

PRESENTATION BY FUMIHIKO MAKI

MR. SAFDIE: I am here to introduce Fumihiko Maki, but I would allow myself the prerogative of a brief comment of my own take on megaform. I really do not want to talk about megaform. I want to talk for a moment about Jerusalem.

There is a 25-year tradition that has evolved that when eminent architects come to the city we receive them, we present to them what is going on here in the way of building, we seek their advice, and we do so with considerable humility.

Over the years it has had an amazing impact on what goes on here. Credit should go to Teddy Kollek who, in the early years after unification, convened the Jerusalem Committee. Many eminent architects came here and saw what was being done and reflected upon it.

Major Olmert spoke briefly about changes going on in the city and suggested he might or might not seek advice about it, but it is important to report that profound changes are occurring right now in what Jerusalem is going to be about physically.

Much of this you do not yet see when you go on the tours, but if you take the sum total of plans being considered for approval and on the drafting board, this city will be very different ten years from today. And megaform is an understatement.

What I find amazing, given the scope and scale of a city being expanded horizontally and vertically, are the dozens of projects of 20, 30, 40, and I am told 60 stories high in the visual basin of the Old City; infrastructure of formidable scale, etc., and somehow there are no debates, no discussion. The barricades have gone. And where, 15 or

20 years ago, architects all over the country would care and be concerned, one cannot get anybody to react anymore.

It is amazing also that this conference, unlike some of the earlier conferences, has not, as one of its activities, seen to present what is going on to our guests. And so I say all this with the hope, both to the Israelis who have come to Jerusalem -- and they do not come that often anymore -- and to our guests from abroad, that you will please see what is being done. We seek your wisdom. I am not making any value judgment. We seek your wisdom.

And on the word wisdom I think is an appropriate place to introduce Fumihiko Maki.

For 35 years he has fascinated us. He has evolved. He has continually surprised us. He has received almost any possible honor an architect can receive, and I have been trying to reflect on these qualities in Maki's work that we so greatly appreciate.

Maki was 17 when the Second World War ended, and so he emerged as an architect in the height of the post-war construction, and obviously into orthodox modernism. As many of that generation, Maki was critical of modernism as he came into it. But unlike many others, he learned to build upon it, to separate the values that underlie it from some of its formal dilemmas, and so the baby was not thrown out with the bathwater.

As Kenneth Frampton wrote some years ago, Maki combined ethical commitment to the provision of an architecture both rational and appropriate, without losing ironic disposition.

To me, the fascination with Maki as an architect is that he combines east and west. His roots are Japan, but he studied in America at Harvard, at Cranbrook, his early years as an architect was in the United States, so that he was really formed with both eastern and western concepts. As someone put it, "evolution-oriented and object-oriented."

Maki has also demonstrated his understanding of the large scale. How often do we say about an architect -- no names necessary -- he makes such wonderful small buildings, but what a disaster when it gets to be too big.

I think Maki gets better as his projects get bigger. I believe that is the case because he treats his larger projects as a kind of microcosm of a city. He invests enormous energy and passion in its connectivity to its urban setting, and he has evolved for those projects a kind of hierarchical order and geometry that has meaning at the urban scale.

Maki lives in Tokyo and has actually witnessed its transformation from traditional urbanism to the chaos that represents so many of our larger metropolitan cities, a chaos of the complete breakdown of urban systems. (?) tells us about this chaos, that we must embrace it. As he talks about urban chaos, he says we must dare to be uncritical.

Well, I think Maki has been critical, and of equal significance, he has always been optimistic. Hence, he never ceases to invest in making the public realm wholesome.
Fumihiko Maki.

MR. MAKI: Madame Rosenberg and Yad Hanadiv, all my friends and audience, I am very pleased and honored to be part

of this place. This is my third trip to Jerusalem. The first one was in 1959, when I had a honeymoon trip from Tokyo. It was a long way. But the place always fascinates me because there is always tremendous change happening.

I am also very pleased to be introduced by my friend Moshe Safdie. Perhaps the first megastructure I have seen in reality was the famous Montreal (?) done by him.

Two years ago I had this realization. Although he may not remember, I visited his firm in Montreal. It was a big room occupied by many people, mostly young, presided over by Moshe Safdie. I was very impressed since, for the architect to be able to run just one project, is something we always dream about.

I would also like to thank Kenneth Frampton twice, first for inviting me to this conference, and second, because he said so much about my project yesterday that I feel I now can pack my bag and go home.

My presentation is about some of my recent projects, but instead of making an introduction, I would like to go the other way around. First I will make a presentation of two or three projects which might be appropriate or pertinent to the subject of this conference. Then I will make some analysis, not only of those projects, but of some of the undercurrents of the situation in modern architecture.

I would like to start with one project Kenneth Frampton showed yesterday. The one you are looking at is the Tokyo Metropolitan Gymnasium which I completed about nine years ago. It is located pretty much at the center of Tokyo, not far from where you now have the metropolitan government.

This is in a place where the buildings are very old,

and also happens to be part of a big park behind it.

Therefore, it was necessary to not make the building too bulky. We have a raised platform, and we also put the level of the gymnasium performance, swimming pool, six meters below. We hoped that even this megaform could be comparable to the scale of the neighborhood.

Also, on the platform we were able to produce a kind

of passage for the people through a criss-cross in a number of places. Therefore, the building is working as a sort of linkage that connects to the area around as well as accommodates a number of functions underneath.

One of the reasons I chose this curved shell-type form was because the properties of a round or curved form is quite different from a rectilinear form. A rectilinear form does not diminish in scale from a distance, but a curved form tends to appear less bulky than it really is. But when you come inside, then you can find a very large space contained within it.

So when we have this kind of environment, perhaps the curved form may give you a more gentle sort of appearance for those small-scale neighborhoods. The curved form requires much more energy in both design and construction, but it also gives more excitement once you are inside since it provides the sense of congregation which might be appropriate for a public building.

We had done the gymnasium, so we knew a little bit about designing a building of this kind. It was crowded with the (?), and sometimes the edges of those forms could melt into the sky to give the appearance of lightness. I think

lightness is also a sort of spirit of the age, and quite often we use a metallic roof simply to give a much finer survey against the sky.

As you see it, the building stands on a platform, each with striking form. The picture here was taken from this point, looking both at the arena as well as at the swimming pool in the inside.

Some people say the figure looks like an oyster. Whenever people start to put a nickname on a building, it suggests something has been imprinted on the minds of the people. It is probably a welcome sign since, today, most buildings in cities and towns are often quite without any character.

The difficulty we face in our modern society, in fact, is how much an idiosyncratic character can reconcile with ordinary buildings, and how much an ordinary building can still make a very substantial and present environment. This is the question being asked to the architect. I do not think there is any solution or answer to that. We just simply have to endeavor to give the best possible solution to each individual building.

As you see, once you come inside the interior spaces are a little more dramatic. Perhaps not like a rectilinear building, this kind of form suggests more dynamic qualities. When there is a performance here, the manner in which the people congregate gives a better sense of communality. Also, those lights will not merge into one. This gives a very dynamic quality.

But I must stress that the introduction of natural light into a big space is essential. This was taken at night. But in the daytime, the introduction of natural light will give a more dynamic quality, and also a floating quality to this particular interior space.

Sometimes we start to work with the interior space and then come up to the outer shell, rather than starting with the external form. For us, architecture is essentially the commodity to provide interior spaces for a number of activities. Therefore, sometimes even when you are making an initial attempt in architectural design, often how you make the interior spaces is very crucial, probably more than what the building should look like.

Again, this ethereality can only be achieved by having natural light which can reflect on the ceiling. Also, when we did the swimming pool next to the arena, I (?) those walls to each other and also from the ceiling, giving a hovering effect for the entire space.

As many other architects, I would stress bringing in natural light is being very crucial for the appreciation of a large megaspace.

This is Makuhari Messe, one of the largest convention centers today in Japan. The other side is the master plan drawn by the agencies, as well as one of the largest firms in Japan about 1970. I will not go into details of the plan, but it faces on Tokyo Bay and is located just between the international airport and Tokyo.

You can see the development on the waterfront. The first phase is here, and was completed in 1989. Then, ten years later, we completed the second phase. Yesterday, Steven

Holl showed his wonderful housing which is located in this complex. Here we have the central park demarcating both housing areas from the central business district.

From the outset we thought this could be a convention city drawing a number of people to exhibitions, and a number of hotels were later added in order to facilitate these functions.

In the meantime, several office towers were completed. When we started to design this building in the mid-1980's, there was nothing here. It was completely reclaimed land. In the last ten years this has become a big nucleus of what you call new communities.

The program for the Makuhari Messe convention center was quite ambitious, 140,000 square meters. It housed many exhibition spaces, conference rooms, an arena and so on.

My first image of this building was like this. It was a couple of pieces cut and bent and placed on this place. It was about 540 meters long, and we felt that may be too long to make just one curve. Instead, we made a curve and also a slightly bent one to give energy to the outside. It could be

seen as a metaphor of the gentle hill with a number of the houses and buildings in the front.

But this was not the kind of image I thought of from the beginning. In the beginning it was more functional, and we felt it might be better to give a different height to this large space without any (?).

Often an architect's mind will not start with an image or a metaphor. Instead, we start with a rational process, a thinking, reflecting program, as Steven Holl

mentioned yesterday. But in the process we may acquire sudden images. Then we will approach the building with this clear image.

These two buildings are drawings showing how the initial image was conceived. The one on the left shows the interior space. Those drawings will be changed in the process. However, the initial idea will be kept to the last moment.

When completed, it spans 540 meters. The view from the top of the building will look like this. It has eight pieces of identical exhibition space which can be divided by sliding doors or which can be unified into one.

The cluster of conference rooms is here and connected again by an entrance hall and also to the arena which is also connected to that.

It took only two years to complete. In order to complete a building of this size in such a relatively short period of time requires not only an XYZ three-dimensional design, but also T, time dimension.

In order to achieve that, from the very outset, when we were choosing even the structural systems, we needed to calculate the time required for the construction. So we used many pre-fab elements, both post-tension and retention, and we also counted things as to how those elements could be assembled, from components produced in the factory and so on. So it was sort of a four-dimensional design, XYZ and T.

In the end it was standing like this. There was one mistake, not done by us but by the city. That was to place this baseball stadium in the front which we did not realize.

We thought this central hall, which is open to the bay, could be enjoyed by viewers here. This did not occur in the end, to our great disappointment.

What is required is much stronger urban design coordination, though we were not in a position to be able to impose or recommend the positioning of this ballpark.

This shows the entrance. You go up either by steps or ramps or escalators. These three big mushrooms receive you to your left where you can see a long corridor; from the corridor to the exhibition space. Just behind, we have this arena.

The building sits near the water and the air is pretty salty. Therefore, we have pretty much become experts on dealing with metallic forms as well as metallic materials. Each material has different kinds of activities and materiality, and it is important to be expert in different kinds of materials since quite often we have to combine those different materials.

This shows the interior space to be used for different functions. This one is for opening ceremonies. This shows a motor show or some big exhibit on which you can look down from this long hall which connects the exhibition space.

In Frampton's essay, he said that today we are coming into an age where we have multi-form buildings which did not exist in the 19th century. Now you can see that. We had this big art show here several years ago. But the place can also be used for sports activities. Here is an international ping-pong contest, and we are able to provide temporary seating for spectators as well.

When I was asked to do a second phase of this complex, the metaphor is flat. There is a gentle hill, as I mentioned before, but then the counter form we thought is not necessarily the same form, but could be a wave since the building was not simply an extension. Instead, it is perpendicular.

Also, when we were moving into the second phase, those high-rise buildings were already there. Therefore, there is a kind of intervention to our existing urban context which did not exist when we did the first phase.

There is a railway station here, and the people can walk to this mall. So we decided to have the second phase along this access which reinforces the movement to the station as well. So there was a certain rationale in positioning and placing the southern function in a similar, second-stage convention center.

This shows my sketch at the beginning. To span 100 meters requires a special kind of structural system. We thought cabinetry (?) would be very economical and natural. However, if we used ordinary cabinetry, the height of the ceiling would not satisfy the conditions when we need to place very high objects. Therefore, we stretched this one a little bit upward.

Then there was a reaction against that, so we put these tension wires in order to give a balance to this whole structure. So now this is about 96 meters. This is about 20 meters. It provided a long hall this way, and then the building itself is about 200 meters long.

Here is a very hard sort of investigation into

providing the way to construct and structure this big megaspace. You can see that now the public mall, which had been here, can be extended here also in parallel with the new mall.

Now we are investigating, for extra, the bridges in case this first and second phase worked with us. You can see a kind of conversation of roof forms between the two buildings. One is slightly curved in this way, the other one in that way.

The public mall I mentioned stretches 200 meters long. In order, again, to give lightness, we provided a tension link from here to there to make the roof structure less thick. There is also a terrace outside where people can sit facing onto this mall.

In order to produce this silhouette we constructed the many buildings and existing buildings around. You can see there is a kind of wave of roof lines produced. The reason there are two different roofs is that this particular section of the building can be divided into small spaces. Therefore, we did not need the kind of height required for this section.

You are looking at these two complexes, one is the first phase, the other is the second phase with a number of hotels and offices behind.

The roof is shown from above with Tokyo Bay, and here you can see the gentle form with a kind of formal intervention to the existing skyline of the center of town.

At the end of this building lies a big plaza. In front we provided a gentle rampway leading to the upper part.

Underneath you see this kind of scenery. We mobilized many different kinds of structural systems in order to give a

certain strength to the space underneath.

The interior space again has natural light intensifying the silhouette of the form. Often in buildings they do not want natural light, so there is always a fight between the users or clients and architects. We provided a very effective system to cut off the intensity of the light. Nevertheless, when there is no such exhibit, to me, having natural light in that vast space is the only way.

There is a long hall along this exhibition space from which you can come down by both escalator and elevator. Trucks go in and out on the ground floor. This is becoming a very standard way of making a convention center in Japan since we can completely separate pedestrian movement. But once the exhibition is put on, everywhere becomes for the pedestrians.

The dramatic aspect of the large space is again emphasized by the curved forms and also by the silhouette they make. To me, this is a most challenging type of building, and not necessarily convention centers, but also airports as well as the train stations of today.

There are so many needs for large spaces. Therefore, we are continuously investigating technologies and construction systems to facilitate such requirements.

You can see that this first phase of Makuhari Messe has a kind of hybrid structural system made up of many different systems, yet appropriate to each function. This long mall is completely prefabricated because, while the construction was going on, this particular threshold was needed for maneuvering the south struts and so on.

A very important aspect of doing a large-scale

building is how the building should be constructed in two phases. This is the second phase, a little different, but again reflecting the different dimensions, the span of the columns and so on. And the silhouette is different. Therefore, again, all the needs lead us to these different solutions.

Tomorrow, when Rafael Vinoly I am sure will present the Tokyo Forum, I think his analysis will be different, although both projects were done by the same engineer, one of the best we have today.

The last project I would like to show you is completely different in scale and nature. It is the crematorium. Yesterday, Frampton said that megaform could be land form. Therefore, I thought this project could offer a certain analysis.

This crematorium was constructed in a small city in southern Japan with a population of about 8,000. It was completed two years ago. I was asked by the mayor of the city -- a city for which I did a small library before -- to

do this crematorium. Previously, there was a small crematorium, but it lacked sufficient facilities.

As you know, today, in a highly densely-populated place like Japan, a crematorium is not a welcome facility. Therefore, we thought to acquire a very large tract of land and convert it into a kind of park. Then we decided to have those structures be as if they are pieces of sculpture. So you could say the architecture is the counter form of the land form, or the land is the intermediary of those sculptural forms.

It is divided into three. You arrive here. The crematorium proper is here. Then, during the cremation, you have to wait an hour or two in this waiting area which is behind this place. Then there is a small service hall independent from this. But often people could use this hall first, and then cremate the body here. This tripartite organization is very common in Japan. Again, the scenery we wanted to create was very quiet to be appropriate to this particular service.

Today, in Japan, the crematorium is either in a very poor city or too gaudy, just like the funeral cars which have tremendously unnecessary decorations. So we wanted to make a very simple but dignified sort of scenery.

I would like to take you through the space by sequences. First, this is a sample view from the top. We have the existing cemetery. Also, in the process of making a park, we found a small burial place which dates back to the first century. So with this burial place, cemetery and crematorium, it becomes a small necropolis.

You come into this place with a casket. After you unload the casket you walk through this passage to give you enough time to just think back. It is the kind of time needed to arrive to this entrance. Then you go into No. 4 where the first ritual will be performed.

Then the casket will be brought in here. There is a small court to give natural light from above. Then it will be cremated in here. After that the people will wait in here. Sometimes, several groups come together. Therefore, we have two small places to perform the first farewell rituals.

When it is ready, the body and the casket will be

brought into this place where people can pick up the ashes and bones in a small pot they brought from home. Then you again wash your hands and go home, or you go into this small hall. The administration office is in here. So it is a very simple building, but the sequence is very important to fulfill this ritual.

The building is covered with brick, but also with this coating. We decided to use very primordial materials in order to make this very close to the earth. One of the reasons this octagonal form was used is as a gesture that that particular form is strongly related to earth.

I think one of the most important things in architecture, regardless of the style or the time it is built, is how the building can relate itself to the sky as well as to the ground.

There is a small pool to reflect the light. Another theme is again, the natural light. I think natural light is a very important agent in order to define the character of the building. As you approach from the entrance you go through this small passage, you arrive in your first entrance and there is a small skylight in here.

Again, here is something very Japanese, and that is to always provide a hint of the next place. Now you go through this grilled gate. Then you turn right and come into the place where you have the first farewell ritual.

Before I go on I would like to say a little about the way we conceived the space. Often in Japan we have this kind of dark space without any visible center. We call it a sense of depth or openness, and it is still in existence

either in cities or in gardens or in the temples.

So when you come into this particular place, again through a grille, you see a small opening in the next room through which can you see the pond. In order to control the natural light we use louvers so you can cut off the light.

We tried to use materials that are pretty much in harmony with this particular kind of ambience. Often we used chiselled concrete or just gray stone. This is called Chita (?), a kind of coating that was imported. It is not like plaster, a little more like stucco.

The palette of color is between white, gray, silver and black, and occasionally brown which is what we used for this particular building.

Then you come into a central space which encloses a small open court with water and sky. You can again see light coming through from here. The waiting space has a skylight of again different characters with the stairways and with the detail of the stairways, small wooden floor and concrete, etc.

The service hall has a different character, again coated with this Chita, and natural light coming in from this edge as well as from the bottom. We also designed all the lighting fixtures as well as the benches, and the floor is covered with black slate.

This is the enshrining room. Again we use natural light in a little bit different way. The casket will come in here. There are candles here, and the people stand surrounding the casket. Then you go home with those pots, so there is a whole sort of sequence.

There is view to the outside like this one. We used

a landscape architect who was trained in the United States.

We designed an ellipse shape to accentuate the periphery.

Further behind you can see the silhouette of the building.

By raising the floors we could cut off the height of the building. It is not a building as you would normally see it. As a whole, this building is to be merged into the land form of the entire environment, yet it announces its own existence in certain ways.

I think that this megaform or land form is different from others I have shown you where the size is much bigger and the materials are different. It is more pronounced, yet I think this might be Frampton's sort of observation. And more and more, we architects are interested in this kind of formation of architecture. Yet it requires a certain historical examination as to why such forms today are receiving attention.

Now I would like to go back to my own observation on the history of the development of 20th century architecture in order to explain the issues.

The dominant trend of 20th century architecture and urbanism could be described as the evolution of space -- as opposed to form or symbol -- as the primary means of political, psychological and aesthetic expression in the built environment. It is only when viewed through the lens of a spatial evolution that the continuous thread of this history becomes visible, transcending the last 30 years of debates on style.

I believe that focusing on space and the role of

technology in enabling new spatial relationships -- again avoiding questions of style -- will put us in an excellent position to understand where architecture and urbanism are heading in the coming years.

In this century there have been two major revolutions in our physical space -- one at the level of urban space, the other at the level of architectural space. In both cases we could say that the revolution was closely related to the emergence of universally homogeneous, limited space as a metaphysical concept.

For better or worse, this new metaphysical view has caused the gradual disappearance of topos (a priori meaning assigned to a place) in our cities and the dissolution of the room in architecture.

Amid the decline of traditional spatial boundaries, however, it is possible to see that society is both constructing new, more subtle expressions of territory and becoming more sensitive to nuance and to differences in what we suppose to be universal space.

You are looking at the famous Bastille, the drawing which is the beginning of the dissolution of the room concept. Again, this is an important notion since it was not interested in the form, but the form only in order to enclose the maximum volume within the minimum means.

Considering first the issue of topos in our urban surroundings, we can witness just how far the modern metropolis has evolved away from the historical model of a city. One of the most striking aspects of historical cities is a strong congruency between the appearance of built form and the identity of place.

The various forms of the city centers -- its streets, open spaces, building fabric and landmarks -- represent an integrated expression of functional order, social values and hierarchies that evolved over many generations. The slow pace of change in the historical city produced a tangible image of stability and specificity of place.

Furthermore, by the end of the last century, many of the world's great metropolises were no longer housing populations that shared a common ethnic or linguistic background. You are looking at Los Angeles.

The interaction of these new multi-cultural societies tended to erase historical differences between places and to accelerate the development of the modernist city based on homogeneous space.

Conceiving of space as universal and limitless tends to encourage urban development schemes that treat the city as a tabula rasa -- or topologically speaking, a zero-degree operative field -- allowing the investment of capital alone to define landmarks and focal points in the city. On the left side is Hong Kong today.

At MIT, in the late 1960's, Lloyd Rodwin and Kevin Lynch proposed, in *The Future Metropolis*, a multi-nuclear urban structure as a model of future metropolises. In this model, a historical city core becomes merely one of several nuclei, a relative center rather than an absolute one.

In embracing a theory of spatial relativity, a multi-nuclear urban structure follows naturally from the assumption of infinitely extendible space, both horizontally and vertically.

The prophetic nature of Rodwin and Lynch's insight

into the forces controlling urban development becomes clear when we compare their model to a plan of Tokyo a mere three decades later. The one you are looking at on the left is Tokyo with dots showing where the service activities occur.

Contemporary Tokyo represents a multi-nuclear city taken to a new extreme, where a post-industrial consumer society's preference for difference has encouraged the development of subtle character differentiation between new sub-center nodes that share nearly identical functions.

The fundamental difference between the utopian visions of 20th century modernists like Le Corbusier and those of Robert Owen and Charles Fourier from the previous century was the modernists' conviction that improved social conditions could be attained directly through planning -- that is to say, by spatial means.

For them, the city of the future would follow a machine model, where the relationship between discrete parts and the whole is rationally structured. I think this is the precise issue of megaform.

In the 1960's, I took an extensive trip to Asia, including Israel and Europe. I made a study of urban design, particularly morphological studies on the ways the coherent wholes were made.

What struck me most were the many villages and small towns around the Mediterranean coast. I found that there are genetic elements which unite those houses and small buildings -- as you see here -- by use of similar building forms and materials in a particular kind of spatial system for both the interior and exterior. I call it group form which is often found in vernacular architecture against more

compositional principles used for classic buildings and at the center of all big cities.

But at the same time, the 1960's, as Prof. Frampton also pointed out in his opening remarks, was the time for rising interest among architects, urbanists and futurists in megastructure, reflecting the use of advanced technology and moving systems.

I think you can see the number of ideas flourishing in that particular time. (?) once wrote me a letter saying when did I start to coin the word megastructure. Those are kind of undercurrent interests which prevailed among the many ideas in the 1960's.

Mr. Tangus (?), the Tokyo project. This is my proposal for the center of Boston where you have a type of arrangement, a sort of highway from which the parking garage extends in this manner for the people to change their mode of transportation.

I put those three principles as collective form and published the result in a small booklet called The Investigation in Collective Form published by Washington University in 1964. But I must say that what really interests me is not so much the form, but the space that connects those elements to make them a comprehensive whole.

Both city and architecture are spatial systems, which is to give them their own internal order. And design, capital and political power are the three interrelated forces that shape the modern metropolis today, for better or for worse.

It is worth noting that the most important commonality of today's quarantined utopias is not formal, but

spatial. At root in the design of theme parks, airport terminals, shopping malls -- as you see on the right -- and cineplexes is the question of how to create commercially desirable spaces.

These new urban (or pseudo-urban) entities cannot really be considered megaform types in the traditional sense of their sharing similar formal characteristics. But in terms of spatial system, modern hybrid buildings like the interiorized shopping mall have significant historical precedent in the glazed arcades, or passages.

I think (?) wrote extensively on the importance or emergence of passage in the 19th century which became the basis of today's shopping mall.

An important legacy of the passage was the creation of interiorized multi-purpose space within the city. Though it was perhaps not immediately apparent to contemporary architects, this development would forever diminish the importance of formal typology in architecture by attacking the idea of formal and functional congruency in buildings.

Also what is very important is, as you see, as spatial systems become bigger and more complex, the demarcation of territory becomes less clear psychologically and optically.

Already in the 1920's, this drawing by Le Corbusier talks about transferring volume or place, expressing that there is ambivalence in architecture in spatial phenomena which might become again important for the discovery and stimulus for the development of architecture's greatness.

And as somebody said, There are few issues more important in architecture now than the question of how

buildings shape and define our relationship to others.

So coming back, you can see on the right side the famous (?) Villa outside Potsdam which might be called one of the first modern planning where, instead of a sort of baroque axial planning there is now this kind of spatial arrangement taking advantage of the view outside in a very informal way, which again could be reflected in this Japanese screen.

When you look at the screen, while you cannot see outside, you can sense the movement outside of the moving trees or the people passing in front. When we did a church a few years ago in Tokyo, we also produced kind of a lightbulb, and I think it was completely cut off in terms of visibility from outside, yet you could sense the outer world which still exists in your memory.

So when we did this one in the later evening, the twilight gives this kind of color to interior spaces. Here again it is an attempt to create a different kind of space related to the outside.

When we did this housing it could be cited as an example of the roof form, but I am not going too much into detail into this particular complex. It was started in 1969, and in over 20 years it has grown this much.

While the buildings here are all very much in the modern tradition, the site planning itself is pretty much Japanese, giving focus to existing trees and small mounds and topographies and also boundary shapes, etc.

This is an enlargement of the sixth phase where we have a number of spaces. I might have mentioned about the sense of depth. Within very small dimensions we made several defined territories or zones. Each has its own function:

galleries and a small cafe and exhibition space, water and entrance and shopping and frontal galleries, etc. We call it layers of space.

We are standing here. Through this building you are looking at the building on the opposite side. This is exactly the kind of space which Paul (?) drawing might already have produced in the early 1920's, and vegetation tends to mediate the differences or the distance between those buildings.

This sense of multiplicity in space is again becoming one of the very important aspects of modern societies. I do not know whether this is closely related to our question of land form or megaform, but clearly the interest in the new spatial concept might be something we have to give more attention to in the next century.

Here again, in the front, you are looking from the second floor. Here are a number of the screens, mostly transparent, yet giving the sense of depth into an area here.

You might be able to say there are several different kinds of spatial allocation. One is a figure on the ground you define in small -- or not necessarily small -- but all European towns. The figure in the street would be exemplified by New York, and the figure in nature is quite often in Japanese cities.

Now, my question is why we accept those notions. In order to produce form, there must be some image for each architect. To me, in each culture there is undeniably what we call the primary landscape. The primary landscape is not necessarily the landscape you find in your immediate environment or vicinity. But it is something coded in your genetic DNA and transcends time.

I hope I am not going to be a determinist on this issue. However, when you look at these two scenes in Japan, they are very typical sort of gentle mountain forms with the building in front or the kind of places where you have a sense of depth.

I might say each culture might have this kind of landscape -- which we could almost call the mental landscape -- which goes into our collective subconscious. And this awareness of our subconscious might sometimes become the basis for our images.

This is my first sketch of the crematorium. This is the model of Makuhari Messe. The curve I used might be a Maki curve, yet being a Japanese, perhaps I may have a kind of subconsciousness which might come up at a critical moment of creation.

People say if you are a psychologist you have to be able to analyze yourself first. So before I analyze anybody else, I am always wondering how I am doing that.

Here is a famous (?) print. He was the one who made a tremendous intervention of this kind of a diagonal form or line against the Fuji print. And you might be able to say, in fact, that this tension wire in the Makuhari Messe could be a similar composition. I never intended it that way, but later I found that there is a certain kind of compositional similarity between them.

A long time ago I did a building outside the city. It was built on a mountain or hill. I did not want to make the building too pronounced on these gentle hills, so I again placed the building half underground, as you see here. Only

half the entrance is shown here. This must be a thesis for the crematorium which I did 20 years later.

So in every architect's mind there is a subconsciousness which could be uniquely his own, but it also is a latent collective subconscious which must be shared by many other people. When people visit the crematorium, many people have said that they would like to be cremated in this crematorium.

This is the highest compliment I can receive as an architect because a crematorium is the last place you would visit in your life.

However, again, architects are very different. Very recently I was given a very interesting site with a wonderful view to the outside. I did not make the building submerged -- this is a museum I won in a competition -- and instead I made a completely different statement. The building itself is a very rectilinear geometry against this land form. Yet it is my own.

So often an architect's mind works in many ways. The museum requires large space, and the idea was to make the passages all around the exhibition space so the people could have a view in different directions -- city, ocean, mountain and so on. But anyway, even when the same conditions are given to a different architect, the result will be quite different.

So my concluding remarks would be that although I have shown you a few examples explaining why I have done this, still I must say I have no answer. One thing is quite certain. Our interest in space in the 20th century might become the strong foundation for our concerns for megaform,

which I might be able to call megaspace as Steve Holl said yesterday.

But there should also be investigation into this primary landscape which still exists in the minds of each region's people, artists and architects, which might become a very critical source for producing the form.

The architecture of our current age, which relies increasingly on intuition and the senses in the experience of the city, may indicate a reaction against the dominant spatial trend of this century. It implies a rejection of the homogeneous space of modernism, a need to create a new sense of topos in the city, and a return to the subjective world view it implies. Thank you very much.