



Global Architecture

世界建築

*Kevin Roche, John Dinkeloo and Associates
The Ford Foundation Building, New York. 1967
The Oakland Museum, California. 1969
Edited and Photographed by Yukio Futagawa
Text by Hiroshi Hara*



Global Architecture
世界建築

世界建築 No. 4

福特基金會大樓 / 紐約市 / 1967年
奧克蘭美術館 / 加州・奧克蘭市 / 1969年
建築師：凱文・羅許 約翰・丁克盧

攝影 / 二川幸夫

本文 / 原廣司

中譯 / 陳銘俊

審訂：浩群建築師 / 蔡榮堂 陳乃城 黃模春 楊逸詠
黃長美建築師

發行人 / 陳桂英

發行 / 胡氏圖書出版社

地址 / 台北市忠孝東路二段39巷2弄2號

電話 / 3926657・3917597

製版 / 王子彩色(股)・飛虎彩色

印刷 / 尚峰彩色(股)

初版 / 1983年8月

定價 / 新台幣400元整

〈版權所有・翻印必究〉

行政院新聞局登記證局版台業字第二九〇〇號

Global Architecture 世界建築

*Kevin Roche, John Dinkeloo and Associates
The Ford Foundation Building, New York. 1967
The Oakland Museum, California. 1969
Edited and Photographed by Yukio Futagawa
Text by Hiroshi Hara*

世界建築 No. 4

福特基金會大樓 / 紐約市 / 1967年

奧克蘭美術館 / 加州，奧克蘭市 / 1969年

建築師：凱文·羅許 約翰·丁克盧

攝影：二川幸夫

本文：原廣司

中譯：陳銘俊

審訂：浩群建築師 / 蔡榮堂 陳乃城 黃模春 楊逸詠
黃長美建築師

胡氏圖書

TM 206/4: 47

正當現代建築呈現退化之際，凱文·羅許的出現，促使了建築的復甦。目前大多數的建築師之所以規避造形的問題，甚而導致現代建築停滯不前的原因，無疑地是在於他們對於造形問題的輕視。現代科技的發達已提供了建築師改變古典建築意象的機會，而建築師也樂於接受此種事實，而且由於對都市計劃或都市設計的熱衷，致使建築師漸次喪失對建築造形賦予表現的努力。此種趨勢為使他們集中心力於建築群組的集合形式，或是追尋建築上富於動態、多變的價值取向而疏忽了開拓建築造形新紀元的原因。就某種意義而言，此種情況與現代繪畫上，藝術家避免使用模特兒畫而嘗試尋求新穎的表現法頗有異曲同工之處；同時也意味著建築家對於造形意義的探索，實欠缺意志力。

回顧近代建築的發展，我們發現強壯的造形表達曾經數度出現。事實上，強壯的造形表達並非得由大尺度建築以呈現，結構力學的支援亦非絕對必要的條件。然而近來，大部分的現代建築造形多仰賴龐大的建築量體與時裝似的美好外表以求表現；一言以蔽之，建築造形已呈現女性化，乍看之下似乎甚為健康，其實祇是嬌柔於趣味性。在這種潮流的趨勢下，凱文·羅許可以說為新建築開拓了男性化的造形意味。

埃羅·沙利南一生熱衷於賦予建築一完整的造形，然而，與其它建築師不同的是，他並未為自己塑造獨特之沙利南式的造形風格，而是在每件作品中各有不同的造形表達。至於羅許原本即

在沙利南處工作，理所當然地對建築造形具有強烈之感性。誠然，吾人很容易分辨他在造形的處理手法上與沙利南有絕對的差異，其要者在於他對造形的塑造並非本諸自我的個性，而是源於某種設計方法準則下的產物。就因羅許對造形的處理手法有如此新穎的魅力，故必將對日後的建築造形發生極大的影響。

縱觀現代建築史，藉造形元素組構而成的累加法，實乃造形處理方法之主流。在此種情況下的所謂元素就如同柯比意為他的純粹主義所作的辯解一般，乃意味著其為一種原始性的表現。而如果單只以一種上述之造形元素用於設計的建築造形上，則最後必然形成如玻璃帷幕建築物一類之形式，成為現代建築中極通俗的手法。又如新藝術建築或者表現主義之建築，其展現的慣用手法則為一種所謂的觸摸的形式；經由觸摸後而塑成的造形，其手跡必然存在。又即使在過程中引入機械性的造形手法，手的痕跡亦歷歷在目。此種纖弱的造形，即使是美好的，仍有矯飾之嫌。諸如上述的幾種造形的基本方法，就其方法本身而言，毋寧說是種“高溫”的；其飄溢著古典的人文主義之氣息，而就美學的觀點言，則立足於移情作用。此種造形處理若以“機械加工”作比喻，便是以取代匠人之手工作業，以具有可敲敲打打之靈活工具的機械透過一番處理後而達成其最終的造形。然而凱文·羅許發明了與此截然不同的形塑方法，基本上，其造形的創造是基於一種切削與切斷的手法。事實上，此種建築造形的細部若不使用切

Kevin Roche arrived just when contemporary architecture was beginning to show signs of aging; he arrived to revitalize it. Many architects were seen avoiding coming face to face with the problem of form. One cause for the stagnancy of contemporary architecture has no doubt lain in negligence of its form aspect. Modernized technique has offered the architect an opportunity to modify the classicist image of architecture, a golden opportunity which the architect was not going to miss. Architects with an inclination toward city planning or city design no longer had to dedicate much effort to giving expressive form to architecture. The tendency which obtained called for giving expressive form to architectural groups or pointed to reading a new architectural value into movement and change, a tendency which was to some measure responsible for the failure to open up a new dimension of form. This, in a sense, bears resemblance to the contemporary trend in painting where artists avoid use of tableaux and search for a new method of expression, and is an indication of the lack of determination on the part of the architect to pursue the world of form to its meaningful depths.

Looking back on the history of modern architecture, we find that on several occasions there appeared a strong manifestation of form. But this was not observable in large-scale structures only; nor did it stand on the help of dynamic technique. Modern architecture has for the most part resorted to massive structures to overshadow the importance of form, or relied heavily on fashionable elegance. Thus, on the whole, architectural form has become rather feminine in taste, and, although putting up a virile face, it has in reality been little more than a fashion item. Amidst such a climate, Kevin Roche proved the validity of new architecture as an effective form of expression with a “masculine” touch.

Eero Saarinen, we may say, was ablaze throughout his lifetime with the enthusiasm to give architecture a completed form. This we

can say on the force of the fact that, unlike other architects, he never developed a form unique to himself, giving each work a different form of expression. It would thus even seem quite natural that Roche, who worked with Saarinen, comes with a particularly strong feeling about form. Of course, one nevertheless at once notices that his form method is quite distinct from Saarinen's and can be discerned in all of his works. It is to be carefully noted that, in his case, form is not due to his personality but is the product of method. It is thought that Roche's form method, by virtue of its very charisma supported by freshness, will be exerting immeasurable influences in the years to come.

One of the current form methods which are associated with modern architecture is the additive method whereby form elements are built up one on the other. These elements, as Le Corbusier asserted in defense of his purism, assume primary expressions. The use of one such element only in designing architectural form would result in a glass curtainwall type of structure, one of the most commonly used methods of modern architecture. Art nouveau architecture, and the architecture of the Expressionists used the method of hand-making form, and traces of the part played by the hand were left unconcealed. And even if a mechanical form method was employed, traces of the hand's role were in most cases left intact. Weak form, gracious as it may be, tends toward mannerism. Basic form methods as such as these, in themselves, come with, so to speak, a “high temperature,” and are highly redolent of classicist humanism and, from the aesthetic standpoint, are really based on empathy. Here is, so to speak, a form which man has machines in place of his hands create through manipulation of bending and hitting functions. Roche, however, discovered a method sharply contrasting against this approach. His basic approach to form creation lay in shaving and amputation. The forms that appear in the details of this architecture

削或切斷的機械即不成其為形。也許他的成功便是在於此種“低溫”的造形方式以避免人類情感的移入。當然，羅許並非首次運用此種構想的人，早在本世紀初，當原始形態頗受重視之時，幾何形態即曾引起共鳴，此現象可更遠溯於勒杜。但此等造形塑造的方法當演變成立足在“組構”的概念基礎上時，漸轉化成為一種“熱化”的過程；但另一方面，原本“冷性”的造形極易代表了一種均質的空間，它是一種將建築回歸於造形及空間均質化的過程。而在此無論是福特基金會大樓或是奧克蘭美術館所顯示的非均質空間，皆說明羅許並未走向造形的均質化；相反地，從他的作品吾人可以肯定他正執著於空間的多樣性。諸如切削或切斷的形塑手法，都非得使用切味十足的刀片或工作機械不可。任何企圖勉強地以手工取代機械所無法切削或切斷的部分細工，除了會將手工的痕跡留下外，亦無法掌握其整體的原始精髓。因此，在何部位以何種方法加以切削或切斷的處理，實屬造形處理技巧的界域。此種方法與一般以剖面顯示其造形的處理手法是不可同日而語的。將建築造形以剖面的方式表達，其目的在於顯示建築的構成性或機械性的曝露與強調未完成的形態之效果。至於就羅許所採用的手法而言，經過切削或切斷而成的面，並非就是剖面，而是藉著切削或切斷的手段以表現最後完成的造形。在此造形並非因由其它因素加以切斷後之產物，而實乃造形本身藉切斷後以表現終極的形。

are basically forms which could not be created without the use of bending and amputating machines. Thus it may be said that he succeeded in avoiding the introduction of human feeling into form, the result being a "low-temperature" form. Of course, Roche was by no means the first to come up with this idea. By the beginning of this century when primary forms were attracting attention, geometric forms had been indicated as an echo, if distant, of the time of Ledoux. But form methods such as these may turn "hot" depending on the conceptual contents of composition, while "cool" forms incorporate a conversion mechanism toward homogeneity of space or form. Roche did not orient himself toward homogeneity of form but rather worked toward diversity of space, as we can ascertain from his works. Neither the Ford Foundation Building nor the Oakland Museum consists of homogeneous space. Form methods such as shaving and amputation would be unmanageable without the use of sharp blades and machine tools. Any attempt to give elaborate forms to parts which could not possibly be shaven or amputated by tools would necessarily allow traces of handicraft to stay, which would result in the distortion of the originally meant overall form. Thus, what parts to shave or amputate, and how, becomes in its own right a domain of skill. Such an approach to form is distinct from the conventionally used method of leaving sections exposed bare. The form method based on showing sections expresses the exposure of structure or mechanism and the imperfection of form, but in the context of Roche's method, a plane resulting from shaving or amputation is not a section, but is a form perfected by the act of shaving or amputating. By this method, a form is not a derivative of some other factor which is amputated; the form itself is amputated.

In order that his method can be expressed in a lucid manner, the elements to undergo shaving or amputation come in larger scales than in earlier similar structures, and this is what confers on Roche's

為了明快地表現此種形塑手法，提供切削或切斷的元素，其尺度往往較早期相類似的構造體為大。藉此，羅許的造形手法並非僅存在於形的創造領域，而是具有賦予新意的契機，此為傳統形塑方法論所無可比擬者。至於尺度與造形手法所存在的關係，或許是尺度問題在先，也許更須考慮建築物的生產方式。但無論如何，造形手法與尺度感是整合成一體的，在此經過切削或切斷的元素，無論是就整體建築而言或者是僅就支配建築物的某些部份而言，其尺度感常是超越吾人所熟稔的人類尺度的。當然，運用這些形塑手法時，那些原先理所當然地產生在建築物上的微不足道之附加要素，總會被剷除殆盡的，於是與原始藝術的雕刻一樣，建築造形也顯得毫無表情而無裝飾性。一般而言，目前雖然具有龐大量體的建築物不在少數，然而其多數者對於尺度的處理毫不關心。與羅許的作品比較後，那些被視為現代建築的佳作幾乎會被誤認為前一代的建築物。緣此，若建築物的每個部分都能貫徹從大處著眼的造形手法，則勢必形成具有大膽表情的“男性化”建築，這便是代表現代建築之強而有力且具象徵意義的復興。

福特基金會大樓與奧克蘭美術館也許不能說是上述造形手法與尺度一體化方法下所產生最具象徵性格的代表作；倒是那些即將付諸實現的幾個計劃，或許更能表達其明快的形塑手法。不過瞭解羅許的形塑手法，則實為瞭解與品賞前述的兩棟建築物之必

form a new meaning which cannot be appreciated in terms of conventional form methodology. Or it may well be that form method has been extracted from scale, the scale being antecedent to the form method. Or it may even be that scale itself was preceded by production method for buildings. Whatever be the case, form method is integrated with scale sense, and the elements to undergo shaving or amputation are either whole buildings or governing segments of buildings, which are of an order exceeding the ordinary human scale. Minor additional elements which may logically appear are preemptively eradicated by these methods, and, as a result, the structure assumes an unaffected and expressionless form reminiscent of primary art sculpture. Indeed, massive structures are plentiful. But they are for the most part quite indifferent to scale treatment. A look at Roche's works suffices to make one experience the illusion that the structures rated to represent the cream of contemporary architecture are already things of a generation ago. As the method of macroscopic integration of architectural parts is pursued in a consistent manner, the resulting structure assumes ever bolder expressions which we can describe as "masculine." And this is how architecture regains its rights as a powerful, symbolic presence.

The Ford Foundation Building and the Oakland Museum may not necessarily be representative examples of the form-scale integration, or the resulting symbolism, which we discussed above. For more lucid illustration, we must turn our eyes to projects which are yet to be realized. It is nevertheless true that consideration of form method provides an important key to the understanding and appreciation of the two buildings just mentioned. For example, the façade wall pillar and other framework elements of the Ford Foundation Building and the structural elements of the Oakland Museum provide a meaningful clue to the respective form methods employed. But in neither case do we discern any manifestation of unique aspirations after

要條件。譬如，福特基金會大樓立面上的壁柱及其它構架元素，以及奧克蘭美術館所有之構架元素的部材，在在都展現了此種形塑手法的痕跡。然而，尺度與男性化造形所展開的特有領域在此並未能加以辨識。若吾人欲就福特基金會大樓以及奧克蘭美術館之建築造形深入探討，則有必要揉合造形與尺度的特質與其它觀點共同作一體性的摸索。

任何人都會留意到這兩件建築作品——在此或謂“建築”不足為其代表，則亦可視之為兩個“環境”——之極端特異處；一個為植物所覆蓋，一個則將植物環抱於建築物內部。雖然這些都和前述的造形手法無甚關聯，然而却都頗具某種象徵性格。將建築物覆蓋於地下的構想，為每個建築師都曾思議的問題，然而却少有人將它付諸實現。至於將花草樹木包覆於建築物內部形成類似溫室的構想，却是極為平常；事實上，有許多住宅早已將此種想法具體實現過。然而，將此種構想於紐約市中心區付諸實現的作法却非“凡俗”建築師所能為者。準此而言，此兩棟建築物之存在實出於“意料之外”，然而，值得我們注意的是：其設計概念與計劃本身都是十分明快的。當然，就概念蘊釀的層次以及造形手法之琢磨的層次而言，此種結果並非師出無名，實乃羅許運用切斷或切削的手法以取代累加組構的形塑方法所致。這也是其所以最初的意圖能完整而直截了當地表達於最終完成之建築物的原因。若吾人從意象的領域加以觀察，必然發現其最初的男性

化概念是多麼完整地表達出來。至於其“象徵性意味”之所以未能在最終完成的建築物上充分被意會，此為因人們的心思極易被其計劃好的優越空間所吸引，以致於未能客觀地加以品賞其建築，其實，就概念的領域而言，該建築物的象徵性格是相當明確的。吾人可以肯定地說，奧克蘭美術館是個頗為愜意的庭園；福特基金會大樓亦提供了人們舒適的工作環境，不致於有置身怪異建築的壓力。然而就建築設計的專業領域言，它實另有不得不讓人驚訝之處，即從設計概念到細部處理的過程中，其所堅持的“冷性”感，乃暗示著一種以“自我中心”之設計方法的構架。在這種設計方法之下，各種附加的可能性都遭到剔除，低層次的可能性也幾乎毫無立足的餘地，唯有當其目的是邁向表現主要空間構造時，這些低層次的可能性才會作保留性的選擇。極端地說，此種設計程序必先始於概念的建構，而後整個具體化過程中，籠罩支配於原始的感覺之下。至於其最終完成之建築物所蘊涵的意味，必然是惟有一貫的單一意義，不致具多重意義的性格，如此方不致在建築物內部造成矛盾。

或許有人會認為這兩棟建築物是藉自然要素環繞著都市元素，而認為它是依循自然的判斷而產生的結果。事實上我個人並不以為然，因為吾人若準此以判斷此兩棟建築物，福特基金會大樓實為矯揉地將自然濃縮，而奧克蘭美術館則確實是將自然導向都市以作為市民活動場所的一部分。前者所顯示的，吾人可視之為

masculine form coupled with scale. If we are to study the Ford Foundation Building and the Oakland Museum in light of the forms they represent in architectural terms, we will have to view them from some other standpoint while bearing in mind the factors of form and scale.

Anyone will at once notice that both of these architectural works, — or perhaps “environmental cases,” — stand on very unique concepts, one surrounded by plants and the other enclosing plants in its bosom. While neither of these has anything to do with the above-mentioned form method, it is certain that both of them come with some symbolic character. Burying a building underground is an idea which all architects debate once or twice and which very few, if any, dare turn into reality. The idea of having a building enclose plants and grass in greenhouse fashion is not uncommon and is, in fact, seen applied to a number of houses. But few “ordinary” architects would ever dream of introducing such a structure right in the middle of New York. These two buildings are, thus seen, based on “unusualness,” but we must not overlook that in both cases the underlying concepts are very clear and project themselves in a very lucid manner. This is, of course, because Roche, even on the concept-brewing level, as well as on the form-method-elaborating level, amputates and shaves, instead of employing the additive constitutive method. And this is precisely why the initial intentions find expression in the finished structures with such straightforwardness. If we seize them in their image aspect, we find in what manly manner their original concepts are projected forward. Standing before them in their finished form, however, we do not find them so “symbolic.” This is because when we study a completed structure we are absorbed into its depths or into planned “vantage points” and fail to appreciate them objectively. But when we chase the imagery of such structures on the conceptual dimension, we can observe

them asserting their symbolic character quite unambiguously. The Oakland Museum is, to be sure, a cozy garden, so to speak, while the Ford Foundation Building promises to provide a comfortable environment to work in, without giving you the impression of being in a bizarre building. Yet these are edifices built on foundations that surprise anyone professionally engaged in building design. The consistent sense of “coolness” which runs from concept to detail treatment suggests the structure of a “self-centered” method in design, where inferior possibilities are amputated and given up instead of various possibilities being additively incorporated. Or at most, inferior possibilities are conservatively treated, and then only in support of the expression of the more important space compositions. To put it in extreme terms, the process starting with conceptualization and ending with realization is allowed to hold away throughout with a rather primary sense. The meaning of the resulting structure itself does not come with a multiple message, but with a single consistent message and does not contain contradictions within itself.

Some may think, on the force of the two buildings' incorporating natural elements as against urban elements, that these structures were conceived under the influence of consideration for natural environment, but I personally do not agree. If we are to suppose that the two buildings were made on such a basis, the nature incorporated in the Ford Foundation Building is unnaturally diminutive, although, in the case of the Oakland Museum, a piece of nature is introduced into a city for utilization by the inhabitants as part of their living space. The former, which shows an architectural trick drawing on the rarity of nature in cities, may be pointing up the urban feature but in no way offers a clue to the solution of the problem, and should rather be taken as using the method of paradox or even irony. But the real significance of these buildings as cases

以建築的技巧揭發了都市中自然的稀少性。此種作法雖能對都市面貌有所指陳，然而却絕不是解決問題的一般性原則性方法；反之，這也可能是一種似是而非的手法，甚至有其嘲諷性的一面。此等建築之所以被視為都市建築的重要者，乃在於其對原本之普遍造形有所復甦的主張，而其被誤為單是以植物與建築的結合作為主題者，實屬偶然。事實上，在此建築與植物並非處於對等地位，其計劃手法純粹地是種建築性的技巧。此處雖然沒有很明確的理由以支持為何將植物引入建築中，然而其以與植物結合之建築手法的基本概念，即使在都市中亦確實提供了與其它建築加以隔離區別的有力契機。無疑地，在設計過程中，此契機成為極重要的要素。

這種方法上的取向當然會使人聯想到埃羅·沙利南。沙利南對造形處理的方法便是賦予建築物一鮮明的主題，而後在此主題之下，忠實地貫徹執行。比較沙利南之主題即造形之方法，羅許對造形有其一貫性的方法，且表現力亦較為豐富。

如果說建築造形僅是針對形的處理而為，則諸如羅許的形塑手法，早經他人所產生了。然而因為建築的造形與建築物的目的、內涵以及構造方法等都有密切的關係，所以它是依設計者的概念、建築物內部諸種組織關係，以及其它各種因素的多重關係所導出者。因此，“造形手法”事實上可以說便是“建築方法”，而建築師的所謂方法也多在造形手法上加以表達。基於此種觀點

of urban architecture comes to life in light of the universality of form, and these two buildings happen to come with a theme composed of the combination of architecture and plants. In neither case do architecture and plants stand on a par with each other, and the mechanism of planning behind them is purely architectural. Here the basic concept of incorporating plants as an architectural trick, though with no definite supporting reason for applying it to an urban situation, does provide a means whereby to clearly distinguish them from other buildings. No doubt, in the process of design, this has been an essential factor.

This approach certainly reminds us of Eero Saarinen. It was Saarinen's way to give single clear themes to his buildings which were built in strict accordance with them. But while Saarinen dealt with his forms in accordance with given themes, Roche comes with a consistent form method and thus appears to be armed with richer means of expression.

If form had been destined to be born from the manipulation of shapes, form methods such as his would have been worked out by any of his precursors a long time before. Because form in architecture is closely connected to the purpose and contents of the given building and to the building techniques involved, it represents the result of the superimposition of a number of factors such as the designer's concept and organization of various intra-structural relationships. Thus, "form method," may safely be paraphrased as "architectural method," and it illustrates the architect's method in the most complete manner. In this sense, the works of Roche shed light on what form method an architect must master. In other words, many architects will most probably adopt Roche's approach to form method in the years to come, but their works are bound to be deficient not only as structures but also as forms unless they learn to adhere to strict consistency from concept to detail treatment. And it

，羅許的作品可謂已闡明了每個建築家所不能不具備的造形手法。換句話說，今後很多建築家極可能選擇羅許在造形手法上所採取的途徑。然而，除非他們從概念的建構到細部的處理都能秉持其技巧上的一貫態度，否則，在構架與造形上必然都會顯得貧弱而無所表現。吾人甚至可以進一步認定，如果忠實地依循此種形塑手法，則可預想而知其結果將與羅許所謂的“建築方法”完全一致。

綜合上述而言，可知吾人必先探索羅許在建築上所表達的整體意味，而後方能針對羅許的建築作品予以評價。何以如是說呢？以萊特的建築為例，其無與倫比之魅力，完全存在於個別的局部與細節的考量上，循此吾人可對萊特的建築觀與生活之輪廓有所瞭解。此乃所謂未能對構成建築物之局部與細節詳加檢視，則無以品味其建築全貌之理由。相反地，就奧克蘭美術館或福特基金會大樓而言，局部的細節並不具任何意義，與其舉福特基金會大樓之玻璃屋頂加以論述，無寧對詹姆士·斯特林的玻璃架構探討來得恰當。再舉奧克蘭美術館為例，其階梯狀的組構，無論是取其局部的魅力或意義，事實上都不應該成為論述的指向，其與整體性空間之組織關係方為魅力與意義之所在。此並非指其局部或細節不佳，實乃在此種情境下，其意義已消失殆盡，所謂“感情移入”的作法事實上是不存在的。依此觀察，現代建築所關切的重要課題之一的“映像演化”的空間效果，在羅許的作品中似

is further presumed that anyone faithfully following this form method will be ineluctably employing a method identical with that of Roche insofar as "architectural method" is concerned.

If we go a step further and synthesize what we have been stating above, we come to a stage where we must question the total meaning of Roche's architecture. And it is only here that evaluation can be given to Roche's architecture. Why so? Take Wright's architecture for example: it abounds in attractive parts and details which facilitate the grasping of Wright's outlook on architecture and life. It is the sort of architecture which cannot be appreciated in full without a good look at the parts and details which make it up. By contrast, neither the Oakland Museum and nor the Ford Foundation Building has much to offer in the way of parts or details. If we are to discuss the glass roof of the Ford Foundation Building, we should rather take up James Stirling's glass framework first. The terraced staircase compositions of the Oakland Museum should not be discussed in terms of the beauty or meaning of parts, but should rather be regarded as contributing to the enhancement of the beauty of the overall organized space incorporating them. Not that the parts, or details, of these edifices are "bad"; but that their meaning is effaced in these cases, dispensing with what one might call an "empathic mannerism." Thus it seems that with Roche the cinematographic staging of the effect of space, which is one of the main themes contemporary architecture is concerned with, is not a topic of major interest. The architectural space in both the cases under study is quite materialistic, and does not exist as a phenomenon involving a meaning of space which would relate to the image of what we would term "space." Here is an architectural world where columns, plants, glass and other "things" make their appearance one after another. It is a world which is more materialistic than ideal. Yet, taken in their entirety, these buildings project their meaning as ideally conceived

乎不是一個主題，其所呈現的建築空間是十足的唯物的，其間並無涉及吾人所期望足以喚起人們對所謂的“空間”產生意象的意義存在。無論如何，在羅許的建築作品中所出現的柱、植物、玻璃或其它的“物體”，與其說它們是觀念性的展示，不如說是唯物性的呈現。然而就整體建築而言，這些建築反映成爲一種觀念性的機械，使呈現出的建築整體意義中不斷地浮現出其象徵性的性格。

此種建築物的個性如果評價爲：僅依創意性而衍生之建築物，則必然會犯下絕大的錯誤。事實上，建築的實現程序並不如此簡單，除非在設計程序上有極明確的方法，否則創意是無從實現的，尤其是在一大尺度建築的實現，更必是在此種情況下深入探索的結果。羅許並未在表面上將技巧過分顯露，因此，其與一般設計過火的匠人氣質是迥然不同的。

現代建築往往付出極大的代價以求得空間的“均質化”，並藉此以呈現其所謂的“整體性”。此種“整體性”往往是藉結構力學之助，以龐大特異形體虛構成的。而另一方面，組構式的建築手法在程序上往往是找出各部分的相對關係，而後將此種關係經過綜合性的整理，以求得其“整體性”的意味。至於羅許所採用的手法，似乎有異於組構式的建築方法，而針對如何表達整體意味之課題，準備提出新的解答。無論是奧克蘭美術館或福特基金會大樓，其整體外形似乎都不能由建築物之主要目的或機能，

devices with an unmistakably symbolic character.

If we were to evaluate the character of these buildings as being made only of idea, we would be committing a grave error. The procedures for architectural realization are not so simple, nor can idea be realized unless the procedures are organized according to lucid methodology. Realizing a large-scale structure would be out of the question. Roche is not an exhibitionistic display of his skill and is a total stranger to craftsman mentality dripping with design.

Modern architecture could offer a perspective of the “whole” only after it had made a big sacrifice of itself by space homogenization. The “whole” was approximately attained by escalating the mass scale of strange shapes with the help of dynamics. The constitutive architectural method's procedures for proposing the “whole” were by coordinating the demands of the various parts. Roche's method appears to come with an answer to the theme of how to give expression to total meaning without resorting to the constitutive method. In neither case of the Oakland Museum or the Ford Foundation Building does the main purpose or function of the building dictate the overall shape of the architectural product in an immediate or primordial manner. The shape common to the two cases, which reminds us of a segment of a simply-shaped solid cube having been scooped out with a blade, does appear to be the direct result of concept, but in reality they cannot have come from the design method of patternism which determines a priori the overall shape as in the case of the architecture of the Formalists who were concerned with symbolic structures in cities. This is clearer from other projects of Roche's than these two. The “whole” is preserved on the force of the support given by the form method which scoops out whole segments, instead of adding up constitutive elements, for the realization of concepts. Here the form method of amputating or shaving exists as a method of not allowing room for empathy, and it

作立即且原始的表明。其共通的外形特徵，乃是將單純的立體以類似刀刃之物削切形塑而成——此種現象尤其可從建築物剖面上獲得瞭解——其造形似乎是直接導自構想，然而它絕不是所謂的造形派建築在都市中做出象徵性的建築，以演繹方法將整體形態付諸形式主義者的設計手法，此種論點亦可由他設計的此兩棟建築以外的其它作品窺其端倪。而採用切削式的形塑手法以取代組構式的累加形態，便是企圖使初期構想之“整體性”得以保存。此種利用切斷或切削式的造形手法，由於不允許部分感情的移入，而終能免除那種狂妄而令人厭惡的浪漫形態。總之，在建築物的概念形成階段，所謂“整體性”爲由有組織的構想加以貫徹，而不是由最終的建築造形決定其“整體性”，如此，建築物所要求的內部關係，在能留下充裕的操作空間之情況下委諸造形手法。相較之下，彼等模式化建築除了以填滿或者說是嵌入必要空間之方法外，其操作空間是很有限的。至於羅許的方法即在決定建築物整體性格之諸種因素中，抽離主要的因素，而後循此決定空間的組構。由於主要的決定因子，具有造形的自由度，方使上述的“物體”呈現“冷性”的表情時有其可能性。吾人可以說，與羅許的其它具有象徵性系統之作品比較，奧克蘭美術館及福特基金會大樓更具有理論性的構造意味。舉福特基金會大樓正面的樓梯爲例，其象徵的是建築元素與整體構造間的等位關係。事實上，此樓梯具有壁柱的機能，然而乍看之下，也只是予人壁柱的聯

is this posture that saves it from the conceited, and often nauseating, romanticism heavily leaning on patternism. In other words, already at the stage of concept, the “whole” is foreseen in a vision propped up by various elements, and the “whole” is not determined by form. Ample room is left for manipulations of parts designated by the internal relationships resulting from the demands of the building, and this is where the form method is called on to discharge its part. In the case of patternized architecture, there was barely enough room for manipulations of parts except for filling out given empty spaces, or inlaying. Roche's method consists in extracting the main factors from among those factors affecting the determination of the total character of a given building and then deciding on space compositions. It is because the main determinant factors come with a measure of freedom of form that the “things” mentioned above can afford a “cool” expression. In this sense, we can say that, more than other projects of Roche's which are equipped with symbolic systems, the Oakland Museum and the Ford Foundation Building come with logical structures. Among other things, the staircase tower standing by the side of the façade of the Ford Foundation Building symbolizes *par excellence* the relationship between the architectural element and the overall structure. In reality, this staircase functions as a wall pillar and at first sight does not look like anything but a wall pillar. If this element had been made to look like what it is, it would have come with its own functional assertion, and the “whole” would have been confused by cacophony. A very skillful answer has been given to this case, which speaks for no ordinary talent of its designer and which also gives us a glimpse of the consistency of method. If, in the design process, various decisions had not been executed with strict precision, structures such as this would not have resulted. The tension-fraught atmosphere which envelops the overall structure eloquently bears testimony to preci-

想而已。若此建築元素能在形態上更寫實地像樓梯，如此雖可道出其機能性的語言，然而對“整體性”而言，將是極不協調的雜音。諸如此種極盡技巧性的解答，除了說明設計者的不平凡才華外，亦且指出了設計者方法上的整體一貫性。由此可以肯定的是，在設計程序中若每一個決定階段並非出於嚴謹而正確的執行，則諸如此等建築物將無以成形。建築整體的緊湊感，證實了設計的嚴密性。

當吾人對其建築與其所賴以支持的方法論有了較完整的檢視後，使人聯想到正統建築的復活。羅許的建築顯現出具有歷史上正統建築所謂的統一意象，歷史上曾經出現的建築物，不都是具有此種意象嗎？無論從任何觀點而言，它都是具有健康、一貫性、男性化及正統性格的建築。值得吾人思量的是，當代美國建築自覺意識之強烈，已可從建築家本身窺其端倪；這可以說是一種對古典主義與神秘主義的憧憬。而事實上，在現況除了極少數的建築家外，某些大設計組織的作品並未顯示多大的創作慾望。值此情境，凱文·羅許扮演了不易衡量的角色。或許羅許為吾人開啓的未來展望，應該不是被目前充斥於都市之汽車、道路與火柴盒似的建築等機械式裝置所填塞的意象，此誠為欲由悲觀主義解脫出來的建築家所期望的。再者，令人驚訝的是，羅許所開創的是一種純粹的建築領域，這也是為什麼我於本文之始即論及“造形”的原因。新乃意味著有各種可能性，然而就建築而言，堪稱

sion design.

When we obtain thus an overall grasp of the building in completed form and the methodology supporting it, we are made aware of the restoration of orthodox architecture. For Roche's architecture presents itself in an integrated image which invites one to wonder if architecture may not historically have been like that. It is an architecture which is healthy, consistent, masculine and orthodox, from whichever angle you look at it. Come to think of it, we notice that America's self-conscious contemporary architecture is showing an ever stronger trend to undergo exposure to the inner self of the architect; there is a strong aspiration after classicism and mysticism. Buildings by major organized design offices, excluding individual architects, do not indicate any meaningful creative ambition on the part of the builders. The role played by Kevin Roche amidst such a stagnant climate is of unfathomable implications. Probably the perspective he has opened up is one that leads us to the image of architecture which will not be crushed by automobiles, roads, match-box buildings and other mechanical contraptions which cram our cities. It is a streak of hope that could be projected only by an architect who had liberated himself from pessimism. What is surprising among other things is that the domain pioneered by Roche is genuinely architectural. This is why we touched upon "form" at the outset of this treatise. There will be diverse possibilities of ulterior development inasmuch as we are dealing with a new move. But in architecture worth the name, every pillar and every wall must represent the fruit of cultural crystallization. Many contemporary architects harbor doubts about the existence of such architecture. Roche has arrived to dispel such doubts.

In this short treatise, I have attempted, my personal methodology aside, to define the position of Kevin Roche while drawing on two of his works. Outstanding architectural works may make

建築的建築，即或是一柱、一牆，都不能不是文化的產物，可是很多建築家對此種建築之存在表示懷疑，此所以羅許欲澄清之疑惑。

本文所論述者，在避免我個人的方法論，而以兩棟建築物為例說明羅許所居之地位。優秀的建築或許能超越時代與其所處的環境而出現，像中世紀諸如僧院之紀念性建築所表現的卓越性，與之相較之下，為人們所遺忘的當代其它建築，該消失的也都消失了。然而不可或忘的是，中世紀的村落亦有比僧院更美的建築物存在。如上述地凱文·羅許代表了正統，正因為他建構了類似僧院的紀念性建築。許多美國建築家都或多或少是個悲觀主義者，這是因為他們是病態美國的建築師，與此不同的是凱文·羅許却屹立於堅強的美國。當然，這是個牽涉到每個建築師的態度與見解的問題，對這些美國人終究將會在歷史中對其建築有所評價的。就我個人而言，透過羅許的建築以觀察美國的社會狀況，因其過分透明，實在不得不對它有所疑慮。況且，目前建築所特有的精神向度，在歷史的涵構中亦不很明確之下無法有所斷言；但是我雖然不能明確地說羅許的方法衝破了近代文化的桎梏，更不能說他把近代建築尖銳化了，然而，就美國既存的設計問題而言，因為羅許的影響而使問題本身明朗化則是事實。就這位建築家早期的兩件予人強烈印象的作品而言，無論人們給予的評價如何，無疑地，在未來的歷史中，必然會予以定位。

their appearance transcending era and circumstances. It may be, for example, that monumental structures such as medieval monasteries truly excel while other works of the same era which have fallen into oblivion were destined from the beginning to disappear, as they indeed did. On the other hand, it is also true that many medieval villages were more beautiful than some monasteries. I have said that Kevin Roche represents orthodoxy because he builds monastery-like monumental structures. Many American architects are to a greater or lesser degree, pessimistic. This is because they are architects of an ailing America. But Kevin Roche is different; he is rooted in a strong America. Of course, these are problems that have to do with individual architects' posture and outlook, and in the ultimate analysis it is up to the Americans themselves to pass their verdict on them against the historical backdrop. Personally, when I see the social condition of America today through Roche's architecture, I do find myself a bit perplexed at the clarity of the picture. I cannot say for certain at this time, when the spiritual domain of architecture is not yet clearly defined in the historical context, but I cannot help feeling that Roche's method skips at a blow the shackles of modern culture and "radicalizes" the modern age. The design problem in America has been helped by the influence of Roche to assort and analyze itself. The two early works of this American architect, which leave such strong imprints on our mind, are certain to find their places in history, whatever significance is ascribed to them in the years ahead.

(Translated from Japanese original by Terutoyo Taneda)

Kevin Roche, John Dinkeloo and Associates
The Ford Foundation Building, New York. 1967
The Oakland Museum, California. 1969







The Ford Foundation Building 11







