

Mid-Century Modern Architects Panel

Don Hackl  
Jack Hartray  
Otto Stark  
John Vinci  
Ben Weese

Moderated by Joseph Rosa,  
John H. Bryan Curator of Architecture and Design,  
Art Institute of Chicago

Landmarks Illinois  
AIA Chicago

Museum of Science and Industry  
Chicago, Illinois

June 14, 2007

David Bahlman: Good evening everybody. I'm David Bahlman, President of Landmarks Illinois, and I'm so glad that you could join us tonight. This is our kick-off this evening for our 26<sup>th</sup> annual statewide historic preservation conference, which will be held in Hyde Park tomorrow and Saturday. There is copious information outside on the table if you don't have it already, pick it up and if you could join us, we'd appreciate it. There is on-site registration and one-day registration is available if you're interested. We want to acknowledge, for this evening, the co-sponsorship of the AIA, both the AIA Illinois organization, with Mike Waldinger, and AIA Chicago with some really superb help from Joan Pomaranc. Thanks to them, and thanks also to Antheus Capital for underwriting part of this evening's reception.

This year's conference, as many of you already know, has a mid-century architecture theme. Since we acquired, along with the National Trust, the Farnsworth House, we of course have been converted soundly to monuments of the recent past and our desire to protect them. In putting together tonight's panel, we worked long and hard: Lisa DiChiera who essentially organized, with Eiliesh Tuffy, this event. We tried very hard, I want you to know, to find some women practitioners to join us; Natalie de Blois and Gertrude Kerbis were invited to participate and were unable to. So we just want you to know that we're not just men. [Laughter] Trying not to be just men.

I'd like now to introduce Peter Schlossman, who is Senior Associate Principal at Loeb Schlossman & Hackl, and the immediate past President of AIA Chicago, who will introduce our moderator and our panel tonight. This is an extremely unique event, I think, to be able to talk to living architects about their works. We as preservationists are always trying to second guess what architects would want done to their buildings after they're gone; we have the chance now to answer some of those questions very accurately. Peter...

Peter Schlossman: Thank you on behalf of AIA Chicago for allowing us to help you co-sponsor this event tonight. Some of you may realize that this is AIA's 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary and while the Chicago contingent of architects didn't join AIA until some 30 years after that date, we decided it's time to celebrate anyway. We'll do it again in 30 years. One of the things we decided to do last year as we were planning our 150<sup>th</sup> events was to co-sponsor events and be more outwardly focused with other allied professionals and other associations. Tonight's event is one example of that, and another event that you might have seen on the way in is the Canstruction

event, which we co-sponsored with the Structural Engineers of Illinois, that's right outside. I hope while you're here you enjoy both of these events, and I thank you on behalf of AIA Chicago. So with that, I will get to the introductions, these are in no particular order, so maybe raise your hands as I call your name.

First I'm going to introduce John Vinci, FAIA. John Vinci has been Principal of his own architecture firm since 1969, and he has an established reputation for excellence in the restoration of historic architecture and the design of new buildings. His restoration work includes Louis Sullivan's Chicago Stock Exchange Trading Room, Frank Lloyd Wright's Home and Studio in Oak Park, and numerous projects for the Art Institute of Chicago. Mr. Vinci's new buildings include the National Italian-American Sports Hall of Fame, and the Arts Club of Chicago, and several award-winning residences. Mr. Vinci received his Bachelor's of Architecture from the Illinois Institute of Technology in 1960. He was elected to the AIA College of Fellows in 1992.

The second one I'll introduce is Don Hackl, FAIA. Don Hackl joined Loeb Schlossman & Hackl in 1963 and has served as President of the firm since 1975. During his tenure the firm has more than quadrupled its commissions and expanded its services to clients worldwide. Under his direction the firm has been internationally recognized for the quality of its designs through numerous awards and winning design competitions. Throughout his career Mr. Hackl has been actively involved in practice, leadership, education, and community affairs domestically and globally. A Fellow and 63<sup>rd</sup> President of the American Institute of Architects, he also currently serves on the executive committee of the Union International des Architectes in Paris, France. And I might add that another accomplishment of his is that he hired me in 1993 to work at Loeb Schlossman & Hackl. He earned his Bachelor's and Master's of Architecture from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. That's Don Hackl.

Otto Stark, AIA, is also on our panel. Otto Stark has served as President of Stark Associates Architects since 1973. Prior to establishing his own firm, Mr. Stark was 1<sup>st</sup> Lieutenant and European Designer in the U.S. Army Security Agency and worked at Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, Naess & Murphy, and C.F. Murphy Associates, where he was named Chief Designer and Associate Partner in 1971. His major projects include the Blue Cross Blue Shield Building, Will County Courthouse, and DePaul University's Schmitt Academic Center and Harold L. Stuart

Center. Mr. Stark was also a member of the Chicago O'Hare International Airport and U.S. Air Force Academy design groups. His restoration work includes Chicago's Holy Name Cathedral. He received his Bachelor of Architecture degree from the University of Illinois.

The next introduction is Jack Hartray, FAIA. Jack has the shortest bio on this list but I'm sure he'll more make up for that in his comments today. He's a native Chicagoan. Jack Hartray received a Bachelor's of Architecture from Cornell University followed by service in the Army and employment with SOM, Holabird and Root, Naess and Murphy, and Harry Weese and Associates. He joined Nagle Hartray Danker Kagan McKay Penney Architects Ltd. in 1977 where he has served as the technical principal on all of the firm's complex, large-scale projects.

And lastly, Ben Weese, FAIA. Ben Weese is the founding partner of Weese Langley Weese, and received Master's and undergraduate degrees from Harvard University and a Certificate of Scholarship at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, Fontainebleau, France. Prior to Weese Langley Weese he worked for 20 years at Harry Weese and Associates, where major projects included the Latin School of Chicago, Williams College Library, Williamstown, Massachusetts, and Lake Village townhouses and apartment tower, Chicago, Illinois. Major projects with Weese Langley Weese include the Art Institute of Chicago Allerton Hall Renovation, Winnetka Congregational Church, and the F.W. Olin Classroom Building at Luther College of Decorah, Iowa. Ben has received numerous local and design awards and is a member of the Graham Foundation for the Advancement of Fine Arts and a member of the City of Chicago Landmarks Commission.

So with that, that's our panel. Our moderator tonight is Joseph Rosa. Joseph is the John H. Bryan Curatorial Chair of Architecture and Design at the Art Institute of Chicago. He is the author of 13 books and his writings have appeared in *Praxis*, *Architectural Design*, *Assemblage*, *Casabella*, *The History of Photography Journal*, *Oculus*, *Architektur & Bauforum*, and *Progressive Architecture*. He has curated over 30 exhibitions and was formerly the Helen Hilton Raiser Curator of Architecture and Design at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art. He was also Curator of Architecture at the Heinz Architectural Center at the Carnegie Museum of Art in Pittsburgh, and he was a chief curator at the National Building Museum in Washington, D.C. He has been a visiting scholar at the Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, he has been a recipient of grants from the

National Endowment for the Arts and the Graham Foundation for the Advanced Study of Fine Arts, and he has taught at Columbia University, California College of the Arts, Catholic University, the University of California Berkeley, and SCI\_ARC. He received his Bachelor's of Architecture from the Pratt Institute and M.S. in Architecture and Urban Design from Columbia University's Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation. He was a PhD candidate in the Department of Art and Archaeology. He has worked in the architectural firms of Gwathmey Siegel and Associates, Peter Eisenman, and Agrest & Gandelsonas. So with that, I will give you Joe Rosa.

Joe Rosa:

Thank you. I'm very happy to be part of this tonight, and preservation is something that I've been firmly committed to. Being trained as an architect and going into art history, I was very interested in early 20<sup>th</sup> century masters and works, and lesser-known masters. We always think in the United States, specifically you think of Mies coming here, you think of Gropius, Wright, and all of these amazing minds, but there's always another generation right below them that helped get the information out, and build, in some of these locations, before many of them even started building in the United States. So with that kind of interest that I have, I kind of migrate over from looking at early 20<sup>th</sup> century work into contemporary work and I think it's very important to know the past to kind of, not predict the future, but help to understand what the future might hold.

So to kind of understand what we mean by mid-century preservation, I just want to give you a little bit of a migration pattern of a modern way of thinking in 20<sup>th</sup> century, specifically the United States. When you think of the modern masters, 1901 let's say, into the thirties and forties, basically when Gropius and Mies are teaching here in the United States... we had kind of deemed these individuals as the classics and the greats. When you refer to the "masters" we come up with those particular names. What happens right after that is what we get, or at least what used to be called post-World War II modern architecture. But then, somewhere in the eighties, it became "mid-century." Part of that was to get away from the negative connotation of the war, but also as a period of time, which I usually like to think of as the product of the European nationals in the United States, getting redefined. If you think about mid-century, people like Gordon Bunshaft, and a variety of other people really condensed some of their aesthetic, because they were considered too decorative. Mid-century modern didn't really have a good sensibility to itself, and a lot of people

actually condemn it, even the work of Edward Durell Stone, which is having a huge debate with the building in New York.

However, now that this period of time has been reevaluated, it's celebrated, and the tenets and the qualities of the mid-century aesthetic, if we properly identify separately from the masters, we can now look at those areas and say: what should we save, what are the characteristics of that, and how should we go forward with that? That also leads to the aspect of contemporary work that follows that, but how do you get the general public aware that mid-century is a valuable aesthetic? Especially in a city like Chicago, where you have buildings that are landmarked, important structures that people come from all over the world to see, how do you make them understand that well, we might have Mies, or Adler and Sullivan, but that there's a few other buildings that were designed in the fifties and sixties that have the qualities that we should be preserving and not tearing down.

So it raises these questions. It also goes back to the bigger fundamental question of the modern movement: the whole notion that the modern aesthetic, and those individuals that were pushing the envelopes, didn't care about the history of it. Modern wasn't historical, it was contemporary. However, as time has gone on, the modern has become historic, and it has taken institutions like this to help people understand that once-radical thinking needs to be preserved to help another generation in understanding the radical, progressive way of thinking. So in saying that, a question now to the panel here: I want to ask, how would you define a framework, from the period of time that you're part of, that would be a way to qualify some of your work that might be worth saving?

So let me ask, Ben, could you maybe address some of that? Like if we looked at your work, what would you take from it that is key to that period of time, that you visually love? Which would become the characteristics that we might want to say, "That's what you want in a classic Ben Weese building."

Ben Weese:

I have my crib notes, if you could put some of my slides on. I'd like to point out the kind of consistency... let's see, the dates would be 1962, that's a building at Eugenie and North Park on the North Side, that's the earliest one. Then we go to a lot of stuff in Hyde Park, which I would like to intone on, a bit, since we can see it here. Kenwood Gardens, which is 24 townhouses down between Kenwood and Kimbark, south of 55<sup>th</sup> Street, 1965. Illinois Institute for the Visually Handicapped, which was 1965 as well. Lake Village East, 1971, and other buildings, which I guess were

not printed. The point here that I was involved with Hyde Park in the titanic struggle between I.M. Pei and my brother's office, as to how to define the city again.

This was a terrible moment of loss of history in which they didn't know how to define the party wall, they didn't know how to build houses next to each other until the lawyers got out there again, and worked on it. They didn't know about the market, they were very unsure of what the direction would be. They used, I think, English city square – [Sir John] Soane type of containment, using the street as a movement system but also as a storage system. They were worried about going up three stories high, so modernity had lost its ability to respond to what people wanted or needed. It was a very difficult moment of marketing; the first houses came in at \$35,000, if you can believe that on 55<sup>th</sup> Street there. The people who actually bought them were the people who were clients of ours. I have to mention a good client, the Hollebs and Marshall Holleb, Bob Gerstein, and Jared Shlaes, they were all loyal Hyde Park-ers, I think they've all escaped; probably blacklisted now for having left.

But I just want to point out a few things. First of all, the struggle of what was going to be in Hyde Park here, they picked a brick color, which I thought was kind of strange. I didn't want to pick red; the whole place is red brick. So what I want to say here is that Kenwood Gardens is a reaction to what really didn't work, it came in 1965 after the work of 1955 through 1957, the opening moments of Zeckendorf being the developer, the University of Chicago being certainly very heavy in what was going to happen here, ultimately. So the lesson I learned, briefly, was to try to use one material. If you look at the buildings around 55<sup>th</sup> Street, of anything that's left over - some of them are decorated differently; they'll add storm doors and other things. So Kenwood Gardens was two materials, lead-coated copper and brick, and there still is a little violation of that around the entries there. Lake Village East was also brick, John Fewkes Tower, all these buildings are made out of brick, whether that's a modern material or not, it certainly lasts long enough. So I'll quit my part here by just saying that Lake Village East was also an experiment in plan form, and we can go about that later, but I'll cede my time. Thank you.

Joe Rosa:

When you think of the modern movement, specifically mid-century, its materiality, that Ben is talking about – the brick, and questioning the brick, and using the brick, while it has other connotations of traditionalism or whatnot. But it's actually a very modern material. So if you wanted to think of this mid-century

period, what would be some of the most difficult materials, besides brick and the re-interpreting of brick in the modern, what other building materials would you kind of think, looking back, were helpful, interesting, might even be problematic, in preserving modern buildings?

Otto, do you want to address concrete? I know you do that so well.

Otto Stark:

Let's see, the reason I chose concrete tonight is the fact that concrete is part of the mid-century development of architecture, following people like Paul Rudolph, with his Art and Architecture Building at Yale; Walter Netsch, U of I Chicago campus; and Frank Lloyd Wright, Unity Temple; Stan Gladych, the FBI Building in Washington, D.C.; and Otto Stark with Blue Cross Blue Shield, Will County Courthouse, and DePaul University Schmitt Academic Center, and some things at O'Hare Field, and a couple others.

In designing the Blue Cross Blue Shield Building, Carter Manny, who worked very closely with me at Murphy's and I was in the middle of, just starting the construction, and I wanted to go with fractured concrete. When you fracture concrete, you expose the aggregate, and the aggregate is just beautiful colors. I found an aggregate in Wisconsin that was really perfect, and that's what they specified. And then Blue Cross Blue Shield said, "We want a mock up." They said, "Would \$50,000 do it?" And I said, "Yeah!" And I gave them a mock up. And then they came back and suggested, that, "Why don't I buy a lot and build myself a house, and experiment with your house?" And I said, "No, my partners wouldn't really like that." But I went to the Concrete Association, where they have property out there in Joliet... not Joliet, Skokie, I'm sorry. And I went to them and built a mock up, you didn't have it on the screen here, I was doing an undulating system of fracturing the concrete, about four inches, and then an inch maybe, I was experimenting with the coursing of that.

About that time Carter said, "Otto, I hear that Paul Rudolph is working on the Arts Building at Yale, why don't you go out and see it? He's fracturing concrete too." So I went out there, I didn't spend more than one day, I came back, didn't even stay over night, because what they had was a saw-tooth façade, and they did it manually, with a group of Italians that knew how to swing a bush-hammer, a little hammer. And I watched them in the morning, swinging the hammer back and forth, and then they stopped for lunch and brought out their little brown bags. And then in the afternoon a saw-tooth was missing, because they were pounding

the heck out of it. And I said, well, I've got to come up with some mechanical way of doing this. So I poured a couple of tracks to do an experiment, I got some actual bush hammers, which you break concrete with, and we mounted six of them. I had a really good contractor, a concrete contractor that wanted to learn too. And so we turned it on, and it started to crawl up, and it broke the heck out of the concrete, the hammers were too powerful. So I set some gauges to cut down the power, and the gauges didn't work; they got broken by the vibrations of the hammer.

So then, I heard in Belgium they had little small bush hammers. So I had some shipped over, or expressed, little bush hammers, and we mounted them, and pushed the button, the carriage took them right up, hammering away – just perfect. That's a 14 story building. It worked great. I should have patented that, because that contractor became a multi-millionaire; he went all over the United States using the same technique, he didn't even stay in Chicago.

Joe Rosa: Concrete is a material that is done on site, integral and all of that, in terms of preservation, it's probably the most experimental material that could represent the 20<sup>th</sup> century, poured concrete, which is fluid form. But when it comes to preserving a building that's concrete, that's where things become kind of difficult. A question: do you think, in looking back on some of the work that you've done, using concrete, how do you think a building has value to it, but the concrete might not be as quality-controlled as you wanted built, what can be done to maybe help obviate that? Because many people will say, "you know, the building's falling apart, it wasn't done well." The Guggenheim has a huge problem with its concrete. It is constantly re-facing that building; the concrete just wasn't done correctly.

Otto Stark: Well, you have to get an architect that's interested in this product. And really research it, I went to the library and I checked out all of the professors at the different universities that had written anything, and I gathered all that.

Joe Rosa: Concrete is such an interesting material, because if you think of what you've done, or say, Lou Kahn, creating this kind of image of pristine concrete, molded and juxtaposed with beautiful woods, but then you get someone who comes to America and actually tries to build something in concrete, and has to fire three different contractors because quality control is so bad, that the concrete craftsmanship is really just nose-diving.

Otto Stark: Well, you have to really research the contractors. The Will County Courthouse, when I went down there to sell that, they had an auditorium like this and people came. And I mentioned the contractor that was the low bidder, who we didn't take.

Joe Rosa: You didn't take the low bid, you took someone else?

Otto Stark: Well, the one that I approved. And then Senator Seymour Simon got up, and took the microphone like that [demonstrates moving microphone away], and said "See Otto, that's what the taxpayer in this county is going to be, because you didn't take the low bidder." And so I lost, because the Senator, well, had more... what do you call it, talked his way through it. But anyhow, that guy didn't last more than, I'd say, a couple months, and his whole system fell apart, it collapsed, and then I got the contractor that I wanted in the beginning.

Joe Rosa: Another question: when we think about mid-century architecture, is it really more about material investigations that represent that period, or is it about aesthetic characteristics? It's not the original, it's not like those first buildings that came out that were minimalist, it's kind of a second generation of it, so would you really say, this is for the panel to respond to, historically, is it about material investigations, when speaking of mid-century, that comes to mind, or aesthetic characteristics?

Otto Stark: Both, absolutely both. Has to be. In concrete you can work, versus steel or glass, what do you get? You get a façade. Concrete can be a very sculptural thing, you can work with it. But you do have to have the rudiments of how it's put together.

Don Hackl: Let me help to try to address that question in a slightly different way, because the examples of the work of the firm of which I am part, is the outgrowth, really, of the leadership of several designers. It is not dissimilar, Otto, to the circumstances that existed at the Naess and Murphy firm, when you and Jane and Hans were there, and Stan Gladych, as a designer to some extent, Jack the same thing, kind of grew up in your office.

I don't think that there is one simple answer to your question, let me give you an example of the period right after World War II. The design leadership at our firm was under the direction of Richard Bennett. Richard was the Dean of the School of Architecture and when Loeb and Schlossman were commissioned, along with others, to do the master plan of the city of Park Forest, Jerry Loeb recruited Dick Bennett, who came to our firm, and I

had the privilege of working with Dick for a period of time. Dick was not particularly interested in the nature of materials, surprisingly enough, for the most of his career; he was an academic and was more concerned with the intellectual ideas associated with the “big picture,” the big planning picture associated with the projects he undertook. And I never will forget talking about... Dick was instrumental in all of the regional shopping centers with which this firm has been associated, over the years, the first beginning at Park Forest, on a smaller scale, followed by Old Orchard and then Oakbrook, which I think was the crowning achievement, and then later four or five others, and we did about 30 of them around the country for what was then the development arm of Sears.

I asked Dick once, I said, “You know, where did the idea for the open mall shopping center come from? What’s the theory? Where did that come from?” And he said, “It’s quite simple.” He said, “Have you ever been to a carnival?” I said, “Yeah, I’ve been to a carnival.” He said, “You ever been to Riverview?” Some of you, native Chicagoans, remember Riverview. Well he said, “A shopping center is like a carnival.” I was intrigued by that. I said, “What do you mean it’s like a carnival?” He said, “You know, it’s easy to find your way in, but once you’re in, it’s very difficult to find your way out.” And in those days, we never put clocks or benches or anything giving people any kind of a clue as to what the design philosophy was, once you were trapped. And all of those angles were not happenstance; they were deliberate, because it was Dick Bennett’s notion that you created a sort of curiosity about, “Gee, what’s that thing around the next corner?” And so he created a lot of corners. And that was as simple an idea as underlies the whole concept of these major, you know, two and three million square foot centers that the firm did.

When Dick’s career began to wane and Ed Dart joined the firm, there was an absolutely entirely different notion about what architecture really meant. And that comes back to what you started with Otto on, you know... concrete is like wood, ok? In the sense that you could put pine on the outside of a building or you could put cypress on the outside of a building, if you put cypress on, the likelihood is the building’s going to last a hell of a lot longer, in most climates, than if you put pine. And pine has a much higher maintenance characteristic. Well, the same is true of the concrete that Otto was talking about. You’ve got to have good concrete, and you have lousy concrete. You have good contractors and you have lousy contractors, much of which had to do with the way these products were used.

Now Ed was... Ed characterized himself as a guy who did “dirty architecture.” And by “dirty” he meant it was very tactile. He used exposed concrete, rough-sawn cedar, and Chicago clinker brick, followed by Cranbrook buckskin, which was followed when they quit making the clinker brick here, because of all of the pollution that was involved in its manufacture. And Ed honestly believed that these materials had a spiritual, simple but valuable quality to them; when used in combination with one another, produced an environment of extraordinary value and spirituality. Probably the best example of his work was at St. Procopius Abbey, which won not only an AIA National Honor Award, but a 25-year award. At the other end of the spectrum, Dick Bennett’s Oakbrook Shopping Center also won a 25-year Award, which is given on the basis of architecture of lasting quality.

But they’re two very, very different types; and the question here today, that I’d like to challenge, is: What is preservable from this era? What is the basis for making those kinds of decisions? If you believe, as I do, that architecture is a reflection, very simplistically, of the art, science, and culture of a particular period of time, then we have to look at each building within that framework, and judge whether it represents an outstanding example of each of those criteria, and that becomes, at least in my mind, the basis for making that judgment. Now, the judgments are always relative, many people have different ideas about what constitutes a high-quality representation of art, or is it the latest technology, could there be something different, and does it truly represent the culture of our time? But at least as a point of departure, which I think is very important in establishing a value system by which buildings are judged.

Joe Rosa: Well, that’s a good point. A question to follow up that: do you think... when you think of painters, painters paint, they make amazing works. But they’re not necessarily the best judge of what is the best work. So as architects, do you think, as an architect, you’re the person who can judge that your work is of quality, of standards? Or do you think it best that somebody else judge it?

Jack Hartray: Modernism was really trapped by education, because in addition to this cage on the materials, which was really, relatively minor, they were working in a very sophisticated way with concrete 50 years before we got to it here.

Otto Stark: Le Corbusier.

Jack Hartray:

Well if you look at the Maillart bridges in Switzerland, those were built at the same time that concrete was used as a disastrous... you know, freeze thaw problems where, actually, they built one building in Michigan that's in some of the history books, which took a whole month to fall down. It basically just thawed up, and they got the concrete up and it was winter, but nobody really thought about that. But I think, one of the things that happened, we say Mies and Corbu sort of came over and shook things up, but Gropius did a lot more mischief than he is given credit for. And the mischief was in bringing to us the idea that buildings had to be built around a specific program, and we were going to fit the building to the program of the client in a very tight way, and we weren't going to do anything extra. And we used to joke about this at IIT, where the sophomore students would be sent to sit someone on a water closet and measure the distance from their kneecaps to the wall, and then that became the basic measurement for a house. You just expanded the house, and then you got a number of houses, and then you put them together and had a community, and then when you got enough of them to justify a school, and eventually you could make a map of all of northern Illinois, based on the one idea.

And you know, what I think apparently has happened is that the distance from the kneecap to the wall has changed. That makes it very hard to save a lot of buildings from that period, and you know, the other thing is I've never done a building all by myself. I've always worked with other architects, a lot the times with Ben and with Harry, and then their clients, and the users to the building, and basically what gets built is the result of a kind of conversation between all of these characters.

You know, a lot of times, when you're all done, there are some things that you'd like to have done differently. And, you know, given the chance... At the Evanston Library, we're in there right now putting in a children's library, which they never had in the original program. And we're doing it – we're vandalizing our own building. And the Time Life Building was built so closely around the needs of the Time Life subscription service that when they moved out, there was actually no reason for the building to exist. And it has been changed, in a number of ways, which almost make it unrecognizable. Oh, the Cor-Ten is still there, but the way the building works internally, and the way the elevators operate, and things of that sort, has been totally changed.

And it's nice to try to preserve these things, but when I look at Paris or Naples or Rome or something, people build buildings, and

they built buildings to look properly on the street. And they got the proportions right for the piazza and whatever the street was, and then an institution would come into the building when it was finished, and, you know, the president would get the big space... and that was interesting. You sort of moved into an existing building. And those buildings are very easy to preserve for hundreds of years. But here, you know, slight changes in the module, in the lighting, of things of that sort in an office building, in the mechanical systems, which is a third of the cost of the building, and people feel a little warm on a Friday afternoon, and it gets a little stuffy, and everybody says "let's just tear it down and replace it."

Joe Rosa:

I want to come back to doing work on your own work, because that's an important point, but it does address this aspect of criteria, framework, and Gropius is a good example. I mean, when you think of what he did at Harvard as a teacher, that's quite amazing, but it's also quite well known that... something that one of his students told me was, "He was a wonderful teacher, but he couldn't put a door in a building to save his life." They really spoke about aesthetics of composition in designing pieces, and when you look back at work of individuals such as people we have here or classmates of theirs from various schools; you can look at some of the work and see a certain aesthetic. Today, individuals talk about design, modern architecture, by its aesthetic characteristics, proportions of windows, all these other things, which were never part of the verbiage while you were all being educated, but were an inherent quality to making beautiful buildings. You could tell a work was by so-and-so because of a certain detail that had to be placed on all of their buildings. Now, does that become part of the framework to judge the quality of the work, one, of the period, and two, of the individual, that might want to preserve buildings of value?

John Vinci:

You know, we're all over the place. And I keep referring to history, and seeing, you know, how naïve we all are. And if you go to Europe, and you examine any building, you find they were remodeled layer after layer after layer, and we continue to do that, and some of us see it as a crime, and it's hard to know how far to go with preservation. But it becomes a strategy; it becomes a battle. You try to save everything, and you end up used to losing. And you know, I saw every building I fought for lose, but now suddenly the tide is turning. But you have to fight for everything. It doesn't have to be a blue chip building anymore. Look what's happening to the Near North: I mean one concrete building after another, they're all blocking each other's view, they're ruining the scale,

we're now talking about tolls coming to the city, the parking, the underground parking – today I was there, what an hour? And it was 18 dollars an hour to park in Grant Park.

There are a lot of issues that we're tackling today. Even the history of concrete, that starts in the 19<sup>th</sup> century with Peret, and then Corbusier gives it a philosophy, and then these guys come along and make their own interventions to the material. But in the end, we found out that concrete had to be painted and that was the way to seal it from the porosity. I mean, you know, there's a lot of sophisticated recent things that are happening, what I find interesting is talking to people who have had hands on experience, and hearing it from their point of view.

I never experiment with materials; I'm interested in the tradition of architecture, making a building that has objectivity, proportion, good construction, and see it that way as timeless. Other people see it as, you know, Gehry, where you have to use bent metal and arbitrary forms. So I don't know what architecture really is, other than that the end is what lasts the longest, what is the most beautiful, and what we can live with.

Joe Rosa: Let me ask everybody to comment on their work, in that sense of... and we'll start with Ben and work our way towards me, would you modify previous work of yours? Would you not? Or would you want someone else to do it, or just tear it down? Given those options, abstracting some of your projects.

Ben Weese: Yeah, outside of the ones that have already been wrecked, which is unfortunate. In the academic field, I can think of six buildings, including the Sawyer Library at Williams College, which is slated to be torn down. What is it Jack? Southeast lower campus, University of Wisconsin; Carleton College Performing Arts Center; Beloit Science Library – these come off the top of my head. The things that you hope would be built for institutional long life, especially for the oldest alums who have the most money, they come back and they see that their favorite building has been torn down. So there's a real problem within the field of academia, with rising tuitions and a lack of favor for a traditional situation, so I think that's part of the problem.

In terms of concrete, I've always shied away from it. It's a wonderful frame, and therefore I privileged brick. I wish I could have done... in Columbus, Indiana, a lot of the buildings that you would hope you could have made an addition to, North Central High School, some other ones, Lillian Schmitt School, a very

small, delicate building. So I thought that the architects, I had to criticize them for coming in with new ideas and a framework that didn't fit the scale and some of the historicity of... Again, in 1959, I think we did a reinforced brick building, looked like a factory, in Columbus, Indiana, but the reason we did it, and we cost controlled it against pre-cast concrete or a curtain wall, and it turned out to be the cheapest. I think I... again, I worked on the Latin School, my colleague here worked on addition after addition, and I wish the one thing he wouldn't have used, was add another material to it. He used spandrel glass, and I hoped he would use lead-coated copper, a simple idea – two materials. It's ok, Jack.

Jack Hartray:

It's ok, you started it. [Laughter] Actually Ben I'll have to show you the budget... I think all things being equal... First of all, you never get it right the first time. There's always something that's sort of troubling you. And then in other cases, you go back 20 years later, and you look at some of the details on the buildings and you can't remember having been that smart. I mean, you know, it's a marvelous combination of things. But all things being equal, I would rather mess with one of my buildings myself than to put it in the hands of somebody that I don't know. And I think that you go out, and you do the best that you can with these things.

There's one detail on the Newberry Library; there's a little vestibule in front of the front door. That's the only thing that I remember doing that was perfect. [Laughter] And I was really happy with it, and it was the most expensive thing that I've ever done in my life. And the contractors made fun of me for it. But that's probably the only think that I wouldn't want to see changed. Otherwise everything could be improved.

Don Hackl:

I would agree with what you've said, Jack that it would be our preference to consider modifications, additions to our own buildings as opposed to having others do that. Why? Because I think there was a certain understanding, a certain foresight, or insight, rather, that went into that design, which may not be fully understood by others. Now, to directly answer your question, I would say that there are some buildings that cannot be modified.

There's a wonderful little church that Ed Dart did out in Pilsen. The church moved and sold the building to a developer; they're trying to figure out what to do with it, and whether it becomes a museum or a performance space or is demolished is the question before us. That particular space I think will lend itself to a performing arts space of a modest size, but to try to anything extensive by way of adaptive reuse would very difficult. In

contrast to that, Dart did, and I assisted in doing, Samsonite's corporate headquarters in Denver, Colorado in about 1968, and that building, we just learned, Samsonite was sold to American Tourister. And American Tourister's manufacturing facility and corporate headquarters are out on the east coast. And an architect from Denver called us recently and said, "Gee the building is being contemplated for demolition." It was an award-winning building, and they said, "We're trying to turn it into a charter school, do you have any drawings of the thing?" So we quickly found them, sent them out, and made some suggestions as to how they could do that. Now here's an office building, which is being reused as a charter school, and I think that's a perfectly legitimate alternative.

But I think you can't generalize and say no building should be touched, or all buildings can be touched. I think they are unique; they need to be looked at on a case by case basis. If I had to make a judgment, probably ten percent or less of all buildings done during this period would meet the criteria that I've tried to establish, and say they're worth saving. Not many of those would fall into the category of buildings we've been a part of.

Otto Stark: Starting with the Blue Cross Blue Shield Building, I originally designed that four stories higher than what it is now - fourteen stories up, and three stories below. And I felt the proportions were just right with the extra four stories, but the President said, "We have a mandate that we can only spend so much." And I said, "Well, you can rent them." And he said, "No way, that's part of the mandate, you can't do any rental property." So I lost four stories in that building. So to answer your question...

Joe Rosa: You'd go back and put them back?

Otto Stark: I'd like to put them back, yes.

The Will County Courthouse is pretty nice, I think it stands out. What's the other one... oh, the DePaul Schmitt Academic Building, I did that, along with the Student Center there - the Student Center and a huge plaza right across the street. And so when I designed the campus, originally the design of the whole campus was a two-level campus, where they had bridges right across the street, and all the traffic was separated from the school and from the students. And I really loved it, but it didn't go ahead. DePaul expanded so drastically that they had to come up with another thing, go other directions. I wish they'd stuck with my plan, it gave it kind of a monumental appearance, you know? But I agree, definitely, if there's got to be a change, it's got to be you.

Joe Rosa:

John?

John Vinci:

Well, I get back to legislation and preservation. You have to remember that even the Vatican had an addition onto Michelangelo's design – it keeps going. I believe in preservation, radical, you know we picketed and so on, and I believe in, like Landmarks Illinois, where you have to have legislation. This gives me time to plug a project I'm working on with Susan Davis, here in the audience; we're doing a book on Hyde Park, and the housing after Jean Block's book. And it's a very interesting time; we started to get into how did we save Kenwood and Hyde Park? And it was with legislation.

But even I, when I worked for a firm called Brenner, Danforth, and Rockwell, we were gutting out Victorian interiors to accommodate modern needs and modern visual aspects, and somehow you start thinking, well, is that the best thing to do? But in a way, some of these things helped to save textured and landmarked, certainly, areas. I mean, for example in Kenwood, there was a time when one developer wanted to tear down a major house by, oh one of the Prairie School architects – who? It escapes me right now. The neighborhood fought and said you have to save that house as it is, you can't divide the property. And that really was a strong stance that helped save Kenwood. Kenwood was on the verge of just getting subdivided and turning into smaller units. And I'm a big believer in social control and fighting for everything. I mean, it's like tug of war – you fight for what you can save, and you put values on things, even though they're value judgments. But in the end, you have something rather than nothing.

And I think, you know, it's worth looking at what should be saved, what shouldn't be saved. And I'm for, even maybe putting an age – I mean, if a building is a certain age, and it's stood the test of time. I mean maybe you have to look at it more radically. In a way it is radical. It sounds conservative, but radical means going to the root of things. And you go to the root of the problem, and then you try to solve it in a way that preserves the texture, the history of what we all come from. You can't save Marshall Field's, but you can save the structure. The structure is what is the representation of history, and you have to look at everything that way.

When I was on a tour of IIT, and they told me the alderman who was [William Levi] Dawson, and so, these are not beautiful buildings, but they give the Black Metropolis a position of where they were at a certain time in the history of their development.

And I guess that's getting off of what these men represent. I mean, they represent a much more noble building tradition; I come from a preservation tradition.

Ben Weese:

I want to add something to that. When I think of a building that's so bizarre, that's running against the grain, I think of 2 Columbus Circle. It came up too late, and it was a terrible building in a lot of people's eyes, but it was so unique and so different, that it should have been saved. Think of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Building by Paul Rudolph, in Boston, which is under extreme threat, but it was running against the grain. It was just a different kind of building; it was only one of a kind. If you have one of a kind buildings that represent the exception to the rule: that's something that has to be really thought about very carefully. And I thought they came out too late with support for that building, and you can probably add some to that.

Joe Rosa:

That's a very good point, Ben, because when you think of these buildings like Edward Durell Stone's building, or Paul Rudolph; you know, it's designers that fell into moments where people seemed to not... they were out of favor, in that sense of the generation above where it was somewhat decorative or odd or strange, and Rudolph's a good example of someone falling out, only to come back with more vengeance as time has gone on. I think the biggest problem in New York in saving 2 Columbus Circle was they were pushing the wrong aspect. They were saying it was a very important example of the international style, and right there they were completely wrong. It's an example of mid-century aesthetics; its kind an of interesting, decorative way of thinking about the modern, which is the product of students, students from the masters building in America. That's what the schools were actually generating. And a lot of people, I believe – critics – hated all of that stuff, and kind of set the negative tone for a generation of only doing what their masters told them to do.

So it's kind of unfortunate, he is rediscovered now, and I think Rudolph is someone who's simply like that: he fell out of favor, the building was somewhat problematic, Brutalism gets a bad rap, and now Brutalism is being rediscovered by a generation. And it's usually a cyclical generation, of a 30-year difference, that rediscovers it. If you think about parents and grandparents, it's the grandparents liking the grandchildren but not particularly liking their own child. [Laughter] That happens; it's that kind of culture. And it's even today's generation of students, discovering works that everyone here is talking about saving, and lesser-knowns. Because it's always been, besides the big known... you know,

Mies and Corb and Sullivan, there's always been that underbelly of the lesser-knowns, the Frederick Kieslers, the John Lautners, that people are intrigued with. And a younger generation, mostly Europeans, find them extremely entertaining and want to know more. And it's only as time goes on that they get rediscovered and re-elevated in their status.

A good example, historically, would be the work of Greene and Greene. We think of Greene and Greene today and everyone goes, "Oh, Greene and Greene!" Greene and Greene, no one particularly cared for Greene and Greene. If it wasn't for Harwell Hamilton Harris' wife, who actually found the archives and prevented them from being destroyed, and wrote the first book on them, Greene and Greene, would be rediscovered and reinserted into the history of modern architecture. So history writes itself at different moments in different decades, and that's why, you know, with a building, you should be preserving as much as you could. And it's not that different from being a museum curator, where, curators before present curators might not know what to do with certain things in the collection, but you don't want to get rid of it. Because all museums, that's why they rarely de-accession art, because generations down the road might discover the qualities in that artist's work that might not be known right now. So you never get rid of it. It's just when that comes into play that the discovery takes place.

Otto Stark:

It's not a building, but... the question was "What would you like to preserve?" And I noticed they chose, for O'Hare Field, the bridge – the elevated bridge. We worked on that at Murphy's, and Stan Gladych came up with the original concept of the "wish bone" – the Y-shaped concept. And it was the three of us: myself, Stan, and Nick LeBar, who was the engineer.

But anyway, this was mid-century, and we didn't have computers or we didn't have sophisticated programs to do the wire diagrams, so I said go up to the art store and get me five pounds of clay, and some armature, and tools. I took sculpture class at the University of Illinois, so we sculpted the heck out of the thing, until finally Nick said, "That's it! No more." It, well, there it is! (Otto Stark points to screen) If you notice, in the background you see the I.M. Pei control tower how he sculptured the top to match!

Joe Rosa:

I thought we'd open it up for questions from the audience, so what we'll do is, Lisa will help identify some individuals, if you could come up to the microphones. But please say who the question is for before you state your question. Any questions?

Lisa DiChiera: Actually, for any of you that would like to ask questions, why don't you start coming towards the front of the room, here in the aisle, and that will help things move more quickly.

Question: Hi, I have a two-part question. The first part is for Mr. Hartray, I'll ask that and then I'll ask the next one. They recently made changes to one of the buildings you worked on, the Correctional Center, and in doing so, in making the repairs, they changed it from more of the natural grey of the concrete to some kind of sand color. So I'd like you to respond to, you know, were you involved in that? What was your thought on that, because I know that the color of the building is probably very critical?

Beginning the second question, for the whole panel, I'd like you to respond to the changes that were made to Walter Netsch's UIC campus, 10 years ago, in which overhead walkways were taken down, because of the problems of the walkways, but in the process they took down all of the other elements, the forms and things, that really created the unity, and in the process really destroyed the meaning of that campus.

Jack Hartray: The federal jail, I was only involved with it because Ben Weese called me up and said they were messing with the façade of the building. I called the GSA; we hadn't heard anything about that, and that's not really surprising, because it's Harry Weese's office, which has disappeared, historically, that did it, and the fact that I was still hanging around would have been a piece of highly classified information. [Laughter] But they had no choice. Now, I think that the finish is something that will slowly work its way out. Actually, the finish on the Jail, we couldn't afford a really fancy colored concrete, and what we had was a combination of a cement that came from Michigan, which had kind of a warm color, and then white sand. And they poured that but what happens is, over the years, a certain amount of moisture gets back to the reinforcement; if the reinforcing rusts, it pops the surface off the concrete, and the deterioration continues. So, they would have to do that. That building was quite unusual in that we got away with, for about 25 years, without painting it. And most of the concrete buildings that we have done wind up getting painted, because that's the only sure way of getting the façade to not misbehave.

We were talking about concrete, is that a difficult material, and yes, it is, but so is terracotta. And we have so many landmarked buildings made out of terracotta, and I can't think of a worse material to make buildings out of. And yet, we have figured out

ways of restoring that, and putting it back in place, and the same thing is true with concrete. But I think that, ultimately, if we can't match the colors and things of that sort, we may wind up painting the building.

John Vinci:

I was around when Walter Netsch's campus was designed, and I remember... his history is yet to be written, and Walter is still around, but there were a lot of ideas there that didn't work. I mean, the ramps were not handicap accessible, the railings did not work in terms of safety issues, and there are some pluses and minuses you have to consider. You lost the idea of what Netsch had in mind, but also there is much more sunlight, and more trees, and it's more planted. I don't know, people like Marty – you teach there, right Marty? I mean, I don't know if you find it better or worse as an atmosphere. But I think that, in the case of Netsch's campus, one could always read what the idea was, but I don't know if one had to maintain... I don't know if that's an honest assessment.

Don Hackl:

I think you're right, John. I think if Walter were given the challenge today, to do that campus from scratch, it would not evolve in the same way that it did initially. Many of us have this notion about architects who are either out of practice or deceased, and we run into this a lot. For many years, I'm sure it existed in Harry's office as well, people would say, "Well, if Harry was here, how would he do it?" Well you know, human beings are not static. I remember once going to Taliesin West, when I was on the AIA Board we had a dinner there. And Wright's wife was still alive, and they have this formal dinner, and they talked about Mr. Wright as though he were away on a business trip. [Laughter] And they had musicians playing after, a small concert and everything, and I couldn't believe it. I said, "This is like the Addams Family!" [Laughter] It was unbelievable!

We have this notion that people are frozen in time, and that's not at all true. If any one of these star architects were alive today, they would have progressed onward. So we have to be careful to not memorialize them in a way that says, this is what they did, and if they were alive they'd do it the same way. So, by way of suggesting, I don't think Walter would have done UIC the same way, given another chance.

Jack Hartray:

Shortly after Wright died, the Taliesin Fellowship decided they would stay down there in the summer; I think they were having a real estate tax problem in Wisconsin, and they rehabbed a certain number of those buildings, which were really just tents, as air

conditioned spaces, and they screwed it all up. You went down there and it was terrible, it was something totally different from what it was to begin with. And it was nice, I went out there about three months ago, I went out to look at it, and they put it all back, the way it was. You know, the dry, desiccated lumber, and the peeling paint, and the canvas, and stuff that leaks a little bit, and it's back the way it was. There are still snakes that come out to sun themselves on the terraces, and, you know, it's back to normal. It's really nice. You've got to defend civilization from people with good taste. [Laughter]

Otto Stark:

On the theme of Taliesin, I remember up in Wisconsin, I was working on a project, and I saw this sign that said "Taliesin – Turn Left." And I thought, "Oh, I'll just take a quick walk around, it'll be the first time that I visit it." And so I pulled in, and I rang the front doorbell – I hit my head on the... [Laughter] It was out of proportion, but anyhow, I rang the doorbell, and nobody answered. So I started walking, you know, I just wanted to see it, and all of the sudden someone opened the door, and it was Mr. Wright himself. He just happened to be there. And I introduced myself, and I said, "I'd like to walk around, I'm late for a meeting up north, and this is my first time here." And he said, "Go ahead! Go ahead!"

And I walked all the way around, and I was on the north side, and then I get to the west, and then I got down to the south, and he was coming around from the other way, he came out. And I looked, and on the south side of the building, the main building projected and had an alcove, I guess, originally, the way it was designed. It was – just huge glass, all across there and all the way down to the ground, and it had limestone, outside of the glass, it was a patio. And so he was there, and I looked in there, and it was... the frost hadn't gone onto the ground yet. It was a bedroom, with a bed and everything, facing south, and I said, "How do you keep that carpet, so white and thick, so clean?" And he said, "That's not a carpet, that's frost!" And so he'd want see the patio extend into the room using a grade beam to support the glass.

Question:

Good evening, I've enjoyed this discussion a great deal. And if you don't mind me calling you John, I will. I'm from Hyde Park, and in 2005, a group of us got together and formed a grassroots organization called the Lakefront Taskforce for Hyde Park, which sounds very impressive, which is what we wanted to do. We're very disturbed about what is happening in Hyde Park. Maybe it also includes Kenwood, but we feel an onslaught is going on, an insurgence, if you will, you know, "if there's a flat surface, we will

build.” As one example, we have five wonderful bookstores, but of course we needed another Borders, which was a travesty, and it bought the beautiful Hyde Park Bank building. So we’re seeing again this onslaught, and if you have a park, or a parking lot, for instance, that gave the eye a little bit of a rest before you get into residential buildings or business buildings, it’s again “we will build.” Even though we say we’re the Lakefront Taskforce, our interests go on into the west, and I’m finding that our elected officials don’t share our concerns, that what is unique and wonderful and precious about Hyde Park is worth saving. The *Hyde Park Herald*, in this week’s issue, said that they’re going to tear down the Doctor’s Hospital, which is architecturally significant and wonderful, and they’re going to build two hotels right on the sidewalk. So I’d appreciate your comments, John. And of course you know what’s happened to the Promontory Point, I’m sorry to say doesn’t, apparently, have landmark status, but things are so wonderful in Hyde Park, and perhaps throughout Chicago, so I appreciate what you’ve said.

John Vinci: Yeah, it’s a tug of war, and you’ve got to keep fighting. There’s social change, and there’s good change and there’s bad change, but if you keep fighting, and promoting Hyde Park and the virtues of Hyde Park... and again, I hope that’s what Susan Davis’ book will do, and other books, I mean, other people writing about Hyde Park. But the more we write about these things, the more we, sort of, sanctify, the less we’re going to have people meddling with historic fabric.

Question: A question for the panel: you’re all really working in a kind of modernism, and I’m wondering, at the time when you all were working in the sixties and seventies, you also had... and I think the Edward Durell Stone building is a good example, you had the folks that were working in the new formalist tradition; in California, not so much here, you had the groovy architects who had kind of a low-style modernism; you all were really working in a modern idiom. How did you view that kind of architecture?

Jack Hartray: This, I think, this probably should be your agenda. And I think the... we’ve gotten now, to the point where hardly anything gets torn down without at least an argument. And the thing that bothers me, a little bit, is that the argument only seems to start when somebody arrives with a wrecking ball. It would be better to work in an environment where the designation of what we wanted to save was clearer, and also, the designation of what we wanted to save included, if we could admit it, in some cases, the scale of a

street, and the light-quality, and the landscaping, and things of that sort.

But I think we've got to start making lists of buildings we really don't like, that we would miss. And I'll give you one – the Thompson, the city, the state of Illinois building. Someday, somebody's going to come up with the idea of tearing that building down, and everybody's going to say "Hooray!" And it's going to be an enormous mistake, because I see geometry teachers and trig teachers out pointing to it with classes, explaining to them what parabolas are, and things of that sort. And the other building – there's a building, I think it's the [Prentice Women's Hospital] that Bud Goldberg did over at the Northwestern Medical Center. And it looks like it's in about its third trimester. [Laughter] I mean the building... and I know everyone involved with that building just detested it, from the time it was built. And that building needs a friend! [Laughter] We ought to adopt it. Concrete will never be made that shape again, and it's quite marvelous! So we all ought to pick out the buildings we hate the most, and make a list of those, and get them designated as landmarks. That'll scare the hell out of the developers. [Laughter]

Joe Rosa: Do we have time for one more question?

Question: I'm a member of a historic preservation commission on the North Shore, and we're having an epidemic of tear downs, as you know, and most of what we're losing is mid-century architecture. And what's replacing it is almost uniformly hideous. It's this retro stuff – horror film gothic or pseudo-Tudor, whatever you want to call it. And these replacement houses are worth millions of dollars, so there's certainly room there for architect's fees. My question is, what on earth can be done to persuade architects, developers, and clients to use some good taste in building new houses, and to do things like you did, John Vinci, with the Davis house in Kenwood, to bring back, to reintroduce modernist and contemporary styles? Because if we don't do this, our whole North Shore – all of the areas on the North Shore that are from, you know, the mid-century – are going to be turned into those gothic or Tudor nightmares.

Don Hackl: I've got to jump on this one, because five have been taken down on the block I live on, and I've got to tell you something, you don't get it. They think it's good architecture! [Laughter] They love it! And it all goes back to something very simple, and that is how you define, within the building ordinance and the zoning ordinance, the FAR. These mega-structures are being built as a result of the fact that they're allowing anything above, I think it's three and a half

feet above grade, not to be counted. And so every one of these houses has the equivalent of what we would refer to as an English basement, that's furnished palatially, as a part of the built house. Now the earlier homes, I live in Wilmette, on the east side, which have the same character - that was truly a basement. And the basement was used to store the coal, and where people did the washing, and that sort of thing. But there's been a reinterpretation of that, that's leaving the houses totally out of scale, to say nothing of the aesthetic. You're absolutely right, and that's something that the citizenry has got to lobby very hard against.

Joe Rosa:

But it also raises that important question of aesthetics and taste. At the turn of the mid-century, you didn't have to have money to have taste. Today, even if you have money, you still don't have taste. So when it comes to building, and you look at a lot of these homes that are going up, the materials are relatively garish, tasteless; "nouveau" would be a complement to the people who mostly move into them. And that's kind of a huge problem, because with a general public that has become so visually illiterate, and separate from the notion of what taste and wealth might be.

It's kind of a real dilemma, because the modern aesthetic of the every day - in thinking about people who bought all this stuff, they bought it because it was cheap and simple and stylish. You started with Danish modern, and then you moved up in your life, and that was a sign of it. Well today, those chairs that cost 20 bucks are going at auctions for two, three thousand dollars; of course it's an aesthetic of consumption. And today, there is more mid-century that is being produced than ever before, for purchasing, because you have a generation of people who want it. Unfortunately, there's a big gap between what that represents to people. The everyday piece of furniture now results in that horrible lawn furniture we see that's plastic... that's unfortunate. So there is a huge problem. And when we talk about buildings of this generation - to save - we do have to put forward a framework for the general public to understand the value of the buildings. And in a city that has Mies, Sullivan, and all of these great, landmark buildings, we have to make an effort to understand the next generation of aesthetics that make those products important, before the wrecking ball shows up. Because then it looks like everyone is just screaming because they're afraid of progress. We're not afraid of progress; we're just kind of frightened by the stuff that people consider to be progress. [Laughter]

John Vinci:

I think it's awfully strong legislation, let's say Kenwood, for example. It was a strong landmark commission law that said they

couldn't subdivide the property. If you put that ruling in Highland Park, you know, you might be murdered. [Laughter] You know, there's the FAR, floor area ratio. Some of these houses do need additions, good additions, and something like the Farnsworth House, you can never put an addition on, and that goes back to this whole thing. You couldn't put an addition on the Robie House, but certainly there are a number of houses that we may have to consider allowing some intervention.

Jack Hartray:

You can do quite a bit with zoning. The Chicago zoning ordinance, about three years ago, added height limits as well as floor area ratios. And so that meant that there was both a limit on the size of a building, and also on the height. Now that is an imperfect kind of thing, because in some cases the underlying zoning allows you to build buildings that are probably not appropriate for the street. And you know, there are two sides to that argument, because half of the people on the street are open to build something bigger. But you can control quite a bit of this on the basis of the zoning ordinance. Then what you have is the problem of the person that buys five adjacent blocks, and builds something that looks like it's for the papal legate, you know, on a street where everything else is of rather modest expression. I think what you do with that is to raise taxes – there's enough money now for people to really exercise very bad taste.

David Bahlman:

Thank you, gentlemen, so much. I have a couple of announcements: the reception is outside, we hope you'll join us, we hope the architects will stay around for more questions from you individually, and I want to remind architects that if you want to get continuing education credit for this wonderful hour and a half, sign up outside, and if you've lost your glasses, please see Eiliesh, we've found a stray pair of glasses. Thank you.