

THE JERUSALEM SEMINAR IN ARCHITECTURE
9 November 1992 Evening Session

Introduction: Arthur Spector
Presentation: Moshe Safdie

ARTHUR SPECTOR: Can I have your attention please? Can we start? I have two announcements before we begin. Last night Julian Beinart mentioned that we made a mistake in the programme and that Harry Cobb would make his speech twice. After hearing him tonight I understand why we made the mistake -- but that really is a mistake. I want to remind you all that Herman Hertzberger will be speaking tomorrow night at 8:00 p.m.

Secondly, I just want to tell you that you will find in your kits a request for anybody who wants to get a box lunch on Wednesday. Our time is going to be very limited -- between the time we finish the morning and we go to visit the Supreme Court -- so anyone who is interested in a box lunch, please order it sometime tomorrow at one of the cafeterias.

Our last speaker is known to most of us in this room. He is one of the most prolific people I have ever known. He maintains offices in a number of countries. I can think of no architect that has had such a major impact on architecture museums in one country as Moshe Safdie. He, too, served as the Director of Urban Design at Harvard University. Recently he has received the important Canadian Lieutenant Governor's Gold Medal, the Massey Medal for Architecture and the Order of Canada.

Despite all of this activity in all kinds of places around the world, we are very happy and indeed proud to think of him as one of us. Moshe Safdie.

MOSHE SAFDIE: [Hebrew]

תודה ארתור. כבוד ראש העיר ערב טוב. אני מאד שמח להיות כאן
ולחגוג עם עדה ורמי את חנוכת בית משפט העליון. מזל טוב לעדה
ורמי. ברשותכם, אני אעבור לאנגלית.

I was torn in considering tonight's talk between talking about public buildings and the design of the public domain. Both are areas which I have been deeply involved with and I would have liked to have talked about our efforts in the town of Modi'in, for example, to create the public domain.

But I think, more appropriately, I would like to talk about the public building and the public building in the city. In particular, I would like to focus tonight on the impact on public

buildings of a pluralistic democracy in which we live -- in which much of the Western World lives and perhaps an increasing number of countries elsewhere -- because I believe that the pluralistic democracy is bringing about a profound change in the design of public buildings; perhaps slowly, in a way that we do not even notice. For example, I think that in pluralistic democracies the programmes -- or (for those who are here from Britain) the brief -- of public buildings is transforming. If we think of a courthouse, a museum, a library or a place for the performing arts, I think we can recognize as we analyze it that they have quite different requirements to -- say the same archetype in the 19th century.

In the 19th century most public buildings were used by relatively few people. They were basically aristocratic places. They were places of the elite. Everything about their design stated that. I think we are moving into an era where public buildings are used by everyone, literally everyone. If the black tie was the symbol of a museum or a performing arts building twenty or thirty years ago, the jeans are no less a symbol today.

This sense of change, I would say, centres around one key word, and that is access. By access I do not simply mean the physical access, but that the buildings speak about a sense of access in a more profound way. That they are buildings which invite, which draw in the public, which do not intimidate, which make the public -- no matter what station in life they are -- comfortable.

That means, I think, that we must re-examine the iconography of public buildings or at least we should consider what is the appropriate iconography. This is a question that Rafael Moneo spoke about earlier tonight, and that is: What is the kind of iconography? What is the relationship, for example, to the question of power? It would seem to me that on the question of monumentality -- which we consider synonymous with public buildings -- we crave for the sense of ceremony even today, but we shy away from the statement of power.

Another change in public buildings is that of scale, their size. This has to do with numbers. Harry Cobb tonight already spoke about this profound change in the size of all public buildings. When you ask people what is their favorite museum, they will say: the Frick, the Kimble, the [Muler Kunsler Museum?] -- all small buildings. If you ask them, "What is your favorite courthouse?" they will think of some Richardsonian courthouse with five court rooms or maybe two -- or Harry has one. If you ask them about a concert hall they will say the Musikvereinssaal in Vienna.

But the buildings that we must build today are bigger because they deal with a complete new scale of numbers. I think that is not simply a more difficult design problem, I think it is generically a different problem.

The third change, I think, that pluralistic democracy brings to public buildings is the issue of patronage. Who is the client? Louis Sullivan in Kindergarten Chats (I'll paraphrase him) says, behind every great building there is great client. He added, an architect cannot transcend his client. And somewhere else he says, every client gets the architect he deserves.

But I am sure that when Sullivan wrote Kindergarten Chats, the client was personified as an individual in his mind. And while still many public buildings are initiated and built, or controlled at least, by individuals -- one can think of the great cathedral in Abidjan or at least in the new capital of the Ivory Coast of [Felix] Houphouet-Boigny (I had the pleasure of designing a building for the Shah one day) -- but more and more there is a shift.

Even major public buildings today, still sometimes even government buildings, fall into the tradition of patronage; for example, Mellon as the central figure in the East Wing of the National Gallery in Washington. There are statesmen who will take part in the process or in the decisions concerning design. We can think of Mitterand or Trudeau, who fired an architecture committee and let Arthur Erikson design the embassy in Washington and said, "I am the sovereign; I have the right to pick my architect."

But for most of us designing public buildings today the client is not an individual, it is mostly a committee. As a committee it often has a very wide cross section of society and a cross section of what our culture is all about. In fact the most extreme case which I recently experienced, and I will come back to later, is design by public referendum, a design chosen by public vote..

Again the impact of this, I think, is very far reaching. If I can have the first slide please.

It is fitting I think for me to start with the Medva plan of Jerusalem. The plan of Jerusalem of Byzantine times, which embodies in it so much of what I think is relevant to public buildings. Not only does it show us the cardo maximus as the central street, as a designed public space, but it shows us that all the public buildings, the Holy Scepical, plugged into that public domain, so that there is first a hierarchy that gives the city legibility.

Secondly the public space itself, the central street the Cardo is designed with as much will as any individual building. There is a differentiation between the public building and the general urban texture of houses, workshops, and we see this again in the

reconstructed model of Rome where we have the hierarchy of streets, principle streets and public buildings, the whole being much greater than the parts.

This structure, this model persisted in cities while it changed form persisted and so we can think of public buildings in relationship to city structure whether we are thinking of, for example, Housemans Paris with its major boulevards and public buildings on access, or we think of the Grand Bazaar and Maydan in Istahan with all the central public buildings plugged onto the bazaar and the principle squares. Or Vienna's ring or many many other examples.

My own first experience with the public building certainly was in Jerusalem at the beginning of the 1970's. It was an institution to be built in the heart of the Old City, Yeshivat Porat Yosef, and I would say that at that moment in time, I was concerned, and I think others were with one central theme, the theme of belonging. While some might be surprised, I felt at that moment approaching a major public building in the Old City a great sense of humility. I felt that the issue of belonging was also one shared in the public mind. After all, everything about planning legislation in Jerusalem had to do with the sense of continuity, legislation to build in stone, that stone should be built and used in the traditional way. In fact, when I was first contacted by the rabbis, I was asked this question about, will you make a modern building for us or a traditional building for us. Some of you know they had already fired two other architects. One for making a traditional building and one for making a modern building. I answered in defence, if I succeed you won't be able to answer the question.

But in my own mind I thought that I wanted to make a building which felt as if it has always been there, yet of today. I did not know of a way of dealing with that except through the tactonic qualities of the building. It seemed to me that only through the tactonics of building, through the materials and methods, might I be able to deal with that sense of continuity.

I have been pre-occupied with this in a very particular way, as Richard Rogers said yesterday and it resonated for me, it is the sense of how a building comes together. How it holds that gives people the greatest pleasure of an architectural experience. It seems to me that it is this sense of a tactonic that separates at the end the authentic building, that which gives us the sense of the authentic from the stage set. Toys and building blocks are in many ways for me a manifestation of that sense of organization of a tactonic aspects of the building.

The building itself ended up being a metaphor between modes of construction, traditional stone construction built as low bearing and a lace like prefabricated structure which formed the inner

spaces. On the site one could see the co-existence of the traditional way and contemporary construction. The building itself became the collision of the juxtaposition of the spaces created by the lightweight structures and the massive walls that contained it, and the elements of the building itself, the sense of entrance, the sense of containment really took their cues from the surrounding areas.

Sio within the stone and the concrete and as experienced in the city, this kind of dialogue between the past and the present was explored. This idea continued as I worked on the Hebrew Union College outside the city walls, and here I went further in relating to some of the archi types of the city, the courtyard as the major public room, the aldo room contained by the non-buildings so to speak in which there is additional activity. But here too the sense of the juxtaposition of traditional construction and contemporary construction were put side by side. So you have a sequence of courtyards, each with buildings surrounding the library, archeology, the classrooms, the hostels, each connecting to the other in the fabric that could be almost the fabric of the Armenian quarter or other parts of the city. In the building itself, an integration of landscape and structures, an integration of gardens, in fact perhaps attempting to erase the line between the outdoor and the indoor and between landscape and structure. ON one hand the arcades, the stone walls built in stone, load bearing, and on the other, concrete, prefabricated, glass and aluminium, cold and warm, light and heavy, silver and gold.

It was immediately after that I participated in invited competition for the Muse de la Civilization in Quebec city, the site of which was in the old city of Quebec what is know as the lower city, the Place Royale, on the St. Florence River and incorporating a number of historic buildings on the site that had to become part of the museum.

Well Quebec is a Nordic city, and Muse de la Civilization Quebec was a national institution. This was a building sponsored by the government of Quebec at the height of the separatist emotion by the Pekist government who was in fact at the time espousing separation.

It seemed to me, looking back now, that what I brought to this project was an attitude and sensibilities from the Jerusalem experience. I was preoccupied and I would say even perhaps obsessed with the kind of attempt to make the buildings merge into the surrounding area in harmonious way. I was preoccupied with assonance, again the sense of belonging. The question of this being part of the city and feeling it belongs. It seemed to me that in terms of the culture of Quebec this building somewhat the symbol of the culture of Quebec, that the building should be anchored in the river, that it should grow out of the river, and

it should sort of feel as if it is a grand stair leaving to the opera city where the major institutions, the seminaries and other government buildings were located.

It was fascinating as we completed the design for the competition, this being the competition drawing, that we uncovered this etching of old Quebec, the site, 100 years earlier with the Quebec market and the stair descending into the water. So that sense of the explorers who came up the river and explored the country seemed to me embodied in this, and we of course did send the etching with the competition drawings.

The building was designed so that its scale related to the surrounding building. It took great effort because part of the programme had to be sunk into the water table, all the out storage in order to achieve that. One of my pre-occupations was the continuity of the street edge, both on the principle street facing the river, with one of the entries to the museum and the surrounding streets where old building, new building were juxtaposed in one continuous edge of the street.

It was not in the programme that you entered the building walking as through a public street, public domain, which went from one end to the other, but above that was a grand stair that led to a roof park and then to a spa with an overlook around the city relating to other vertical elements in the city and actually making the building feel that it can be possessed even when the museum is closed, the park, the roof is part of the public domain.

Weaving within it, spaces of the museum, courtyards and the older buildings which were restored and became part of the museum. The question of scale again was central. The question of size., Again a very big building in a very fragile small scale fabric. The whole effort was to break down that scale, both in terms of the massing and the roof warms and the sky lights which became part of the silhouette of the building, so that as you looked down from the upper city, you have no sense that you are looking at 25,000 square meters.

One critic pointed out in one of his reviews that the sky lights in the museum evoked ecclesiastic Quebec. I thought that was strange coming from me, but so be it.

I would like to move on to the project that followed. The National Gallery of Canada. I would like to focus on the whole process of decision making which seemed to me central of the understanding of how and why public buildings get built.

The story begins with the decision of the government of Canada to build two museums, not one next to parliament. The National Gallery on this site and across the bridge in Hull, Quebec the

museum of civilization, symbolically bridging Quebec and Ontario, French and English and relating that back to parliament. The choice of site was very bold, by the National Capital Commission, and we received a very elaborate set of programmes about the requirements of the building. But I have come to the conclusion that most programmes that you receive from clients give you a lot of information, and mostly they do not state what is really important in terms of the character and nature of the building. In fact, most clients writing the programme don't even have a sense of the issues which they are overlooking.

It was with that sense that I embarked on an unusual process in interacting with the client once we had received the programme. I rapidly came to certain conclusions about the site. This was the city, the cathedral, the markets, the entrance, I felt had to be at this end of the site, otherwise the coldest capital in the world and it seemed to me just at that point, is where access should be. I also felt that the central public space of the museum should be across from parliament, across the water in the place where the view was magnificent and really was part of the skyline of the city. I felt that it was not clear what kind of a museum they really wanted. The programme talked about this is a national institution, it should fit the sense of a national institution.

So I did three schemes, this one was called the Village Scheme. It consisted of a series of pavilions. I should say that this was a very large programme, 60,000 sq. meters of space total required by the building. The whole series of galleries, the different parts of the collection and a very large curatorial wing as the gallery serves the country as a whole. So this was the Village Scheme. A series of pavilions set in an informal network of parks and glazed connections, entered at one end, bridging over to a park on the water at the other end. Next.

Another scheme positioned the entrance at the corner by the cathedral also, but arranged the galleries so as to enclose a large central space which would be glazed, which will become the sort of life centre of the gallery with a library overlooking parliament and the curator wing to the north. This quickly got nicknamed the east wing.

A third scheme also entered at the corner by the cathedral, but proposed a colonnade that leads to a public space at the end, turning around and organizing the galleries into four clusters, or four buildings of galleries, again the curator wing to the north.

Well there was a lot of discussion, the Village Scheme would not do they said, too informal. This is too introvert and besides the character of the space would be very hard to make appropriate for the national gallery. This scheme intrigued them, but they were

worried that one would be moving 80 meters across from entry to the galleries before seeing the art, and maybe that was inappropriate.

Two additional schemes were developed. These became nicknamed The Introvert Scheme and the Extrovert Scheme. The Extrovert Scheme entered, went through, ramping up towards the great hall in a glazed colonnade, turning at 90 degrees with the clusters of galleries. The Introvert Scheme was double loaded, so that you immediately entered into the world of galleries, then arrived at the great hall turning, so that the major part of the programme of galleries faced the city.

Now it was at this point that the curators got into a big fight, three voted for this and three voted for that, and it was a requirement that we should present the scheme to cabinet, and in fact we should present alternatives to cabinet. Our attitude often, all of us, is when we need to present alternatives is you do your scheme then you do another one that is an easy push down and then you go forward. But I have to confess at this point that I myself was ambivalent about which scheme was more appropriate.

So, with very rough sketches showing in one case the colonnade going up, the city visible, the double loaded ramp going up as the alternative, and sketches showing the sort of opaque and solid face of the gallery towards the city as contrasted with the total transparent we went to cabinet. Well one minister said he really liked that it, was really Canadian, understated, and maybe more economical. Another one said Ottawa is such a dull city let us give it a good time, let us make a museum that is really accessible. There was a tie vote which was then decided by the Prime Minister. In fact he came to me at one point and he whispered in my ear saying, this was Prime Minister Trudeau, "which scheme do you really like?" I said, "I really don't know, you know how it is when you are in love with two women." And he said, "Yes I know." In a remarkable moment of decisiveness, which has impressed me ever since, he then turned around and said this is the scheme we must build, because this is the kind of museum that we want to present in terms of accessibility and openness to the public.

The plan emerged, the L shaped galleries and the curator wing and I realized as it evolved that what had happened is that we had inverted the traditional museum plan. Here in Chinkles plan the public space is centred, and we are wrapped by galleries, even more dramatically and Pope's west wing in the national gallery in Washington the public space is centred wrapped by galleries, always posing the problem of what do you do on the outside face. All what we have done here is taken the public spaces and wrapped the galleries with them.

But there was another element that had to do with programme and with size that came into play, because what emerged here was a plan which, to go back to Rafael Moneo's term, it is like making a city. I would say what we had here was streets, piazzas and more streets and buildings along these streets. So 60,000 sq. meter building broke down into smaller buildings.

Moreover, this we realized later, also had to do with a recognition that museums are different today. All kinds of things happen in museums today, concerts, lectures, weddings, and so on and so forth. So that the plan recognized that there was a public side of activities, m exuberant, transparent, open, and there were places beyond that for the art, which will come and contain and secure.

There was an unstated question. *here we come back to the programme. That is, on such a prominent site how visible should the gallery be in relationship to parliament? Well my sense was the cathedral, parliament, if the gallery is on that site it had to have a presence and it had to have a dialogue with parliament. Trudeau later said when we picked the site we never realized that we would be giving a place for culture in the city skyline like no other capital has.

The dialogue between the great hall and the parliamentary library was immediate and conscious, I would even say self conscious, an attempt to relate it and at the same time contrast it and to make it the centre of activity, the transparent next to the solid. The public is drawn into the building which has proven to be extremely active. Rising up the colonnade separates you from the city. It is an 80 meter rise of a gentle ramp, but it creates a sense of preparation. It creates a sense of possession, so that you have a transition form the activity of daily urban life into the sort of inner sanctum of the gallery.

The great hall, was never programmed. It said there should be a foyer that would lend itself to receptions. What now has become of the spaces that it is continuously used, it is the place where official dinners for heads of states takes place, and if there is a problem, it is the fight between the Prime Ministers office and the director of the gallery over the fact that these dinners and other events disturb the visitors to the gallery. But as a room, I felt it should be transformable, shades coming out on hot summer days, sails, accoustically transforming for a concert or dinner on a cold evening night. The continue down the concourse towards the rotunda with entrances to the various galleries and even these spaces, street light spaces have become very actively used with all kinds of curricula activities.

One of the problems in the building was trying to get the galleries of both levels to have their light. The lower level being devoted to the Canadian collection. I felt it would be

inappropriate if the Canadian collection, like in most museums had no daylight in the lower level while skylights lit the upper level. So we devised a system of light shafts, two meters wide, lined with mylar. This is, if you enter that shaft, in fact this is the width of the shaft, there is a skylight, the light is travelling down to the galleries below. This is the upper level gallery with the traditional level skylight, this is the lower level gallery with the light travelling down the shaft.

The galleries transform in relationship to the collection. These are actually identical rooms, this the bare structure painted white, this one with the suspended vault, but otherwise exactly the same. The contemporary galleries forming a separate pavilion.

The courtyards which are in the centre of each loop places of rest and orientation, so as you move through the galleries you always have these reference points, and coming back to the same points you originated, which has to do with making big buildings legible.

The biggest problem I felt about big buildings is that you get lost in them. The problem of the Metropolitan Museum, which to give it credit was not built in one go and got many additions, which is about the same size as this museum, is that you never know where you are. To me the most difficult problem of large scale public buildings is how to get a sense of location and orientation.

I would like to briefly touch on another project, the Ballet Opera House for Toronto which for one thing did not have a glamorous site. Bay Street in Toronto, the hotel. I would like to talk about it, how I felt the programme for this building was different from the 19th century Ballet Opera house which we have studied as a model. To start with we have the tension of the site, the subway and Young Street at one end, Ceremonial Street, Bay Street at the opposite end, and a building that must be entered at any directions. Which led to the notion of a gallery that connected Young to the principle space, principle modular building. But more relevantly there were two strategies that I think marked the difference in programme. This is Goveniers Opera House in Paris, which we studied and visited with out clients, the grand lobby in the centre off the street with its grand stair, the rehearsal rooms partly in the big dome and partly contained int eh back of the building.

These two components take on a completely different position in this building. The main lobby is made part of the street. The rehearsal rooms are organized along this internal gallery, so that as the public goes through them, the experience of the making of the art, of the workshops, the ballet and rehearsal rooms, the orchestra, all become visible to the public. The

whole sense of the making of the art is demystified. The public becomes aware of the hundreds of people who are creating the art which they will come to experience.

So the lobby is no longer a lobby, but a public room open 24 hours a day. It becomes a lobby before and after a performance. This is a five tiered horseshoe, so as you come out of the auditorium, the rings of circulation with bars and lounges, restaurant, exhibitions and other events.

The construction system which I worked on for several months with the later Peter Rice, was a load bearing precast system where the spaces in the walls were formed by these precast elements which had stone inlaid into them in the plant in the form of marketry.

This is a view from one tower to the other across the rotunda. So these concrete elements with stone inlaid in them formed this public room, and a dome and pyramid integrated structure, which Peter Rice nicknamed the sphyramid formed the glazed structure over the room. This was an early sketch from the competition phase. This was an invited international competition of the auditorium. the decision for the five tiered horse shoe was made by the companies who felt that this is the best kind of room for both ballet and opera. But we had to do it with 2,000 seats and with perfect site lines, unlike most horseshoes.

But again to me as a most significant part of the scheme was the fact as the public walked down the gallery, that street, they passed by and had peaks into the gallery rehearsal room, or the orchestra rehearsal room, and when the orchestra was not using it is could be used for recitals. I was not sure the ballerinas were that happy about it, but maybe they would get used to the idea.

I would like to conclude with two projects. Two of my most recent projects in two very different cities. One is in Vancouver, a glimpse of which you see here, surrounded by wonderful mountains and one is for Munich in the heart of the city, this is the site for the proposed new museum of architecture industrial design and contemporary art.

There is a couple of things I would like to say about these buildings in relationship to each other. Both were for international competitions, announced almost at the same time. these invited international competitions, and both of them were due on exactly the same day. Submission within four hours. A strange coincidence. We worked on them at the same time, which is unusual. We were dealing with two very different cities and two very different programmes. In one case the public library and the other case the museum, two very public buildings.

In each case the city putting a great deal of importance on the impact of this public building, on its development. In the case of Munich, is proposing this new museum, because it feels the heat of Berlin, and it feels that to keep its stature culturally in Germany, given what has been done in Frankfurt and what will be done in Berlin and what there is in Berlin, they wanted yet another great museum.

In the case of Vancouver an enormous public effort was mounted to up a major new library. I suppose in looking back at the process, I would say I was totally surprised what came out and how different it was and how surprising in terms of the two cities. If in building the Hebrew Union College, or the Quebec museum I personally was preoccupied with the question of belonging, I think that at this point I was somewhat more distant and feeling the appropriateness of being a commentator or an observer of sorts.

So I would like to start with the Munich museum, but first show you what was a genesis of the idea, which was a design for a museum of contemporary art in Stuttgart, which occurred some months before on a site diagonally from the Staatsgalerie facing the park and facing the famous railway station with the Mercedes Benz logo on top.

I won't go into details other than to say that the programme of this museum was made up of two components, permanent galleries for existing collection and changing galleries for changing exhibitions, and I came to the conclusion for this building changing galleries means designing space for art not yet created. So towards the principle street there is an edge of galleries almost houselike in scale, and there is a tower which has some offices and restaurants and more galleries. But towards the park I took liberty with the programme. I said that there was no point, this was a museumlogical idea, there was no point in building permanent galleries for changing exhibitions in this day and age. Most artists, or many artists are making bigger and bigger installations, they like to modify space so drastically that you usually go and construct it. I thought that that side of the building should be every changing. There should be a grid of supports. The power becomes the crane. Galleries are built, dismantled, they might be there for a year or two, five, they might change rapidly, translucent galleries, roomlike galleries. In fact in submitting we showed many variations, and I suppose there was another ingredient and that was the tower itself. I could not resist challenging the primacy or singularity of the only tower in Stuttgart, built during the Third Reich, part of the railway station, I felt perhaps a tower next to it, a symbol of culture and a symbol of change might be appropriate.

Well, we did not win it, it was won by Isau Zaki and we were told that the tower was inappropriate and as far as this idea, artists are demanding too much these days anyhow, don't give them anymore.

Looking at the Munich site, I felt a great deal of, I was going to use the word affection, but I would say respect is a better word. Von Klnazer's Alte Pinakotech. Behind it is the Noie Pinakotec. It is in a whole museum district as you can see here the site of the alte pinakotec and here the brown alley with the kliptotec and the museum across. We have a museum district coming down at the new site at this corner.

My first sense of that site was that this was a wonderful park and the city should expand it, so this became a two block open space, so that the new museum echoed in its organization and location the alte pinokotec. So that in fact it would be entered in three places, here where there is a gate house that had to be preserved, and at the corner, the above ground structures would more or less echo the pinokotec in height and mass and underground galleries below the par with skylights would provide the rest of the programme. So one ended up with a very major open space, part of which was devoted to exhibiting sculpture and art at various levels below the park.

So again as in Munich there is this pavilion which forms an entry as well as the street performs the entry, but that pavilion is acrane. Industrial design at that level, the painting collection at that level and then graphics and architecture and other galleries below the park level, but with daylight.

These were some of the very early sketches which I made, and I found myself again dealing with the spine of permanent galleries, warlike, and the changing arrangement of various rooms and spaces. This in fact is after a gallery design by Frank Stella for himself, it is being constructed right now, so that this was the suggestion of the dynamic and changing part of the museum.

I suppose, in some ways one could not build in Munich without reflecting in terms of the kind of building it should be, about this moment in history. German reunification, Munich's ambitions. The sense of the Germans that this is the place for art, or at least so one thinks or feels. So here again this street coming across, connecting the inner (?) with the street on the other side, which you see here, with galleries at three levels of that, and future museum expansion on the other side of that street.

Again, in plan, the street, the galleries and the extension of the underground galleries which you see here through the skylights protruding through the park, and the entire becoming a part of sculpture and are with a large decor centre built into it there.

There was a very rigid condition in the programme. It said nothing should be over 18 meters. Any submissions above 18 meters in height would be disqualified instantly. I had this urge there should be a tower on this location. There is in fact a number of spars further down that street, but I did not want to break the rules. So the crane is retracted and it rises for the occasion.

This is the winning scheme. It seemed to do the opposite of every strategy that we adopted, in fact the building feels the entire site and leave vacant the part which we occupied. It forms a wall towards the city and a diagonal access through it. It is interesting that all seven prizes followed the same diagram, occupying the space, and these were all German submissions. It is interesting that all but one of the five or six invited competitors built along this access leaving the path open.

Richard Rogers said to me last night, if you want to win a competition in Germany you have got to give them squares, but he was six months too late.

This happened at the same time the library for Vancouver. Vancouver is a gridded city but it is not a city street edges. It is a very new city, lots of towers, very thin towers, lots of glass, if you can call it glass, no street edges to speak of. I think I was preoccupied here with a number of questions. One had to do simply with library. What is a library for large metropolitan city today? It is a major information space. It is a hitech exchange of information and storage of information. But it also seemed to me, in terms of Vancouver, and the needs of Vancouver needed to be a significant civic building. That seemed to me to mean memories of libraries of all times.

There was another difficult problem, this again was a three phase international competition. There was another problem and that is the plan had to incorporated 30,000 sq. meters of space for the Federal government, which is a good size office building, not as large as some of the ones we saw earlier, but 30,000 sq. meters just the same. So there was this tension between the federal bureaucracy and the civil purpose of the building. I would like to tell you more about the building, but I am going to resist for a few minutes, because what I would like to focus on for a moment is about a process, the process of the competition itself, the process of the selection of the design which goes back to what I spoke about earlier, design, selection by public referendum.

These were the two other finalist schemes. This by Hardy Holtzman of New York and this Coor Barpen of Toronto. Now the conditions of the competition said that the three finalist schemes will travel to the city on exhibition for three weeks, at

which point the public will be called to vote, then in fact explain the vote and the ballot, which be calibrated and presented to the city council. However, independently of that. an architectural profession jury would convene, not knowing the results of the public ballot, the jury was headed by Maki and Bill Pederson, and it would render its own judgment. So the party began.

Now, while this was going on, the public coming in in big numbers to see the buildings, the architecture jury had not yet convened, the press was discussing the designs. So we started first with the press presenting the schemes. Each time this appeared more and more people came to see the exhibition, and as this Toronto paper says, library designs have Vancouver abuzz.

Now the mayor explained that he chose the referendum, because he believed this was the only way that you could get public support for spending \$130 million on a new library. He felt that this with this kind of expenditure of a public bond, the public's involvement with the project is conditional. Well one would hope that the public would go and see and relax and think and decide. but the pundits decided to perhaps help them. So here the Toronto Globe and Mail, the colossal exercise and denial, and when I saw that I said it is lost, only to see the next day the Toronto paper hates our Colosseum.

So in parallel with the thinking about the building, these discussions back and forth with the building nicknamed the Colosseum, and the various statements for and against it and of course the other schemes as well. Well, here is the announcement, what should I say, however the road to the Colosseum is a long one, and notwithstanding the nickname, these are the models that we have explored, beginning with a kind of simple gesture on the site, occupying the full city block. Coming from downtown on two principle streets, of a curve that leads you into the site and try to get that office not to look like a tower. Well, it did not quite fit, there was another try at it. Another attempt was to put the library off centre at the site and put the office block across the glazed garden.

Finally, there was this larger curve again coming from downtown into the site, the library positioned and the office building stretched out into two floors, and restricted in height to about 12 floors. But we knew that if we present an office buildings with two floors we did not have a chance, because the efficiency of such a building would not be acceptable.

There were other ideas which had to do with the nature of the stacks and the storage of books and information on one hand, and the reading room as a principle space of the library and the reading areas on the other. Eventually this led to the idea of the reading room being a linear reading room, wrapping around the

block of stacks and information. The programme also asked to create the public room, a concourse which would have 20,00 sq, feet of retail in it, 2,000 meters a day care centre, auditorium, meeting rooms etc. programmed to be active throughout the day, throughout the week, as part of the programme.

Well this is the plan as it emerged and there is this rectangular block of 5x7 modules 9 meters each which is totally flexible, locked for stacks, rewirable reading areas etc. It is surrounded by this free standing wall, a living wall, we have it an inhabited wall, which is at street level, but which is in all upper floors, reading gallery accessed by bridges from the main block.

The second wall contains the other part of the site, so coming from downtown you flow into it this way, these are the two principle streets, and so here you flow in to the concourse and here is shops, cafes on top, a gallery for the public for the federal workers to come out and sit on the gallery up there and have lunch; a reading gallery outside the library, you can take a book and go up there and enter the library and all departments totally visible and accessible.

In fact, I thought of this wall glazed with its entry point as a kind of a menu of the library. When you come into this room you see at once every level, all departments, what there is, what there is is what you get, and again when you are inside the building, crossing bridges from the reading gallery back into the main stack, overseeing the various levels, always understanding where you are and again a 40,000 sq. foot library being made as a building that you can understand do not get lost in.

Again it seemed to me that there was a term on the 19th century plan. this is actually a recent library but it has by Kallmann, Mc Kinnell & Wood, in Newton outside Boston a very pleasant small town library. It has got its reading room in the centre and it has got the stacks all around it, and in fact what seemed to happen here, is that it got reversed. You have the sense of the community of readers. I went to the public library in New York and I enjoyed the great reading room, but there seems something acronistic about everyone sitting there, some with computers in this grand big room, sort of wanting to be a bit more private, doing things you did not use to do in libraries, like ticking away on the computer, and at the same time I felt that the solution one has seen in recent in libraries, of getting totally private alcoves, defeats the very notion of library, which is we go to libraries not to be alone. We can read or take a book and be alone at home. We go there to have a sense of privacy on one hand, but the sense of the community of readers, community of people using the library on the other.

So here we have the sense of continuity of the collective while giving a much greater level of privacy when you sit there looking to the city, looking back to the stored treasures of culture across the light well.

I suppose, as one central objective the office building is there, but as you perceive it is subordinate to the library, and while one knows it is a large bureaucratic assemblage of spaces, the wall relating back to the library makes it part of it. This will be low bearing precast and in meeting with Peter Rice some month ago before he fell ill, he proposed as making these as hollow pieces of precast. when I talk about precast concrete, this is almost reconstituted stone. It can take on the color of stone and because Vancouver is a severe earthquake zone, concrete it poured then this is another piece of the form and concrete is poured again. You have a building with continuity, structure continuity, but you have got the quality of finish of stone on the surface.

Finally as the great wall contains the concourse, buttresses come out to this free standing part of it, to stabilize it and they contain within them the day care centre and other meeting rooms and shops.

I would like to try and summarize by coming back to some of what I think are the central issues. The first one has to do with the public as a client. I am ambivalent even though we won the competition. I have a liberal side that says we have got to trust the wisdom of the public. I also reflect that the many examples of public intervention has had major benefit, stopping freeways going through cities. The whole heritage movement of the United States is really something that was publicly generated. But, I am also distressed or concerned. It seems to me that design selection by public vote, in some ways negates the possibility of the avant garde. Mahler's Second Symphony was booed first time, as a matter of fact we don't need to go that far, how long did it take each of us to appreciate the Beatles for those who are old enough. It took me six months at least. would the Eiffel Tower be selected by referendum, probably not. Pompidou, probably not, Sydney Opera House maybe.

There is another side of me that is suspicious of the avantgarde, so this is a kind of question. I think Joseph Rykwert today in his own words was suspicious of the avant garde. I think with the back to the wall I might come down on the side of the public, but I think it is a tough one.

I would like in conclusion to come back to the Madeba Plan of Jerusalem, because it seems to me in the final analysis the key is in that plan, and that is there is no point in what we seek in the public domain if we focus only on the design of public buildings, and we do not focus on the design of the public domain

that links them. I was thinking when Harry Cobb was showing his faces under these office centres, how wonderful it would be if one space of that magnificence connected to the next one and another one and the next developer and all of a sudden had six of those going through the city. Except the way we do things today we get one at one end and another at another end, because we do not design the public domain.

The public domain is a leftover for the Byzantines, the greatest effort went into the design of the street itself. Now I don't think that that public domain is going to be a colonnaded corridor, I don't think it is even going to be a 19th century street. It is clear that the scale, that numbers, that the transportation issues are new and unique. But without a vision for the public domain that connects the pieces, I think we won't get very far.

Some say the shopping mall is the answer, there it is. The best seller in the United States, Edge City that says the new world is in the mall, that the mall is single use of the mall to work you would have to have commerce and culture and governments and recreation integrated as they always did in the traditional city. That is not a traditional idea. Public spaces do not work well when they are not the collage, the connection of all these different uses.

So in the final analysis I think we should focus on what is the public domain, how do we design it and can we be as willful about it as when we design individual buildings. Thank you very much.

ARTHUR SPECTOR: Well you can all go home. We will see you tomorrow morning at 9:45 for the second installment of the Ken, Joseph and Stan show. Thank you.

© Yad Hanadiv, 1992. All rights reserved. Not for publication or quotation without prior written permission.