, Ridolfi was an ink pen guy—his fingers were always covered with ink. He had an ability of sketching that was very close to the process of making a building.

“If I want to see things, I do not trust anything else. I put them in front of me, here on paper, to be able to see them. I want to see, and for this I draw. I can see an image only if I draw it.” — Carlo Scarpa

Moeller: You talk about Scarpa, Rusconi, Ridolfi. As an Italian you may be biased, but do you think the concept of drawing as an analytical tool is a peculiarly Italian phenomenon?

Frascari: There is a particular tradition of analytical drawing in Italy. Contrary to what you might expect, this was even evident well before the Renaissance. Of course, the major achievements in drawing in the Gothic period were all French and German, and there were relatively few from Italy, but the Italian ones, rather than showing the finished building, tended to show the construction process. The scaffolding used to build the structures, for instance, often would appear on the drawings. The character of the drawings themselves actually suggested a building under construction.

As for why this tradition might be so closely associated with Italy, I think there may be a linguistic explanation. The word “design” comes from the Italian word disegno, and you might assume that that word derived from Latin, but in Latin there was no such word. Rather, the Italian word slowly arose within the field of architecture—not the other fine arts—and it was related to what was called “designa-
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tion” (disegnare equals designare). If you think about it, the designer is the one who “designates” where things go. In the pre-Renaissance era, one might draw a “plan” of a building by putting poles in spots “designating” the corners of the actual structure to be built. “Design” was much more broadly understood to be a craft—an ongoing and circular process—than it is now, when it is generally associated with a finished object that may be regarded as a work of art. Gradually, the modern sense of the word emerged, and became understood as l’arte del disegno—the art of design.

Frascari: You have written about the idea of “the well-tempered drawing,” alluding to Johann Sebastian Bach’s collection of musical compositions titled The Well-Tempered Clavier. What do you mean by that term with respect to drawings?

Frascari: The phrase “well-tempered” has to do with word “temperature.” In Italian, the word “tempo” means both “weather” and “time.” The drawing process takes time, and once it is completed, the drawing itself must also weather. A good building should grow more beautiful as it weathers. In the same way, a well-tempered drawing is one that has weathered well. It is not just the gradual change in color of the paper and ink, but even the change in humidity in the room where you are working will have an influence. For me, there is the setting of a powerful synesthetic condition between the weathering of a drawing and the weathering of a building.

Real architectural drawings are very dirty. Scarpa’s drawings were on the table for a long time, and they show a building up of layers. This is true even in ink drawings, but the ink drawing in the end looks very clean like a building does at end of construction, but even on the ink drawings you can often see traces of the “construction” of the drawing, which can be very revealing.

Moeller: You also wrote an essay on the “tell-tale detail,” arguing that study of the smallest elements can inform our broader understanding of buildings. Some of the most interesting drawings throughout history have been details.

Frascari: I was reading an article in which [Richard] Rogers was talking about his experience with [former business partner Renzo] Piano, who was the son of a builder. Piano, he said, would always start the design process with details. Rogers would always start from totality. Either method can lead to beautiful architecture, but I think it is extremely important to recognize that both exist. And each requires its own kind of drawing. Erich Mendelsohn, for instance, started from totality, but Otto Wagner started from detail, and they produced radically different drawings. Mendelsohn represented shadow and form, and not the tectonics of construction; Wagner was the opposite. But eventually the two meet in the middle.

Moeller: How would you assess the impact of the digital revolution and changes in architectural practice?

Frascari: Modern computer drawings are so ascetic. They look like the “clean environments” where they make chips and computer equipment.

The authority of hand drawing has been lost a bit. Now, with computers, someone has to do a translation between the image constructed by the architect and the actual building to be built. [The engineering firm] ARUP does a very good job of this, transforming the architect’s drawing so it can represent the real act of construction. They do these amazing drawings—the construction to allow the construction, as it were.

When architectural drawings became merely legal documents, they lost most of their power. But, com-
The Round Tower, Plate III
From the Carceri Series (1749)

Giovanni Battista Piranesi

Trained in architecture, engineering, and printmaking, Giovanni Piranesi gained fame in the 1740s for his highly romanticized etchings of ancient and contemporary Roman buildings. Thanks in part to their exaggerations of scale and often fanciful compositions, these etchings fueled the popular fascination with classical antiquity and inspired the burgeoning neoclassical movement in architecture.

Today, Piranesi is best known for another series of images called the Carceri d’Invenzione (Imaginary Prisons). The fantastical and ominous interior spaces of the Carceri constituted an unreal yet believable world, powerfully represented in two dimensions on paper.
Jean-Jacques Lequeu was, along with Claude-Nicolas Ledoux and Étienne-Louis Boullée, one of the great French “visionary” architects of the late 18th and early 19th centuries, notorious for often utterly impractical, absurdly overscaled, but visually stunning schemes for buildings, monuments, and infrastructure. Of the three, Lequeu produced the strangest body of work, including both architectural renderings and numerous drawings of the human form, whose character ranges from quasi-scientific to unabashedly pornographic.

The drawing reproduced here shows the interior of a structure that Lequeu called “the haunt of the magicians.” In its surprising visual juxtapositions and obvious—though not necessarily comprehensible—symbolism, this rendering presages the work of the surrealist movement.

Hugh Ferriss

Few non-practicing architects have had as profound an influence on the profession as Hugh Ferriss. His iconic renderings of landmark buildings helped to define public perceptions of early modern architecture, and his series of drawings exploring the compositional implications of New York’s 1916 zoning law directly shaped the city’s skyline and set the tone for skyscraper design until the Great Depression.

Ferriss produced several renderings of the theme structure—commonly called the Trylon and Perisphere—for the 1939 New York World’s Fair, including this heavily stylized depiction of the two giant forms under construction. The drawing includes a number of people, some of whom are obviously working while others are merely standing around as if admiring the audacity of the project.

Daniel Castor

The rather dour Amsterdam Stock Exchange, designed by Hendrik Berlage, has been unpopular with the Dutch public since it opened in 1903. But it has long intrigued the American architect Daniel Castor, who was awarded a Fulbright scholarship in 1992 to study the complex structure.

In order to convey the fascinating intricacies of Berlage’s design, Castor developed a series of innovative drawings that depict solid forms and voids simultaneously. These “jellyfish drawings,” which render walls transparent and give spaces substance, help to explain the building’s convoluted circulation paths and other eccentricities. Shown here is a drawing called Sugar Daddy—so named because the area illustrated is relatively rich with ornament—which traces the elaborate spiral path between an exterior entrance and the vestibule to the Chamber of Commerce above.
The Gabriel Prize, named for the 18th-century French architect Ange-Jacques Gabriel and presented annually by the Western European Architecture Foundation, provides the winning individual with a stipend to spend three months studying architecture and landscape in France. Each winner is required to produce three renderings of an appropriate subject of his or her choice.

Gabriel’s works included the façades of two buildings lining the north side of the Place de la Concorde in Paris. The 1997 prize recipient, architect and teacher Ron Witte, created renderings showing the façades of these palatial buildings in stark isolation. The drawings, while revealing the extent of Gabriel’s design, also allow a simultaneous reading of the façades as the skins of individual buildings and as the coherent edge of a large outdoor space.

Many a great city derives character and identity from its relationship to a river, lake, or sea. With no such body of water nearby, Phoenix has long suffered from a certain placelessness. Inspired by the name of the city’s airport, Sky Harbor, Wellington Reiter, who is dean of the College of Architecture and Environmental Design at Arizona State University, created a series of drawings exploring the possibility of turning the transportation hub into an urban focal point, serving the same purposes as aquatic harbors elsewhere.

Reiter’s drawings exhibit a clear debt to Piranesi, with heavy line work yielding a literal and figurative darkness evoking strong emotional responses. The Sky Harbor images offer both utopian and dystopian visions for the proposed civic center, in which the airport is not only an exciting urban gateway, but also an instrument of surveillance and control.

At first glance, artist Mark Bennett’s translations of fictional settings from television shows and movies into precise architectural plans may appear to be nothing more than campy celebrations of pop culture. After all, it is hard for the viewer not to laugh after recognizing some telltale element that evokes a strong memory of a favorite episode or scene.

In fact, Bennett’s drawings are remarkable achievements. They are the products of skillful analysis of diverse and sometimes contradictory visual clues, turning imagined forms and spaces into credible architectural environments. His work thus represents the full potential of drawing as a medium to present ideas, visions, and information that would be difficult to convey by other means.
The largest and most significant holding in the National Building Museum’s permanent collection is the 50,000-drawing Northwestern Terra Cotta Collection. At the beginning of the 20th century, architectural terra cotta was the preferred material for detailing commercial structures. The Northwestern Terra Cotta Company (1877–1956), headquartered in Chicago, was one of the nation’s leading manufacturers of this specialty product—a mix of clay sculpted or molded into a custom design and then fired in a kiln or furnace.

To direct production and installation, the company’s draftsmen transformed architectural blueprints into comprehensive “shop drawings” that provided instructions for the company’s sculptors and mold makers. Every project necessitated the creation of a “key” drawing which outlined the building’s form and identified the intended location of the terra cotta cladding or ornament. For quick and easy reference, the terra cotta was often rendered in color. Each key drawing also pinpointed the secondary drawings where specifications and exact dimensions were detailed.

Ironically, the key drawing—often the first drafted—remained incomplete until all of a project’s terra cotta elements had been scaled on secondary drawings. Only then could the final references and page assignments be transferred to the key.

The drawings reproduced here are for the Holy Family Church in Cincinnati, Ohio, designed by J.F. Sheblessy. On the key drawing, “Sheet 10” is listed as the page relating to the church’s bell towers, and section JB identifies the urns at the corner base of each tower. On Sheet 10, each section of the urn is further delineated. Notice, for example, how the urns are supported by tripods—a refinement not shown on the key. Together, these layered, puzzle-like drawings reveal the complex, labor-intensive process behind construction with architectural terra cotta.

collections highlights

Key Drawings in the Northwestern Terra Cotta Collection

by Chrysante Broikos, Curator
Museum Honors Stanford Engineering Professor with Turner Prize

by Scott Kratz, Vice President for Education

A contingent from the National Building Museum traveled to Palo Alto, California on February 1 to bestow the fifth Henry C. Turner Prize for Innovation in Construction Technology on Dr. Paul Teicholz, founder of Stanford’s Center for Integrated Facility Engineering (CIFE). Teicholz, who has more than 40 years of experience in academia and the engineering industry, joined the ranks of previous Turner Prize recipients structural engineer Leslie E. Robertson; architect I.M Pei; engineer and builder Charles A. DeBenedittis; and the U.S. Green Building Council, the first institution to receive the prize.

Norbert Young, president of McGraw-Hill Construction and chair of this year’s Turner Prize jury, remarked that “[Teicholz] has created industry-wide improvements in modeling, project management, and business processes by integrating information technology with the architecture, construction, and engineering fields.”

The Museum thanks Stanford University for hosting the presentation and enabling Teicholz’s west coast colleagues, family, and friends to celebrate his accomplishments.

Witold Rybczynski Wins Prestigious Scully Prize

by Scott Kratz, Vice President for Education

On January 17, 2007, scholar, professor, and architect Witold Rybczynski was awarded the Museum’s eighth Vincent J. Scully Prize, named in honor of the esteemed teacher and author who has spearheaded the debate about the future of American cities for more than 50 years. Mr. Rybczynski joins an impressive group of past awardees comprising Scully himself, the late Jane Jacobs, Andrés Duany and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown, His Highness The Aga Khan, His Royal Highness The Prince of Wales, and Phyllis Lambert.

As David Schwarz, chair of the Scully Prize jury stated in his opening remarks at the award presentation, the prize recipients “have caused us to think about the places we live, and more importantly, they have helped us learn to care about them. In doing so they help each and every one of us build a future that can be worthy of our past.”

Architect Moshe Safdie, in a tribute to Rybczynski, described him as a “voice of plain talk. He is not afraid to expose the nakedness of the emperor. His belief is [?] that architecture is measurable and that it can be understood and appreciated by the public at large.” Upon receiving the award, Rybczynski presented an original lecture on the history of urban planning, which was well received by the audience of more than 450 people. He concluded by exploring the intersections between city planning and economics, and in classic “plain talk” fashion, reminded listeners that, ultimately, it is the market that drives what gets built, and it is the role of architects and planners to offer the public the best possible options from which to choose.

above: (from L to R) David M. Schwarz, Chair of Vincent Scully Prize Jury; Witold Rybczynski, Vincent Scully Prize winner; and Vincent Scully during the presentation of the eighth Vincent Scully Prize. Photo by F.T. Eyre.

above: The 2006 Turner Prize recipient, Dr. Paul Teicholz discusses his research, career, and the future of the engineering industry with Bob Tatum, Stanford engineering professor, during the Turner Prize ceremony. © Mike Abbott Photography.
The National Building Museum eagerly pursues strategic partnerships with like-minded organizations in order to offer the most compelling programming possible. The brief articles in this section describe some recent activities that have been conducted in partnership with outside groups.

Taking L’Enfant on the Road

by Bryna Lipper, Director of Marketing and Communications

When Enrique Peñalosa, the former mayor of Bogotá, Colombia, delivered the second annual L’Enfant Lecture to an enthusiastic audience in November 2006, the partnership between the National Building Museum and the American Planning Association entered an exciting, new phase. Held at New York’s Cooper Union, this was the first official Museum lecture program to take place outside of Washington, D.C. The third lecture in this traveling series is scheduled to take place in Chicago in the fall of 2007.

The L’Enfant Lecture was established by the APA and the Museum in 2005 to enliven dialogue about urban and regional growth and to foster communities of lasting value. The inaugural speaker, Sir Peter Hall, set the tone for future programs with an ambitious and broad discussion of sustainable cities. Peñalosa built on this auspicious beginning by offering a candid presentation about initiating social change through urban policy and transportation. While the speaker for 2007 is yet to be announced, both partners anticipate an exciting program in Chicago—a city with an unparalleled legacy of urban and architectural design.

•

Women in Architecture

by Jaime Van Mourik, Public Programs Coordinator

IN 1866, when the first architecture degree program was established at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, all of the enrolled students were, of course, men. Since then, university demographics have changed dramatically, and now more than 50% of the students in U.S. architecture programs are women. Yet women currently account for only 11% of the members of the American Institute of Architecture.

Why is there such a drastic drop off in numbers between academia and professional practice? A partnership begun in 2006 between the National Building Museum and the Beverly Willis Architecture Foundation is exploring this discrepancy and related questions. On March 15, in celebration of International Women’s Day, the Museum and the Foundation held the second annual program focusing on the achievements of women in the architecture profession, providing a forum for discussion of how this rich history can inform contemporary practice. This year’s program was moderated by Wanda Bubriski, director of the Beverly Willis Architecture Foundation, and included Museum curator Susan Piedmont-Palladino, Columbia University professor Gwendolyn Wright, and Concordia University professor Cynthia Hammond as panelists.

Correction

Two images in the Museum’s 2006 Annual Report taken by Ann Elkington were incorrectly credited to F.T. Eyre and Museum staff. The photos were DAP 13 on page 19 and Design Apprenticeship Program on page 22.
Framing a Capital City
by Scott Kratz, Vice President for Education

Washington, D.C. is distinct among American cities. From Pierre Charles L’Enfant’s revolutionary plan for the new capital in 1791, to the audacious vision of the 1901–02 McMillan Plan, to more recent proposals to expand the scope of the National Mall, Washington has been shaped by a constant struggle to balance the permanence of monuments and memorials with the dynamic needs of a living city.

On April 10 and 11, the National Building Museum, in collaboration with the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission, convened prominent scholars, designers, and policymakers to discuss the future of federal planning for the city in the 21st century. The keynote to the symposium was delivered by David Childs, FAIA of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill. Childs’s presentation, which explored the past, present, and future of planning in the capital, was the first annual Charles H. Atherton Memorial Lecture, commemorating the life and legacy of Charles Atherton, who served for almost four decades as secretary of the Commission of Fine Arts.

The following day’s symposium explored such critical issues as sustainability, the siting and design of memorials, protection of public open space in an era of enhanced security, and the integration of the federal presence into the community.

Proceedings from the day’s events can be found on our website at www.nbm.org.

How Can You Get MORE Information About These Programs?

Would you like to hear one of the panel discussions from the Framing a Capital City Symposium? Are you interested in learning more about past Scully or Turner Prize winners? Visit the National Building Museum’s website, www.nbm.org, where you can access transcripts, photos, and press materials for past events and view a listing of upcoming public programs. Visit the website often for up-to-date programming information.
The Museum thanks the following individuals, companies, associations and agencies for gifts of $250 or more received from February 1 – April 30, 2007. These generous gifts provide essential support for the Museum’s exhibitions, education programs, and endowment funds. Some of the contributions listed below are in partial fulfillment of larger pledges.

$25,000 and above
Anonymous
The Bayport Foundation of Andersen Corporation
Marilyn and Michael Glosserman
MASCO Corporation Foundation
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Weiser LLP

$10,000–$24,999
The Associated General Contractors of America
Bender Foundation, Inc.
Boston Properties
Carolyn S. Brody
Davis Brody Bond Aedas Design Cuisine
Delon Hampton & Associates
Gwathmey Siegel & Associates Architects
Hellmuth, Obata + Kassabaum
Hines
Hypo Real Estate Capital Corporation
Island Capital Group, LLC
The JBG Companies
Lt. Col. & Mrs. William K. Konze
Meridian Investments, Inc.
Neighborhood Investment Fund, Office of the Deputy Mayor O’Connor Capital Partners
J.E. Robert Companies
Robert A.M. Stern Architects LLP
STUDIOS Architecture
Taconic Investment Partners LLC
Turner Construction Company
Weiser LLP

$5,000–$9,999
Baltimore-Washington Brick Distributor Council
BE+K Building Group
Davis Brody Bond Aedas Design Cuisine
Greenstein DeLorme & Luchs, P.C.
Hellmuth, Obata + Kassabaum
Hines
Hypo Real Estate Capital Corporation
Island Capital Group, LLC
The JBG Companies
Latin American Business Council
Meridian Investments, Inc.
Neighborhood Investment Fund, Office of the Deputy Mayor O’Connor Capital Partners
J.E. Robert Companies
Robert A.M. Stern Architects LLP
STUDIOS Architecture
Taconic Investment Partners LLC
Turner Construction Company
Weiser LLP

$1,000–$2,999
Akridge
The American Architectural Foundation
Hargrove, Inc.
HRH Construction
The IDI Group Companies
Lafarge
National Cherry Blossom Festival, Inc.
Reed Smith
Michael and Deborah Salzberg Philanthropic Fund
Stroock, Stroock & Lavan LLP

Suman Sorg, president of Sorg & Associates, and her husband Scott have been generous contributors to the National Building Museum since 2000. In addition to their philanthropy, Suman served on the panel in last year’s Women in Architecture symposium, sharing her experience with aspiring young architects, and also sat on the advisory board for the Museum’s D.C. Builds lecture series.

“When Suman and Scott Sorg are gracious and enthusiastic friends of the Museum. We greatly appreciate their active interest in our programming, especially considering that they manage an extremely busy practice involving high-profile projects around the world,” noted Chase Rynd, Executive Director.

Established in 1986, Sorg & Associates provides architecture, urban design, interior design, planning, and construction phase services in both the private and public sectors. The firm’s recent projects include new U.S. embassies in Bridgetown, Barbados; Katmandu, Nepal; Kabul, Afghanistan; Surabaya, Indonesia; and Kuwait. The firm’s portfolio also includes residential, educational, and civic buildings in the Washington, D.C. area and around the country.

When asked recently why she supports the Museum, Suman replied, “The National Building Museum is everything a museum should be and do; it informs, educates, preserves artifacts, and engages a wide variety of patrons ranging from local area residents to visitors to the District of Columbia who come here from all over the world. As an architect, I am delighted to have such an important venue in our nation’s capital that is focused on the built environment, an important aspect of our lives, whether we are laypeople or industry professionals.”

The Museum could not achieve its success without the annual support of our Corinthian members, the Board of Trustees, and staff are grateful to Suman, Scott, and Sorg & Associates for their ongoing support.
mystery building

Previous Mystery Building Problems

Pretty Darned Mysterious

The spring issue’s Mystery Building challenge proved to be a toughie. Only one respondent correctly identified the pictured structure as the Kandahar International Airport terminal in Kandahar, Afghanistan.

Commissioned by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and designed by Pacific Architects and Engineers, Inc., the airport was dedicated in December 1962. With its audacious, repeating parabolic roofline and robust, buttress-like concrete arches at ground level, the terminal design is elegantly exuberant, yielding what would seem to have been a fashionable and quite memorable structure in its day.

Alas, the building was doomed to obscurity, thanks to its remote location and the fact that its raison d’être—to provide a refueling stop for air routes through central Asia—disappeared with the advent of long-range passenger jets.

The Kandahar International Airport was correctly identified by Nathaniel Martin, of Washington, D.C.

This issue’s mystery...

Clock Watch

This time, your challenge is to identify the building from which this photo was taken (not the building visible in the background).

Once again, responses will be accepted by e-mail or regular mail. To be eligible for a prize (reserved for the first five correct respondents only), send an e-mail to mystery-building@nbm.org. You may also respond by regular mail, though you will not be eligible for the prize. The mailing address is:

Mystery Building, National Building Museum, 401 F Street, NW, Washington, DC 20001
The exhibition *Reinventing the Globe: A Shakespearean Theater for the 21st Century* was launched with an opening reception on January 11, 2007. The event, like the exhibition itself, was characterized by a melding of elements from Shakespeare’s era and the present day. Held in the Pension Commissioner’s Suite, the reception featured “modern Elizabethan” fare, fanciful bouquets of wildflowers, and the contemporary folk music of the duo Flutar. More than 150 friends of the Museum attended, including several of the architects whose hypothetical 21st-century Shakespearean theaters were featured in the exhibition.

Described as “refreshing and insightful” by *The New York Times*, the exhibition has been extended until October 8, 2007.