



国外著名  
建筑师

# 伊东丰雄作品集

方翔翔 余 阳 张 燕 译



黑龙江科学技术出版社  
天津大学出版社

TU206

22

# 国外著名 建 筑 师 伊东丰雄作品集

方翎珊 余 阳 张 燕 译

武云霞 夏 明 审

黑龙江科学技术出版社  
天 津 大 学 出 版 社

黑版贸审字 08-2001-001

本书中文版由韩国建筑世界杂志社授权出版。未经出版者书面许可,任何个人或单位不得以任何手段和方式复制或抄袭本书内容。

责任编辑 杨晓杰 曹俊强

## 国外著名建筑师伊东丰雄作品集

Top Architect Works in Series——TOYO ITO

方翔珊 余 阳 张 燕 译  
武云霞 夏 明 审

---

出版 黑龙江科学技术出版社

(150001 哈尔滨市南岗区建设街 41 号)

出版人 王继义

电 话 (0451)3642106(发行部)

传 真 (0451)3642143

\* \* \*

天津大学出版社

(300072 天津市卫津路 92 号天津大学内)

出版人 杨风和

电 话 (022)27403647(发行部)

(022)27402742(邮购部)

印刷 辽宁美术印刷厂

发行 全国新华书店

开本 930 × 1260 1/16

印张 12

插页 1

版次 2001 年 6 月第 1 版·第 1 次印刷

印数 1-3 000

书号 ISBN 7-5388-3810-4 / TU · 305

定价 90.00 元



Toyo Ito  
伊東豊雄

## 目 录 / CONTENTS

现代之外的主体意象:

是否存在无临界性的居住建筑 / 伊东丰雄

*A body image beyond the modern:*

*Is there residential architecture without criticality? / Toyo Ito*

13 我们时代的建筑师 / Choi, Moon Gyu

*An architect of our era / Choi, Moon Gyu*

24 访谈录

*Interview*

### 建成作品 / Works

44 大国的 S 住宅

*S House in Oguni*

52 横滨市社区及日间照料中心

*Community & Day Care Center in Yokohama*

64 大冢穹窿

*Dome in Odate*

74 长野县大田口胜地综合楼

*Ota - ku Resort Complex in Nagano*

88 野津原町市政厅

*Notsu haru Town Hall*

100 东京祐天寺的 T 住宅

*T House in Yutenji, Tokyo*

### 工程项目 / Projects

112 大社砂丘的 T 大厅

*T Hall in Taisha*

118 大分县农艺园

*Agricultural Park in Oita*

126 千代的中介工程

*Mediatheque Project in Sendai*

138 2000 年汉诺威(健康的未来)世界博览会

*Expo 2000 Hannover (Health Futures)*

144 罗马当代艺术中心

*Center for the Contemporary Art, Rome*

152 水晶球馆(汉城穹窿竞赛)

*Crystal Ballpark (The Seoul Dome Competition)*

162 巴塞尔 BIS(国际事务银行)扩建工程

*BIS (The Bank of International Settlements) Extension Project, Basle*

172 简 历 / Profile

176 建筑年表 / Chronology

于个体挫折感和愤怒感的反社会的、否定的表达，能够作为个体消极或怀疑的盾牌而一直为社会所认可吗？这是我在过去的十年间设计公共建筑的过程中所碰到的最棘手的问题。能否将消极的情绪转化成唤起人们信心的积极的表达，而同时又不必牺牲其活力呢？然而，即便是私邸，一旦竣工便也呈现出一派独立于其环境而存在的架势，尽管它们作为私人财产的角色并不妨碍其社会意义的获得。从这个意义上讲，公共建筑和私人建筑在理论上都存在着同样的问题，但是，如果涉及到设计公共建筑的实际过程时，就得另当别论了。

## 2. 对临界性的误解

纯属巧合，在我开始设计公共设施之后，我有一段时间没有机会涉足私人住宅了。直到两年前，终于有了多年以来的第一次机会设计两栋住宅。很幸运，我遇到了两位极好的业主，重新享受设计私邸的乐趣，真是妙极了。而更使我高兴的是，能够再次和住宅建筑面对面地在一起。这两个项目都是低预算的，但是基地却出乎意料之大，这就意味着我们不得不在外装修材料上缩减开支。竣工后的建筑看上去就好像一个简易的工棚，但要知道这两个工程都是在同业主张却还算友好的争执中最终完成的。这是我多年来第一次真切感受到业主和我平起平坐的。这种共识不仅使住宅的表情显得谦逊朴实，而且也避免了过于极端的表达。

这样的共识在公共建筑中是不可能体会得到的。偶尔，在某些项目中，建筑师可以和某些特殊的个体达成共识。但就总体而言，这种密切和谐的交流关系会被接连不断的分歧所打断，这分歧不是别的，就是所有无法弥补之裂隙的集合。

我一直用“临界性”（Criticality）一词来指代这种裂隙的缺失或存在。我曾在一次非正式讨论中谈到，在私邸的设计中不存在“临界性”这回事。对我而言，这是在我完成上述两栋住宅项目后，切身体会的自然表述。我没感到有什么裂隙存在和径直发泄愤怒或挫折的必要。能够不受临界性语言的习惯性困扰来做设计，让我在丧失方向感的同时得到愉悦。然而我还不能确定这是否只是我自己的特有的解答方式，故我特地说明，这当然要取决于一个人是如何界定临界性一词的。

当我看到一篇对于我这篇评论的回应时，我十分吃惊，因为这篇文章以此断定我将自己完全定位于公共建筑中，而对探求私邸的主题设计缺乏兴趣。该文甚至认为，已被社会认同的建筑师们总体上已不再对住宅设计感兴趣了。被误解得这么厉害，我实在感到很遗憾。但是在此，我不愿把这场争论降低在如此个人的

层面上。我想，当居住建筑的临界性这个话题超越了我个人的情感而上升到一个更为普遍的层次上时，将其拓展开来该是更有意思的吧。这样说的依据是，我在70年代设计我的第一栋住宅时，就认为对社会持有一种批评的态度是建筑师职业道德的一部分。无论如何，这已经成为自现代主义到来之后就一直伴随着我们的一种理念。自从现代主义建筑着手改变社会以来，建筑师们就对社会持有一种否定的态度。他们将主流社会对他们的拒绝当作荣誉勋章一样佩戴起来。但是只要建筑师们没有找到更积极的建筑语言来和他们所处的社会对话，或者说，只要他们拒绝放弃这种临界性的理念，他们就会继续创作出带有排斥性的建筑来。居住建筑提供给我们的正是从这条狭路上逃脱的一个最有效的途径。这就是为什么该文的题目不是“在居住建筑中是否存在临界性”，而是“是否存在无临界性的居住建筑”。

### 3. 一群隐遁的美学家

当我坐下来写这篇文章的时候，我从头到尾仔细翻阅了该杂志过去两年内曾详细介绍过的年轻建筑师的设计作品，发现其中的许多作品都有一个共同的征状，即大体量、立方体且尽其所能地透明。在我下文所引用的一段 Hasegawa Akira 为《新建筑》1998年4月刊所写的文章中，他十分专业化地把握住了频繁出现在这些设计作品中的“透明综合门”的本质所在：钢筋或木框架结构，特别强调透明的大尺度的入口，纤细的构造墙体是平直的、全然中性的且没有一丁点儿支撑的意图……虽然如此，这些住宅还是隐含了对20世纪前卫建筑难以觉察的引证，轻盈的且多少带有暂时性的建筑显得优雅生动。这些住宅均由出生于1960年前后的年轻建筑师所设计。当我看着这些作品的时候，我的审美意识变得迟钝起来，并且感到一种失语症侵袭而至。

此类作品在该杂志中频频出现的情形也许是编辑选择的结果，但是实际上，在现实社会中这一类设计也已经变得相当普遍了。当然，我自己的作品也带有许多这样的特征，而且毫无疑问，我很清醒地意识到，作为将轻盈、暂时性以及透明性当作自己作品主题的建筑师，我也必须为频频出现在那些晚我20年出生的建筑师的作品中的这些综合征状负有一定的责任。然而当 Hasegawa 写到，这些作品使得他的审美感觉迟钝起来并且患上了失语症时，我不免与他有同感。许多年轻建筑师所建造的房子似乎被赋予了微弱的内省性。当然，这情形并非存在于所有的作品中，不过大部分作品自始至终都采用混合了光和透明的美学原则。这类作品尽

管美丽优雅，但却回避了同外界的冲突，并且对现实保持着一种轻蔑的拒绝。换句话说，即便当今所设计的绝大多数住宅继续强调现代主义的临界性，但是他们并没有寻找到任何一个清晰的批评方法。仅有少数难得的几个人竭尽所能地在众人趋之若鹜的情形下面对现实。但是如果我们追溯在这些住宅中所看到的否定临界性的根源的话，我们就将回到 20 年代。事实上他们的确认同现代主义语言并且被赋予对现实强力批评的特色，这种对现实的强力批评正是早期现代主义建筑的目标。正如我早期所提到的，我本人也坚持自己的作品应该具有批评性。不过我不由自主地感觉到，这种对现实社会的否定态度易于将我们同社会隔开并导致对其的轻蔑和拒绝。

#### 4. 一座最纯粹的现代主义住宅，或奥戈曼 (O' Gorman) 悲剧

去年春天，我负责在东京的一个画廊里举办一次展览，是关于一栋建于 20 世纪 30 年代早期的住宅：“迪埃戈·里维拉 (Diego Rivera) 和弗瑞达·卡洛 (Frida Kahlo) 之家”。它位于墨西哥城并于近期重建。在最近一次对墨西哥的访问中我有幸参观了这所房子，而在此之前我对它一无所知，我甚至不知道设计者的姓名，但从我自庭院前的轿车中出来的那一刻起，我便被这栋住宅深深地打动了。首先，它纯净、恬淡的形式足以推翻我已有的关于墨西哥的印象。这栋住宅是贾安·奥戈曼 (Juan O' Gorman) 为两位因喧闹的生活而出名且极具创意的画家所设计的，竣工于 1932 年，正好与勒·柯布西耶完成他的萨沃伊别墅 (Villa Savoye) 相隔一年。

这两位画家是一对夫妻，但工作起来却是各干各的，因此奥戈曼为这栋住宅设计了两套起居空间和画室，分别位于两侧翼中。这两侧翼仅由架于屋顶之间的天桥相连，每个都是简单的立方体，看上去犹如漂浮于半空中。他们分别涂以印第安红和海藻两种颜色，以使人联想起墨西哥风情。两侧翼为仙人掌篱笆所环绕，并支在立柱上，与地面完全脱离开来。该建筑由纯粹的现代主义语言所构成，它不仅凌空而起，而且即使是在墨西哥这个悬挂之风依旧浓厚的国度里，也好像是完全独立自在的。也许，路易斯·巴拉根 (Luis Barragan) 的作品和当代墨西哥建筑的联系最为紧密，但这栋由奥戈曼所设计的房子则有着迥然不同的特点。巴拉根的住宅与墨西哥自然景观的融合更为柔和些，不同于奥戈曼，他经常采用一些喜庆的色彩来增进同自然景观的调和。他那突出建筑外观的粗糙肌理以及他在实体的入口处对树木不拘一格的作法反而进一步加强了建筑同大地的亲近感。他的建筑整体看来也许是以现代主义语言为基础而创作的，但是为了尽可能避免同周围环境的冲突，也常带有将其淡化、钝化以及利用植被将其隐蔽化的倾向。巴拉根的建筑是现代主义同大地的一



种妥协，一种与本土的修正主义式的休战。就此而言，它确保的不是一种新的生活方式，而是一种平静的、丰富多彩的既定生活方式。

显然，迪埃戈那一侧带有锯齿形屋顶及混凝土螺旋外楼梯的侧翼的设计灵感，来自于“奥赞范特住宅与工作室”（Ozenfant House and Studio, 1923），但对功能的追求上，它比勒·柯布西耶早期设计的住宅走得更远了。对理性和经济的追求被奥戈曼发挥到了极致，这种追求明显地体现在柱子、楼板、墙体以及楼梯所有这些据说都被他简化至仅从结构上考虑而设计的元素中。这种极至同样也体现在平面、立面的精确度上，出于纯粹的功能和经济的考虑，每一要素（从门到窗框，从污水槽、排水沟到家具）的每一细节都经过一番仔细琢磨和推敲。如果把他的作品同两个被公认为勒·柯布西耶早期杰作的加切斯别墅（Villa a Garches, 1927）和萨沃伊别墅（1931）作以比较，我们就会明白奥戈曼对纯功能的追求到了何种地步。同“里维拉和卡洛之家”（Rivera and Kahlo House）一样，勒·柯布西耶的这两个住宅都有着由简洁的几何形体所形成的鲜明的轮廓，但是蕴涵于其中的建筑意义却大相径庭。勒·柯布西耶的作品关注于功能并倡导新的生活方式，但与此同时，他的作品又被娴熟地注入了古典主义与抽象绘画二者兼备的旨趣。正如科林·罗欧（Colin Rowen）在《理想别墅中的数学》（The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa）一书中所指出的，勒·柯布西耶作品外部的比例及修饰让人联想起帕拉第奥的别墅，而其室内那些如同运用于纯绘画中的曲线，形成了层次（给人以一种通透感）。当勒·柯布西耶在为一座新的城市提出新构想时，他继续将前卫艺术的体验与历史性建筑的模样结合起来。就这一点来看，勒·柯布西耶那意图使一种新的生活方式成为可能的新建筑五原则（1926），看上去不过是一种借助现代主义逻辑替其作品辩护的工具而已。较之更为甚者的是26岁的奥戈曼，他一直在梦想着借助支撑柱、屋顶花园、水平带形窗、自由的平面和立面这五点来使这种新生活成为可能。所有这五点在“里维拉和卡洛之家”中以最为纯粹的形式展示给了社会。难道我们不能说就是在这专心致志追求功能性的时刻，现代主义语言才得以突破它自我封闭的语境并且否定了其作为批评式语言的身份？对此，我们绝对可以从这样的一个事实中得到最有力的验证，即便是里维拉和卡洛这两位极为为古墨西哥文明而战的狂热者和共产主义运动的支持者，也都为这纯粹的现代主义空间而感到自豪；但奥戈曼的追求飘忽不定。在30年代早期，他做了许多包括学校和公共住宅在内的社会性项目，但是在30年代末他放弃了建筑转而从事绘画。再往后，他又投身于壁画运动，这多少是受了里维拉的影响。他献身社会改良的初衷始终没有改变，只不过形式从西方现代主义纯净、抽象的空间转向了与其对立的另一个极

端。然而，奥戈曼的转变并非到此为止。1953年，他搬进了自己设计的洞穴般的住宅，里面满是印第安人的饰品。最后，1982年搬到他年轻时设计的一座现代主义住宅中并在那里自杀。很可能，对现代主义空间过于纯粹和彻底的追求，迫使他对将现代主义语言从墨西哥文化中分离出来的这种裂痕有着一个过于清晰完整的洞察。的确，这是一种无法修补的裂隙。

### 5. 现代之外的主体意象

奥戈曼在他一生中所象征性表达出来的两种世界，对应于他体内的两个相对立的意象，一个是概念上的，一个是直觉上的。前者为非自然体，旨在追求一个在意识层面上构想出来的抽象的乌托邦社会；而后者则是自然体，与古墨西哥传统相关联。各个年龄段的人们都曾努力在他们的住宅空间里保存铭刻于内心的关于土地的记忆。这种记忆的空间化不仅发生于个体记忆中，也发生于家庭和整个社区的记忆中。以这种方式建造的住宅经过几代人与大自然殊死的抗争，直至它们几乎成为人类皮肤的延伸。然而，与此同时，人们始终在努力建造另一类可以收藏他们未来记忆的住宅。尤其是在本世纪，当技术取得如此惊人的进步时，许多人就梦想着有那样的住宅，就是尝试着把我们在类似汽车和飞机这样的机械空间里所体验到的令人愉悦的感觉转化到我们的住宅中来。当人们试图滑进这些由钢铁、玻璃、铝材或塑料制成的“皮肤”里时，他们体验到一种主体的释放，犹如进入了另一个维度中。于是他们就尝试着将这种释放的感觉扩展到另一类的皮肤和主体中去，这是一种从土地的束缚和世俗家庭、社会日常生活中挣脱出来的释放。我称那种寻求能收藏未来记忆之住所的主体为非自然体，但它正在变换成体验宇宙的主体。到目前为止，将它当作探求一种不同于以往的崭新自然界的主体应该是可能的。这个寻求机械的主体在它开始探寻作为未来记忆的自然之前，就已经有了深一层的扩展，这就是我们所说的虚拟主体（Virtual body）。

奥戈曼的“里维拉和卡洛之家”是在意识沉迷于机器时代时找寻主体的一种尝试。但是，当它被另一类有着土地情结的强大的集体记忆之主体所拒绝时，那种尝试便告失败。回想起他自身，奥戈曼试图把他自己归还于乡土的记忆，结果却再告失败。他无法同时容纳两种主体。但是今天这两个主体依然伴随着我们的生活，我们城市空间的杂乱无序可以被认为正是我们为之抗争的结果。许多建筑师继续着现代主义的传统并且用其语言来表现他们的作品，他

们左右彷徨，无法找到一个落脚点。而被认为是点燃了我们激情的乡土力量，则早已失去了其对于现代化的效力并发现其主体被晾在那已萎缩了的地方世界里。也许，它无法与本世纪初爆发革命的墨西哥相提并论，但是对我而言，上面所提到的那群年轻的建筑师们，似乎象征了一个业已越过现代化的顶峰且迷失其目标的日本。看到他们含糊其词，既没有信心去继承现代主义又无力和社会对话，Hasegawa已无任何感觉和言辞，就只能是借否定临界性之名为那令人窒息的恼怒而进行的辩解。既然无法从陷入困境的两主体的僵局中获得有关未来的记忆，那么我们唯一能够希望的就是，这些恼怒的建筑师们能够超越他们作为现代主义继承人的主体。我们必须找到一个能够帮助我们走出僵局的崭新的主体意象，它将不会是一种非自然体的，而是一种纳新但不吐故的主体。只有当这两个新故自然和谐相处时，这种探寻新三体的住宅才能以一种积极的语言表达出来。

# ***A Body Image Beyond the Modern : Is There Residential Architecture Without Criticality?***

Toyo Ito

## **I. Fissures with Contemporary Society**

The first house I designed was completed 28 years ago. This was also the first time I used the medium of architecture to send out a message to the world. There is no doubt that the position of architecture in the city is fast losing its social meaning. But if, as a lone frail individual, one insists on lingering over the work of design after the unexpressible and futile collapse of logic in the world of architecture, the only way is to expose the absurdity of one's surroundings such as they are... For me, designing a home is a labor of tracing the desperately profound rift between myself as the designer and the home's future occupant. Perhaps one should use the term "bridge" rather than "trace" when speaking of this gap, but the fact is that we lack the common terms necessary to bridge it. This labor, then, can only begin in contradiction: by building insurmountable walls with an awareness of that unbridgeable gap.(from "The Act of Design is the Tracing of One's Thought Processes as they Become Distorted" *Shinkenchiku*, October, 1970)

As this passage suggests, I began the work of design as an expression of an unbearable frustration over the state of society and the city. This emotion was given blatant expression in aluminum-covered exterior walls that flaunted their dents and irregularities in the light of the sun, and cylinders of light thrusting upwards without meaning. At the time, this was the only and the greatest critical tool I had.

In the past ten years my design work has focused almost exclusively on public architecture. The feelings I have for this work are almost the same as those expressed in the message I sent by way of that small house 28 years ago. It is impossible to conceive of a common language to bridge the gap with the systems of actual cities and societies. We are left dumfounded by our awareness of the excessive depth of that gap. Not a few times, during discussions with local governments, I have been tempted to smash the models and storm out of the room. Recently, however, I have begun to worry that staring into that gap has closed me off from the world around me. Sometimes I wonder if I am not taking refuge in the comfort of "critique" as a selfish justification of my own condemnation of society. Architecture and other creative practices often take their inspiration from frustration and anger towards the world outside. They also sometimes stem from irritations and insecurities arising from an inability to express one's emotions directly. Whether they are hot or cool, these emotions are linked to the desire to express oneself. But however much they may have their origins in individual impulses, the resultant expressions ultimately leave the hands of their creators and acquire a life of their own. Paintings and novels remain in the museum or the bookstore, but architecture makes its appearance in our surroundings. They are there for anyone to see in unmediated form. They are available for use in people's lives and for specific purposes. Architects have no choice but to face the social or public nature of their expressive work. Can anti-social, negative expressions arising from personal frustration and anger ever be socially redeemed as individual expressions in the negative or the interrogative? This has been the most difficult issue I have confronted over the last ten years designing public architecture. Is it possible to transform negative impulses into positive expressions evoking trust without sacrificing their energy? But even private residences take on an independent existence in their environment once they are



completed. Their status as private property does not prevent them from having social meaning. In this sense the same problem exists in theoretical terms both for public and private architecture, but there is a difference when it comes to the actual process of designing public architecture.

## 2. The Misunderstanding of Criticality

By a complete coincidence I had no opportunities to design private residences for some time after I began designing public facilities. It was not until two years ago that I finally designed two homes for the first time in years. I was lucky enough to have two excellent clients and it was wonderful to rediscover how enjoyable it can be to design private homes. But more than that, I was just happy to be face to face with homes again. Both of the projects were low-budget, but the sites were unexpectedly large, which meant that we had to cut back on finishing materials. The exteriors ended up looking like a simple factory shed, but the projects were finally completed amidst tension-filled and yet friendly disagreements with the clients. For the first time in many years I felt certain that the clients and I were occupying the same space. This sense of commonality made them modest spaces but also kept them from descending into too radical an expression.

It is impossible to experience this sort of commonality with public architecture. There are moments on certain projects when one feels that one has shared a space with specific individuals. But the communication as a whole is interrupted by a succession of gaps, nothing but an assemblage of irreparable fissures.

I have used the term "criticality" to refer to the absence or presence of this kind of rupture. I once said in a roundtable discussion that there was no criticality in private residence design. For me, this was a natural expression of how I felt just after having completed the two residential projects mentioned above. I felt no fissures and no need directly to vent any anger or frustration. I felt at once disoriented and happy to have been able to design something outside of my customary obsession with the language of criticality. And yet I was not sure if this particular solution was mine alone, so I added the caveat that of course this would depend on how one defines criticality.

I was thus quite astonished to read a response to this comment of mine which took it to mean that I had my sites set exclusively on public architecture, had no interest in looking for themes in private residence design, and even that established architects in general were no longer concerned with designing homes. I even felt sorry for myself at having been so roundly misunderstood. But I prefer not to bring the discussion down to so personal a level here. I think it would be more interesting to expand the theme of the criticality of residential architecture as it has developed out of my personal emotions onto a more general level. This has to do with the fact that in the seventies when I designed my first home I thought that a critical attitude toward society was part of the architect's ethic. This is, however, an idea that has been with us since the advent of modernity. Architects have maintained a negative attitude toward society ever since modernist architecture set out to change it. And they have worn their rejection by mainstream society like a badge of

honor. But as long as architects fail to find more positive terms in which to speak to their society, that is to say as long as they refuse to give up the idea of criticality, they will continue to create an architecture of exclusion. And residential architecture offers us the most accessible escape route from this narrow path. This is why the theme of this essay is not "Is there criticality in residential architecture?" but "Is there residential architecture without criticality?"

### 3. A Flock of Reclusive Aesthetics

When I sat down to write this article I looked over the designs of young architects written up in this journal over the past two years and found that many of them shared a common symptom. They were large and cubic and striving toward transparency. Hasegawa Akira expertly captured the essence of the "transparency syndrome" affecting these designs in the passage I cite below in his essay for the April, 1998 issue of *Shinkenchiku*. The structures are of reinforced steel or wood-frame and the entrances extremely large with a peculiar insistence on transparency. The slightly built walls are flat, utterly neutral and without the slightest pretension to structural strength... Pleasantly light and somehow makeshift, these residences nonetheless contain inconspicuous citations of the avant-garde architecture of the twenties, with whose forms they are gracefully enlivened. These are all residences designed by young architects born in or around 1960. As I look at them my sense of taste goes numb and I feel a kind of aphasia coming on.

The prevalence of this kind of design in the pages of this journal may simply be a result of the editors' selection, but they have in fact become quite common in the real world as well. Of course my own work has a good deal of the same kind of character. And I am certainly self-aware enough to realize that as someone who has made lightness, provisionality and transparency my own themes I must also bear some responsibility for this syndrome affecting those born twenty years later than I. And yet I cannot help but sympathize with Hasegawa when he writes that these works have numbed his sense of taste and made him aphasic. Many of these homes built by young architects seem to be characterized by a kind of feeble introversion. Of course this does not go for all of them, but for the most part they begin and end in the sophistication of a light and transparent aesthetic. They are beautiful and delicate, but they avoid conflict with the outside and remain disdainfully closed to reality. In other words, the vast majority of homes designed today fail to come up with any clear critique even as they continue to insist on the criticality of modernism. Only a precious few manage to confront reality in a proactive fashion. But if we were to trace the roots of the negative criticality seen in these residences we would end up right back in the twenties. They do in fact subscribe to the language of modernism and are characterized by the strong critique of reality that was the goal of early modernist architecture. I myself, as I mentioned earlier, have also insisted that my own work should be critical. But I cannot help feeling that a negative attitude toward actual society tends to separate one from the land and cause one to turn one's back on it.



#### 4. A Home of the Purest Modernism, or the Tragedy of O'Gorman

The last spring I curated an exhibition at a gallery in Tokyo devoted to a single home built in the early 1930s: the "Diego Rivera and Frida Kahlo House," located in Mexico City and recently restored. I was lucky enough to see this house on a recent visit to Mexico, before which I knew nothing about it. I did not even know the architect's name. But from the moment I got out of the car in front of the grounds, this house made a powerful impression on me. First of all, its pure and stoic form was more than enough to overturn all of the images I had associated with Mexico. The house was designed by Juan O'Gorman for the two highly original painters known for their tumultuous lives and completed in 1932, just one year after Le Corbusier completed his Villa Savoye.

The two painters were husband and wife but worked independently from each other, so O'Gorman designed the house with two living spaces and ateliers in separate wings. The two wings, connected only by a bridge from roof to roof, are each simple cubes that seem to float in mid-air. Painted Indian red and marine blue respectively to evoke the Mexican landscape, the two wings are surrounded by a fence of cacti and held aloft on pilotis, completely cut off from the ground. Composed solely in the language of pure modernism, this architecture was not only separate from the land, but seemed utterly autonomous even in Mexico, where a sense of place still hangs thick in the air. The work of Luis Barragan is perhaps most strongly associated with contemporary Mexican architecture, but this house by O'Gorman is entirely different in character. Barragan's homes are much more gently integrated into the Mexican landscape. Unlike O'Gorman he often used festive colors to promote harmony with the landscape. The rough textures that highlight his surfaces and the liberal use of trees in his substantial entryways only further heighten the sense of an intimate relation to the earth. The volume as a whole may be based in the language of modernism but there is always a tendency to downplay it, to dull its edges and cover it in vegetation in order to avoid as far as possible any confrontation with the environment. Barragan's architecture is an accommodation of modernism to the land, a revisionist truce with the local. As such it ensures not a new lifestyle, but a tranquil, rich, and established one.

The Diego wing in particular, with its sawtooth roof and exterior spiral staircase out of concrete, was clearly inspired by the "Ozenfant House and Studio" (1923), but it goes even further than the early houses of Le Corbusier in its pursuit of functionality. The pursuit of rationality and economy evident in the columns, floors, walls, and staircases, all of which O'Gorman is said to have designed down to the structural calculations, is taken to its furthest horizon. The same is true for the precision of the horizontal and vertical surfaces and each element (from the doors to the window sashes, the dust shoot and gutters to the furniture) was thought out down to its last detail for the sake of pure functionality and economy. A comparison with "Villa a Garches" (1927) and "Villa Savoye" (1931), two works considered early masterpieces of Le Corbusier, will make clear the extent to which O'Gorman's work was invested in the search for pure functionality. Like the "Rivera and Kahlo House", these two houses have clean-cut edges based in simple

geometrical volumes, but the architectural meanings embedded in them are quite different. Le Corbusier's works are concerned with functionality and with proposing new ways of living, but at the same time they are expertly infused with tendencies of both classicism and abstract painting. As Colin Rowe (in *The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa*) points out, the proportions and phrasing of the exteriors are reminiscent of Palladio's villas, while in the interior curved lines like those used in purist painting form layers (giving a sense of transparency). While Le Corbusier was making new proposals for a new city he also continued to incorporate both the order of historical architecture and the experiments of avant-garde art. When seen in this light, Le Corbusier's "Five Principles of Modern Architecture" (1926) which were supposed to make possible a new lifestyle, come to look like little more than a tool to justify his own architecture through the logic of modernism. More than Le Corbusier, it was the 26-year-old O'Gorman who was dreaming up the new life to be made possible through the five points of pilotis, roof gardens, horizontal rectangular windows, and free vertical and horizontal surfaces. All five of these points are offered to society in the purest form in the "Rivera and Kahlo House". Could we not say that it was only in this moment of single-minded pursuit of functionality that the language of modernism was able to burst through its closed context and sublimate its identity as critical language? The best proof we have of this is surely to be found in the fact that even Rivera and Kahlo, with all their fanatic championing of the blood of ancient Mexico and their support of the Communist movement, were so proud of this purely modernist space. But O'Gorman's pursuits were not sustainable. In the early 1930s he worked on many social programs including schools and communal residences, but gave up architecture by the end of the decade to take up painting. Later he threw himself into the mural painting movement, partly under the influence of Rivera. His commitment to social reform remained constant but its form changed to the opposite pole from the pure, abstract space of Western modernism. But O'Gorman's transformation did not end there. In 1953 he moved into a cave-like home he designed and filled with Indio decor. Finally, in 1982, he moved into a modernist house he had designed as a young man and took his own life. O'Gorman's all too pure and thoroughgoing pursuit of modernist space most likely forced upon him an all too clear vision of the fissure separating the language of modernism from the culture of Mexico. It was an irreparable fissure indeed.

## 5. A Body Image Beyond the Modern

The two worlds that Juan O'Gorman expressed symbolically in his life speak to two opposing images of his body, one conceptual and one visceral. The former is an unnatural body aiming for an abstract utopian world conceived on a conscious level, while the latter is a natural one which relates to the traditions of ancient Mexico. People of every age have tried to preserve in the space of their domiciles memories of the land inscribed in their bodies. This spatialization of memory happens not only with personal memories but also with those of families and whole local communities. Houses built in this way pass through generations of desperate struggles with nature until they become almost like extensions of human skin. At the same





time, however, people have always striven to build another kind of domicile to house their future memories. Particularly in this century, when technology has made such startling advances, many have dreamt of that other house. Such are the attempts to transform the exhilarating sensations we experience in machine spaces like cars and airplanes into our homes. When people try to slip into skins made of steel, glass, aluminum, or plastic they experience a liberation of their bodies as if they were moving into another dimension. And they try and expand that feeling of liberation into another skin and another body. It is a liberation from the bonds of the land and from the customary life of earthbound families and communities. I referred to the body that seeks a home as a memory of the future as an unnatural one, but now it is changing into one which experiences the universe. By now it should be possible to think of it as one which is seeking a new and different kind of nature. The body in search of the machine has gone through further expansions until it has begun to seek nature as a memory of the future. This is what we call the virtual body.

O'Gorman's "Rivera and Kahlo House" was one in search of a body as consciousness bewitched by the machine age. But that attempt failed when it was rejected by another body of strong communal memories tied to the earth. Brought back to himself, O'Gorman tried to give himself back to the memories of the earth, only to fail again. He could not tolerate having two bodies at once. But these two bodies are still with us as we live our lives today and the chaos of our urban spaces can be considered the result of our striving toward them. Many architects continue in the modernist tradition and use its language to speak of their work, lingering ambivalently without ever finding a place to touch down. And yet the power of the land that was supposed to engage our fire has lost its strength to modernization and finds its body exposed in the shrunken world of the local. It may not be comparable to revolutionary Mexico at the beginning of this century, but it seems to me that the flock of young architects mentioned earlier symbolizes a Japan that has passed the peak of modernization and lost sight of its goals. Hasegawa lost his taste and his words to the sight of their ambiguity, to the sight of them caught without the confidence to be the heirs of modernism and without the power of meaning with which to speak to society. To lose social language and close oneself off into a sophisticated aesthetic is merely to justify a stifling exasperation in the name of a negative criticality. We can only hope that these exasperated architects can get beyond their bodies as inheritors of modernism, since no future memories are going to arise from the impasse of two bodies locked in a stalemate. And we must think of a new body image that will help us out of this deadlock. It would not be an unnatural body, but one accustomed to a new nature, and one which would yet be able to accept the old. It is only when these two natures come together that houses seeking new bodies will begin to speak in a positive language.

(translation by James Keith Vincent)