ABSTRACT

After the downfall of Metabolism in the 1970s, Japanese architecture dissolved from its previous pyramidal structure (paralleling Japanese society) into a horizontal expansion of powers. The Japan Architect entitled this phenomenon “New Wave” and depicted it graphically with an adaptation of Tawaraya Sotatsu’s legendary folding screen Fujin Raijin wherein, under two dominant Metabolist figures—Kisho Kurokawa (the Wind God) and Arata Isozaki (the Thunder God)—thirty-four New Wave architects (represented by cumulonimbus clouds) emerged, overshadowing the skyscape (i.e., Japanese architecture). Notwithstanding the vivid depiction, New Wave remains a cloudy phenomenon; the power structure—who’s in, who’s out, and who defines it—continues to shift.

Neither to dismiss New Wave as infinitely haphazard, nor to fabricate a unifying view (as the movement has thus far been treated), this dissertation argues that the logic of the amorphous “clouds” resides in the local and the details, from the heterogeneous works emerging from a changing constituency of individuals. By focusing on the archetypical New Wave group ArchiteXt—including rebuilding the hitherto lost ephemera ArchiteXt, uncovering archival materials, and interviewing the architects—the dissertation brings to light the elusive functioning of this non-group (and the New Wave movement itself). Like morphing clouds or flowing waves, ArchiteXt's individualist works extend freely between non-architecture and architecture, with one form presaging and inspiring the other: magazines, maps, signs, encephalograms, masks, toys, puzzles, pastas, and buildings.

Evoking the spirit of Japanese non-art predicated upon acushon, yet in their uniquely lighthearted fashion, ArchiteXt redefines architecture as action, and realigns it with Japanese
culture at the grassroots (which Metabolism had disposed of), via disjointed actions in reading, writing, mapping, masking, playing, jesting, cooking and eating. Joining forces amidst disjointedness, the clouds eventually instigated a paradigm shift, transforming Japanese architecture into an egalitarian system of New Wave.
Figure 2: Takefumi Aida’s sketch re: play and Nirvana House, interview by Lisa Hsieh, 2008.
Figure 3: Minoru Takeyama’s sketch re: Kon Wajiro’s Modernology and Takeyama’s theory of Heterology, interview by Lisa Hsieh, 2008.
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CHAPTER 0
INTRODUCTION

On a spring day in 1970, amidst drinks and cheers at a small Japanese bar called Brook (ブルック) in the fashionable Aoyama district of Tokyo, five fledging architects formed a novel architectural alliance which they dubbed ArchiteXt. Takefumi Aida, Takamitsu Azuma, Mayumi Miyawaki, Makoto Suzuki and Minoru Takeyama made up this atypical, even paradoxical, collective—five architects pledging fraternity yet avoiding a common architectural philosophy. The formation of ArchiteXt marks a dramatic paradigm shift in Japanese architecture—the end of Metabolism and the arrival of New Wave—instigated by a new generation of architects, notably these five young men at Brook.

In the seemingly carefree setting of a bar, the five architects ambitiously decided to produce an alternative, underground self-publication—alternative, that is, to the mainstream Japanese architectural professional magazines which mainly reported on current building activities in Japan. Eating and drinking blurred the boundaries between leisure and work. “We got together within this vicinity, sharing lunch or dinner. By the end of the meal, we would decide on what’s next. We enjoyed meeting, all of us, more than putting efforts to a publication.”¹ However, the polemical journal that arose from these meals is nothing like the happy-go-lucky picture they painted of themselves. ArchiteXt would become the only independent architectural journal coming out of the East when an “explosion” of architectural

¹ Interview with ArchiteXt by Lisa Hsieh (September 8th, 2006).
little magazines flourished in the West in the 1960s and 1970s.\textsuperscript{2} In the end, ArchiteXt’s lighthearted self-portrayal proved to be strategic rather than entirely naïve.

Following this general \textbf{introduction 0}, my investigation begins with \textit{ArchiteXt} in \textbf{chapter 00: the readable}, followed by \textbf{chapter 1: the playable}, on ArchiteXt’s individual building designs, and then extends to works by their peers in \textbf{chapter 2: the edible}, ending with an investigation of the New Wave movement in \textbf{chapter extra}.

In our first interview, Aida and Takeyama revealed the process of christening their magazine. The name \textit{ArchiteXt} was inspired by the London-based architectural group Archigram and the Florence-based Archizoom. The Japanese architects wanted their name to be Archi-\textit{something}, and settled on \textit{text}. Noting the visual similarity between the words \textit{architext} and \textit{architect}, they magnified the letter X to symbolically cross out the second letter \textit{c} in \textit{architect}. This gesture is both playful and critical. As if to “cross out” the letter \textit{c} (the first letter of the word \textit{conventional}) with a capitalized letter X, \textit{ArchiteXt} denies conventional architecture.\textsuperscript{3} ArchiteXt also became the name of their group. To a degree, ArchiteXt resembled Archigram, who also formed around their self-publication, \textit{Archigram}, 1961-1970. But unlike Archigram

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{3} Aida and Takeyama described the naming process in my interview with them. ArchiteXt interview transcript by Lisa Hsieh.
with a shared proclivity for techno-pop utopias, ArchiteXt determinedly avoided a collective architectural philosophy.

ArchiteXt chose the theme “self” for the pilot issue of ArchiteXt, both as a means of introducing their alliance and emphasizing their denial of the old Japanese social more of “no self” based upon the teachings of Zen Buddhism and Confucianism. This “self” theme would continue in the next issue, ArchiteXt 00, followed by “the earth” for ArchiteXt 1 and “my home” for ArchiteXt 2—ArchiteXt Extra was an insert to another magazine, Toshi Jutaku [都市住宅, Urban Residence], August 1972, and fits with the “collective dwelling” theme of that issue.

The accordion fold format of the magazine was inspired by the Paris and Helsinki-based magazine Le Carré Bleu. Instead of the customary bookbinding, ArchiteXt opens from a 21 cm square (the maximum square that can be cut out of the standard A4 size of 21 x 29.7 cm) five times back and forth into an extended 21 x 105 cm accordion fold. The same construct is multiplied five times. Each issue contains five strips, one per architect/editor. The strips were put into a specially designed square envelope for mailing. ArchiteXt was mainly circulated among friends for free.

Interestingly, the physical format of ArchiteXt mirrors the formation of ArchiteXt: five loose leaves of parchment in an envelope reflecting five individualists in a group. Within the strip, each architect/editor was free to design his own squares/pages. Individuality and plurality formed both their medium and their message. Therefore in two reciprocal forms—a magazine and a group—five individualists joined forces, becoming one strength. Eventually, ArchiteXt

---

4 This Japanese conception of “no self” is discussed in chapter 00.
5 The use of bracket [...] in this dissertation denotes the original Japanese text and/or its English translation.
was published five times (*ArchiteXt* 0, 00, 1, 2, and Extra) between the summer of 1970 and the winter of 1972.

*Figure 4: ArchiteXt.*
ArchiteXt can be considered part of the explosion of little magazines in the world of architecture, especially in the West, in the 1960s and 1970s. Our collective doctoral research at Princeton, *Clip/Stamp/Fold: The Radical Architecture of Little Magazines 196X – 197X*, led by Professor Beatriz Colomina, takes stock of seventy of these magazines published over a dozen cities, including the aforementioned *Archigram* and *Le Carré Bleu*. Pivoting on these short-lived radical magazines (as the literary term “little” originally designates), our investigation extends to pamphlets, building instruction manuals, as well as professional magazines that show moments of “littleness.” This research eventually became the basis for an extensive traveling exhibition.6

In Japan, the professional architectural magazines from that period included *Shinkenchiku* [New Architecture] (with the English edition *Japan Architect*), *Kenchiku Bunka* [Architectural Culture], *Toshi Jutaku* [Urban Residence], *Kindai Kenchiku* [Contemporary Architecture], *SD* (Space Design) and *A+U* (Architecture and Urbanism). While scanning through these publications, I came across small reprints of ArchiteXt strips in *Japan Architect*—in its June 1976 special edition on ArchiteXt. But reduced to about 21 x 21 mm per square from the original 210 x 210 mm, the reprints were so small that they were basically illegible. My ensuing attempts to locate a copy in the Japanese libraries were frustrated. None of them had the collection, which was not surprising in light of ArchiteXt’s loose format and underground circulation. Only ArchiteXt Extra was obtainable. The National Diet Library [国立国会図書館] in Tokyo xeroxed the pages from *Toshi Jutaku* and mailed a copy to me. Until this point, my encounter with ArchiteXt had been indirect, through other magazines: *Japan Architect* and then *Toshi Jutaku*.

6 For details of the *Clip/Stamp/Fold* project, see *Clip, Stamp, Fold: the Radical Architecture of Little Magazines, 196X to 197X*. 
Japan Architect’s special edition on ArchiteXt features an introduction by architectural critic Charles Jencks. In my correspondence with Jencks, he suggested that I contact the Japan Institute of Architects (JIA) [日本建築家協会] (JIA is the most established architectural professional organization in Japan, founded in 1987, merging the former Japan Architect Association (JAA) and the Japan Federation of Professional Architects Association (JOPPA)) about how I might locate the members of ArchiteXt. To my delight, JIA provided me with the phone number of Takefumi Aida Architect & Associates, which enabled me to get in touch with Mr. Aida. Henceforth began my direct communication with ArchiteXt.

Figure 5: Takefumi Aida’s card design on bristol paper.
Figure 6: ArchiteXt featured in Japan Architect, special edition (June 1976).

Figure 7: Toshi Jutakua (August 1972).
Meanwhile, our first *Clip/Stamp/Fold* exhibition was to take place at the Storefront for Art and Architecture in New York City. Our plan included examples of original magazines and audio clips of interviews with various editors and designers involved in the publications. I flew to Tokyo (in the summer of 2006) and interviewed Aida and Takeyama—Miyawaki had passed away, and Azuma and Suzuki were not available at that time (later in 2008, upon my returning for further dissertation research, I met with Suzuki). Prior to the formal interview, which would take place in Takeyama’s office (now no longer in Ayoyama district but in Shibuya), I first met with Aida in his office (now in Shinjuku). Fortunately, Aida had retained a copy of the original materials. Being the youngest member of ArchiteXt, and in accordance with the Japanese tradition of a seniority-based status relationship, *senpai* [先輩, senior] vs. *kohai* [後輩, junior], Aida took upon himself the administrative responsibilities concerning *ArchiteXt*. He had filed away the magazines in his meticulously organized office shelves, from which he retrieved this rare set of translucent loose leaves of parchment, delicately folded and tucked away in a now yellowed envelope. Then and there, *ArchiteXt* became a tangible reality. (The magazine, as well as an audio clip of my interview with Aida and Takeyama, was featured in *Clip/Stamp/Fold*.)

My further inquiry into the myriad works by the individual members revealed the tremendous significance of ArchiteXt in the New Wave era. To date, however, there is limited study on this Japanese architectural movement, in contrast to the prolific literature on Metabolism, which is still emerging—Rem Koolhaas and Hans Ulrich Obrist’ *Project Japan: Metabolism Talks* only came out in 2011 (including new interviews with the surviving members, and hundreds of images including intimate snapshots of the Metabolists at work and play,

---

architectural models, magazine and newspaper excerpts). This lack of attention to New Wave has to do with its ostensibly pluralistic nature; the period presented a tremendous array of individual value systems in theories and in praxes, which thwarted any unifying view of it by historians or critics. For that reason, New Wave has been largely deemed random, haphazard, and without logic. However, ArchiteXt affords us a useful case study with which to reexamine this period. The group represented a driving force behind New Wave; their divergent, versatile practices reflect the ethos of the Post-Metabolism era in Japanese architecture. Avoiding logic at the level of generality, ArchiteXt points to an alternative theoretical treatment: in the local, in the details, as (what cultural theorist Michel de Certeau calls) a “science of singularity,” which relates disjointed practices to a particular circumstance.8

... 

Japan suffered a national identity crisis right after the war, though this almost seems an overdue question, since it was the Meiji Restoration (1868-1912) that introduced westernization to Japan and caused profound social changes. Consequently, an anxious quest for a lost, or perhaps brand new, Japanese identity ensued. In the sphere of art, this search narrowed in on a debate over what constituted Japanese essence.

Of course, what is Japanese—or “Japan-ness” as architect Arata Isozaki calls it9—only obtains meaning via a gaze from outside, especially in comparison with “Western-ness.” Before

---


9 Isozaki invents the term “Japan-ness” to designate the polemics of Japan’s proper characteristics or the essence of its culture, instigated by an external gaze at the insular nation. See Arata Isozaki, *Japan-ness*
the Meiji, while not yet known as “Japan,” the country was insular; it was shut off from the rest of the world by the Tokugawa shogunate to secure a feudal society. In due course, however, pressure from Western powers pried its doors open, and the country embarked on a path of westernization.

This westernization gave rise to “Japan-ness”—that is, the awareness of it—as the native culture was juxtaposed with distinct foreign conventions. Unsurprisingly, cultural clashes reverberated within the domestic domain, where everyday life ran on two tracks: Japanese [wa] verses Western [yo]:

The average Japanese man spends his day in yo-fuku (Western clothes) then changes to wa-fuku (traditional Japanese clothes) when he gets home. He keeps his yo-fuku in a yo-tansu (cabinet) and his wa-fuku in a wa-tansu. He has wa-shoku (Japanese food) for his breakfast and yo-shoku for lunch at his office. His dinner is more eclectic but is usually served in a wa-shitu (traditional Japanese room), seated on the floor…

Quoted by ArchiteXt member Minoru Takeyama, this witty observation vividly catches the duality of everyday life in Japan (and reflects ArchiteXt’s playful attitude toward the situation).

The government’s response to this odd infusion of westernness was nonetheless a grave, state-directed nationalism, i.e., Japanese imperialism. Consequently, conservative backlash, such as the denial of women’s political participation and individualism, occurred alongside the abolition of feudalism and the introduction of civilization. Under its imperialism, the Empire of Japan supported militarism. The Imperial Japanese Army and Imperial Japanese Navy forces thrived through the Taisho period (1912-26) and the early Showa periods (1926-89), leading up

---


to World War II. But finally, after their defeat, the Empire dissolved. Many Japanese felt a great pang of shame as a result of this imperialism that had led them into war.

Between the end of the war and 1952, Japan experienced a substantial cultural void; until 1952’s San Francisco Treaty, the country underwent a forced occupation by the Allied Powers (led by the United States with help from the British Commonwealth Occupation Force). When the Allied Powers withdrew their troops, nationalistic sentiments resurfaced vis-à-vis the ignominy of their failed imperialism. Incited by these complex emotions, the emerging artworks appeared to manifest an identity crisis. Innovative artistic groups and movements cropped up. In self-reflection and by multimedia experimentation, these artists confronted the conventional definitions of Japanese art.

In cinema, *Nuberu Bagu*, the Japanese version of the French *Nouvelle Vague*, emerged, whence the editors of *Japan Architect* derived the name “New Wave.” From a rather dark angle, the typically young directors of *Nuberu Bagu* ventured into the lower social strata of Japan to capture “Japan-ness” in the postwar setting. They braved the ugly culture heretofore avoided by other directors. Common *Nuberu Bagu* themes include crime, violence, selfishness, lust and amorality—behavior well outside of the customary Japanese rules of order and decorum. Nagisa Oshima’s *Cruel Story of Youth* epitomizes this genre—Oshima is known as “the Japanese Jean-Luc Godard.” In the story, a teenage couple, Makoto and Kiyoshi, perpetrate the profitable scam of luring older men to solicit Makoto and attempt to rape her, and afterwards Kiyoshi beats them up and obtains hush money. *Cruel Story of Youth* avoids the obligatory “happy ending.” The movie ends tragically in a split screen of two bodies, with Kiyoshi being beaten up and strangled to death, and Makoto, while attempting to escape, gets her foot caught in a car door, and is then dragged along and killed. Therefore spoiling the harmonious image of the nation, Oshima was
accused of “selling out” Japan. But he retorted, “involved as I am with being Japanese, I have no way to make films except by examining the Japanese and endeavoring to discover what they are.” His portrayal of the dark side of Japan was, in a sense, his way of expressing “Japan-ness.”

In terms of their technique, Nuberu Bagu directors attempted to break away from the traditional narratives by employing methods associated with the Nouvelle Vague cinema, such as jump-cuts, tilt angles, long-shots and close-ups, and the newsreel look of the hand-held camera, thereby venturing into the stream-of-consciousness approach. Nuberu Bagu resonated with the popular postwar slogan: “Japanese spirit, western technique.” Foreign cinematic inventions were readily assimilated into these Japanese directors’ search for “Japan-ness.”

Elsewhere in art, the notion of dent [(Japanese) tradition] gained special interest. An intense “tradition debate” arose, preoccupying the cultural sphere of Japan. In order to define “Japan-ness,” designers sought to reconnect with the country’s past, and interpret dent in the context of modern Japan. Various collectives formed for this purpose, notably the Japan Design Committee (JDC), which consisted of eminent members, including architect Kenzo Tange and artist Isamu Noguchi. They gathered monthly to select the best made-in-Japan design for commercial launch at the Matsuya department store in the Ginza shopping district of Tokyo.

---

12 For an overview of Nuberu Bagu, see Richie, A Hundred Years of Japanese Film.
The JDC’s main goal was to elevate Japanese crafts to modern design without sacrificing tradition.\textsuperscript{14}

In architecture, the debate focused on the comparison of the prehistoric Japanese styles: Jomon and Yayoi. This debate unfolded mainly in print media, and primarily in \textit{Shinkenchiku}, which with a monthly circulation of 8,000 copies had a significant influence on the Japanese architectural community. \textit{Shinkenchiku} was under the editorship of journalist and architectural critic Noboru Kawazoe (who later became a key figure in Metabolism).\textsuperscript{15} In particular, the 1955 and 1956 issues investigate the dialectics of Japanese tradition and modernity, featuring articles by eminent Japanese architects. For example, Seiichi Shirai, the revered architect of “Atomic Bomb Memorial” (1955) in Hiroshima,\textsuperscript{16} addresses the dichotomy of Jomon and Yayoi in postwar Japan in his essay “About Things Romanesque: the Medieval
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Residential Architecture of the Egawas, Nirayama-kan.” In turn, Kenzo Tange advocates synthetic applications of Jomon and Yayoi styles in the present day in his “My Conception [of] Modern Architecture in Present-day Japan: To Create Tradition.”

The Jomon and Yayoi cultures occupied a special place in the “tradition debate” because these prehistoric periods had not yet been introduced to, and hence colored by, foreign cultures. Jomon (14,000–300 BCE), the hunting-and-fishing age, began immediately after the Japanese Paleolithic (35,000–14,000 BCE). Jomon means “cord-patterned,” referring to their characteristic pottery style with markings made by using cords wrapped around them. This period is especially rich in pottery, tools, jewelry, and figures. After Jomon came Yayoi (300 BCE–250 CE), the iron age. New pottery styles emerged, marking the start of intensive rice agriculture in paddy fields. The Jomon and Yayoi cultures are aboriginal. They are deemed absolutely Japanese by the postwar architects. (Subsequently in the Yamato period, Buddhism, Confucianism, and Taoism, as well as the Chinese writing system, were introduced to Japan.)

The contrast between Jomon and Yayoi can be thought of as free-spirit vs. logic, which translates, in the stylistic realm, to organic vs. geometrical forms. Jomon designs are dynamic and vernacular, as illustrated by their cord-patterned, frame-formed earthenware. They are rich in mass. Their forms elicit a strong sense of space and volume yet without comprehensive geometrical order. Their houses are pit dwellings of rough squares with bulging sides and simple roofs consisting of pillars linked by beams and covered with thatch and leaves. In Tange’s words, Jomon design exemplifies “the vital pulsations of life.”

In contrast, Yayoi designs are sophisticated and aristocratic. They clearly display the beginnings of logic and intellectual order. Their forms show control and calm in opposition to the uninhibited forces of movement and mass in Jomon design. Yayoi culture developed when
the people practiced agriculture and settled in fixed domiciles. An advanced platform-type house with a raised floor emerged; it has a basic frame consisting of posts and beams (with king posts above the beams to support a ridgepole) and a simple gable roof resting on parallel rafters. Geometrical order and aesthetic concepts characterize the design in contrast to Jomon’s organic volume.

Between the two styles, Shirai favors Jomon. He claims that Jomon has silently sustained the Japanese ethnic spirit, and that it continues to be vital to the arts and culture of modern Japan. In contrast, Kenzo Tange seeks a synthetic sensibility assimilating Jomon and Yayoi, culminating in his *Katsura: Tradition and Creation in Japanese Architecture*, 1960—\footnote{Kenzo Tange, *Katsura: Tradition and Creation in Japanese Architecture*, Tokyo: Zokeisha Publications; New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, c1960.} for him, Katsura Palace represents the synergy of the distinct Japanese cultures. In *Katsura*, Tange uses photographer Yasuhiro Ishimoto’s works to recast this 17th-century Japanese architecture as a modern symbol of postwar Japan. He edits and represents Ishimoto’s photos to emphasize, question, deny, and deconstruct Katsura’s formal and spatial conceptions in hopes of transforming them for modern Japan. In a sense, *Katsura* is Tange’s visual manifesto of postwar Japanese modernism. Offering an entirely new and different approach to the imperial villa, this seminal publication (published by Yale University Press in the United States and reprinted more than seven times) concluded the “tradition debate” in Japanese architecture. Afterwards the architects’ attention shifted.

\dotfill
Metabolism succeeded the identity crisis. By 1960, Japan’s dark postwar mentality had for the most part lifted, and was followed by an incredible economic boom, propelling the country into an optimistic mode of reconstruction. Under Tange’s mentorship, a group of young professionals gathered informally after-hours to discuss the future of architecture and critique each other’s designs. The group included Kisho Kurokawa and Kiyonori Kikutake, who were working for Tange at that time, and architectural critic and Shinkenchiku editor Noboru Kawazoe. Soon they were joined by architects Fumihiko Maki, Masato Otaka and Takashi Asada, industrial designer Kenji Ekuan, and graphic designer Kiyoshi Awazu—and later, Arata Isozaki and Tange himself. Reflecting the flourishing economy, their visionary proposals materialized in grand urban scale. They made reference to the biological process of metabolism to devise an architectural formula of “mega-structures plus plug-in cells,” hence the name: Metabolism.

Beginning with Kikutake’s “Floating City” (aka “Marine City”) in 1958, the project consisted of majestic, cylindrical service towers planted in the sea and shooting upward into the sky. Inserted into these towers were capsules, which provided spaces for living. By design, the service cores have a longer life span, whereas the plug-in capsule cells recycle periodically to renew life. The architecture thus “metabolizes.”

Similarly thriving on grandiosity and pseudo biology, Kurokawa’s “Helix City” in 1962 alludes to the helix structure of the chromosomes (DNA). In plan, the city expanded in an amoeba-like, centrifugal pattern; the living urban organism swept around the existing streets with loop line highways via a chain system. In elevation, the DNA-like, spiral Helix-structures twirled and stormed upward, making up multiple, multi-level cities by themselves.
Figure 9: Kiyonori Kikutake, Floating City, 1958; Kisho Kurokawa, Helix City, 1962.
Metabolism’s biological predilection stemmed from the fall of CIAM (Congrès internationaux d'architecture moderne, i.e. International Congresses of Modern Architecture) in 1958. Le Corbusier sent out this message: “The new age is started as the old age is finished and it’s your turn.” During their early informal meetings, the young Japanese professionals fervently discussed what the next generation would be. In conclusion they posited an “Age of Life” to replace the “Age of Machine.” So, with recourse to the science of life/biology, Metabolism dreamed up a new world of gargantuan, living architectural organisms, which metabolize unstoppably to regain strength and force.

Metabolism first garnered international recognition through their mentor Tange. In 1959, Tange attended the Team X conference in Holland. He brought along Kikutake’s “Floating City” and presented it to the participants. Thereafter, Metabolism became known outside of Japan. In 1960, the group formally launched themselves at the World Design Conference in Tokyo, presenting its manifesto in a short book, *Metabolism 1960: a Proposal for a New Urbanism* (designed by Kiyoshi Awazu—who also designed the Metabolism logo). Metabolism solemnly declares:

We regard human society as a vital process, a continuous development from atom to nebula. The reason why we use the biological word metabolism is that we believe design and technology should denote human vitality. We do not believe that metabolism

---

18 It was unclear whether the message was sent to Peter Smithson or Aldo Van Eyck or others, but the person who received the letter from Le Corbusier forwarded it to many, and one of them went to Kisho Kurokawa.

19 The message led Kurokawa to write *From the Age of Machine to the Age of Life*. For a thorough discussion re: the “Age of Life,” see “Interview with Kisho Kurokawa” by Betty J. Blum for the Chicago Architects Oral History Project (The Art Institute of Chicago, 2002).
indicates only acceptance of a natural, historical process, but we are trying to encourage the active metabolic development of our society through our proposals.\textsuperscript{20}

Besides the introduction by Kawazoe, which codifies Metabolism’s works under a conceptual umbrella (using the word “metabolism”), \textit{Metabolism 1960} features four essays (in Japanese and English): Kikutake’s “Ocean City,” Kawazoe’s “Material and Man,” Otaka and Maki’s “Toward Group Form,” and Kurokawa’s “Space City.” Each contributor talks about the processes of renewal (i.e. “metabolism”) in their proposals for future cities. Consisting of eighty-nine 210 x 203 mm pages, \textit{Metabolism 1960} had a limited edition of 2000 copies, printed by Bijutsu Shuppansha [Fine Art Press] and sold for 500 yen a copy by Awazu and Kurokawa at the entrance of the World Design Conference.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{cover_metabolism1960.png}
\caption{Sample pages from \textit{Metabolism 1960: a Proposal for a New Urbanism}.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{20} This part of the manifesto is published in Kisho Kurokawa, \textit{Metabolism in Architecture} (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1977), 27.
Evidently, the Metabolists were on a self-appointed humanitarian mission. Their manifesto revealed enormous ambition to restructure society through architecture. As such, their grandiose utopian proposals were not mere architectural fantasy; they were deliberate plans to intervene in the natural, historical process of human society, which ironically contradicted what they purported to be—of life. Predicated upon advanced technology, the capsules were inhumanly homogenized and constrained. Moreover, the metabolic process of unplugging the deteriorated cells and plugging-in replacements seemed robotic and mechanical, instead of vital.

Consequently advocating pseudo biology and prophetic technology, Metabolism consigned the question of dent to oblivion. Between its Metabolism 1960: a Proposal for a New Urbanism and Tange’s Katsura: Tradition and Creation in Japanese Architecture (which concluded Tange’s historicist effort), 1960 marks a watershed. At this point, Tange too put the “tradition debate” behind, but assimilated the Jomon and Yayoi cultures in his work. In the same year, he conceived “Plan for Tokyo.” In line with Metabolism’s biological thinking, he radically redesigned the capital city in a linear form, based on the theory of evolution and growth of living organisms:

The evolution and growth of living organisms indicate the necessity of the development from radial to linear forms...vertebrates have linear bone structures with parallel radiations. When the living functions of organism differentiate and perform the composite function of life, the centripetal pattern evolves into a system of parallel lines grouped around an axis formed of a spine and arteries. The process whereby a vertebrate body hatches from an egg illustrates the possibility of gradual development on the part of a linear system.21

---

Therefore, Tange’s organic city evolved along a civic axis through several stages, gradually extending out over the Tokyo Bay. The axis had two parts: outside, an infrastructural frame of transportation systems consisting of circular rings, with the small ones inscribed in the medium ones, and the medium in the large; inside, a unified structure of pilotis (for automobiles and pedestrians), core system (for vertical traffics and service arteries—water ducts and electric wiring, etc.) and architecture. From this central civic axis radiated a system of parallel streets and monorails with building blocks attached to sustain the composite function of urban life.

While abiding by the principles of Metabolism outwardly, “Plan for Tokyo” suggests a synergy of Jomon spirit and Yayoi logic. The Yayoi logic manifests itself at the planning level, with clear intellectual and geometrical order in the use of primary and secondary axes and spatial divisions for various systems: transportation, infrastructure, architecture, and so on. But within this rigorous logic, the dynamic city reveals “vital pulsations of life.” Force and movement characterize the bay city. Architecture with deeply curved roofs populates the sea. Layer upon layer of circular rings for transportation sweep across the water. In that sense, the plan is Jomon in spirit.

Following “Plan for Tokyo,” the 1960s saw many more visionary urban proposals inspired by Metabolism: Kurokawa’s “Floating City” in Kasumigaura (1961), Isozaki’s “City in the Air” aka “Join Core System” (1962), and Maki’s “Golgi Structure” (1967), to name a few. By 1970, Metabolism had reached its pinnacle. At the Osaka Expo, their visions materialized into actual built forms, including Tange’s Japanese Theme Pavilion and Kurokawa’s Toshiba-IHI Pavilion and Takara Beautician. But afterwards, the downturn in Japan’s economy and the energy crisis dampened the architects’ optimism. Finally, Metabolism declined.
Figure 11: Kenzo Tange, Plan for Tokyo, 1960.
Figure 12: Plan for Tokyo: rings of infrastructure along a civic axis and parallel streets and monorails with building blocks attached to them.
Up to this point, Japanese architecture reflected a hierarchical pyramid of order, which also ordered Japanese society to a great extent: the emperor and the people, master and apprentice, supervisor and underling, father and son, and so on. The system was simultaneously open and closed. It was open because one could move up the rungs of the ladder with effort or advancing age, or down if losing a superior’s favor. However, it was closed because the pyramid was all there was; those who defied the system would be cast out with no place to go.

Within this pyramidal structure, an architect’s place was determined by the school he graduated from, his experiences in the professional world, age, talents, and so forth; within, everyone strived to reach higher. Kenzo Tange mounted the peak in the 1950s. His works bespeak Japanese modern architecture: “Hiroshima Peace Center” and “Memorial Museum,” 1949-1956 (based in part on Katsura Palace and in part on Shosoin Temple, the treasure house of Todaiji in Nara), as well as

22 The participation of Japanese women architects seems missing at that time. Even into the 1970s, only Itsuko Hasegawa and Reiko Tomita (of ZO Atelier) appeared in the New Wave scene.
the architect’s own house (consisting of a skeleton structure raised off the ground fused with traditional Japanese design in timber and paper). In the 1960s, Metabolism ascended to the apex, with its utopian visions of mega-structures and plug-in cells. But beginning in 1970, this pyramid began to slacken.

In an attempt to capture the structural change, *Japan Architect* published a special edition on the subject of “Post-Metabolism” in 1977 October-November. With an adaptation of artist Tawaraya Sotatsu’s legendary folding screen, “Wind God and Thunder God” (*Fuji Raisin*), the magazine editors portray Metabolists Kisho Kurokawa and Arata Isozaki as the deities, followed by cumulonimbus clouds of thirty-four New Wave architects, including Tadao Ando, Toyo Ito, Hiroshi Hara, ZO [Elephant] Atelier and all five members of ArchiteXt (who are listed individually, instead of as a group like ZO). Their introductory essay, “The New Wave in Japanese Architecture,” compares the new generation of architects to clouds and classifies them into three groups—based on who’s “energetic and billowing” and who’s “misty and thin.” This graphic illustration and categorization suggest the architects’ places in the big picture rather than their connection in thoughts and/or actions. *Japan Architect*, in fact, admits to its unscientific approach. But the depiction vividly captures the new tendency toward an egalitarian system that tolerates individuality and diversity in the world of Japanese architecture.
Japanese New Wave architects:

**Group 1:**
- Arata Isozaki
- Kisho Kurokawa
- Osamu Ishiyama
- Kazuhiko Ishii
- Tadao Ando
- Yasufumi Jijima
- Takefumi Aida (ArchiteXt)
- Monta Mozuna
- Toyo Ito
- Toyokazu Watanabe
- ZO Atelier

**Group 2:**
- Shozo Uchii
- Kiyoshi Kawasaki
- Takamitsu Azuma (ArchiteXt)
- Hiromi Fujii
- Takashi Kurokawa
- Minoru Takeyama (ArchiteXt)
- Yasutaka Yamazaki
- Kazumasa Yamashita
- Mayumi Miyawaki (ArchiteXt)
- Kazumari Sakamoto
- Masayuki Fujimoto
- Yoshio Taniguchi
- Hisao Koyama
- Hiroshi Hara

**Group 3:**
- Koichi Sone
- Makoto Suzuki (ArchiteXt)
- Seinosuke Kimura
- Shin Toki
- Masamitsu Nozawa
- Kijo Rokkaku
- Yûzuru Tomminaga
- Itsuko Hasegawa
- Tetsuro Kurokawa

Figure 14: Post-Metabolism.
In this new picture, Kurokawa and Isozaki still dominated the scene. Although Metabolism no longer prevailed, Kurokawa continued to advocate it. He issued his “Capsule Declaration,” which applies the Metabolist urban vision at the building level, as exemplified by his Nakagin Tower (1972), with 144 capsules in 8 variations attached to a heavy concrete shaft. On the other hand, Isozaki shifted his interest to buildings with strong formal themes; his Gumma Museum of Fine Arts (1974) typifies the trend. In turn, the cumulonimbi presented multifarious theories and works: Tadao Ando’s interplay of light and shade, Monta Mozuna’s cosmic architecture, ZO Atelier’s zoological metaphors, Osamu Ishiyama’s “screw system space production,” which incorporates mass-produced industrial products, and so forth.23

In retrospect, Kurokawa and Isozaki’s split signaled the slackening of the pyramid. The two architects left Tange’s office to venture out on their own. In particular, Tange remarked that Isozaki had since acted like the head of “a guerilla band.”24 Although the master expressed strong hopes for his now-matured apprentices to return to the establishment, these hopes were perpetually frustrated. Isozaki and Kurokawa never returned—in fact, Kurokawa severely criticized his teacher’s works later on.25 Following Metabolism, a tremendous array of individual value systems emerged. These diverse, individualist activities in the 1970s—comparable to guerrilla strikes—pulverized the pyramid bit by bit. Henceforth Japanese architecture moved into a horizontal, free-flowing expansion of New Wave.

23 For the diverse New Wave activities, see my chapter extra.

24 See the Japan Architect’s editorial for its special edition on Post-Metabolism (Oct.-Nov. 1977), 5.

25 See chapter extra.
Figure 15: Arata Isozaki, Gumma Museum of Fine Art, 1974; Kisho Kurokawa, Nakagin Tower, 1972.
In postwar Japan, organized collectives in architecture were sparse, although they flourished in art—to the extent that “collectivism” can be said to form their ethos.\textsuperscript{26} Anti-Art [Han-geijutsu], a rebellious movement (against the Japanese art establishment), prevailed in the 1960s. This development was peculiarly influenced in the 1950s by a single collective called Gutai [Concrete Art Association]. Against the conventional, institutional settings and art forms, Gutai proffered unprecedented outdoor and on-stage presentations. The artists exploited the tradition of “exhibition collectivism;” they were the forerunner of “happenings” in Japan. (Apart from this atypical collective environment, the works of Gutai were created primarily by individual artists.)

Gutai’s precursor of “happenings” set the Anti-Art movement in motion; soon, artistic collectives, such as HRC (Hi Red Center) and Zero Kai [Zero Society], dominated the scene. Anti-Art artists worked in collaboration within their collective, and mostly in the local context—except for those who participated in the international tendency of Fluxus, including Ay-O, Takako Saito, Shiomi Mieko and Kubota Shigeko. “Exhibition collectivism” had evolved into “collaborative collectivism.” Their works are often action-based, revolving around “junk” or everyday objects and activities; hence, the movement is also known as Junk Anti-Art.

Though grounded in the everyday reality, Anti-Art practitioners often used sarcasm to make social and political critiques. For example, HRC staged their “Cleaning Event” (1964), on the streets of downtown Tokyo. The artists dressed themselves in healthcare workers’ uniforms: white coats, shades and red armbands with the group’s trademark “!” in white. In a meticulous manner, HRC feverishly scrubbed the sidewalks, using, absurdly, a toothbrush, floor cloth, and

Figure 16: Hi Red Center, Cleaning Event, 1964.
other utterly ineffectual and out of place cleaning tools. In this farcical manner, Cleaning Event mocked the postwar effort of the city’s hasty beautification. Ironically, mistaking HRC’s official-looking disguises for a sincere beautification effort, the police thanked the artists for their diligent work.

Then, toward the end of the 1960s, Anti-Art was succeeded by Non-Art [Hi-geijutsu]. In place of Anti-Art’s “junk-based” productions, Non-Art centers on “concept-based” installations and actions [acushon or koi], as it confronts the relation of the subject (artist) to the object (art) by experimenting with the idea of not-making [tsukuranai koto], instead of making [tsukuru koto], art.27 New collectives emerged, including Group “I,” Zero Dimension, Bikyoto [Artists Joint-Struggle Council], The Play, and Psychophysiology Research Institute, instigating new modes of collectivism: “inadvertent collectivism” and “participatory collectivism.” In the case of The Play, the artists organized atypical excursions, such as walking with sheep and sailing across the water. The Psychophysiology Research Institute devoted itself solely to Mail Art. Between December 1969 and May 1970, the group made six mailings, plus one extra after May 10th, 1970, 12:00. Two were “political stones” sent to the American president Richard Nixon and Japan’s prime minister Sato Eisaku to appeal for world peace (during the Vietnam War). These mailings were political and purposeful.

There was a striking disparity between the number of flourishing artistic collectives and the fact that in architecture, Metabolism soloed in the 1960s, and the 1970s saw only two New Wave groups: ArchiteXt and ZO Atelier. This paucity of Japanese architectural collectives was even more dramatic when compared with the burgeoning number of architectural groups in the western world, as covered by our *Clip/Stamp/Fold* research: Archizoom, Superstudio, 9999, UFO and Global Tools in Italy, Coop Himmelblau, Haus-Rucker-Co, Missing Link, Zünd up [Light-up] and Salz der Erde [Salt of the Earth] in Austria, Ant Farm, ONYX, PULSA in the USA, Utopie in France and Eventstructures Research Group in Netherland, for example.

ArchiteXt’s Takeyama postulates that, in postwar Japan, the motivation for forming an alliance was frustrated by a growing individualism. Each architect thought, “I’m avant-garde,” and “avant-garde architects do not form groups.” But Takeyama’s view apparently contradicts the success of Metabolism, which gained traction through a collective spirit; despite some disputes which arose among the members after their initial launch, the group continued to convene and

---

28 From September 8th, 2006 ArchiteXt interview transcript by Lisa Hsieh.
collaborate on pivotal occasions, either in small alliances or as a full team. A more palpable explanation for the small number of Japanese architectural collectives perhaps lies in the inertia of the pyramidal hierarchical order, which still dictated the professional path of an architect even in the New Wave era.

ArchiteXt and ZO Atelier were formed upon opposing conceptions. Vis-à-vis ArchiteXt’s individualist collectivity, ZO jointly championed a design philosophy, advocating vernacular traditions and zoomorphism to counter architectural intellect (influenced by architect Takamasa Yoshizaka’s thinking). For example, their “Domo Cerakanto” shows “a fish dreaming about architecture, and architecture dreaming about fish.” But then inside, the fish changes to a “ravine”\(^\text{29}\)—this building also uses local materials and craftsmen to create a regional identity. ZO was founded in 1971. By 1978, the group has expanded into Team Zoo to include small individual studios, each named after a different animal: Kuma [bear], Wani [crocodile], Gaii [bull], Iruka [dolphin], Todo [sea lion], etc.\(^\text{30}\) By 1990, the team branched out into fourteen offshoots to support its architectural aspirations: Atelier Mobile [Running Bird] in architecture and furniture, Atelier Nirinsha [Two Wheeler] in timber work, Atelier Wani [Crocodile] in regional planning, and so on.


\(^{30}\)See Team Zoo and also Space Design’s special edition: “Atelier ZO” (Nov. 1985).
Figure 18: ZO Atelier, Domo Cerakonto, 1974: a mystic fish by design.
Figure 19: ZO Atelier, Domo Cerakanto, 1974: the living room is a ravine.
HISTORY OF TEAM ZÔ

Team Zô (Elephant) 1971–1978

Founder members 1971
Keiko Arimura .......................... Iruka
Hiroyasu Higuchi ...................... Zô
Koichi Otake (died 1983) .............. Zô
Tsutomu Shigemura ................... Iruka
Reiko Tomida ........................... Zô

Members until 1978
Kenichiro Kikuno ........................... Kuma
Munenori Kanazawa .................... 1971–72
Masamitsu Yoshizaka .................. 1971–78
Tami Kondo ............................... 1972–74
Hidekazu Hirai ........................... 1975–80
Hajime Sakagawa ....................... 1975–78
Sadaomi Nishio ....................... 1975–82
Kasuyuki Tamura ........................ 1975–76
Miwako Kikuchi ........................... 1975–80
Akira Ono ................................. 1977–82
Taeko Nagayama ....................... 1977–82
Masasumi Matsui ....................... 1977–82

Diagram: Team Zô from 1971

Figure 20
ArchiteXt, on the other hand, embraced diverse theories and praxes. Its totality was rather fragile; the members converged and diverged freely. Outside of the magazine ArchiteXt, each member ran an office of his own. But even within their joint publication, each editor did his own thing: Aida played dice, Azuma wrote a diary, Miyawaki charted maps, Suzuki sailed a watercraft, and Takeyama sang a (spatial) song. In their uniquely playful way, the architects produced a cluster of heterogeneous non-architecture, evoking the spirit of Non-Art—ArchiteXt especially evinces an artistic affinity with Mail Art.

Figure 21: ArchiteXt: Aida, Azuma, Miyawaki, Suzuki, and Takeyama.

Despite their obvious dissimilarity, ArchiteXt and ZO Atelier each manifests a distinct microcosm of New Wave. At the group level, ZO breaks up and reunites around a set of animalistic design offshoots. At the individual level, ArchiteXt gathers and dissipates. Lacking any obvious cohesiveness, this non-group’s character is illusive, its very identity cloud-like.
At heart, the modus operandi of ArchiteXt is reflected by its bold use of the letter “X.” This ideogram can be interpreted in three ways. In the first place, the entirety of “X,” that is, a cross, expresses negation (as opposed to “O,” a circle, which expresses affirmation and agreement). Secondly, its radiating limbs suggest diversification; they stretch out in four different directions. Moreover, the center indicates intersection, where the two diagonal lines cross and meet. The ideogram simultaneously signifies negation, diversification, and intersection.

Not only in symbol (by having the capital letter X cross out the letter c to obliterate convention) but also in practice, ArchiteXt boldly breaches the formality of architectural praxis, as shown in its inaugural meeting. Instead of an office environment, the five young men chose to convene at a bar, which in Japanese tradition is considered a “laughter place” [warai no ba, 笑いの場], far from a professional setting. In all likelihood, the mood in the bar was bubbly, even intoxicating—glasses slammed and clanged, laughter reverberated. Yet all the while, creative ideas for the production of ArchiteXt were tossed into the air and thrashed about. In replacing drafting tools with drinking wares and mingling design with alcohol and cheering, ArchiteXt concocted their little magazine, flouting the Japanese default code of conduct of “emotionless behavior” for a Japanese professional. This contrasted starkly with the birth of Metabolism, which formed around pensive discussions about the future of architecture under the mentorship of a master architect. In defiance of convention, ArchiteXt renounced formal mentorship, choosing an informal bar as their studio. Thereby work and play coalesced, with one inspiring and transcending the other.
The apparent joviality of ArchiteXt’s creative milieu permeates the contents of ArchiteXt as well. Takeyama claims, “We wanted to avoid a big statement, a manifesto kind of thing, which Metabolism did.”

Obviously, Takeyama is referring to Metabolism 1960: Proposal for a New Urbanism, which in a grave tone proclaims to interfere with the historical trajectory of human society by an “active metabolic” schema predicated upon advanced technology. ArchiteXt defies this formality, beginning with a page nearly identical in size to Metabolism 1960’s—210 x 210 cm vs. 210 x 203 cm—yet opens vertically to an accordion fold, instead of a formal book. On this loose strip, Takeyama concocts a fictitious, melodramatic dialogue between ArchiteXt, Snoopy and Charlie Brown (in ArchiteXt 1). Aida creates architectural jokes by flipping a Japanese pagoda, squashing apartments between the posts of torii (the gateway of a Shinto shrine), converting an American military tank into a house, and so forth (in ArchiteXt Extra). Unlike the weightiness of Metabolism 1960, humor and playfulness saturate the squares and pages of ArchiteXt.

---

31 ArchiteXt interview transcript by Lisa Hsieh.
ArchiteXt’s negation of the old Japanese social more of “no self” in favor of individualist thinking is transmitted loudly in ArchiteXt 0, rebelliously designating this the “self” issue, in which the editors/architects portray themselves in conspicuous ways, eschewing the premium typically placed on self-negation for a self-radiant and self-centered presence. The very format of their unique magazine bespeaks independence and individuality.

This individualistic operation inevitably necessitates diversification, manifesting the second meaning of “X.” In the pluralist spirit of New Wave, the members advocate their own theories and praxes. Azuma reconfigures the Japanese “tatami-mind.” Miyawaki designs some 180 “Box Houses:” Yellow Box, Blue Box, Green Box, Black Box, Match Box, Triangle Box, White Triangle, A Quarter-Circle, and so forth. Suzuki pioneers a technique of crafting exposed concrete. Despite its disparities, ArchiteXt’s collective directs their disparate energies toward coalescence in one strength, engulfing even paradoxes, and finally reflecting the cumulous representation of New Wave.

Not only are their approaches to architecture diverse, but they move outside of the conventional disciplinary boundaries, crisscrossing with theater, play, food, cartography, and signage. Their exotic productions evade a clear definition, though I’ve categorized them as “readable,” “playable” and “edible.” For instance, Takeyama scans his brain activities and charts pages and pages of architectural encephalograms (readable). Aida creates a puzzle consisting of chairs, a table, and a lighting fixture, which interlock into one perfect cube (playable). Miyawaki participates in the Japanese show Architecture and Macaroni and designs “architecture on a plate” (edible). Resonating with Anti-Art and Non-Art’s everyday objects and actions, the readable, playable, and edible designs by ArchiteXt attest to the third meaning of “X” in their creative intersection of topics.
ArchiteXt employs Gutai’s “exhibition collectivism;” the architects worked in a communal venue, i.e., the pages in ArchiteXt. Then again, ArchiteXt shares Anti-Art’s “collaborative collectivism.” The architects formed an alliance, jointly producing ArchiteXt for freedom of expression. Their conception appears casual and playful, with a minimum of deliberate planning. ArchiteXt never intends a specific route for its magazine. The editors freely contribute ideas and designs amid drinks, which brings to mind Non-Art’s “inadvertent collectivism” and “participatory collectivism.” Ultimately building upon varied collectivisms, and embracing differences more than similarity, ArchiteXt spawns its all-inclusive collectivity of “X” without conformity.

![Diagram](attachment:figure23.png)
Art critic Miyakawa Atsushi’s incisive thesis, in 1964, was that “Descent to Everyday” [Nihijo-sei eno kaki] consigns an end to Japanese modern art. In Japan, modernism had triumphantly deemed Art “with a capital A” to have absolute superiority over Life. But when Anti-Art introduced everyday signs, images, and objects into their works, subverting the conventional art forms of painting and sculpture, Art was knocked off its pedestal and jolted into the humble realm of life. Non-Art further dematerializes it, capitalizing on everyday acushon in letter writing and sending mailings, building vessels and rowing down the rivers, and so on. The artists literally descend into everyday life.

In a uniquely playful manner, ArchiteXt too launches its descent to everyday; the architects draft magazines, chart maps, make signs, play toys, and cook pastas, even as they build buildings. Stretching the boundaries between architecture and non-architecture, ArchiteXt’s extensive productions evoke Rosalind Krauss’ “Expanded Field,” where sculptural works penetrate the realms of “non-architecture” and “non-landscape”—as exemplified by Robert Morris’ quasi-architectural “Plywood Show” (at the Green Gallery in New York City, 1964) and Robert Smithson’s sweeping “Spiral Jetty” (at the Great Salt Lake in Utah, 1969-1970). However, instead of a robust expansion, ArchiteXt’s spatial practice fluctuates; architecture shrinks, flattens, arises, flops, vanishes, back and forth, among changing forms and media. Unlike Krauss’ non-architecture of “pure negativity,” which can only be located for what it is not—“it is what is in the room that is not really the room”—ArchiteXt instigates a marriage of

---


architecture and non-architecture, as well as art and life. For example, ArchiteXt assimilates the 3-D quality of architecture, extruding from a square to an accordion fold and then straightening out again into a long strip, at the same time presenting various readable 2-D information: maps, signs, poems, matrices, encephalograms, photographs, and so on.

Further, ArchiteXt’s creative expansion can be illustrated diagrammatically paralleling Krauss’ “expanded field.” ArchiteXt, the confluence of architecture and a magazine, generates an extended category of what I term readable architecture. Similarly, ArchiteXt’s toys, puzzles and games beget playable architecture; food and cuisine, edible architecture. Linked by a shared core in architecture, this diagram opens to a radial expansion, which can potentially expand
further by supplementing new non-architecture—for instance, with clothing spawns wearable architecture.


This creative expansion, theoretically and empirically speaking, is vectorial, enacted by ArchiteXt’s varying acushon: reading, writing, illustrating, walking, mapping, masking, acting, playing, jesting, cooking and eating. The readable, playable and edible mutate in form, crisscrossing in action and function—the magazine tells a joke, the toy conceals the architect’s anxiety, the pasta entertains, etc. By virtue of this versatile functioning, ArchiteXt’s readable, playable and edible act as architectural apparatuses, permeating between texts, graphics and objects, networking diverse architectural ideas, forms, media, culture, history, theory and praxis—therefore strategically orienting architecture toward everyday reality in action.

---

34 For a definition of “apparatus,” see Giorgio Agamben, *What Is An Apparatus?: And Other Essays* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2009). In brief, the Italian philosopher defines “apparatus” (through Foucault’s use of the term dispositif in his thought system) as a strategic network to correlate a heterogeneous set of elements, including discourses, institutions, architectural forms, philosophical propositions, and so forth.
Accordingly, each of my chapters pairs architecture with a set of actions: the **readable** with reading, writing, illustrating, voyaging and mapping; the **playable** with playing, jesting, masking and acting; the **edible** with cooking and eating—with some *acushon* percolating through the categorization. Thus organized according to actions, my investigations do not treat all five members of ArchiteXt equally or extensively. As the chapters progress, the timeline extends into the 1990s, and the examination expands to the works of ArchiteXt’s peers—with chapter **extra** focusing on New Wave to shed light on the context and conditions of Japanese architecture, which motivated ArchiteXt’s unprecedented practice in Japan. My nomenclature follows that of *ArchiteXt*, as chapter 0 (Introduction), 00, 1, 2 and extra.
ArchiteXt emerged in 1970 at the height of the Japanese Non-Art movement, while architecture transitioned from Metabolism to New Wave. As the dust of war slowly settled and Japanese artists increasingly moved away from “making” to “not making” art, the conventionally object-based work was outshone by concept-based work, such as mail art, concrete poetry, and earthworks. Mail Art especially acted as a catalyst for Non-Art, as it transcended geographical restrictions, reaching out even to otherwise uninterested parties. Letters, manuscripts, printed matter and ephemera, clippings, sound recordings, etc. proliferated; they were packaged and sent around. Meanwhile, performance-based work flourished, too. These were variously called “action” (acushon or koi), “happening” (hapuningu), “event” (ivent), and “ritual” (gishiki) in Japan. Therefore by making, or “not making,” everyday objects and activities into art, postwar Japanese artists instigated their “descent to the everyday.”

Echoing the happenings in Japanese art, ArchiteXt’s “not making” architecture defied the conventional building of buildings. Their creation of ArchiteXt, along with its disjointed contents—Aida’s jests, Miyawaki’s maps, Suzuki’s voyages, Takeyama’s encephalograms, and so forth—reflected a trend of non-architecture paralleling non-art, yet somehow retaining architectural concept, method, form, structure, space, etc. Although non-art thrived in postwar Japan, non-architecture was rare. Veering away from Metabolism’s grandiose fantastical visions, ArchiteXt’s unique non-architectural oeuvre re-engaged Japanese culture and arts at the

---

35 For details of Non-Art, see Art, Anti-art, Non-art: Experimentations in the Public Sphere in Postwar Japan, 1950-1970 (Los Angeles, Calif.: Getty Research Institute, c2007).
grassroots level in the actions of everyday life (as opposed to Metabolism’s metaphor of life). In orienting architecture toward the actions of reading, writing, illustrating, signifying, mapping, walking, sailing, and so forth, ArchiteXt initiated their own “descent to the everyday.”

Embracing diversity, even divergence, ArchiteXt defies a single comprehensive reading. Each strip, square, or image, is a locus; each bears a signifier without a fixed signification—reflecting Roland Barthes’ Empire of Signs, which reads Japan into a fictive system of “empty signs.” This chapter argues that ArchiteXt comprises an empire of empty (architectural) signs in itself. In particular, my investigation centers on two recurrent themes, to which the myriad signs of ArchiteXt attest: “Heterology” (an architectural theory posited by Takeyama) and “Voyage” (a non-art practice initiated by The Play). The former aims to shed light on a distinctive architectural semiotics embedded in the harenchi [shameless (literally)] culture of postwar Japan anchored in fantasies and sex thrills, which gave rise to unforeseen sex programs and building types. The latter articulate “voyage” as a means to comprehend space and narrate, or reinvent, everyday life. Again, my chapter is organized according to ArchiteXt 0, 00, 1, 2, and Extra.
Architect 0: Self

Architect 0 came out in the summer of 1970. The chosen theme was “self.” In this pilot issue, the five editors/architects introduce themselves in conspicuous graphics. A devout Buddhist, Aida presents himself practicing zazen meditation in the lotus posture; Azuma shows a side profile of his naked self, his left hand teasingly placed to hint at the sex organ as if it were erect; Miyawaki employs repetitive shots of himself engaging in varied architectural activities: drafting, building models, visiting a site, etc.; Suzuki turns a somersault across the squares of his strip; and Takeyama shows an enlarged, elongated self standing on top of the earth. The five men feature themselves distinctively: long profiles across the strip (Azuma and Takeyama), orderly depictions in each square as if it were a separate page (Aida and Suzuki), and just pixels (Miyawaki). But more than the varied format, Architect 0 shows intriguing contradiction in content. Sitting underneath an ethereal circle of light practicing zazen, Aida wears a befitting Japanese kimono with wide sleeves, tied with a sash, whereas Takeyama, standing tall above an earth (the globe echoing Aida’s circle of light), clothes himself in the western attire of a jacket and pants. Azuma wears nothing. Moreover, Aida scribes his signature in meticulous Japanese calligraphy, while Azuma quotes a western poem from Robert Sheckley’s science fiction Mindswap—perhaps the architect is suggesting that his consciousness has been swapped into the body of an alien life form, which contrasts with Aida, whose physical body is transfixed in the world while his mind indwells a meditative spiritual realm. Resulting from five distinct “self” expressions, Architect 0 is teeming with eastern and western exchanges, and corporeal, mental, and spatial transpositions. Even as an editorial team, these are clearly five unhitched individuals, five characters, in five strips.
Just as the “X” replaces the “C” in conventional architect, the 0 issue exemplifies ArchiteXt’s mode of negation: oblique and lighthearted. To begin with, ArchiteXt negates the Japanese publishing monopoly by its alternative self-publication, while the mainstream Japanese architectural magazines mainly reported on building projects and commercial products. As much as fifty percent of the pages of a typical magazine was allotted to advertisements. There was little room for conceptual work or discussion, much less space for young architects to voice their opinions. In contrast, ArchiteXt 0 displays not a single building or advertisement. With ArchiteXt, ArchiteXt creates a forum entirely for free self-expression.

Deeper than its negation of the existing norms of Japanese architectural publications is its overturning of the Japanese social more of “no self.” The “no self” code of conduct had been instituted by Takugawa shogunate (1603-1868) to secure a firm foundation for feudal society. On top of retaining control by force, this government attempted to inculcate compliance and acceptance in the minds of the people, using Shingaku teachings which integrate Confucian tradition and principles from Zen Buddhism. The shogunate admonished Japanese men and women not to hold on to self, rejecting every spontaneous impulse as selfish. This ethic of “no self” henceforth gained firm ground and remained ingrained in the Japanese mind for generations to follow—even after the Meiji modernization (1868-1912).

Nevertheless, a transition in this attitude regarding “self” occurred between the Allied Powers’ withdrawal and the Japanese student riots, which echoed the global protests of 1968. The Japanese Ministry of Education conducted a national survey on the “common life philosophy” in 1953. People voted that “to live a pure and just life”—that is, selfless and disinterested—was the optimal life philosophy.36 This result still attested to the widely held

---

belief in “no self.” However, in the 1960s, this suppressed Japanese “self” began to awaken. The political climate in Japan instigated an unforeseen culture of protest. At the outset, the protests were directed against the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty in 1960. In May and June that year, the streets of Tokyo were not free of protesters for a single day. The demonstrations continued to spill over into the streets of the major cities and, through the medium of television, to citizens in their own homes. More profound than merely expressing disapproval of pro-U.S. foreign policy or even anti-Americanism, the activists advocated *shutaisei* [主体性, independence/individuality], which was ironically an American ideal, as part of Japan’s postwar liberal democracy. Toward the end of 1968, the protests turned violent. Echoing the student riots overseas, Japan’s universities too erupted into mayhem. Students barricaded school buildings and fought with the police force, confronting authority and demanding autonomy from the government. The tumult lasted until the end of 1969.37

In 1968, at the height of the turmoil, the Japanese Ministry of Education again administered the very same national survey on common life philosophy. This time discarding the doctrine of “no self,” the Japanese chose instead “to live one’s life according to one’s own tastes.” 38 Those in the young generation, especially, sought passionately to create their own identities and explore their individuality. By 1970 the tempestuousness seemed to have settled and life returned to normal. Nevertheless, the shared aspirations for *shutaisei* persisted, but now in a nonviolent way. Instead of destructive action, the young Japanese engaged in constructive outlets for self-expression. For ArchiteXt, in particular, *ArchiteXt* was their conduit.

---


**ArchiteXt 00: Self**

The same theme, “self,” continues in *ArchiteXt* 00. Its focus, however, shifts from the architects to their architecture. Each author’s physical self either diminishes (Aida’s zazen self is pushed to a corner; Takeyama now stands on top of a small building), becomes a background (Azuma’s previously blank, dark body profile is now filled with architectural images head to toe), or disappears altogether (no Miyawaki or Suzuki in sight). Small houses dominate the pages: Aida’s House Without a Title, Azuma’s Tower House, Akatsuka Mountain Lodge, Miyawaki’s Villa Moby Dick, House of Akari, Plaza House, and Mon Chapeau, Suzuki’s Takahashi House, Shimamura House, and so on—except for Takeyama’s strip. His runs the gamut from an austere Fuji Industries Labor Union Hall to two multistory “sex buildings:” Ichibankan [No. 1 Building] and Nibankan [No. 2 Building] in Kabukicho, the red-light district of Tokyo.

Takeyama’s compilation of heterogeneous architectural images in *ArchiteXt* 00, in fact, illustrates his inward “self” extended from his outward/physical portrayal in *ArchiteXt* 0. From top to bottom, his squares display: an image of the earth (first); him standing, arms wide-open toward the sky on top of Ichibankan, among an array of postmodern skyscrapers (second); Ichibankan in the palm of his hand, surrounded by piecemeal images of Nibankan (third); and his sundry projects in adjacent, small picture frames: furniture in human shapes, walls consisting of shoe boxes, fragments of buildings, etc., filling up the pages (fourth and fifth). The selection is diverse and the arrangement seemingly haphazard. His intention becomes clearer, though, in the reappearance of a similar composition in his “Imago Encephalogram” in 1972 and 1974. Now Takeyama classifies his images into M_X (memory), A_X (association), P_X (project) or W_X (work), corresponding to his three major brain activities: memory, association, and creation, with the
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39 ArchiteXt’s individual housing designs are treated in detail in the next chapter re: playable.
Figure 27: 
Architect X: Self.
Figure 28: Minoru Takeyama, Architekt 00, 4th square.
The architect’s immediate motivation for this method, as he later recounted, derived from his own medical history. He had a sudden brain aneurysm, which necessitated a series of encephalogram tests to record the electrical activities of his brain. This experience provoked his interest in cerebral functioning, and led him to trace his own architectural encephalogram in spatial scales and imagery. The haphazard heterogeneous snapshots in ArchiteXt 00, and then in Imago Encephalogram, actually reflect Takeyama’s own erratic brain activities—that is, the architect’s thinking “self.”

Figure 29: Minoru Takeyama, “Imago Encephalogram,” 1972 and 1974.

Not only does this composition reflect Takeyama’s medical “self” and his thinking “self,” but it signals the shift in global architectural thinking during the 1960s. In western architecture, the displacement of functionalism provoked a search for a codifiable system of architectural meaning, drawing upon the writings of Roland Barthes, Umberto Eco, Noam Chomsky, and

others—variously explored by architects, such as Peter Eisenman, Charles Moore, Michael Graves, and Robert Venturi.

In Japan, a similar trend can be identified in the New Wave architects’ efforts to conceive linguistic or semiotic architectural systems. At one end of the spectrum, architects were concerned with architectural syntax; they devised rules (grammar) for putting together structural and non-structural components (words). For example, Osamu Ishiyama’s “screw system space production” employs dome structures, pneumatic structures, cylinders of corrugated steel sheets, and stained glass to produce small structures. With a twisted use and composition of these elements, His Fantasy Villa [Gen-an, 幻庵] (1975) looks paradoxically heavy-duty and lightweight at once. “Screw system space production” is generally set in a rustic setting, which Ishiyama calls “conceptual retirement from the city.” The architect romantically compares the mass-produced industrial parts to nature’s language: stone, wood, earth, and water—despite the fact that Fantasy Villa appears to be at odds with its rural backdrop.

Monta Mozuna and Hiromi Fujii also create their own syntactic systems, but with typical beams, columns, stairs, windows and walls, instead of industrial products. Take Mozuna’s Anti-Dwelling (1971) for example: The building instigates a complex set of mirrored or double-mirrored relations among its interior and exterior components. Formal themes, such as the

---

41 For his “screw system space production,” see Kenchiku Bunka (June 1975) and Osamu Ishiyama Laboratory website http://ishiyama.arch.waseda.ac.jp/ (accessed Feb. 10, 2013).
triangular lattice and the circle, repeat themselves in elevation and in plan. Through windows, slits, holes and openings which puncture the cube, one can see from one side of the house into the other. The inside and the outside consequently permeate each other. This visual connection and formal similarity create a strong tension throughout, to the point of overriding perceptions of distance and direction.

Not only is Anti-Dwelling syntactical, it is symbolic to boot. In his “Theory of the Cosmic Architecture,” Mozuna includes a 10-point manifesto—unlike ArchiteXt, this New Wave architect is not averse to architectural manifestos. His “Manifesto 10” states:

1. “Uchu-an” (universe-hermitage) is a cosmological architecture. Universe, human body and architecture constitute its trinity.
2. “Uchu-an” is an ancient image of universe. It is the miniature of a projected visional image of the world or a model of the universe.
3. The symbol of “Uchu-an” is the “universal ovum.” The “universal ovum” possesses both the character of an elliptic universe and the character of a closed and distorted universe.
4. “Uchu-an” is constructed with a special design method. The method combines various mandalas that involve multi-layered structures of the universe and of the human body. We call it the “Kenchiku Mandala Zoho Giki.” These are ritualistic rules for construction of architectural mandalas.
5. “Uchu-an” aims to follow the example of the demiurgic creation. Its system resides in governing the mechanism of the universe. It involves the binary scale of differentiation, the dualism of “Ken” and “Kon” (two of the eight divination signs in Yi-King). It is related to the “holy tree” in the cabala, etc.
6. The spatial “mythos” of “Uchu-an” can be regarded as mirrored images or double-mirrored images. Maps of the legendary cities, maps of Utopia and imaginative pictures of the Millennium are the indicative plans transferred from the visual world to the real world. We regard them as the prototypical architectural space of “Uchu-an.”
7. The space of “Uchu-an” consists of various mirrored or double-mirrored images. The space can be regarded as a four dimensional space-model of the ‘elliptic universe’ or the ‘nested universe.’
8. These two prototypes of space (i.e. the two models of the universe) are already realized in “sodo” (Buddhist temple with twin structure) and in “sayado.” We regard these two types of building as the ancestors of “Uchu-an.”
9. As the physiognomy and the palm of a man represent his fate and destiny, so “Uchu-an” reflects within itself the changing aspects of architectural history. We call this reflecting method “Satakuzo Kukan Zoho Giki” (the ritual rules for construction of the chained-house image).
10. The scriptures of “Uchu-an” consist of rare books full of mysteries, inspirational books handed down from ancient times and all the literature on Esoteric Buddhism and the Yuitsu Shinto, etc.\(^\text{42}\)

![Figure 31: Monta Mozuna, Anti-Dwelling, 1971.](Image)

Points #6 and #7 apply directly to Anti-Dwelling, which comes into existence through the operations of mirroring and double-mirroring. In Japanese myth, fire can be stolen from the sun and water from the moon by a concave mirror—by gathering up sunbeams and focusing them on the dew that the moon brings out. The mirror therefore represents the key to the secrets of the cosmos. In Anti-Dwelling, elements reciprocate and reflect each other from side to side, front to back, left to right, above to below, and inside to outside. This reciprocation and reflection results in endless pairs of “twins” (echoing point #8, which claims the twin structure of sodo as a model of the universe), manifesting the creative forces of the universe, e.g., a pair of hands in which the left mirrors the right. Again by mirroring, Anti-Dwelling produces “architecture in

architecture”—comparable to the natural concentric rings in the trunk of a tree. Evidently, Anti-Dwelling stems from this cosmological ideal rooted in ancient oriental symbolism. Therefore, the house steals and incarnates the secrets of the universe. Reflecting points #1 and #2, the hermetic architectural cube itself constitutes a miniature of the universe. Just as the palms of a man show his destiny, the house narrates the laws of the universe (point #9)—if nothing else, symbolically.

Hiromi Fujii likewise advocates a semantic system, “Existential Architecture,” which parallels the structuralist model in western architecture exemplified by Peter Eisenman’s “Cardboard Architecture” (in reference to Chomsky’s work). Between 1967 and 1975, Eisenman created Cardboard House I-IV, arguing for “form as a marking or notational system” to address the question of grammar in architecture. In line with the nature of cardboard, Cardboard House consists of simple columnar and planar components but elaborately interlaced inside a simple cube. Specifically, Cardboard House I and II comprise a dense layer of vertical planes and columns, which demarcate and subdivide a cube.
into complex compartments. House III interlocks two cubes, again defined by planes and columns, at a 45-degree angle; the design gives the formal system a diagonal twist. In contrast, House IV places an equal emphasis on the vertical and horizontal division, which results in further complexity. Eisenman created this closed conceptual system to accentuate the interrelations among architectural components at the expense of functional considerations. Structural redundancy, such as the excess of columns, poignantly occurs throughout the system.

Both Mozuna’s and Fujii’s hermetic formal systems echo Eisenman’s Cardboard House in conception, where architecture amounts to a set of constructed relations among building elements. But in form, Fujii’s Todoroki House (1974) of orthogonally related elements especially resembles Cardboard House, whereas Anti-Dwelling is dominated by diagonal cuts and triangular shapes—Kenneth Frampton calls Fujii’s work “Eisenman pushed to a level of abstraction beyond Eisenman.” Divided by inexhaustible grids in varied scales, Todoroki contains concentric cubes and complex spaces; the house is predicated upon geometrical laws exercised to the point of excess beyond redundancy: symmetry, implication, concentricity, parallelism, similarity and congruence. Echoing Eisenman’s self-referential notations, Fujii argues that “meaning emerges in relation to the character of a given object when the object is contemplated in its relationship to the self.” Just as Cardboard House, Todoroki House shows no signs of commitment to outside reality, but rather relentless logical, geometrical operations imposed upon and within itself.
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44 Interview with Frampton by Lisa Hsieh (June 12th, 2012).
Figure 33: Hiromi Fujii, Todoroki House, 1974.
Figure 34: Todoroki House, 1974 vs. Cardboard House II (right above) and III (right below).
At the other end of the spectrum of the search for a codifiable system of meaning are semiotic systems of architectural signs, correlated with the cultural and urban conditions in Japan—or “sign architecture,” as Denise Scott Brown and Robert Venturi call it. The Japanese “signs,” however, are distinctly different from Scott Brown and Venturi’s, which reflect the advertisement and pop aesthetics of American commercial strips. In particular, architect Toyo Ito observes an idiosyncratic urban condition in Japan: an “architectural mélange” of superficial signs, where innumerable heterogeneous symbols float about, covering the surfaces of the built environment. What causes this mélange, Ito claims, is the allure of the modern, western styles mixed indiscriminately with a nostalgia for traditional Japanese forms. Then again, these superficial architectural signs are not only heterogeneous but capricious, following the incessant change and rapid development in Japan. Paradoxically, this disorder is also the order of the Japanese city—or at least instrumental to the understanding of it, where a clear physical pattern such as a grid or radiating network is missing. Hence swimming in a sea of signs, skimming across the surfaces of the city, the Japanese rely on a collage of superficial signs to make empiric sense of their world.

Because of this urban idiosyncrasy, Ito argues that the meaning of Japanese architecture exists only on the surface and is graspable by collage. In contrast to Mozuna and Fujii’s “deep structure” of complex cubes, Ito posits “Superficial Architecture” and “Collage Architecture” as design strategies to encode and decode the city. With regard to superficiality, Ito plays up the design of his building skins, as exemplified by his PMT Building (1978) in Nagoya and White-U House (1976) in Nakano. PMT has conspicuously smooth, reflective curved façade, whereas the curved skin of White-U further extends to the internal enclosure, where every surface from wall to ceiling is painted white. Despite their dissimilar stylistic expressions (metallic vs. sculptural)
Figure 35: Toyo Ito, White-U House, 1976 and PMT Building, 1978.
their expansive skins both serve as a screen upon which various light, shadows and their architectural surrounds are projected.

With regard to collage, Ito devises an approach he terms, linguistically, “morphemes,” referring to the eclectic elements he puts together to make up a building. “Morpheme” stands in opposition to the use of metaphors to derive architecture. This approach implicitly denies Metabolism’s biological analogy, where a singular equation, “mega-structure plus plug-in cells,” applies to all. Without recourse to an outside field, Ito uses common architectural words/forms, pasting them up and over to derive a composite whole. These include white plain geometrical motives, such as the circular arcs and zigzags used in White-U. In addition, Ito freely quotes works by, for example, Mackintosh, Loos and Le Corbusier, reinterpreting them for his own use. His eclectic attitude recalls the postmodernist style, which Ito actually claims is “necessarily of consequence to the current situation as it (Japanese Architecture) stands on the threshold of Post-Modernism.” In that sense, Ito’s “morphemes” are not only post-Metabolist but post-Modernist as well.

Morphemes are architectural signs. They are temporal, taken from the past (elements of other master architects’ works), yet pointing to the future (towards Post-Modernism). Of course, they are spatial as well. In particular, the superficial morphemes signal the Japanese “architectural mélange.” In Ito’s PMT Building, other than conspicuous logo, only a thin grid and an array of clean-cut square openings mark its reflective facade; the smooth building skin is essentially devoid of ornamentation. In addition, bulging out at the center in a streamlined fashion like a rising belly, this curved surface serves as a screen, reflecting changing information in its surroundings—rapid as the indeterminate light and passing cars, and apathetic as the shadows of the structures nearby. The signified is immediate and real, in contrast to the hermetic
architectural systems disengaged from reality. Instead of a cryptic message (Anti-Dwelling) or an incessant internal dialog with itself (Todoroki House), Ito’s Superficial Architecture discourses with the city, discursively, and receptively. Therefore from Mozuna and Fujii to Ito, ArchiteXt’s New Wave peers devise their own architectural language and theories without reference to each other, exemplifying the free, cloud-like spirit of New Wave.

... Likewise signaling the idiosyncratic urban and cultural heterogeneity of Japan, Takeyama yet contrarily conceived architectural signs in exuberant geometries and colorful supergraphics. Across the squares of his various images in ArchiteXt 00, two projects stand out: Ichibankan, i.e. No.1 Building (1969) and Nibankan, No.2 Building (1970)—using two out of the five squares in his strip. No.1 especially demonstrates a commanding presence. Ichibankan consists of a zebra-patterned black-and-white tower, spiky thin panels and oblique masses of reflective surfaces, whereas Nibankan has full-scale, brightly colored stripes in red, yellow, green and blue, a bull’s eye of concentric circles alternated in red and in white, plus a large number 2 painted over its varied volumes (though only black-and-white images are shown in ArchiteXt 00).
Figure 36: Minoru Takeyama. *ArchiteXt* 00, 3rd square: Ichibankan and Nibankan.
Figure 37: Minoru Takeyama, Ichibankan (No.1 Building). 1969.
Figure 38: Minoru Takeyama, Nibankan (No.2 Building), 1970.
Predictably, these buildings of mix-coding geometries and blown-up graphics are considered Post-Modern. Charles Jencks even puts Nibankan on the cover of his *Language of Post-Modern Architecture* (first edition), and calls Takeyama “the quintessential Japanese Post-Modernist—even more than Kurokawa and Isozaki.” Indeed, Ichibankan and Nibankan share many postmodern traits: playfulness, spectacle, pastiche, and so forth, as identified by Japanese literary and cultural scholar Masao Miyoshi and leading scholar of modern Japan Harry Harootunian (in their co-authored book, *Postmodernism and Japan*). But Takeyama’s own concern is semiotic; his architecture illustrates Japan, which is in his view “a huge kaleidoscope
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of signs which presents a vision which is extremely heterogeneous.” This view of Japan as heterogeneous signs resonates not only with Ito but also Barthes.

Barthes wrote *Empire of Signs* in 1966 during his first trip to the country; the semiologist inevitably perceived in each Japanese practice or object a signifier, from a pair of chopsticks and pachinko game to the custom of bowing and gift packages. But the reading of the signifier was for him multivalent, owing to Japan’s cultural heterogeneity, and hence “empty.” Layer upon layer of meaning unfolded through yet beyond itself, producing a dazzling kaleidoscopic vision. Although the Japanese translation of *Empire of Signs* did not come out until 1974, Takeyama (being trained and educated in the West) may well have read and been influenced by this semiotic thinking.

As a cultural and urban sign, Ichibankan exceeds Ito’s receptive/reflective screens of immediate visible information. This sex building selectively relays the idiosyncratic Japanese sex culture, *harenchi*, rendered in the red-light district of Kabukicho. *Harenchi* emerged as a by-product of postwar Japan’s struggle over *shutaisei*. Long held mores such as “no self” were replaced with psychological perplexities, especially “[an] unrelieved uncertainty introduced by a dominant historical culture no longer anchored in fixed values but in *fantasy* and *desire*” (my emphasis), argues Harry Harootunian. Concurring with Harootunian’s view is Japanese psychologist Hiroshi Minami, who contributed heavily to the introduction and expansion of social psychology in Japan. In his *Psychology of the Japanese People*, Minami elaborates on the

---

47 Takeyama, “Heterology in Architecture,” 86.
changing moral code in postwar period. He argues that, much like the Japanese “self,” the sense of “happiness” had a suppressed existence in Japanese psychological tradition. Even the word itself hardly existed in daily conversation. Minami attributes this void to a sense of danger associated with happiness—an idea again inculcated by the Takugawa shogunate. Various teachings admonish against pleasure and indulgence. *Treatise on Five Virtues* warns: “If you indulge your desires, you will certainly ruin yourself in the future. If you give full swing to your inclinations, you will without fail destroy yourself. If you go to extremes in seeking pleasure, you will encounter sorrow in the end. If you restrict yourself, you will be able to avoid catastrophe.”

Similarly, the Confucianists caution: “A happy event is followed by many mishaps.”

Wishes for pleasure were harangued as murderous desires that would wreak havoc if not kept in check. Misfortunes, on the other hand, were deemed desirable and a safer state of being. This nearly masochistic philosophy culminated in a lifestyle of self-denial and a psychological gravitation toward unhappiness. Much like the “no self” ethos, “unhappiness” was considered a virtue.

However, Minami claims that the Japanese feeling of unhappiness has been disappearing during the past fifteen years, referring to the period from 1953 to 1968, between the time that the two surveys on common life philosophy were conducted. In the wake of freedom, the Japanese sense of unhappiness lifted, the desire for pleasure picked up, and given full swing, it readily transmuted into lust. In the extreme, hedonism was deemed the pinnacle of happiness.

Especially symbolic of the change of Japan in this postwar period was the increasingly popular
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expression *harenchi*, which though literally translated “shameless,” has come to mean “the fashionable thing to do.”51 On television, the most popular shows were replete with sexual thrills and exploits, while the radio played pop songs that would heretofore have been considered vulgar. “Happiness in love and sex was pursued positively”52—and aberrantly, as *harenchi* encouraged it. In due course, the mass media hauled the suppressed “shameless” desires out of the Japanese unconscious. *Harenchi* pervaded every household, seeping into everyday life. Sex thrills, speed, shock and sensation were sought openly.

Ichibankan signifies this peculiar trajectory from *shutaisei* to *harenchi*, which equates happiness with freedom of sexual expressions. The building belongs to a building type called *zakkyo biru* in Japan, which literally means a “multi-tenant building,” and assigns its inside units to different uses. But *zakkyo biru* in Kabukicho specifically denotes those that house sex clubs and shops. For that reason, the authors of *Made in Tokyo* (2001) re-label it “sex building.”53

Typically, a “sex building” in Kabukicho feigns the austere look of an office building, with conventional entrance foyers and elevators halls, etc. Journalist Peter Popham demeaned this imitation: “Why bother? What boozer wants to be reminded of his workplace?”54 Ichibankan not only dispenses with disguise, but openly flaunts its prurient identity with showy, mix-coding geometries and supergraphics. In a sense, this mix-coding (outside) signifies its mix-tenants (inside)—*za* means “mix” and *kyo* “living.” Ichibankan’s *za*-form of a zebra-patterned tower, spiky wings and oblique, reflective masses echo with the multifarious, colorful
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52 Ibid.
sex-programs co-“living” inside. Meanwhile, the building’s phallic connotation is obvious, especially as portrayed in ArchiteXt 00 from a skyward angle, and among and above a surrounding crowd of low-rise buildings in Kabukicho.

Arguably, Ichibankan’s overall shape symbolizes “happiness” as well. In reporting about the sex buildings in Kabukicho, Popham specifically compared the atypical form of Ichibankan to an “avant-garde origami.” The structure indeed resembles a paper crane—in the Japanese tradition, the crane is a mystical creature (among others such as the dragon and the tortoise) that symbolizes good luck and happiness. Analogously, the zebra-patterned tower represents the crane’s neck; above, it carries a boxy head with extruded ears and a truncated beak; behind, a pair of reflective wings and a tail of spiky panels. But the architectural crane appears somewhat offbeat with its boxy head, brittle wings, and gigantic black body. Then again, the offbeat symbol echoes the aberrant happiness of harenchi fixated on sexual thrills.

Inside the form, the content of Ichibankan continues to connote happiness by saturating its interior space with erotic harenchi programs. There are eight floors above street level and two basements. A typical floor packs eight rooms close together with four on each side of a narrow corridor to maximize its capacity. These spaces are rented out to a whopping forty-nine

---

Figure 40: Ichibankan: a phallic sign.

55 Ibid.
Figure 41: Origami-like, symbolic of happiness.
night clubs, shops, bars, cafes and game rooms—some spaces reserved for other building facilities, such as storage and toilet. Director Jake Clennell (in his 2006 Sundance documentary “The Great Happiness Space: Tale of an Osaka Love Thief”\textsuperscript{56}) fittingly dubs these unique Japanese sex clubs and shops “the great happiness space.” Compacting forty-nine “great happiness spaces” in itself, Ichibankan is the ultimate spatial rendering of \textit{harenchi}.

Figure 42: Ichibankan: ground floor plan (left); typical floor plan (right).

\textsuperscript{56} “The Great \textit{Happiness} Space: Tale of an Osaka Love Thief,” directed by Jake Clennell (TRT: 75 min, Japanese Dialogue/English Subtitle, 2006), DVD.
A peek into this erotic underworld of “great happiness” in Kabukicho—of which the content of Ichibankan represents a microcosm—is found in the photo reportage by photographer Nobuyoshi Araki and Akira Suei (the editor-in-chief of Photo Age\(^57\)). Night after night (for two years), Araki and Suei made the rounds of Kabukicho, shooting various sex scenes in different clubs\(^58\)—the two were hailed as the pre-eminent “tag team” in 1980s Japanese publishing. Erotic fantasies become tangible in Araki’s photos; he portrays nude women in odd poses in bed and the shower, and businessmen in ties engaging in wild sexual exploits. The photographer himself also appears here and there in the pictures, always wearing his dark sunglasses. Evidently, Araki and Suei too were drawn to the murky, invigorating sex enclave, which at once feeds and is fed by the vigor of human lust and ostentatious hedonism.

In detail, Suei and Araki’s photo reportage exposes the eccentric interior of the sex shops and clubs, such as nopan kissa (no-panties café), where waitresses are pantiless under their mini-skirts and walk back and forth upon reflective surfaces as they wait tables; or “voyeur’s peep,” which consists of polygonal rooms with slots in the partitions to allow men to peep through and see the showgirl inside performing mundane tasks in an arousing manner—grooming hair, changing clothes, etc. There is also “Lucky Hole,” consisting of lined rooms separated by plywood partitions and curtains instead of doors at the entrances. The curtains are not full length and therefore do not guarantee full privacy. There are headshots of young female singers and actresses attached in front for the customer to gaze at. Beneath, supporting the headshot, a graphic female body profile is drawn with an opening drilled in the plywood partition at her genital—the “lucky hole.” A synthesized sensual episode ensues when the customer enters a

\(^{57}\) Photo Age was founded in 1981. It features mainly Nobuyoshi Araki’s work.

\(^{58}\) Nobuyoshi Araki’s book, Tokyo Lucky Hole (Kèoln; New York: Taschen, c1997), compiles over seven hundred pages of his photos from these erotic night excursions with Suei.
cubicle, removes his trousers, grasps the handrail attached to the partition, and inserts his genital into the “lucky hole.” On the other side of the partition, a woman moans through headphones while massaging the protruding penis from the hole. Thus standing, eyes fixed on the picture, hands holding onto the handrail, and his genitals in the hand of an unseen woman, the man imagines himself to climax.59

Figure 43: Nopan Kissa [no-panties café], Voyeur’s Peep, and Lucky Hole, photographs by Nobuyoshi Araki.

59 For further details of Lucky Hole, see Akira Suei, “The Lucky Hole as the Black Hole,” Tokyo Lucky Hole (Kèoln; New York: Taschen, c1997), 10-15.
Paralleling the impulsivity of libidinous urges, Ichibankan not only provides the “great happiness” space but ushers, even rushes, customers inside in anticipation of this erotic destination/ Climax. With no entrance at its front tower, the opening sucks customers straight to the elevators and stairs, and then speedily to their destinations. This open circulation reinforces a sensation of a continual movement from the street straight up into the air, smooth and seamless. Ichibankan consequently connotes harenchi in speed as well.

Yet once inside the great happiness space, the tempo changes. Ironically, delay now marks the scene. Happiness becomes elusive. A scene in Clennell’s “The Great Happiness Space: Tale of an Osaka Love Thief” captures the aporia of happiness sought herein. The film centers on a popular male host club in Osaka with their lead host Issei. With heart-rending sincerity, Issei tells every woman that he loves her, and like addicts, the female customers keep coming back to hear Issei’s lies. Issei’s profession of love, though, comes at a price. The customers must order obscenely overpriced champagne (at $500.00 per bottle) to coax Issei to their tables—that is the cost of “the great happiness.” Throughout the night, each woman customer watches Issei move swiftly from table to table, but he never stays long anywhere unless a bottle of champagne is opened. So each hopeful woman waits and waits and waits, until she cannot wait any longer. She orders champagne. Immediately at the sight and sound of the flying cork, Issei rushes over to celebrate—exactly what they are celebrating is unclear. Sex is constantly in the air amid alcohol and sweet talk, nonetheless the host wilily stays out of it to keep his customers on an emotional hook. Withholding sex consequently charges the space with impediments to happiness; the woman suffers as she waits and pines for her object of desire. In the great happiness space, love often stays a fantasy; like a mirage, it never arrives.
In light of this reality, the formal gesturing and spatial ushering and rushing by Ichibankan may well end in unconsummated happiness. In that case, the architectural sign is literally empty, as it falsely points inwardly to a signified (that is, happiness) that can never be found there.

This duplicity of Ichibankan further extends to the illustration of its context, Kabukicho. In contrast to Ito’s passive signs, Ichibankan actively signals and participates in Kabukicho’s transformation. Kabukicho emerged in the Shinjuku ward as a result of the collectively revived libido in Japan’s postwar resuscitated economy. During World War II, the area had been razed to the ground. When a kabuki theater was planned there afterward, the town changed its name to Kabukicho, i.e. kabuki-town (though the theater was never actually built). Later in the 1960s, a proliferation of sex shops and clubs broke out across the area due to its proximity to Shinjuku station, through which swarms of humanity passed daily. Piece by piece, this district changed into a neon-drenched, exotic enclave.

Schizophrenic in character, Kabukicho has distinctly different daytime and nighttime personalities. In daylight, the place looks inhospitable and lifeless. Yet when darkness descends, the urban blight rapidly thins out into a sea of neon lights. Imbued with alcohol, sex and fantasies, the town transforms into sheer thrill and folly. People from all walks of life pour in: flirtatious hosts, eager patrons, curious visitors and the like. At this hour all reserve melts, social norms and behaviors are left behind, and fantasies of all sorts are explored.
Figure 44: Kabukicho; photograph by Nobuyoshi Araki.
Figure 45: Ichibankan and Nibankan in Kabukicho.
Situated at the heart of Kabukicho, Ichibankan mirrors the schizophrenic change. During the day, while the town lay dormant, the black-and-white-striped tower stands majestically above the neighborhood’s derelict buildings. Yet as the night delirium begins, the architecture dematerializes into pure excitement. Botond Bognar, scholar of contemporary Japanese architecture, remarks, “The half-mirror glass walls are designed to perform fascinating animation with light and a range of visual illusions, as they reflect the surrounding cityscape throughout the day, while at night the electric illumination inside renders the glass walls transparent when seen from the outside, with the interior spaces appearing as if a kaleidoscope.”60 In the dark, Ichibankan’s front tower humbly recedes, and in turn, lit up and transparent, its flanking glass volumes expose the sex clubs and shops inside. In a flash, the *harenchi* desires awaken as the light floods the interior, as if the switch also turns on the red-light district. Throughout the night, the structure performs live via animations (of light) and visual illusions (with half-mirror glass), shining a “kaleidoscopic” interior of great happiness spaces to the fore. Therefore Ichibankan signs *harenchi* through and through, illustrating, assimilating, reflecting, mirroring and illuminating the shameless culture, interlacing form, content and context—skin, space and site—into one epic architectural climax.

Following Ichibankan, Takeyama built another sex building, Nibankan, and also produced sex furniture: Body Lighting and Body Furniture (1970), where the connotation of *harenchi* is unmistakable. Body Lighting resembles a fashion mannequin with a wavy, fuzzy wig. The fixture lights up from the wig, creating patchy glows on the body parts, highlighting particular female features: luscious lips, a slender neck, thin shoulders and breasts. Turned into

---

a sex object, the glowing woman can be eyed and/or fondled at will. This blend of eroticism and servility intensifies in Body Furniture, which consists of a three-piece chair set, each chair made up of several copies of a woman’s profile laminated together. In its pronounced female form, each chair evokes a distinct sex position: hands and knees on the floor, backbend in a crescent shape in the prone position, and legs lifted with the torso in the recumbent position. A man using the furniture will complete the image of intercourse, for instance, if he sits on the recumbent woman with her legs stretched upward. Although Takeyama claims that Body Furniture merely expresses the individual’s yearning to reaffirm existence, which resonates with the yearning for “self” (but rather than personifying things, the human being itself is converted into a thing), harenchi permeates the chair set. Paralleling the contents of Ichibankan and Nibankan (*nopan kissa*, voyeur’s peep, lucky hole, etc.), Body Light and Body Furniture cater for sexual fantasies.
There is a nonchalant note of shamelessness in them. Takeyama argues, “My aim has changed its direction [from] reacting against the homogeneity of the content [to] escalating the heterogeneity of visual experience as much as possible.”\footnote{Takeyama, “Heterology in Architecture,” \textit{A New Wave of Japanese Architecture}, 87.} Clearly, Body Lighting and Body Furniture escalate the visual experience of \textit{harenchi} in their vivid sexual expressions.

Besides building signs, Takeyama theorized (architectural) signs. His theory of “Heterology” posits architectural creation as the “Relator” that “governs the relationship of Expression and Content in the process of signifying.”\footnote{Ibid., 86.} In particular, Takeyama identifies three hypothetical scales and qualifiers—analogy, homology and heterology—to measure likeness and unlikeness among different entities. \textit{Analogy} refers to entities of similar contents or functions, and to an extent, similar forms and structures. He gives an example of a bat’s wing compared to a mosquito’s; both confer the capacity to fly. \textit{Homology} establishes a slight functional or formal association, for example, a bat’s wing compared to a dog’s leg; both offer mobility, though one allows movement in the air and the other on the ground. But \textit{Heterology} only institutes a relationship at the metaphysical level. The architect compares a turtle’s head to a mushroom, which though without biological commonality, are both phallic symbols in the Japanese culture—even this example inevitably relates to sex. In essence, for Takeyama, architecture means creating “relators” (of varying degrees of likeness and unlikeness) to govern its content, function, form, structure, space, effect and spectacle, and therefore deriving multiple architectural meanings through the processes of signifying and relating.

This theory not only qualifies, for example, the mystical crane in Ichibankan as a “heterological relator” and the Body chairs in their erotic positions as “analogical relators,” but more importantly, reveals that Takeyama’s \textit{ArchiteXt} 00 strip on the whole operates under this
specific logic of “Heterology.” Locally, each of its heterogeneous images serves as a relator. For example, the picture of Body Furniture in a recumbent position also includes a man in a sequence of motions from sitting on the woman to standing up and walking away. The four layers of lamination in the chair echo the four movements of the man. This image institutes an erotic heterology between the chair/woman and the user/man beyond their formal associations; the culmination of intercourse is suggested, and the man leaves. Globally, across the squares of the magazine strip, the placement of these images/relators institutes further relationships through their organized adjacency. On the left of the picture of the man walking away from the recumbent woman (4th square, top row), we see a piece of empty Body Furniture; only the woman in the backward crescent position, no man; above, through a rich collection of fragmented images of Ichibankan (3rd square, bottom rows), this relator arrives at an enlarged picture of the phallic structure in its entirety, rising majestically skyward (3rd square, top row). Finally the signified climaxes. (This phallic sign is also held by a mysterious hand below, possibly another hint of sex as masturbation.) Just as Ichibankan variously signals harenchi, ArchiteXt 00 operates as a master “Relator,” semantically and thematically relating and weaving its heterogeneous contents together. Thus hosting an empire of signs, this readable architecture connotes to no end.
Figure 47: Heterology: the logic of “Relator” at play in Takeyama’s ArchiteXt 00 strip.
Figure 48: *ArchiteXt 1: The Earth*.
ArchiteXt 1: The Earth

This issue of ArchiteXt is not to be read literally. Literally, Aida shows four elements at play: the earth, the dice, torii (the gateway of a Shinto shrine, with two uprights and two crosspieces), and a house—his Nirvana House. Aida playfully encases the earth underneath a torii, peels off the skins and slices the sphere, tosses it out of a dissected earth (as if tossing a die), boxes the planet in Nirvana House, and then stuffs a number of them into the holes of a die. Azuma scribbles a diary entry. He laments the earth’s unsuitability for human settlement. In one place, Azuma fantasizes about expanding constructions outwardly beyond the earth’s atmosphere and inwardly beneath the earth’s crust. He then returns to reality, recording a small incident of his life (about a fallen tree in front of his house). Miyawaki reconfigures the earth by sketching up a “cubic earth” with pseudo architectural details, such as the use of buttress supports to sustain the new flat surfaces extended from the globe. Then he redistributes the continents and geographical properties along the new surfaces and reinstates the architecture accordingly. Suzuki presents an ekistics study matter-of-factly, thick with statistics and descriptions. His report shows, for example, the speed of the earth (a flying speed at 16,000 km/hr and a spinning speed at 1,600 km/hr), its age (4,500,000,000 years), weight (66,000,000,000,000,000 tons), geography (46.4% land vs. 53.6% water), etc. Suzuki concludes that the planet is “in poor health,” with skin disease, parasites, etc., its condition exacerbated by wars and architecture. Takeyama composes a “Parody on Apollo 10.” He gives the earth a makeover by steadily covering it up with triangular plates until no trace of the surface is left. An equally exaggerated
dialogue among ArchiteXt, Snoopy (Lunar Module-4) and Charlie Brown (Command and Service Module-106)\(^{63}\) complements the graphics:

Snoopy: “Charlie, we’ve just seen an earthrise and it’s got to magnificent!”
Charlie: “Great! We experienced that, too, man!”

Snoopy: “What are those triangles?”
Charlie: “Not a single piece, see. Look at the growing clusters everywhere.”
(unidentifiable sound): “[…] over.”

Snoopy: “They are linking up, now.”
Charlie: “Heeeeeee…. It’s growing and covering the whole earth…”
ArchiteXt: “…zzzzz…. Don’t… Don’t… worry… soon, you’ll see a more magnificent form…”

Snoopy: “What are you?”
ArchiteXt: “I’m an ArchiteXt, in charge of wrapping the whole earth.”
Charlie: “Wrapping the earth? Are you trying to make a new planet?”

ArchiteXt: “Certainly yes! Earthtecture! I’ve done a good job. I’ve erased pluralism and dualism from this globe… No Heaven and Hell, no black and white, no east and west, no north and south, no mountain and sea, no Ying and Yang… no borders, no divisions, no geology… no meteorology…zzzzz…. Monism now takes command here…”
Snoopy, Charlie: “… We are overcome!”\(^{64}\)

Graphically, Takeyama’s “Parody on Apollo 10” bears a strong resemblance to Buckminster Fuller’s geodesic domes. Fuller posits a dome to be the optimal architectural solution because the sphere encloses the largest volume of interior space with the least amount of surface area, consequently saving on materials and cost. What’s more, the spherical structure created from triangles proves to have unparalleled strength. Applying these scientific principles,

\(^{63}\) This spacecraft Apollo 10 was the second Apollo mission to orbit the Moon, and the first to travel to the Moon with the full Apollo spacecraft, consisting of the Command and Service Module (CSM-106, “Charlie Brown”) and the Lunar Module (LM-4, “Snoopy”). For details of the mission, see http://nssdc.gsfc.nasa.gov/nmc/spacecraftDisplay.do?id=1969-043A (accessed February 24, 2013).

\(^{64}\) The original dialog is in English, Takeyama’s own translation.
Figure 49: Buckminster Fuller, U.S. Pavilion at Expo ’67.
Fuller created, for example, the U.S. Pavilion at Expo ’67 (in collaboration with Japanese architect Shoji Sadao). This giant dome—a space frame of steel pipes enclosing 1,900 molded acrylic panels, roughly three-quarters of a sphere, 200 feet in height and 250 feet in diameter—looks like “a lacy filigree weightlessly poised against the sky.” This ethereal dome also bespeaks Fuller’s “Spaceship Earth” conception—the earth as a spaceship flying through space, in which “we are all astronauts.” In his *Operating Manual for Spaceship Earth*, Fuller admonishes us to conserve the finite energy and resources on our planet, as this determines our survival and success of operating the spaceship/earth. Accordingly, his own geodesic domes oblige by “doing more with less.”

Takeyama’s destructive “Parody on Apollo 10” fundamentally contradicts Fuller’s ecological geodesic domes; Takeyama’s is, after all, a “parody.” Although its title presents “Apollo 10” as the subject of derision, its images and texts insinuate a deeper criticism, disapproving of all that the space vehicle represents. Apollo ran from 1961 to 1972. In particular, Apollo 8 (1968) successfully orbited the moon and Apollo 10 (1969) set the record for the highest speed (at 39,897 km/hr) attained by a manned vehicle. The wild success of the program inculcated enormous optimism in humanity’s capacity to conquer the universe, so much so that it spread beyond the field of aeroscience and across continents. In architecture, this optimism spawned grand-scale, imaginative and technology-oriented territorial explorations. For example, Archigram created “Walking City” (1964), a herd of mechanical mammoths with telescopic limbs, “Plug-in City” (1964), a colorful rendition of Metabolism operated by heavy
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industrial cranes, “Computer City” (1964), a complex metropolis of circuits and nexuses, and “Instant City” (1968), a transient city consisting of balloons and media paraphernalia. In Austria, Laurids Ortner (of Haus-Rucker-Co) created “Turned-On Town Pod,” a science-fictional beehive city in which the city-dwellers dressed in spacesuits fly and alight on the ground like astronauts; Haus-Rucker-Co invented “Pneumacosm” (1967), a vertical expansion of New York City populated with giant bubbles. In Italy, Archizoom produced “No-Stop City” (1969), a climatic universal system, artificially lit, air-conditioned, and without boundaries; Superstudio created “Continuous Monument: An Architectural Model for Total Urbanization” (1969), an endless framework of a black-on-white grid extended across the earth’s surface in a critique of contemporary urban planning. Their sequel, “Twelve Ideal Cities” (by Piero Frassinelli), especially shows direct inspiration from outer-space exploration—in “Spaceship City” (Fourth City), couples are born, enclosed in cabins for their entire lives, programmed to dream the same dream, made to reproduce, and then they die.67 Reflecting the symbolic power of Apollo to conquer territories and expand colonization, these utopias were conceived in the name of a city, a town, even a cosmos. In Japan, Metabolism likewise dreamed up “Floating City,” “Helix City,” and “City in the Air.”

Figure 50: Archigram, Computer City and Walking City, 1964.
Figure 51: Archigram, Plug-In City, 1964 and Instant City, 1968.
Figure 52: Haus-Rucker-Co, Pneumacosom, 1976; Laurids Ortner, Turned-On Town Pod.
Figure 53: Archizoom, No-Stop City, 1969.
Fourth city
Spaceship city

If a city can be considered a place where a group of men are born, live, and die, then a city is a mother who makes fertile the children, the buildings. The mother decides how they shall be happy, if a city at all this, independent-of its physical and demographical dimensions, is a spaceship, which, for centuries, has been following a just plane inside the planet, the orbit of sight any away, is also a city.

This spaceship is a huge and wide 50 m. in diameter.
The central nucleus 9 m. in diameter, contains a complex, programmed at the time of departure, to guide the ship, the propulsion engines, and others. The propulsion engines are located on the quay and the ship.
The propulsion engines are divided into eighty sections of two cabins each, one above the other, in each cabin steps one of the 156 members of the crew, to the upper cabin, in step.
The ship takes only one person, the inhabitant, who takes slowly completing one rotation every 60 years.

Members of the crew sleep four months free from death, enclosed in their cabins and regulated by those who regulate their existence. Their brains are captured and by robots to a memory, an electronic memory, to eliminate any memory of their lives.

The crew, as they move, each pair of cabins move through the ship which projects its avoiding the damage to the inhabitants, all concepts therefore wise through the same system at a different moment. The eighth ship section, facing a permanent area where there is a cylindrical connection to the ring, on the center of the ship, already explained.

Figure 54: Superstudio, Continuous Monument, 1969 and Spaceship City, 1971.
Figure 55: Metabolism, Helix City, 1962.
Grand as it is, Takeyama’s intention with “Parody on Apollo 10” to efface the earth and mummify it with endless homogeneous triangular plates hardly presents a vision. On the contrary, its dystopia of nothingness seems to mock overambitious architectural utopias in general, and caricature Metabolism in particular. In melodramatic hyperbole, ArchiteXt declares: “Monism now takes command.” Snoopy and Charlie Brown exclaim in kind: “We are overcome!” Considering the pyramidal structure of Japanese architecture at that time, the hyperbolic exchange points to none other than Metabolism. In addition, Metabolism’s obsessive reiterations of mega-structures with plug-in cells manifest a unitary architectural conception of the world, echoing Ernst Haeckel’s conception of Monism, which deems all matter as “ensouled” and endowed with the power of motion (seen in even the simplest chemical processes) as the ultimate monist principle. In that regard, instilling life into inorganic mega-structures, Metabolism’s architectural approach is monistic, if only by analogy.

In “Parody on Apollo 10,” the pervasive, triangular tectonic plates reflect the sprawl of Metabolism’s mega-structures across land and sea, like living organisms, exerting supreme power of motion over the earth. In various renditions, this new world either replaces the existing or superimposes itself upon the old. For example, in “Helix City,” the mega-structures land arbitrarily among, and in some cases, right on top of, the existing buildings, as if invasive foreign objects have landed the earth—the form of the DNA chromosome is ironically foreign as well. Vast infrastructure swirls across the town, disrupting the urban fabric at will. Metabolism speaks absoluteness, denying any other architecture and leaving no room for distinction. Planting down one mega-structure after another, the group overwrites the earth without inhibition. “Are you trying to make a new planet?” No doubt.

See Ernst Haeckel, “The Monist,” *The Monist* (July, 1982), 481-486. In the article, Haeckel summarizes his theory by positing eight theses re: monism, from “mechanism” to “immortalism.”
Moreover, “Parody on Apollo 10” hints at this pervading architectural grandiosity in connection with the moon landing and a full view of the earth. Reflecting the symbolic power of Apollo, Metabolism envisions conquests of, not only the land, but also the sea and the sky. Buildings in “Floating City” grow from the inlet outwardly toward the water in the form of connected hexagons (in plan). At each Y-intersection, three mega-structures fan out to form a full circle. This indefinite expansion suggests the prospect of eventually taking over the sea entirely, as Takeyama’s triangular plates finally cover up the whole earth. In similar fashion, the mega-structures soar majestically into the air, demonstrating great potential for sky colonization.

For the most part, Metabolism’s illustrations look down at the earth from far above, like an astronaut’s view from outer space. Their renderings show no color, consequently giving the impression of a black-and-white dreamy world detached from reality. Again their drawings are devoid of human population or activities, with the exception of Kurokawa’s “Floating City” in Kasumigaura (1961) and “Helix City” in Tokyo (1962). In the former, there are perspective drawings in ink and pencil to illustrate the vision up close. Near the bay, where the new world clashes with the existing, a fisherman gazes at the development in awe. All around him stand layer upon layer of hefty buildings, so humongous that they seem nearer than in reality (as verified by the indistinguishable figures in the layered structures). Above hovers a plank of heavy construction stretched out from a source not in sight. There are airplanes circling the air and vessels patrolling the sea. Two men and a woman in modern clothing await ferry transport to the other side. In contrast, the fisherman in shorts and a tan top stands stunned, clutching the handle of his fishing net, seemingly thinking to himself Snoopy and Charlie’s sentimental cry: “We are overcome!”
Figure 56: Metabolism, Floating City in Kasumigaura, 1961.
Figure 57: Metabolism, Floating City in Kasumigaura, 1961.
Again, Takeyama’s histrionic parody of Metabolism is shared by Miyawaki’s “cubic earth.” “Cubic earth” evokes the false archaic belief of a flat earth. In contradiction with Metabolism’s futuristic thinking predicated upon advancing technology, Miyawaki presents a backward model. Miyawaki is being sarcastic, of course. What he does not say explicitly in ArchiteXt he says in Japan Architect. Miyawaki argues:

The architect’s society is a closed one, a kind of family. No matter how much he may preach revolutionizing architecture and through it society itself, in the final analysis, his activities on this front do not exceed the realm of family affairs. True he may criticize the world around him and express his thoughts on its betterment in terms of vast projects. But the extent to which his projects can actually revolutionize and stimulate society into action remains very questionable. Though he may change the family, he cannot exert sufficient pressure to alter society.69

Miyawaki denounces architecture of vast scope, i.e., Metabolism’s, as a futile conceit. The utopian city planning bent on revamping society serves at most a behind-the-door, cerebral exercise within the “family affair;” no efficacy to stimulate actual change will be found.

Miyawaki’s tone is almost hostile. In Japan Architect, he goes so far as to call the architect with such ambitions a “deluded policeman,” who thinks that by “standing at an intersection and waving his arms he is really moving the cars and trucks by means of his own power.”70

Implicitly yet bluntly, he calls Metabolists sufferers of delusions of grandeur. The juxtaposition of Miyawaki’s statement in Japan Architect with his graphics in ArchiteXt reveals the hidden sarcasm of “cubic earth,” accordingly contesting Metabolism’s grandiosity.

In addition to overt sarcasm and parody, ArchiteXt defies Metabolism with its lightheartedness. For example, in “Parody on Apollo 10,” the naming of the Lunar and Command & Service Modules after the cartoon characters from the “Peanuts” comic strip

70 Ibid.
lightens its parodic attack. On the other hand, Azuma gets personal in a journal entry; his informal journaling style is the opposite of Metabolism’s lofty pontification. In turn, Aida plays with the earth as if it were merely a ball, mischievously tossing, crating and peeling it.

Aida’s play also seems to scorn Metabolism’s God-like status. Botond Bognar compares Metabolism to a self-proclaimed “demiurge”—Kurokawa and Isozaki continue to be seen as the Wind God and the Thunder God in the New Wave era. But even before Metabolism’s success that wins them the title, Noboru Kawazoe divulged a wish to be a God (at the same time wanting to be a mussel and germ):

I would like to be Kai (mussel in Japanese): I am a mussel. I do nothing but open and close. This is a marvelous world for lazybones. In any case machines will soon do all the work. The only thing I shall do is to dream. Suddenly a thought comes to me.

I would like to be Kami (God in Japanese): I hear a voice from Heaven, I am a prophet, no, I am God. Now I give orders to the word of architecture to design universal architecture: 4-dimensional architecture and 3-dimensional drawings. Who will do this? Ohtaka, Kikutake or Kurokawa? I am sure I am the only one who can grasp 4-dimensional space. Justifiably I am God.

I would like to be a Kabi (germ in Japanese): I am described as mad, fanatical and dictatorial. It is a thankless thing to be God. Perhaps I am really too concerned with my ‘Self’. I will put off my ‘Self’-consciousness and thus merge in mankind as a mere particle. I must reach a stage of perfect ‘Self’-lessness. So now I am a tiny cell, a germ…

In contrast, Bognar compares ArchiteXt to “ordinary citizens.” Aida, in particular, presents himself as “homo ludens” [playing man], playing with the earth and the dice with

---


abandon. The “die” would become a recurrent theme in Aida’s work, which recalls Charles Jencks’ allusion to Einstein’s “I cannot believe that God plays dice with the world;” Jencks hypothesizes Aida’s response to be “Since I’m not God, I will play dice with my architecture.” Hence amid Aida’s trivial play, a hidden message looms. Aida appears to be saying, unlike the Metabolists’ imperial bearing, “I am only an ordinary playing man;” this also seems to be the group gestalt of ArchiteXt.

ArchiteXt 2: My Home

ArchiteXt conceives home as a voyage, and ArchiteXt 2 tells travel stories. Stemming from everyday practice, ArchiteXt produces maps, visual melody, spatial poetry, etc., and accordingly, orients architecture toward the actions of walking, sailing, and mapping. Their non-architecture in this issue shows especially strong overlap with the Japanese non-art thinking in the “descent to the everyday.”

ArchiteXt 2 has only four strips; Azuma did not participate in this issue. The theme is “my home.” Aida again presents himself in meditation, along with images of Guan Yin (the goddess of compassion in Buddhism), suggesting nirvana as his true home and home as a voyage into the spiritual realm. Miyawaki gives a report of his everyday life, tracing and mapping his trajectories in the city and inside the household. Suzuki composes a poem about a man-maku [curtain] home that sails on the water, whereas Takeyama sings “My Home Blues” (in the back

"マイ・ホーム・ブルース"

先ず4枚の正方形の対角線に、前後よく折れ曲がる折り目をつけ、(1) 次に丁度規を用いてナイフかピンの先端で薄くぎざみ込むのがよい

4枚を水平に差し、各紙片の両端末の表裏をセロテープでつなぎ合せる。折れ曲がりを容易にする

ため、各紙片の間を約2%ほどあけておく (2). 最後に全体の両端末を同様にテーブ止めして、立方体の

チューブ（16ヶの三角形）を完成する。この場合、図が表にしても裏にもても構わない (3). この立方体の中空チ

ーブの表裏を逆転するにはどうするか--少なくとも3つの方法があるといわれる。 そのうち一番容易な方法が以下

に掲げる(4)～(6)の図解である。08に至って作業が半分終わる。これを組むとき立方体の最初の四角の半分のチューブであ

る。それを08のようにたたみかえて、08のチューブに組み替える。それから先は、今迄の操作を全く逆方向にとどければよい。最後に

立方体の中空チューブは完全に表裏を逆転する。「マイ・ホーム・ブルース」の視覚メロディーが一巡する。

HOW TO PLAY "MY HOME BLUES"

First make the diagonal straight lines on each strip so as to become well-foldable. Use the point of either a knife or
pin slightly along the straight edge (1). Make the row of four strips and tape them with transparent tape on the both
sides of each of paper, allowing the clearance of 2 mm between the each other which make the easier folding effect
(2). Finally tape the both end of the whole row to make the empty cube complete. Which side in or out is up
to your choice (3). How to make inside-out or outside-in of this empty cube is the puzzle you are
attacking. There believed to be at least three ways to do and here presented the easiest one. Follow
the illustrations from (4) to (12). You will finish the half way of the whole process by the phase of
08 where the cube will become half size of the beginning. This is again the empty cube
so that you may twist 08 and open the inside to change into shape of 08.

Follow the above process completely the other way around to make the
empty cube reverse. A tune of visual melody of MY HOME
BLUES is now over. (This method is based on the suggestion
of Author H. Stone who is known for his discovery
of Hexaflexagon.)

Figure 59: Minoru Takeyama. ArchiteXt 2. "My Home Blue."
of his strip, whereas on the front, he regards the earth as home). The spatial tune comprises a puzzle of, and a solution to, turning an empty box inside-out and outside-in in twelve steps (based on a method invented by British mathematician Arthur H. Stone to generate a flexagon by folding paper in certain ways to produce the faces of this polygon). “My Home Blues,” as it turns out, would inspire Takeyama’s design of his home/studio “Atelier Indigo” (1976) in Hokkaido in the form of a 3-dim mathematical origami puzzle.76

Figure 60: Minoru Takeyama, Atelier Indigo, 1976.

---

76 This playable house by Takeyama is discussed in the next chapter re: play.
The non-architecture of Miyawaki’s maps and Suzuki’s poem, in particular, parallel Non-Art’s thinking in “not-making.” From top to bottom, Miyawaki’s squares show: (1) A picture of himself, his son and wife in their living room, along with an inventory of the books and journals he read between April 15th and May 15th, 1972. The foreign architectural magazines include *Abitare, Architectural Design, Domus, L’Architecture d’aujourd’hui, Progressive Architecture* and *Ottagono*. (2) A map of his neighborhood, annotated with symbols and texts. (3) Floor plans of the places he lived between 1958 and 1965 based on his recollection. They increase in size from a studio (the apartment he rented in college) to a two-bedroom house. (4) A picture of his employees dubbed “my family,” along with a list of the employees’ names and his own itinerary. (5) Miyawaki’s current house floor plans (there are two levels) noted with a day’s activities. Though entitled “my house,” the house really contains both the architect’s home and office, roughly divided at its *genkan* (the vestibule right inside the main entrance to a Japanese house). Yet this is not surprising since his “family photo” also includes his employees. For Miyawaki, “home” bundles up family and work functions.

Miyawaki’s depiction of “my home” prioritizes actions over the space in which they take place. The day’s activities begin from 7:30 am and end at 12:00 midnight. There are heavy tendril lines drawn over the floor plans, each curve ends with a dot and a time in “hour : minute.” The tendril represents Miyawaki’s moving about the house, whereas the dot and time denote his presence in a certain room at a certain hour, in relation to the activity list shown. For example, he goes to water the plants in the yard at 9:15 am, then those outside the office at 9:18 and 9:20 am. His home voyage is rapid,
Figure 61: Mayumi Miyawaki, *ArchiteXt*, 2, 5th square.
with actions disposed at one-minute increments—except from 6:00 to 8:30 pm, when the architect goes out for a drink with friends after a meeting. One moment here, the next there, Miyawaki’s everyday life is hectic and scattered. Even as late as 11:00 pm, a client drops by unexpectedly and demands a change of design. Consequently mapping his activities and trajectories onto the house plans, Miyawaki conceptualizes home as a timed voyage generated by a string of domestic actions.

Miyawaki’s conception of home adopts a “tour” mentality, which Michel de Certeau speaks about in *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Drawing upon linguists Charlotte Linde and William Labor’s analysis, de Certeau recognizes two ways to comprehend space: map vs. tour. When being asked to describe an apartment, the map-type says, for example: “the girls’ room is next to the kitchen,” whereas the tour-type says: “you turn right and come into the living room.” The map-type bases his/her knowledge on “an order of places,” whereas the tour-type on “spatializing actions.” In Miyawaki’s home, “tour” takes precedence over “map.” Observing a busy schedule, the architect launches into a string of “spatializing actions:” sleeping, bathing, eating, reading, drafting, designing, etc. Actions prevail over spatial order, as shown by the fact that in the floor plans, the tendril lines that denote movements dominate the straight edges of the rooms.

Miyawaki’s tour-minded spatial conception, as described by de Certeau, is not uncommon among the Japanese. The mentality may have stemmed from the complex configuration of their physical environment—their capital city especially. In *Tokyo, A Spatial Anthropology*, urban historian Hidenobu Jinnai differentiates two types of streets in the Japanese
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city: *omotedori* (the public avenue) and *uradori* (the private backstreet). Jinnai argues that the Japanese city is organized by the intricate “backstreet society,” as opposed to the “piazza society” of the European city.\(^7^9\) Miyawaki’s annotated map of his neighborhood corroborates Jinnai’s thesis, where the vicinity illustrates the spatial logic of the “backstreet society.” In this area, *uradori* web in a non-linear fashion among small and over-packed lots. There are two *omotedori* cutting through, which abruptly interrupt the fabric. Yet disregarding the cuts, buildings are singularly oriented along the intimate *uradori*, and hence lend to the vitality of the neighborhood (the back alleys are a common hangout for Japanese adults and a playground for kids, serving as a de facto extension of their home). *Uradori* connect lives. In the intricate web, the private paths create, even as they conceal, a “backstreet society” within.

This fine-meshed Japanese “backstreet society” follows neither a recognizable grid, nor a strong axis or a radiating network. To comprehend and navigate the city, a peculiarly Japanese practice called *kata* (“form-as-process”) emerges (*kata* is often observed in the detailed patterns of movement in Japanese art, such as the traditional theater kabuki, tea ceremony, and martial arts\(^8^0\)). *Kata* parallels the “tour” logic described by de Certeau. Basically, *kata* considers form as an evolving motion, which is directional; it points to the next in sequence, incorporating time and vectors of direction in space. In other words, *kata* operates at a local level, in succession, and in sequence.

---


\(^8^0\) The concept *kata* is discussed in Sarah Chaplin, *Japanese Love Hotel: A Cultural History* (London: Routledge, 2007).
Figure 62: Mayumi Miyawaki, ArchiteXt 2, 2nd square.
A prime example of using *kata* to maneuver in the Japanese city is given by Barthes in his “No Address” in *Empire of Signs*. To be expected, the “backstreet society” yields a chaotic address system: “The streets of this city have no names. There is of course a written address, but it has only a postal value, it refers to a plan (by districts and by blocks, in no way geometric).”

Due to the strenuous street-numbering system, Barthes got lost many times during his visit, and in asking for directions, he noticed a common spatial practice:

> Anonymity is compensated for by a certain number of expedients, whose combination forms a system. One can figure out the address by a schema of orientation, a kind geographical summary which situates the domicile starting from a known landmark; a train station, for instance. (The inhabitants excel in these impromptu drawings, where we see being sketched, right on the scrap of paper, a street, an apartment house, a canal, a railroad line, a shop sign, making the exchange of address into a delicate communication…
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81 Barthes, “No Address,” *Empire of Signs*, 33.
82 Ibid., 33-34.
This practice of mapping (mentally) and sketching (physically) involves locating a point and evolving a path to another, and so it continues and repeats. Arrows, dash lines and other notations are used to stress the direction and the progression: start here (●), walk the street (→), make a turn at the shop sign (↑), trail the railroad line until a red apartment, and so on. Of course Barthes does not mention the term kata, though the idea of kata is embedded in this thinking. The residents’ impromptu sketches that he acquires show an experience-based, subjective composition, which unfolds spaces in steps in time, rather than in one comprehensive image. Likewise Miyawaki’s “home,” depicted as a string of actions, utilizes this spatial psychology of kata.

![Miyawaki’s daily route](image)

**Figure 64**

Outside home, from the street, Miyawaki depicts and maps his trajectories in his neighborhood. On top of omotedori and uradori and the building squares in pale gray lines are handwritten notes about the places he frequents and the frequency of his visits. For example, he goes to a nearby dry-cleaner two or three times a week. There are dashes denoting the shortcuts north to a subway station and south to a day nursery. Miyawaki does not categorically label the places in the vicinity but only those he frequents, along with the routes and the frequency of his
visits. Beyond locality and toponym, the map encompasses and unpacks his everyday life as
traveled within the city.

Besides this map- vs. tour-mentality, which characterizes Miyawaki’s map, de Certeau
further makes a distinction between two spatial concepts: space (espace) and place (lieu). He
defines a place as “the order in accord with which elements are distributed in relationships of
coexistence,”83 and space as “actuated by the ensemble of movements deployed within it.”84 In
other words, place denotes a location, whereas space includes also the actions and happenings
within. De Certeau argues that “space is a practiced place.”85 He cites two examples: “[an] act
of reading is the space produced by the practice of a particular place: a written text, i.e., a place
constituted by a system of signs,”86 and likewise, “the street geometrically defined by urban
planning is transformed into a space by walkers.”87 This distinction between space and place
enlightens the “not-making” of non-art (and non-architecture) not as rejecting “making,” but
shifting of attention from a place-minded (object-based) production to a space-oriented (action-
based) practice; the latter comprehensively includes the background and the “happenings” in the
foreground—in a sense, “not-making” is “making” in action.

Miyawaki’s charting of maps had a precedent in Fluxus artist Shigeko Kubota’s acushon-
mapping (in collaboration with George Maciunas). Kubota traced the “actions” of Hi Red Center
on a map of Tokyo—HRC epitomized the trend of acushon in Japan, which culminated in their
Cleaning Event.88 Kubota’s map inventories and deploys HRC’s actions within the city, in
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83 de Certeau, The Practice of Everyday Life, 117.
84 Ibid.
85 Ibid.
86 Ibid.
87 Ibid.
88 For details of HRC’s activities, see Art, Anti-art, Non-art.
Figure 65: Shigeko Kubota (with George Maciunas), map documenting Red Hi Center’s events in Tokyo, 1963-64.
Figure 66: *Bundle of Events* (Fluxus edition), 1965.
which activity information overwrites the city geography. In addition, Kubota made a photo
 collage of the artists’ appearances, the photos numbered in relation to the map. Kubota’s map
 may have inspired Miyawaki’s annotated drawings with dots and time linked to a day’s activities.
 But beyond recording discrete events, Miyawaki’s map suggests continuity in space in time, as
testified by his flowing tendrils over the floor plans.

On the other hand, Miyawaki’s neighborhood map presumes the preexistence of a place
(i.e. the neighborhood), which is actuated by the act of walking performed in relation to that
place. The space thus enacted contains a spatial collage of the architect’s day-to-day activities
carried out in the city. In fact, action (noted in dark text) is emphasized over geography (the pale
gray lines in the background)—comparable to the heavy tendril lines over the straight edges of
the walls in the map of his home. For Miyawaki, space is voyaging, walking and mapping his
trajectories. His non-architecture is action (“not-making”), not building (“making”).

This not-making buildings but making maps is not new in the western art/architectural
world. As early as the 1950s, the Situationist International (SI) produced “psychogeography”
based on a method of dérive (drift)—that is, strolling aimlessly in the city.89 Guy Debord defines
“psychogeography” as “the study of the precise laws and specific effects of the geographical
environment, consciously organized or not, on the emotions and behavior of individuals.”90 He
argues that each place possesses an inherent “psychic atmosphere,” which elicits certain
emotions and desires, and hence actions. To investigate psychogeography, Debord (with Asger
Jorn) fervently walked about the city of Paris and produced maps, for example, The Naked City

89 The concept dérive was first proposed by Gilles Ivain in his 1953 essay “Formulary for A New
Urbanism,” collected in Theory of the Dérive and Other Situationist Writings on the City and also
90 Guy Debord, “Introduction to A Critique of the Urban Geography,” Theory of the Dérive and Other
Situationist Writings on the City (Barcelona: Museu d’Art Contemporani de Barcelona, 1996), 18.
(1957) and *Guide Psychogéographique de Paris* (1957). In theory, psychogeography generates space through one’s journey in a moment of choice (based on Jean-Paul Sartre’s dramatic concept Theatre of Situations⁹¹), not unlike the Japanese practice of *kata*, which unfolds space step by step and moment by moment. And like the Japanese residents’ impromptu sketches, or Miyawaki’s maps, psychogeographic maps originate in, and are contingent upon, a subjective roaming experience.

However, their attitudes about the subjective roaming “self” differ to the point of contradicting each other. Psychogeography promotes a psychic self. The Situationists argue that each place assumes a “psychic atmosphere” which causes a division in the city into different mood zones: “happy quarter,” “bizarre quarter,” etc.⁹² Some zones are more appealing while
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⁹² The concept of “mood-zone” was also proposed by Gilles Ivain.
others repelling, emotively speaking. When these psychological characters of a city are factored in, different paths inevitably emerge: “the sudden change of ambiance in a street within the space of a few meters; the evident division of a city into zones of distinct psychic atmospheres; the path of least resistance which is automatically followed in aimless strolls; the appealing or repelling character of certain places.”93 Driven by subjective perception, the rambler will instinctively change and generate a certain trajectory, moving from place to place as well as from emotion to emotion. Reflecting this psychic self’s purely emotional response, a psychogeographic map consists of cutouts of the Paris city, torn from their actual context, and linked together by a series of red arrows. Each of the cutouts represents a place (a “situation”) of a distinct ambiance and feeling. Their deployment, in turn, indicates the mentally felt distance, whereas the arrows represent the most frequented crossings. Therefore, the map puzzles together different emotional experiences prompted by the city as the psychic self strolls through it.

In contrast, the Japanese map of kata promotes an intellectual and a physical self, as it ignores, if not suppresses, emotion. The intricate backstreets inevitably necessitate a mental schema of orientation, where the inhabitants locate known landmarks—a house, a shop, a street, a canal, a railroad line, etc.—and mentally map a route to a specific destination. The drawings which Barthes acquired during his visit to Japan represent a discovery, derived from unraveling the strands of the maze-like, complex backstreets. Similarly, Miyawaki’s routine itinerary embedded in the city shows both his physical trajectory and mental mapping: the architect goes here and does this and there and does that, not because of “psychic atmospheres” but is rather driven by everyday affairs. His map registers no emotion, though it foregrounds a physical “self.” The old Japanese default code of “emotionless behavior” still looms.

Besides “self,” their attitudes toward “everyday” contrast with each other. Rooted in Marxism, the Situationists aspire to break the passivity of life conditioned by the capitalist society. Their psychogeography celebrates leisure and obliterates the humdrum of everyday life. The suggested duration to *dérive* is one day, considered as the time between two periods of sleep. The participants set aside an hour or two at the beginning or the end of the day for taking care of banal tasks. The rest of the time is devoted to emotional abandonment, allowing the city’s varying mood zones to stimulate and revive their desires. *Dérive* anticipates no physical destination, though it embodies an ideal aim: stroll for stroll’s sake as a new way of life. The participants walk to recognize and resuscitate their emotions, hence countering the passivity of life. In contrast, Miyawaki strides through mundane routines: dropping off dry-cleaning, picking up his son, catching a train to a meeting, etc. His walk is purposeful and goal-oriented: dry cleaner, nursery, train station, and so forth. Whereas psychogeography attempts to reinvent everyday by psyching up the strollers for fourteen hours of play in a day (assuming twenty-four minus eight hours of sleep and two hours of banal tasks), Miyawaki’s map demonstrates a literal “descent to everyday,” embracing the minutiae of the mundane.

Consequently, Miyawaki’s map and psychogeography tell a different story. Psychogeography is fictional; it denies the omnipotent perspective of a planimetric map, preferring fragments and margins to continuity and unity. Reflecting the paths and the changing psychology of the stroller, determined by the city’s “appealing” vs. “repelling” psychic atmospheres, intermittent patches and white breathing spaces are manifested. A psychogeographic map favors, say, “happy quarter” over grief, and leisure over the humdrum of everyday life. As emotional truth overwrites geographical reality, the map rises above reality, recreating the city anew (despite some fragments of truth in it).
Miyawaki’s map denies nothing of the reality. The dense footprints of streets and buildings in his neighborhood remain intact. His truthful planimetric description of the city’s fine-meshed backstreets reflects the architect’s continuous voyages in it, that is, his everyday life, which is unbroken, as opposed to the vacillating psychological states that psychogeography captures. This disparity between Miyawaki’s and the Situationalists’ story is especially evidenced by their distinct use of symbols, i.e., the red arrows vs. the gray dashes. As if unstoppable forces, the Situationists’ red arrows catapult a flux of desires and shatter the Paris metropolis. In contrast, Miyawaki’s dash-lines simply seep through the meandering backstreets and weave the practice of everyday life into a voyage through them, and then into “my home,” where the architect quietly starts his day: waking up at 7:30 am in the bedroom, moving to the dining room, drinking coffee and eating toast at 8:30 am, reading newspapers at 9:00 am…

In ArchiteXt 2, Suzuki even more explicitly conceptualizes home as a voyage. Suzuki writes a poem to recount his story of a man-maku vessel that sails adventitiously in the sea. His strip reads (the architect’s own English translation):

It is “my home” and is “your home.”
The home can only be defined by people living here and they are we.
Whether our home is a house or not is not a question.

Here, in this Man-Maku Curtain, We have our meals.
Meal is an important home ritual Linking to festivals.
We shall bring to open the concealed activity of eating and hide all the objects which up to now have been in the open. This wall, Man-Maku, sways as wind blows thus is somewhat unstable but the enclosed home becomes open. In this space, we are, most of the time, naked.

Here, our bodies are consecrated to the wind and rays.

Daily, for about four hours, we are in the air, a typical free posture of the new living activities.

The only infringement of privacy left is the view from below.

The floor has been eliminated. This living space is an exterior yet interior; it is above and is below. Top of the net is the living space and so is the bottom.

The floor moves with our movement and its shape changes with the weight of the people.

Discarding objects and becoming independent of machines will not change the meaning of a home.

We have a factory, not just for production but for our physical and mental recreation.

We use this factory for zazen, for contemplation, for romping, for carpentry, for most anything.
We have a spherical shaped, a space-ship shaped, rather, a tear-drop shaped conveyance. It moves with the wind and waves. Its false engine room is the bathroom. Since the commuting time is considered as an extension of a home, our home could be moved.94

Suzuki sketches out this home/vessel in four drawings: (1) a cylindrical space bordered by flying strips of curtains, which radiate out like cartoonish sun beams; (2) a square trampoline with a taut net in between; (3) a U-shaped pair of legs from the trampoline with curtains draped over it; and (4) a big teardrop floating in the sea.

Suzuki’s “home” is a non-house. It is a moving vessel in the form of a teardrop, or it could be a sphere or a spaceship. Instead of an engine, the wind and waves propel the vessel. There is no itinerary; the sailing is accidental, its trajectory random. The enclosure is just as loose. Instead of walls, man-maku hang from the vessel’s ethereal frame. Attached above yet detached below, the curtains flutter as the wind blows. In lieu of a fixed floor is a trampoline-like net, upon which people jump, the net morphing accordingly. Inside, objects and machinery generally associated with a house are hidden. Openness characterizes the home. In addition, just as the architecture is stripped of its walls, men/women inside are stripped of their clothes. Privacy poses no concern. Nude inhabitants move freely in the wind and under the sun, as they sail along. Man-maku home makes an open voyage in the sea.

Suzuki’s man-maku home also means performance. The vessel stages domestic rituals, from mealtime to zazen or carpentry, depending on the inhabitants/sailors. Eating provides a rhythm. A daily dose of free-form exercise spices up the routine. Rituals serve as the pivot of the vessel, not the shell or an engine. Home is about living, not housing; about performance, not

94 Makoto Suzuki, ArchiteXt 1 (1971).
placement or place. As the wind blows *man-maku* open, and hence the non-house, life becomes a moving spectacle.

Suzuki’s non-house/non-architecture especially evidences the influence of non-art. Although he never mentions The Play, this non-art group’s Voyages must have provided a live example for him. Between 1968 and 1972, the group launched three sailing voyages—plus one on foot. *Voyage: A Happening in an Egg* began on August 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1968. The artists released a giant egg (3.3 meters long and 2.2 meters wide in size) made of polyether resin and fiberglass (weighing 150 kilograms) into the Pacific Ocean from Shionomisaki, the southernmost point of Japan’s main island. An annotated world map shows the projected trajectory of the egg to the United States; The Play took their egg 20 miles offshore and dropped it into the Japan Current so that it would eventually meet the California Current. On the margin of their world map, the artists dubbed themselves “performers,” in cooperation with Kushimoto Fishmen’s Union and Kusimoto Ferrymen’s Union (who offered current data and arranged the use of a boat to launch the egg). It was unclear if the egg ever reached its destination; only one telegraph report sighted the vessel after a month. This was The Play’s first water voyage, unmanned, with an egg to symbolize incipience.

In the following summer on July 20\textsuperscript{th}, The Play launched their second voyage: *Current of Contemporary Art*. In place of the egg was a gigantic Styrofoam arrow (3.5 meters wide and 8 meters long), symbolizing direction and force. This time ten members rode on the arrow and sailed down the rivers of Uji, Yodo and Dojima. The entire journey took 12 hours. In August, 1972, The Play launched their last water voyage: *Ie* (House). Symbolizing home, the house-shaped vessel had a footprint of six *tatami* mats (4 meters by 3 meters). Five members spent six
Figure 69: The Play, Voyages: *A Happening in an Egg*, 1968; *Current of Contemporary Art*, 1969.
days in it, drifting downstream on the rivers Kizu and Yodo. (In between, in 1970, The Play took a voyage on foot called Sheep, which consisted of 11 members walking with 12 sheep for 8 days, sleeping along the roadside in the night.)

Although dissimilar in form—an egg, an arrow, and a house (The Play) vs. a teardrop, a sphere and a spaceship (Suzuki)—their vessels similarly create a moving show on the water. Carried by the current, their architecture/vessels and inhabitants/sailors co-perform in a spontaneous manner. Oriented towards action, the house/home design no longer revolves around specific siting, detailed planning, or domestic programs. The human performers come to the fore, as architecture dematerializes, blown away by the wind and the waves, literally. The Play’s voyages veer off the architectural trend toward technology. Their Current of Contemporary Art deliberately took off on the day before the historic landing of Apollo 11—a strike against scientific rationalism, as art critic Tomii Reiko remarks. Suzuki’s home likewise avoids machinery (though this could be read as a strike against the modernist idea that “the house is a machine for living in”). His man-maku home shows nostalgia for a return to nature (a defining character of Japanese architecture), embracing the essential elements (in Japanese conception): mountains and valleys (earth), river and sea (water), flowers and trees (fire), and clouds (wind)—especially emphasizing a consecration ritual to the wind and the sun. Four hours a day, the nude performers immerse and indulge themselves in nature, posing freely. As a demonstration, a naked woman stretches comfortably on the trampoline, making herself quite at home. Her serene posture oddly invokes a meditative absorption along a rickety ride.
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95 For details of The Play’s Voyages, see Reiko Tomii, “After the ‘Descent to the Everyday,’” 65-68.
96 Ibid.
Despite striking resemblances, Suzuki’s non-architecture and The Play’s non-art voyages are disparate in their distinct “descent to the everyday.” In Ie, The Play made a house the vessel. In reverse, Suzuki makes a vessel “home.” Although both constructs thrust everyday life into a voyage, The Play’s “descent” was an excursion. Ie had a specific duration of six days in the summer of 1972. Their voyage was a pastime, their vessel dispensable; if the house or home symbolized everyday life, theirs was a break from it. The Play bracketed an interval in the continuum of everyday life, sailing into rivers, or in the case of Sheep, walking with sheep along the roadside. From an Egg, Arrow and Sheep to Ie, they were “Play,” as their name suggests.

In contrast, Suzuki’s “descent to the everyday” flows through all currents of life, even if only in theory. Conceptually, his home/vessel sails continuously. There is a rhythm to it but no break; life does not stop. Man-maku gets down to the nitty-gritty of life: eating, exercising, etc., accommodating both the leisurely and the mundane. Comparable to Miyawaki’s maps, Suzuki’s voyage is 24 hours, daily, monthly, all year long. ArchiteXt makes full “descent to the everyday.”

ArchiteXt Extra: Collective Dwelling

ArchiteXt Extra was a special edition put together for Toshi Jutaku, 1972 August. Toshi Jutaku has its own theme: “collective dwelling,” and its standard A4 format. To adapt to the A4 size, ArchiteXt breaks the pages of 297 x 210 mm into two parts: a 210 x 210 mm square on the left and an 87 x 210 mm column on the right. Their presentations retain the customary 210 x 210 mm squares of ArchiteXt. The remaining area is then dedicated to an “Encyclopedia ArchiteXta”
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97 ArchiteXt Extra came in two forms, either as printed pages in Toshi Jutaku or as a separate booklet of its own.
compiled in the Japanese alphabetical order あ, い, う, え, お…, for example, い for いま (居間), living room (western-style), お for おくじょうていえん (屋上庭園), roof garden, か for かいだんしつ (階段室), staircase, and so forth. There is no direct correlation between the information in the “Encyclopedia ArchiteXta” and the contents in the adjacent squares.

Here again, ArchiteXt shows its diversity in approach. Their work varies from practical (Azuma, Miyawaki and Suzuki) to theoretical (Takeyama) and comical (Aida). On the practical side, Azuma gives a 10-page report of surveys on land use and housing planning conducted for a local committee over the span of two years. Miyawaki presents a “sketch-survey” of “Neighborhood on Foot” in the Sendagaya district [千駄ヶ谷二丁目]. His investigation focuses on the immediate vicinity of the Japanese houses, including entrances, balconies, the semi-public courtyards, streets, etc. and their common usage—bikes parked by the front door underneath the balcony, lovers hidden in the shade of trees in the private backstreet, etc. Suzuki in turn examines public communal spaces, the busy streets, the quiet parks, the arcade, the rooftop, and so on. These surveys by Azuma, Miyawaki and Suzuki variously include notes, analysis, statistic charts, photographs and sketches applicable to actual situations. In contrast, Aida wittily recasts Japanese landmarks and historical architecture for disparate purposes (see chapter 1: playable). Contrary to Azuma, Miyawaki and Suzuki’s realistic analyses and criticisms, his nonsensical non-architecture aims at pure entertainment.
Figure 70: ArchiteXtra Extra in Toshi Jutaku, August 1972, covers and a typical page inside.
Takeyama revisits Heterology in *ArchiteXt* Extra. But this time he composes fastidious matrices in place of the random collages in *ArchiteXt* 00. Takeyama compiles five double-sided pages of photographs in square matrices in diminishing order: a 5 x 5 matrix on either side of the first page, 4 x 4 on the second, 3 x 3 on the third, and so on. As the number of photos decreases with the entries of a matrix, the images grow larger. Each matrix is assigned a theme: knob/handle/pull, door, row (house), map, and the earth. Takeyama calls them “co-living elements.” These elements also show a sequential relationship, with the latter containing the former: a knob as a part of a door, which belongs to a house, and so on. Yet in contrast to this systematic order, his photo selections appear to be random. For example, the first column of the page on “the door” juxtaposes a wooden lattice door with an entryway to a garden/yard; below, an interior shoji sliding door is followed by the entrance to the Wife Hermitage. The only clear logic seems to reside in the eastern-western differentiation. The front page shows elements of Japanese traditions whereas the back displays foreign conventions, for instance, on a Chinese gate, an arch opening, a car door, etc.

In the architectural milieu revolving around semiology, Takeyama pertinently reveals Modernology [*Kogengaku*, 考現学] as a model influence of his Heterology. Modernology was invented by urban ethnologist and cultural anthropologist Kon Wajiro, whom Takeyama studied with at Waseda University—Wajiro held a professorship of architecture from 1920 to 1959 at Waseda, where Takeyama also earned his bachelor’s degree in 1956. Wajiro began his work of Modernology right after the devastating Great Kanto earthquake in 1923. The earthquake killed 140,000 people and instantly reduced most of Edo (the former Tokyo) to
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98 For a key summary of Kon Wajiro’s life and work re: Modernology, see Tom Gill, “Kon Wajiro, Modernologist,” *Japan Quarterly* (Apr.-Jun. 1996), 198-207. See also Harootunian, *History’s Disquiet*. 
Figure 71: Minoru Takeyama’s matrix system in ArchiteXt Extra, August 1972.
ArchiteXt

Kon Wajiro’s Shoji screen

Figure 72: Minoru Takeyama, ArchiteXt Extra, 1st square.
charred rubble. Witnessing the prosperous modern city thrown back into the Stone Age overnight, Wajiro grew anxious to seize what he called a “moving present” [ugoki tsutsu aru imam, 動きつつある現在],99 which, while being lived, was at the same time always escaping. For fear that this “moving present” would again disappear into the past without a trace, the ethnologist walked in the shattered city day after day, making inexhaustible sketches on location to capture whatever the scene presented him with in that moment. Wajiro’s sketches documented the makeshift constructions and revealed the architectural ingenuity of the inhabitants to cope with the disaster: shacks built around the trunks of live trees (creating the central pillar that is a feature of traditional Japanese homes), structural supports made of wooden tablets from graveyards, etc.100

But rather than Takeyama’s semiotics, Wajiro’s starting point was archaeology. Comparing his own work to an archaeologist’s (except that his was carried out in the ruins of a modern city with an intention to catch the present rather than to discover a past), Wajiro coined the term kogengaku: removing the central character ko in the Japanese word for archaeology kokogaku and replacing it with gen, meaning the present. Kogengaku translates into English as “Modernology.”

After the ruins and the makeshift constructions, Wajiro continued his surveys but moved on to capture the newly emerging modern Japan. He intended to seize the myriad manifestations due to westernization, which would result in “doubling;” some fifty years later, Takeyama would try to catch the split in realm of architecture. Wajiro took particular note of the developments in fashion. In 1925, he deployed himself at the Ginza (then the undisputed fashion center of Tokyo)
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100 This survey was published in 1927 as Shinsai Barakku no Kaiko (Earthquake Barracks in Retrospect).
and compulsively sketched the clothing styles of the street population: collars, watch-chains, neckties, footwear, gloves, kimono material, design and color, hats, glasses, items being carried, pipes and cigarettes, facial hair, hairstyles, clothing accessories and handbags. In contrast to Takeyama’s composed photos of knobs, pulls, handles, doors and so on, the ethnologist anxiously aimed for an all-inclusive study.101

But more than a gathering of information, Wajiro in fact sought to write a different history—at present rather than in retrospect, while history was in the making. Wajiro argues that, in capturing the “moving present,” Modernology looks forward even as it fixes its gaze in the here and now. With the passage of time, the inventory of contemporary customs will automatically turn into archives. Consequently accumulating knowledge at present avoids the loss of information and future investigation/excavation. In other words, Wajiro aspired to forestall the vanishing of the present while creating a preemptive history by his own copious sketching and logging.

Built upon this method, Takeyama compiles his study of Heterology in ArchiteXt Extra with the very same aim of capturing Japan’s heterogeneous happenings though in his own time and zooming in on architectural manifestations. When Wajiro surveyed the fashion tendency at the Ginza in the 1920s, 99% of women still wore kimonos, while 67% of men had changed to Western-style (the survey revealed an abrupt gender division at that time).102 But the “doubling” phenomenon had since prevailed, spreading beyond fashion. Finally, the co-mingling of wa
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101 The ethnologist also recognized the gap between the aesthetic preoccupations of modernism and the reality of ordinary lives, that is, the emerging vs. the existing everyday life. His detailed analysis of human patterns and lifestyles (collectively known as seikatsu-gaku, 生活学, the study of everyday life) also covers, for example, the daily activities of a farmer’s wife.

102 Kon Wajiro, Modernology for Beginner, ed. Fujimoto Terunobu (Chikuma Bunko, 1987). This example is mentioned in Tom Gill, “Kon Wajiro, Modernologist,” Japan Quarterly (Apr.-Jun. 1996), 204.
(Japanese) and yo (western) in everyday Japanese life, e.g. wa-fuku vs. yo-fuku (clothes), wa-shoku vs. yo-shoku (food), and wa-shitu vs. yo-shitu (room),\textsuperscript{103} came to be the norm. “Doubling” necessarily demands a double vision. Therefore Japanese architects grappled with their received forms of history and culture vis-à-vis the imports of foreign aesthetics and conventions.


Figure 73: Kon Wajiro, Modernology, a clothing survey at Ginza, 1925.
Takeyama’s collation in ArchiteXt Extra reflects “doubling,” juxtaposing Japanese customs and foreign conventions back to back in sequential matrices. Takeyama pertinently calls his illustrations “co-living” elements. In addition, a subtle connection to Modernology is drawn on the first page, where the 5 x 5 matrix begins with ArchiteXt’s logo, followed by 23 assorted images of doorknobs, handles and pulls (in Japanese styles), significantly ending with a sketch of shojis (paper sliding doors) by Wajiro—this last image also introduces the next subject on “the door.” According to Takeyama’s theory of “relator,” this sequential imagery aptly establishes Heterology’s connection with Modernology, even as it signals “doubling” and introduces the next matrix.

But despite the connection, Takeyama’s Heterology really centers on semiology rather than history; the architect is invested in constructing and imparting meaning, rather than documenting events. Takeyama does not simply follow Wajiro to sketch everything passing before his eyes. He consciously interprets and illustrates the architectural heterogeneity (originated from “doubling”) by composing a photo compendium with the aid of technology in modern media. Further coordinating the co-living elements, Takeyama presents a way of seeing the world of “doubling” with new eyes.

To begin with, Takeyama opts for mechanical eyes, that is, lenses of cameras and telescopes. In place of Wajiro’s pencil sketches, photography becomes the new medium of documentation and seeing mechanism for Takeyama. An air of realism consequently marks his presentation. In addition, the outlook of his Heterology is expansive. With the eye of a telescope zooming in on the co-living elements (from small to large units), the photo compendium engages subject matter traversing cultural and geographic boundaries, from the American, Moroccan, Tunisian to Chinese. The expansive view contrasts the singularly fixed and limited perspective
of Modernology, as the ethnologist obstinately stationed himself at the Ginza (and other places, such as a park, the street, etc.). On that account, Heterology reinvents Modernology as it captures the architectural manifestations of “doubling” in space across cultures, whereas Wajiro’s focus was on capturing time, in his attempt to arrest history in the making. In other words, Heterology is spatial (and spacious), whereas Modernology is temporal.

Furthermore, Takeyama prefers the mind’s eye to the real eye. In Modernology, chance was the operative principle; Wajiro compulsively documented everything he saw in the street. In Heterology, Takeyama makes conscious choices. In all likelihood, his “co-living” elements are pictures clipped from magazines, books or catalogs: a shoji door, a Chinese gate, a garden entryway, the Wife Hermitage, etc. That is to say, his assemblage follows his mental trajectory of reading and selecting images out of printed media, whereas Wajiro’s productions were mainly a result of a physical trajectory, with the ethnologist personally walking down the streets. In that sense, Takeyama’s photo compendium presents a method of sampling, instead of surveying. The architect is mindful of his choices and arrangements, creating matrices and fastidiously deploying elements in them, as opposed to the haphazard piles of sketches churned out by Wajiro.

Consequently predicated upon Heterology, Takeyama produces his cognitive, purposeful matrices and photo sampling in ArchiteXt Extra. By compiling the everyday objects of architecture from knobs, handles and pulls to doors, etc., and orienting architecture toward the conscious actions of tracing, clipping, mapping, and illustrating, Takeyama uncovers yet another pattern distinctly embedded in the Japanese architectural habits, resulting from “doubling.” Thus flowing from small to large (objects, squares and matrices), domestic to foreign, local to global, past to present, Modernology to Heterology—expanding volumetrically, spatially, culturally,
geographically, temporally and theoretically—ArchiteXt culminates in this expansive readable finale that epitomizes the logic of “clouds.”

... Soon after their beginning in 1970, ArchiteXt caught the Japanese media’s attention. In 1971, Kindai Kenchiku featured a “Secret Recording” of an ArchiteXt meeting. But the recording was obviously staged, not stealth. As though responding to interview questions, ArchiteXt discussed their sources of inspiration, target audience, distribution method, and their intended informality. In 1972, Toshi Jutaku featured the special edition: ArchiteXt Extra, as an insert. Then in 1976, the Japan Architect dedicated a whole issue exclusively to ArchiteXt. Besides an introduction by Charles Jencks and the diminutive reproductions of ArchiteXt, Japan Architect featured the five architects’ individual works, writings and building designs. Aida, Azuma, Miyawaki, Suzuki, and Takeyama were each frequent contributors to various journals as well, where ArchiteXt’s diversified views were individually presented.

The uniquely non-cohesive, pluralist and individualist functioning of ArchiteXt’s non-group finds its best description by Takeyama in his answer to Jenck’s question regarding ArchiteXt’s common philosophy, which was indeed nonexistent—ArchiteXt intentionally avoided a shared architectural philosophy. Yet as ArchiteXt thrived on paradox, Takeyama responded: “discontinuous continuity” —a term coined not by Takeyama but former president of AIJ Takamasa Yoshizaka. Observing the danger of chaotic disintegration in postwar Japanese

105 Japan Architect (June 1976).
architecture, Yoshizaka proposed “discontinuous continuity” as a theory to enable “energies of multifarious directions and numerous people to develop and still direct their potentialities toward coalescence in one strength.”\textsuperscript{107} ArchiteXt attests to such a convergence in praxis, coalescing their otherwise divergent energies. After ArchiteXt, ArchiteXt’s individual building works (which my next chapter examines) continue to demonstrate this philosophy of “discontinuous continuity.”

\textsuperscript{107} Takamasa Yoshizaka, “Five Individuals in a Group,” \textit{Japan Architect} (June 1976), 80.
Figure 74: Kindai Kenchiku, “Secret Recording” of ArchiteXt’s meeting, 1971.
Lightheartedness characterizes ArchiteXt’s readable architecture, percolating into their building design, which elicits distinct notions of play. The members mainly built houses, owing to postwar conditions in Japan and the urgency of reconstruction. U.S. firebombing destroyed 50% of Tokyo and 60-88% of seventeen other cities; an estimated 4,200,000 houses were shattered, forcing the Japanese to rebuild their homes. And because the government refused to provide public housing (e.g., apartment blocks or rental houses), the Japanese began to desire their own houses built on their own land. Everyone, from the general salaried class to blue-collar workers, shared the ambition to acquire a house. Along with the impact of a flourishing economy, this Japanese “my home-ism” finally escalated into a national “epidemic.”

On the other hand, the trauma of war provoked a tabula-rasa mentality among Japanese architects, as Kenzo Tange divulged: “When we saw our national land turned into scorched earth with sporadic burnt concrete structures, we had a dream and hope of drawing a new city as if over a blank white sheet…” The devastation wrought by the atomic bomb necessitated a master plan for reconstruction. Commissioned by the Institute for War Recovery of the government, Tange immediately set up the Tange Lab [kenkyushitsu] at Tokyo Imperial
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University (where he was an assistant professor), surveying bomb damage in Hiroshima and the destroyed district of Tokyo.111

These “ground zero” conditions in Japan formed a critical backdrop for Metabolism. The Metabolists had been obsessed with tabula rasa, basically ignoring the urban reality at hand, and the Tange Lab served as an incubator for their visionary mega-structure proposals. While working on “Tokyo Plan 1960” in the Tange Lab, Arata Isozaki also developed his “Cluster in the Air,” a “joint core system” with branches radiating in different directions, creating a hovering network of buildings. “Cluster in the Air,” like other Metabolism proposals, seemed to help sublimate the war trauma into a new architectural beginning. Notwithstanding, the mega-structures still manifested the city’s wounds spatially. Striding over the chaos of the Shibuya ward, the Clusters allow habitation to begin only at the limit of Tokyo’s building height law, that is, thirty-one meters. “Tokyo is helpless,” Isozaki declares. “I am no longer going to consider architecture that is below 30 meters in height… I am leaving everything below 30 meters to others. If they think they can unravel the mess in this city, let them try.” Isozaki’s proposal reveals the dark side of Metabolism’s seemingly optimistic, high-tech mega-structures.

Meanwhile, housing needs grew ever more urgent, reaching a climax in the 1970s. This post-war housing boom influenced the types of commissions undertaken by young architects in the formative years of New Wave. At that time, industry virtually controlled the hierarchical order of Japanese society. For the most part, big projects fell into the hands of large organizations. In the brutal competition for existence, the senior architects who notched the top of the pyramid underwent the same trial: Kenzo Tange now worked on big commissions in the

111 Tange Lab also visited Maebashi, Isezaki, Fukushima and Wakaanai.
Figure 75: Arata Isozaki, Cluster in the Air, 1962.
oil-producing countries of the Middle East, spending an equal amount of time (if not more) abroad than at home; Kiyonori Kikutake moved from small houses to immense structures; Shoji Hayashi became the head of the biggest design organization in Japan (with a staff of about 1200), and so on. Although ArchiteXt attempted to break away from the pyramidal order, their building commissions were still subject to the industry’s control, which left only a small corner for emerging young architects: designing houses for private clients.

But even in this tiny segment of the building market, competition was still stiff. Up until the war, the profession of “architect” had been vague (Japan Professional Architects Association was only formed in 1947, and Japan Architects Association in 1956\(^{112}\)). The average Japanese person had no notion of an architect’s expertise. To build a house, one would usually consult with a carpenter on a simple design and then he’d build it. But this co-creative intimacy changed; immediately after the war, small contracting organizations (komuten) replaced local carpenters. (It was also during this time that fine Japanese woodworking craftsmanship began to assume a much smaller role in the building of a house.) Soon thereafter, big companies with tremendous financial capital cornered the market. The condition worsened. In the hands of specialist suppliers, manufacturers and developers, housing increasingly transformed into commercial merchandise. Therefore, young New Wave architects, including ArchiteXt, struggled not only within the hierarchy of Japanese architecture but against the commercial trend propagated by profit-driven building companies.

This rampant commercialism was predicated upon the novelty of modern western houses. Although western clothing and cuisine were widespread by this time, westernization in housing had only begun. Prior to the war, practically no ordinary citizen in Japan had ever been exposed

---

\(^{112}\) http://www.jia.or.jp/ (visited on October 25, 2012).
to modern household amenities such as carpeting, sofas, beds, central heating, stainless-steel sinks, lawn gardens, lace curtains, not to mention television, refrigerators, washing machines, and ovens. Even the word “living room” was foreign to them. (A traditional Japanese house comprises small rooms free of clutter—only futon pads and tatami mats—no chairs or beds, etc.) Commercial building companies, suppliers, manufacturers and developers widely advertised these western inventions in catalogs and magazines. Lacking proper architectural knowledge, the general public took them as standards and models to emulate in rebuilding their homes.\footnote{113}{See Miyawaki, “Japanese Houses: Transitional Pains,” 4-5.} In this interim period after the war, the domestic realm of Japanese life experienced an overarching transformation; expectations of home were drastically revised. As western living habits entered the Japanese household, “home” came to mean a motley assemblage of commercial items. Consequently, on top of the struggle to affirm their professional identity and fend off the commercial trend toward “catalog friendly” architecture, Japanese architects faced the challenge of balancing western and eastern home conceptions.
In the spirit of “discontinuous continuity,” ArchiteXt managed to creatively incorporate the aporias of eastern tradition and western invention in their individual building designs. Their houses often bring toys, games, puzzles, and dramas into play, expressing humor and informality in form—so much so that, in speaking of ArchiteXt’s built works, Charles Jencks asks: “How many modern buildings can you laugh at—with the architect standing beside you?”

Meanwhile, with their signature lightheartedness, ArchiteXt’s building designs continued to operate under the logic of “X,” negating commercialism, modernism, and Metabolism, as well as the default codes of Japanese conduct: “no self,” “emotionless behavior,” etc.

Aida was especially keen on play, creating his trademark Toy Block House I-X, based on geometrical blocks in primary colors. In “On Playfulness and Toy Blocks,” Aida put forth his
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own aphorism “form follows fiction” (in place of “function”), giving a nod to Dutch cultural historian Johan Huizinga and French sociologist Roger Caillois as his sources of inspiration. Miyawaki similarly produced Box House in bright colors and simple geometries: Yellow Box, Blue Box, Green Box No.1, Green Box No.2, Black Box, Match Box, Triangle Box, White Triangle, A Quarter-Circle, and so forth. Carving a niche in the booming Japanese housing market, Miyawaki designed over 180 houses in a mere decade’s time, of which about 90 were actually built. Takeyama even created a real playable home/studio: Atelier Indigo. Playfulness permeates these toy-like houses, though it can be construed as a mask of the collective war trauma that the Japanese suffered. Then again, in the spirit of ArchiteXt’s inherent paradoxes, Azuma and Suzuki expressed austerity in their works; the architects were enthused with recasting Japanese spatial conceptions in a modern concrete container.

This chapter is organized in alphabetical order: Takefumi Aida, Takamitsu Azuma, Mayumi Miyawaki, Makoto Suzuki and Minoru Takeyama—with preferential treatment given to Aida, the key advocate of play among ArchiteXt.

Figure 77: Takefumi Aida, *ArchiteXt* 1, 1971.
Aida’s varying styles of play can be encapsulated into two forms: drama and toys/puzzles/games, in connection with the actions of masking (in the former) and playing and jesting (in the latter), and by his theories: “Architecture of the Mask” and “Form Follows Fiction.” These variants of play had already surfaced in ArchiteXt, which foreshadow Aida’s building designs later on. Just like free-flowing clouds, his readable architecture extends to his playable architecture.

ArchiteXt 1 (1971) especially demonstrates Aida’s intertwined strands of play in his recurrent use of four elements: the earth, the dice, torii, and a house. To recap, the first square shows the earth being encased underneath a torii; the second, the globe’s skins being peeled off, thrown out; the third, a house tossed out of a dissected earth as if a die; the fourth, the planet boxed in the house; the fifth, a die with an earth stuffed in each of its holes. This strip is suffused with play and packed with action. Its spinning earth and flying house almost bring on mild vertigo in the reader. But these energetic elements also contain important messages. They are symbols that connect architecture with non-architecture: the dice symbolize play, torii, religion, house, architecture, and the earth, everyday life/drama. In practice, the house being tossed out of the earth (in the 3rd square) then encasing it (in the 4th) is reincarnated in Nirvana House (1972). The die (in the 5th square) eventually transmogrifies into House Like A Die (1974)—the actions of playing and jesting spark the marriage of a toy and a house. Further,

interplay between correlated objects and subjects—impassively: torii and nirvana; playfully: die and humor—signals Aida’s Noh play (drama) vs. toy play (toys/puzzles/games). These non-architectural (dramatic, religious and play) themes, in fact, recur throughout Aida’s ArchiteXt strips beyond ArchiteXt 1, sometimes separated (Aida sits zazen in ArchiteXt 0 and 00, and evokes the image of Guan Yin in 2), sometimes connected (Aida playfully jams apartments between torii’s two posts in Extra), and generally in an erratic fashion. But these fuzzy threads were straightened out into systematic approaches in his actual buildings:

re: drama, mask and silence

1972  Nirvana House .......................................... Fujisawa, Kanagawa
1972  Annihilation House ................................. Yokohama, Kanagawa
1974  PL Institute Kindergarten ........................... Tonbayashi, Osaka
1974  House Like A Die ........................................... Izu, Shizuoka
1974  Persona House ........................................... Suginami, Tokyo
1976  Stepped Platform House .............................. Kawasaki, Kanagawa
1977  Pension-Style Hotel at Shiobara ..................... Shioya-gun, Tochigi

re: toy, puzzle and game

1978  Toy Block House I ............................................. Nakano, Tokyo
1979  Toy Block House II ........................................... Kawasaki, Kanagawa
1980  Mondrian Pattern ............................................ Kodaira, Tokyo
1981  Toy Block House III ........................................... Nakano, Tokyo
1982  Toy Block House IV .......................................... Suginami, Tokyo
1983  Toy Block House VII ......................................... Meguro, Tokyo
1984  Toy Block House X ............................................ Shibuya, Tokyo

As it happens, the beginning of Aida’s building practice coincides with the end of ArchiteXt’s publication (in 1972). House Like A Die (1974), in particular, marks a watershed in Aida’s style change from stoic to playful. This house consequently occupies a critical position in
Aida’s building sequence. (After Toy Block House, Aida moved onto new architectural/theoretical interests and terminated this play.)

... 

Figure 78: Aida’s illustrations of the Noh mask.

Aida’s dramatic form of play is derived from none other than the Japanese Noh play. Emerging in the fourteenth century, Noh is the oldest surviving form of Japanese theater and combines music, dance and acting, and typically communicates Buddhist themes. In Noh, only the shite (the main character) wears a mask (not the other three categories of performers: waki, kyogen, and hayashi) to portray one accelerating emotion, whether jealousy, rage or sorrow, which is at last exorcised at the climax/close of the play—according to fourteenth century Buddhism, a person, even after death, cannot attain spiritual release (i.e., nirvana) if still possessing a strong emotion or desire.\footnote{In a Noh play, to exorcise this emotion, shite recreates his/her battle against the emotion in a dance, which reveals his humiliation at suffering defeat. In turn, waki, the secondary part, performs the role that is the counterpart or foil of the shite. Kyogen interludes during the play. Hayashi are the instrumentalists}
In the course of his practice and writings, Aida repeatedly refers to this Noh mask. His initial use of the word *mask* (仮面 kamen) appears in “Architecture of the Mask” [仮面としての建築] in *Toshi Jutaku* [都市住宅], December 1973, where he defines “architecture of the mask” as buildings with a strong silent form: 「仮面は何も語らないように建築も何も語らない」

…それらの住宅の外観は、自身に厳しく「沈黙」を強いている。[Like the mask, the architecture utters nothing… The house’s exterior shows a strong “silent” form].


who play the four instruments used in Noh theater: the transverse flute (笛 fue) made from bamboo, hip drum (大鼓 otsuzumi or 大皮 okawa), the shoulder-drum (小鼓 kotsuzumi), and the stick-drum (太鼓 taiko).


Even into the 1980s and 90s, Aida still talks about this mask. He shows images of Noh masks, for example, in his lectures “Works of Takefumi Aida—Lectures in the United States” (at UC Berkeley, Columbia University, and Architectural League) in 1986 and in his book *The Architectural Anthology of Takefumi Aida: Excursive Thoughts* published by Shinkenchikusha-sha Co., Ltd in Tokyo in 1998. However, in these later works, Aida reconnects the mask with Nirvana House (1972) and Annihilation House (1972), even though they were built before his introduction of the term.

Figure 79: Nirvana House, elevations.

Nirvana House clearly demonstrates Aida’s initial idea of “architecture of the mask,” that is, as a form of silence. The house is a white cube with simple symmetrical compositions on its sides: a front with two squares and a rectangle, plus four circles (two on each side of the rectangle); a back with two rectangles (tapered toward the center) and two circles (on one side of the rectangles); and two sides each with four squares. The design epitomizes formal simplicity obtained by geometric abstraction.
But Nirvana House captures the Japanese conception of silence not just by virtue of its form. Silence underlies many Japanese art forms: “the Noh drama, the tea ceremony and the flower arrangement… [they] constitute the beauty of silence,” argues Aida. The essence of this Japanese silence truly originates in the concealment of emotions. Speaking of Noh, Aida argues: “There are many kinds of Noh masks; but, in all of them, emotion is not externally expressed. Instead it is restrained and concealed. The deliberate attempt to conceal emotion has the reverse effect of indirectly conveying emotion to the viewer.”\(^\text{122}\) That is to say, the Noh mask paradoxically conveys emotions by the very act of concealing them. Suppression is its means of expression. “By itself [the mask] can express a variety of emotions from weeping to laughing by the deliberate change of the tilting angle of the face.”\(^\text{123}\) Subtlety and minimalist movements also characterize the Noh act.

Similarly, the Japanese poetic form of *haiku* employs succinct words and restrains sentimentality. Aida argues:

> A Haiku poem consists of only seventeen syllables arranged in groups of five, seven and five. Within this limited scope, the haiku poet compresses emotion, ideas, and pictorial elements in an economical way that brings many different meaning to the reader. These various meanings awaken more cords of associative thought in the reader’s mind than direct revelation of content…\(^\text{124}\)

Comparable to the way both the Haiku poem and the Noh mask adopt the Japanese principle of silence, Nirvana House reveals subtle variations of geometries and carefully deploys them on its white walls that together form a perfect cube. Just as the Noh mask tilts in a slight angle and the *haiku* poem whispers a syllable, the cubic house changes one of its sides, adding or
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subtracting a small circle, a square, a rectangle. In this utter simplicity, Nirvana conceals emotions, as Botond Bognar perceives when he finds on the house’s front facade “a blankness of expression that is akin to the emotionless facial expression of Buddha statues, symbols of ultimate nothingness or nirvana.”

Then again, Nirvana House also demonstrates the power of Japanese silence to awaken, like a haiku poem, various cords of associative meanings in the reader’s mind. Contrasting Bognar’s reading, Chris Fawcett, author of Japanese New House, sees Aida the architect, not the Buddha, in Nirvana. In a caption appended to a picture of Nirvana, Fawcett writes:

A chirpy smile on the house’s countenance; when primitive man started to build, he couldn’t separate phenomena in the way science does; the primitive saw himself as part of a natural continuity that joined everything together, so that when he came to build his own house, in its making he couldn’t separate himself from the completed structure—he felt part of the house and similarly saw it as an extension of his own physiognomy.

Interestingly, Fawcett’s perception of a “chirpy smile” on the house’s countenance echoes Aida’s own lightheartedness and humor. Hence open to multiple readings, one wonders if the seemingly expressionless mask of Nirvana already hints at Aida’s second, more typical manner of play.

But before becoming explicitly playful, Aida’s silence would deepen, as it both literally and physically deepens in Annihilation House. Nearly identical to Nirvana in its exterior appearance, Annihilation is instead half buried in the earth, its faces half concealed, veiled by dirt, annihilated by nature. The “architecture of the mask” is itself wearing a dirt mask. And this literal underground cover would become Aida’s other strategy of silence in architecture.


Figure 80: Nirvana House, 1972.
Figure 81: Annihilation House, 1972.
In his essay “Silence,” Aida articulates his strategies of silence in four distinct avenues: “elimination:” by reducing geometrical forms to achieve simplicity; “disappearance:” by blending the building with and returning it to nature; “allusion:” by associating forms with the tranquility found in Japanese shrines, temples, etc.; and “persona:” by cloaking the building in a mask—now the mask becomes a subcategory of silence. These methods evoke Roger Caillois’ theories of mimicry—that is, biological mimicry of natural creatures—in *The Mask of Medusa* (although when Aida alludes to Caillois as a source of inspiration, he is likely referring to Caillois’ *Man, Play and Games* on different notions of play). Aida’s method of “disappearance” resonates with Caillois’ biological strategy of “camouflage,” where the animal blends into the background by taking on the color of background; for example, the homochromatic colors of the grasshopper, the white owl, chameleon, etc. (or the animal relies on patterns of contrasting colors to break up its apparent shape). Comparably, in “PL Institute Kindergarten” (1974), Aida attempts to camouflage architecture, making it disappear. The building resembles a bunker with ample sloping surfaces completely covered by grass and flowers, its shape altering with the changes in weather. Again in “Pension-Style Hotel at Shiobara” (1977), Aida creates a curved low roof, which conforms to the incline of the topography as an extension of the landscape. In winter, covered up by snow, the building disappears into nature. One green creature, one white creature, the kindergarten, and the hotel camouflage into the grass and snow.

---

129 Ibid., 78-88. See “Camouflage.” In Caillois’ classification, additionally there is “intimidation,” where the animal paralyses and frightens its enemy or its prey. Ibid., 89-102. See “Intimidation.”
Aida’s method of “persona” (i.e., “architecture of the mask”) is also comparable to Caillois’ mimicry by “disguise,” where the animal passes itself off as another species. (Caillois categorizes fashion into this group too, particularly the attempt to change one’s identity with fancy dress—though this is behavioral rather than biological.\textsuperscript{130}) Nirvana passes itself off as a Noh mask (or a Buddha statue) with an emotionless expression. In fact, there seems to be a trend of “persona” in the New Wave of Japanese architecture, where buildings acquire a physiognomic front, such as the robotic look of Arata Isozaki’s Gumma Museum (1974), the cartoon-like expression on Yasuo Yoshida’s Ota House, and especially the literal face of Kazamasa Yamashita’s Face House (1975), which blatantly maps a face in the fashion of pop design, with big round eyes, a gun-barrel nose (so much so that Charles Jencks thinks it needs plastic surgery), and a toothed capsule-shaped mouth. (Inside, it accommodates a graphic designer’s studio on the ground level and apartments above.) Contrasting Nirvana’s silent Noh mask, Face House flaunts an evocative persona with its bold imagery.

\textsuperscript{130} Caillois, \textit{The Mask of Medusa}, 55-77. See “The Three Functions of Mimicry” and “Disguise” under the section Contrasts and Parallels.
Figure 82: PL Institute Kindergarten, 1974; Pension-Style Hotel at Shiobara, 1977.
Figure 83: Yasuo Yoshida, Ota House, 1978; Kazamasa Yamashita, Face House, 1975.
But more than Caillois’, John Hejduk’s *Mask of Medusa* warrants a comparison with Aida’s “Architecture of the Mask,” given their common context (architecture, of course, and play—play as in dramatic entertainment) and cultural contrast (East vs. West—Japanese Noh vs. English Masque). Hejduk’s correlate of the mask is the masque. In a fantastical fashion, he interweaves drawings, essays, and poems to produce Geometric Masque, Retreat Masque, Theater Masque, New England Masque, Lancaster Hanover Masque, and Berlin Masque. These works defy categorization, abstract or figurative, opaque or transparent. (Among the diversified speculations and interpretations, the mask acquires layers of meaning: metaphorically, the “reinscription of the modernist opacity back into representation itself… the mask that figures a real that did not exist before its representation;”¹³¹ architectonically, the “mimesis of types with various formal and expressive tactics,”¹³² to name a few.) Though generally avoided, a direct association of the masque with the English mask ball (popular among the nobility in the 16th and 17th centuries) can actually reveal the dramatic logic of Hejduk’s complex Masque, which opposes that of Nirvana’s.

Take Berlin Masque for example. The cast consists of twenty-eight animistic structures: Wind Tower, Watch Tower, Bell Tower, Clock Tower, Water Tower, Observation Tower, Guest Towers, Pantomime Theater, Reading Theater, Cross Over Bridge, Silo Passage, Book Market, Maze, Masque, Mask Taker, Shopping Booths, Public Facility, Lottery Woman, Waiting House, Caretaker’s House, House for the Eldest, Neighborhood Physician, Arbitration Hall, Conciliator,

Units A and B, Wall Hung Units, and Hedge-Gate. These lively structures occupy strategic positions on the site, which comprises one patch of square and one triangle. The square serves commercial purposes: Shopping Booths, Book Market, etc., whereas the triangle accommodates the arts: Reading Theater, Pantomime Theater, and Public Theater. The site is enclosed by twelve-foot high hedges, gated, and connected by Cross Over Bridge with spiky wings in between. In situ within this double site, the ensemble of Berlin Masque has the appearance of an ecstatic architectural masquerade, each structure a masked player.

The juxtaposition of Nirvana House with Berlin Masque reveals striking differences not only in form but also in mood. In contrast with Nirvana’s absolute geometries, the Berlin Masque’s structures are Medusa-like, with her radiating, squirming hairs of living venomous snakes. Wind Tower has a mop of leather strings blowing in the wind above a body of glass-block. Observation Tower has snaky scarf around its neck. Lottery Woman has sucker-bearing arms around its waist. Masque has stinging tentacles at its tail. Arbitration Hall has wriggling serpentine tubes on top, and so on. These organic features appear so lifelike that one can imagine them moving. The snaky scarf might twirl; the sucker-bearing arms, stinging tentacles and serpentine tubes might wriggle and wave. In comparison, Nirvana House seems perpetually frozen in space.

Figure 85: Berlin Masque: Wind Tower, Observation Tower, and Arbitration Hall.
And, contrasting Nirvana’s silence, Berlin Masque is articulate. This hyperactive architectural ball not only visualizes but verbalizes each of its structure’s functions, histories and stories. “Lottery Woman travels over the sites within her box. She sells the lottery tickets. One puts the money in one of the tubes, it sucks in the money, then a ticket is blown out from the tube… The tickets can not be returned.” Mask Taker, a wooden tower with a parasol sticking above its head, “is responsible for maintaining the Masque. He also collects masks.” Some of the structures are anthropomorphic and gender specific—Lottery Woman is a woman and Mask Taker a man—and others zoomorphic. For example, Cross Over Bridge is beastly, obviously an animal though not one that actually exists in nature. Made of steel painted green, this architectural beast has a prolonged horizontal body of trusses, spiking wings and long legs. It stoops at the edges of the Wilhelmstrasse grazing on grass or drinking water. Consequently pairing verbal descriptions with graphic illustrations, Berlin Masque introduces its complex set of characters.

Figure 86: Berlin Masque: Lottery Woman, Mask Taker, and Cross Over Bridge.

134 Ibid., 146.
135 Ibid., 145.
In diametrical opposition to Nirvana’s silence, Hejduk’s Masque demonstrates architecture’s capacity to narrate stories with images and words. Berlin Masque is expressive and voluble. In fact, on top of its sundry colorful characters and their riveting biographical stories, Hejduk’s structures often break the Masque’s confine, leaving their double site framed by tall hedges in connection with other Masques. They elope to participate in multiple plays. The Towers in the Berlin Masque also play the Tower Hill in the Lancaster/Hanover Masque; the Units A and B in the former are the Silent Observers in the latter. Their unrootedness is indicated by their architectural features: wheels, wings, etc. The Masque’s anthropomorphic or zoomorphic characters seem capable of walking away at will, whereas its other machine-like objects seem ready to be redeployed. Nothing is very fixed in Berlin Masque. With some minor changes of accessories and armors—hair, beaks, helmets, blades, etc.—its characters adjust their costumes and reappear in another ball, complicating their dramas.

Hejduk’s interweaving architectural narratives are manifestly inspired by Italo Calvino’s writing. Berlin Masque was projected for a design competition which opened with this following passage from Calvino’s story of the Maurilia city:

In Maurilia the visitor is invited to view the city and at the same time to look at certain old postcards showing the city as it used to be…

Take care not to let them know that city after city may follow one upon the other on the same spot, with the same name, rising and falling with nothing to say to each other. Sometimes the names of the inhabitants, the sound of their voices, indeed even their faces may remain the same; but the gods who reign under names and over places have gone without a word and in their places strange gods have settled… the old picture postcards do not show Maurilia as it was, they show a different city which just happened to be called Maurilia, as this one is.\textsuperscript{136}

\textsuperscript{136}Hejduk, \emph{Mask of Medusa}, 138.
Just as Maurilia produces city upon city in the same space with divergent lives reflected only in postcards, Hejduk generates Masque after Masque, with their legends mobilized in *Mask of Medusa*, carried on by the escaped wild masked players.

In particular, Cross Over Bridge is pregnant with emotive dramas, the opposite of Nirvana’s emotionless expression. This beastly character connects the threads of an intricate story of Medusa. Outside Berlin Masque, the animal shows up in Devil’s Bridge, where it tells “A Wissahickon Tale.”

```
Mother
Yes,
I want to build a bridge
Girls don’t build bridges
I want to
Besides you are only 13
Father
Yes?
How do you build a bridge?
That depends
On what?
On where you want to build it
Over Devil’s Whirlpool
The Devil don’t need a bridge
I want to build a bridge
Well?
What can I build it of?
Wood and metal spikes
Will you help me?
Yes
```

Here the reader learns the origin of the bridge. And the story continues: The woodsman and his daughter went into the woods to build the bridge. The small animals began to disappear, and so did the woodsman’s daughter eventually. While searching for her, the woodsman came upon a deep red blood flowed off the metal spikes. He thought that the wooden bridge was too

---

137 Ibid., 154.
Figure 87: John Hejduk, Cross Over Bridge from Berlin Masque and Devil's Bridge.
soft to catch the devil and that it needed to be made completely out of metal. He rebuilt the bridge in hopes that the Devil’s wings would get caught in the passage…

Berlin Masque seems to pick up where Devil’s Bridge left off. Cross Over Bridge reappears in steel painted green. So whose are the spiky wings on the bridge? And the legs? Is Medusa the evil-averting force against the Devil? And the Masque an elaborate construct of a multiple mask for none other than her? Is she among the participants of the masked ball, secretly dancing behind from Wind Tower to Lottery Woman to Arbitration Hall (which, one way or another, exhibit Medusa-like features)? Or are these architectural characters varied masks for Medusa? Mystery looms in Hedjuk’s *Masque of Medusa*. A mood of danger and ecstasy intensifies, as question upon question and story upon story sprout from it.

Vis-à-vis the incessant dramas of Hedjuk’s Masque, the Noh drama in Aida’s Nirvana House appears constrained to the extreme. On the surface, this expressionless “architecture of the mask” conforms to the implicit Japanese code of emotionless behavior. But in truth, the house embodies, as it conceals, a dark psychological drama of the architect, which Aida was only able to reveal a decade after the project’s completion. Aida confessed that, at the conception of Nirvana and Annihilation, he was in a heightened state of anxiety, which lingered from his shattering experience visiting Europe for the first time in 1968: “there was something for which I was totally unprepared, and that was the sight of the Latin Quarter in Paris. Students demanding university reforms had destroyed whole rows of trees, and the image I had had of a lovely, verdant cityscape vanished in an instant.”

Shortly afterwards, the Japanese university where Aida taught also became embroiled in student disorders. Aida divulges his fear:

---

I was afraid-afraid of creating. It was a time of insecurity when I did not know what to create and when I myself could not find any answers. I at last produced the Nirvana House and the Annihilation House. Looking back, I see that they reflect only partially digested Buddhist ideas and philosophies that were then fashionable. At the time, however, I was caught up in these systems of thought, and it became my obsession to project such ideas onto works of architecture. This needless to say, was an extremely difficult task. I felt as if I were falling into a bottomless pit. A desire to escape from reality was intermingled with a strong interest in Buddhism. It was only to be expected that under such circumstances I would choose not to express my inner feelings directly in architecture but to deal with matters external to myself in an indirect, ironical manner.\textsuperscript{139}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure88.png}
\caption{Nirvana House, samsaric collage.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{139} Ibid., 16-17.
The confession illuminates the Noh drama in Nirvana House in connection with Aida’s personal struggle to transcend his insecurity and confusion. Now the mask not only serves to conceal emotions but is conceivably entrusted with their exorcism. In this architectural version of Noh play, Nirvana House is the shite (the main character), which echoes the samsaric collage Aida created for the house. In concentric squares, Nirvana takes the center stage, surrounded by a ring of Buddha statues, which are in turn encircled by alternate pictures of Nirvana, the Buddha, and Aida himself, and then again by other Buddhist images. As opposed to Berlin Masque’s convoluted stories and multiple biographical accounts, Nirvana’s autobiographical drama is singular and self-centered, narrated by one humble abode, with a lesson and a goal, just like the Noh play.

Contrastingly, like the English masked ball, Berlin Masque is de-centered and has many foci. The Masque hosts a motley crew, allegorically and figuratively speaking, of machines (Clock Tower, Bell Tower, Wind Tower, Water Tower, etc.), humans (The Mask Taker, The Lottery Woman, Neighborhood Physician, etc.) and animals (Cross Over Bridge, Arbitration Hall, etc.). In this elaborate Masque, a reader is made to forever catch the elusive monster and apprehend the mystery without success. One simply meanders from one masked structure to another, one poem and one story to the next—eyes constantly ricocheting off of every structure, led to wander.

In the end, despite their distinct ways of masking, Nirvana and Berlin Masque nonetheless converge on their concealment of truth. One stares into Nirvana House’s expressionless face in simple geometries and sees nothing—certainly not Aida’s postwar insecurity and struggle. The lack of detail renders the mask silent. One can only project one’s thoughts onto it—the Buddha’s expressionless face, the architect’s chirpy smile, etc. Again, one
traces the affluent expressions of the convoluted Masque with multiple structures and extensive stories that bleed into one another, but still finds no certainty. Things are not at all what they appear. A tower is never just a tower. A bridge is never just a bridge, and so on. Whether in silence or commotion, all remains masked.

Aida’s conception of “Architecture of the Mask” changed direction in House Like A Die (1974), where Noh recedes, and silence gives way to playfulness. In a sense, Nirvana’s theatrical metaphor has exorcised Aida’s insecurity and uncertainty. The Noh mask is now off. Aida puts on a new play.
House Like A Die, as its name suggests, mimics the form of a die. There are respectively two, three, four and five windows on each of its vertical surfaces (with paired wood-louvered shutters outside)—the square openings replace the typically round holes in a die. The lower of the two diagonals is slightly elongated in the middle to accommodate a door. In addition, the roof is punctured by a skylight and the bottom, with six foundation supports—the cube alights on these supports. All the openings and the head-pieces of the foundations are of the same size square, except for the entrance (though it has the same louvered shutters outside).

Although silence is eclipsed by the vivid form of a die, the logic of mask still persists. Along with the house, Aida publishes “Twelve Memoranda on the House Like A Die:”

1. By giving independent meaning to the outer membranes of a form it is possible to establish the independence of the form itself. It is essential that forms have their own distinctive characteristics.
2. When the outer form stops trying to relate the drama of the daily lives and functions that take place within the building, it becomes independent and relates things about itself.
3. House Like A Die express the independence of architecture and the multiple meanings of dice.
4. This house was created according to the system used in dice and says no more than that dice are dice.
5. Dice have many associations: chance, gambling, suspicion, whiteness, cubical form, and so on.
6. This is what I call architecture of the mask.
7. The outward-directed faces of the die are the mask of the house.
8. If the façade of the individual building is a mask, the city is an aggregation of various kinds of masks.
9. Sliding the shape of the die into architectural form is more than mere analogy; it is a way to expand the metaphysical meaning of architecture.
10. The idea of suitability of form—what is suitable to the residence, what is suitable to the kindergarten—has become well established, but it ought to be one of the aim of architecture to overthrow this concept.
11. House Like A Die has its own limitations. Whether those limits can be surpassed depends on the awareness of the architect.
12. Architecture is in the middle of an age of groping attempts to find meaning. I feel that we must do something though all our efforts may be futile.

These twelve points seem to form more of a manifesto than a memoranda. The pith of the declaration surfaces in memorandum 6, which states: “This is what I call architecture of the mask.” However, the word silence never once shows up. Instead, in memorandum 7, Aida redefines the mask as “the outward directed faces of the die,” to which he also refers, in memorandum 1, as “the outer membranes in a form.” Then, as if to affirm the “membrane” character of House Like A Die, as opposed to volume and solidity, Aida chooses an unusual architectural representation called okoshi, commonly used by Japanese carpenters but not architects.

In an okoshi drawing, various planar elements of a house—floors, ceilings, exterior and interior elevations—are laid out as surfaces in one single composite plan. Similar to the unfolding of a cube into six connected squares, except for doubling the planar elements to show...
the interior as well, this method of representation results in twelve connected squares, sometimes with extra squares for more details. Following this convention of okoshi, Aida presents Die as a collection of squares adjoined to one another in a particular order. The center four squares—respectively with 5, 3, 2, and 4 openings—represent the four facades of Die. Connected to the left square (with 5 windows) above is the roof plan, and the second left (3 windows) below, the foundation plan. These squares are surrounded by another set, which shows Die’s interior. This representation of okoshi reinforces a superficial reading of House Like A Die. As if it were only a sum of planes, the bedrooms, the bath, the living and the dining are pressed onto one continuous strip. The house therefore flattens unto a membrane/mask without content/space.

(Aida also shows Nirvana and Annihilation House in okoshi drawings.)

Following the definition of the mask in memorandum 1, Aida elaborates on the meaning of the “architecture of the mask” in memorandum 2. No longer in direct comparison with the silent form of the Noh mask, “architecture of the mask” is now taken to mean an independent building envelope with a distinct character, dissociated from the function within. On that account, the emotionless character of Nirvana still applies, but only as a subcategory of this more expansive definition of the mask.

Earlier on in ArchiteXt 1, Aida hints at his conception of the mask and its forthcoming transition from silence to play and humor. In the symbols of the die (play), the house (architecture), torii (religion) and the earth (everyday drama), “architecture of the mask” is formulated as the earth enclosed in Nirvana House’s impassive envelope (in the 4th square). The membrane is detached from the drama within—the geometry of the sphere inscribed in the cube only comes in contact with its container in one point on each side. Next, the house transforms
into a die (in the 5th square), whose holes are filled with earths, as if offering windows into all sorts of dramas. Accordingly, Die supersedes Nirvana; play replaces silence.

Figure 91: Takefumi Aida, ArchiteXt 1, 1971.

Though similar in geometrical abstraction, Die and Nirvana evidence very different characters, mostly as a result of the disparate images they evoke (of course, Nirvana’s unembellished, smooth white walls with clean-cut geometries vs. Die’s textured exterior with wooden louvered shutters also contributes to the distinction). As opposed to the Buddha’s sacred representation, Die has mainly secular associations, as memorandum 5 points out: chance, gambling, suspicion, and so on. This suggests Die’s play to be less innocent than child’s play. In fact, mischief, humor, even defiance can be discerned in House Like A Die. Here a sense of lighthearted negation comes through the humor and absurdity of transmogrifying a house into an enormous die.
Masking subversion with humor, Aida’s mischievous brand of play indeed starts with his jesting in ArchiteXt Extra. Aida composes nine architectural riddles by manipulating known objects, structures and places. He provides the answers at the end, showing the origins of the manipulated designs, to ensure that the reader gets his humor. Aida cleverly uses formal setup to highlight the absurdity of his jests. He constructs these architectural riddles in standard hardline drawings for a construction document, framed in the title block of Takefumi Aida Architect & Associates, and annotated with scale, page number, date, and certified by the architect’s notary stamp. This false drawing collection ranges from apartment tower elevations, house and housing complex plans, site plans, to a wall-section detail, each composed with great care to feign authenticity. But the disguise of formality quickly dissolves in the humor of their contents.

Created in the same period as Nirvana and Annihilation House, Aida’s architectural riddles predictably involve religious themes, but they are unexpectedly rendered in a blasphemous manner (though only in jest). One design literally, and the other figuratively, turns a religious structure upside down. “Chateau Himeji” [シャトーひめじ] presents a wall-section detail rendered in ink with fine penmanship, showing structural (such as concrete slabs and wood beans), nonstructural (such as glass, mullions, wall insulation, blinds, and floorings), and mechanical elements (ducts, ventilation, etc.) in accordance with the architectural graphic standards. Every pertinent dimension and specification is called out in immaculate handwriting. Such formality and fastidiousness makes the design seem credible. But in truth, the wall section only stems from flipping a pagoda (the many-tiered Japanese Buddhist temple) upside down. In a way, Chateau Himeji is a one-liner born out of numerous, laborious lines.
Figure 92: Takefumi Aida, Chateau Himeji, 1972.
Figure 93: Takefumi Aida, *Torii* Apartment aka Palace Good, 1972.
Similarly impious, “Torii Apartment/Palace Good" [パレス・グッド・パッド] crams the space in between torii, blocking the gateway to the shrine. Aida hangs four rows of apartment units in between the posts. As a result, the sacred gateway is not only impassable but immoral. This symbolic structure now caters to everyday activities. In between, the residents sleep and mate, feed and excrete. Divinity becomes humanity. The sacred meets the secular. No act is too obscene or taboo to be performed in front of a holy shrine. In this sacrilegious twist, torii descends to everyday drama.

On top of profaning sacred Japanese architecture, Aida’s jests disparage Japanese emotionlessness. “Chateau Himeji” and “Torii Apartment/Palace Good” necessarily provoke laughter, which, though a natural human reaction, is customarily deemed inappropriate in Japan. By tradition, there exists a hierarchy of emotions. Laughter (笑い, warai), associated with the emotion of happiness, is rated lower than other expressions—even below anger or grief. The reasons are not obvious or rational. According to Shokichi Oda, writer and vice president of Japan Society for Laughter and Humor Studies, it may be connected with the forbidden subject of sexuality, a topic commonly used to generate a primitive form of laughter (Azuma’s example of teasingly placing/misplacing his hand to hint at the sex organ in his naked body profile in ArchiteXt can be seen in this light). Consequently, laughter ends up being branded with a similar taboo. On the other hand, the other side of laughing—that is, being laughed at—carries enormous stigma in Japanese society, because the person doing the laughing oftentimes intends to insult the other person, argues anthropologist Ruth Benedict, author of Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture. To laugh makes one offensive. Therefore in

141 The name involves a word play: いい in torii has the same sound as the word “good” in Japanese, and the word for apartment in Japanese sounds like “bad” in English.

consideration of both civility and self-interest, laughter in either direction—to laugh or to humor others—is refrained from.\textsuperscript{143} (But this is not to say that Japanese did not enjoy laughing, but rather that their conventional wisdom and culture prescribe where one should or should not laugh. Shokichi Oda coins the term \textit{warai no ba}, 笑いの場, “laughter places” to denote where laughter is socially permissible, such as in the private gathering for drinking and at \textit{hanami}, flowers-viewing.\textsuperscript{144})

However, in the Meiji period, a debate over the values and ethical status of Japanese humor arose, stirred up by Japanese writers. On the one hand, the feeling that humor is bad, as an insult that necessarily involves a victim, continued to form the negative end of the dilemma. The other side argued that humor is good, a badge of humanity that Japanese should wear proudly. The debate eventually subsided, but only to resurface with a vengeance in the 1960s. In particular, in the second wave of the humor debate, writer Ui Mushu (winner of the first Prize for Humorous Literature in 1969) loudly condemns the Japanese as “the most humorless people on earth.”\textsuperscript{145} In like manner, comic playwright Iizawa Tadasu calls the Japanese \textit{“homo majime-dens”}, \textsuperscript{146} (\textit{majime} means serious or earnest), with a reference to Huizinga’s \textit{Homo Ludens}. So


\textsuperscript{144} Oda, “Laughter and the Traditional Japanese Smile,” 18.


with even greater vigor, pro-humor Japanese writers produced extensive literature involving wit, sarcasm, nonsense, irony, and so forth.\textsuperscript{147}

In light of this discourse, Aida’s architectural jests fully support the literary humor debate, negating the idea that laughter is low in the hierarchy of emotions in Japanese tradition. Flipping a pagoda in Chateau Himeji and cramming a \textit{torii} in Torii Apartment/Palace Good, Aida is crying out, “I am not \textit{homo majime-dens}; I am \textit{homo ludens!”}

Aida’s jesting also indirectly rebuffs the growing trend towards architectural consumerism in Japan. In the second wave, the debate shifted its focus from the Meiji controversy’s attempt to secure a place for humor in Japanese literature to attempting to prove that humor in Japan existed but was in decline. Ui Mushu again writes, “We are losing a great many things as a result of the sham prosperity of economic growth with mass production and mass consumerism. Humor is one of these.”\textsuperscript{148} In the expansion of Japanese consumerism, humor was deprecated for its lack of utilitarian value, and hence devalued—if it had ever been valued in the first place. In contrast, Aida’s unproductive designs in \textit{ArchiteXt} Extra value nothing \textit{but} humor.

In fact, Aida’s subversive humor strikes still farther. In the architectural context, his jests also negate the modernist equation “form follows function.” In “Plaza S & E” [プラザ S & E], Aida fits a housing complex onto the footprint of the Tokyo Shinkansen (bullet-train) station; each single train of the stationed locomotives houses an apartment. Again in “Maison Sheridan” [メゾン ド シェリダン], he jams a single-family house into an

\textsuperscript{147} For details of the Japanese humor debates, see Marguerite Wells, \textit{Japanese Humour} (New York: St. Martins Press, 1997).

\textsuperscript{148} Mushu, \textit{Nihonjin no warai}. Quoted in Wells, \textit{Japanese Humor}, 147.
Figure 94: Takefumi Aida, Plaza S & E, 1972.
Figure 95: Takefumi Aida, Maison Sheridan, 1972.
Figure 96: Takefumi Aida, *ArchiteXi Extra*, 1972.
American M511 tank—the house has no windows but heavy arms: a large-caliber main gun and secondary machine guns.

Significantly, Aida’s non-architecture implies the course of his architecture. His 2-D (readable) humor expands into 3-D (playable) constructs, and eventually solidifies in House Like A Die, where a real home is packed into the shell of a die. Inside, there are two floors: an open space for living and dining on the first, and on the second, three bedrooms (each six tatami in size) plus a bath. Spiral stairs connect the two levels, with polka dot wallpaper adorning a significant part of their surfaces. The typical residential programs are stuffed into a box, which “says no more than that dice are dice” (memorandum 4). Accordingly, this same method of stuffing, which applies to a tank and a train station (in drawing), reappears to a die (in building), where form comes first and function follows after.

Absurd as it seems, Aida’s humor series illuminates the design rationale behind his transformed mask of play. In “Maison Sheridan,” echoing memorandum 2, “the outer form stops trying to relate the drama of the daily lives and functions that take place within.” This tank-house fully embraces the principle. Life in “Maison Sheridan” is not just concealed but hermetically sealed off in its heavy shell. Similarly dysfunctional though not to the extent of unbreathability, House Like A Die dictates the placement and numbers of windows solely by mapping and matching the spots in a die. Its exterior envelope ignores the interior room’s capacity for optimal light, undermining the windows’ utilitarian purpose. Aida brazenly declares:
Figure 97: House Like A Die, 1st floor and 2nd floor interior.
Architects are too often the slaves of function. That is, functional demands become paramount for them, and architects allow function to determine architectural forms… I wished to conceal architectural function within architectural form.149

In House Like Die, utility clearly defers to humor. Aida’s message is clear: form must stop following function.

... 

What should form follow then? Aida grappled with the impasse of modernism: “I was considering how it might be possible to escape from the narrow standards of modernism or to make up for what was missing in modernism when I happen to think of the word ‘playfulness’… I came to wonder whether it was not a consideration of ‘play’ that was lacking in modernism.”150

In a jocular retort, Aida proposes his own aphorism: “form follows fiction.” He explains, in Japanese, the word *fiction* can mean four things: (1) imagination, concoction, fabrication [想像、虚構、仮作]; (2) literature that describes imaginary events and people [仮作物、小説、小説作法]; (3) lie [つくりごと、つくり話]; (4) hypothesis [擬制、仮説] (especially in the context of law). His “form follows fiction” observes the first definition.151

Aida obviously chose the word *fiction* to rhyme with *function*, although *play* seems to more appositely describe his form-making. Play involves imagination, concoction and fabrication. In fact, both Johan Huizinga and Roger Caillois—Aida’s sources of inspiration—

theorize play as fictive. In *Homo Ludens*, Huizinga describes play as a free activity situated in the unreality of play: “a stepping out of ‘real’ life.”\(^{152}\) Similarly, in *Man, Play and Games*, Caillois characterizes play as “a second reality or of straightforward unreality in relation to everyday life.”\(^{153}\) Both authors distinguish play from the practical, mundane living of everyday life—play as outside of, yet contingent upon, reality; it begins in reality, but moves on to an unreality beyond.

This unreality of play has its own spatiality and temporality. In terms of locality, Huizinga argues that the unreality is secluded: “it is ‘played out’ within certain limits of place.”\(^{154}\) In terms of duration, it is limited: “play begins, and then at a certain moment it is ‘over.’ It plays itself to an end.”\(^{155}\) The seclusion and temporality distinguish themselves from the reality of an indefinite continuum. Evidently, during the conception of Toy Block House (TBH), Aida immerses himself in this world of play, and yet he tampers with the idiosyncratic spatiality and temporality of it to devise playable architecture.

Among his Toy Block House projects, Aida creates three toys: Aida Box, Aida Block, and Dollhouse IX (non-architecture), and nine houses (architecture), based on playing building blocks. Essentially a puzzle, Aida Box (1981) consists of interlocking pieces that make up a big 1 x 1 x 1 meter cube. The goal is to restore the cube. To play means to assemble the exact


\(^{155}\) Ibid.
Figure 98: Takefumi Aida, Toy Block House I-X, 1978-1984.
Figure 99: Aida Box, 1981, drawing courtesy of Takefumi Aida.
pieces together. But in the opposite direction, the cube decomposes into a useful set of furniture: a table, four chairs, four storages units and one lighting fixture. Utility is consequently built into the puzzle—play in one direction, practicality in the other. Thus reversed, play extends into reality indefinitely. Aida Box (the lighting fixture) illuminates, (the storage) contains, (the table and the chair set) configures and reconfigures one’s living world. Via real-scale playable components, the architectural puzzle affects our built environment.

By comparison, Aida Block (1981), modeled after a child’s toy brick, is purely fictional. The toy is solely for play—until the architect uses it for actual design of inhabitable houses. The set consists of wooden blocks in basic shapes: square, triangle, cylinder, etc., in primary colors or white. The pieces pack neatly into a long narrow cardboard box. Just like a common child’s game, playing Aida Block means selecting and combining any number of the pieces to make an analogous form of a house (or an animal, etc.). As a demonstration, Aida puts together two houses, Toy Block House V and IV, using all the pieces (the whole collection was showcased at
Matsuheya Design Gallery in 1981). Until this point, Aida Block, plus TBH V and IV, belong entirely to the unreality of play.

Then, Dollhouse IX obscures the fiction of a toy again. However, unlike Aida Box, its distortion happens in the unreality of play and is sealed within it. As its name suggests, Dollhouse IX is a playable miniature house. Aida designed the toy for a dollhouse design competition sponsored by Architectural Design. AD editor Andreas Papadakis launched the competition in hopes of soliciting good, customized designs (after failing to find a satisfactory model for his daughter). The competition proceeded in two rounds. The first round was opened to all, beginning in 1981. It drew 260 entries from 27 countries. The second included winners from the first round plus invited architects across continents—Aida and Tadao Ando of Japan, Ron Herron of Archigram from England, Jean Nouvel of France, Charles Moore of USA, among others. Apart from the official, all-male jury, the competition invited several girls to cast their votes; they presumably voted on the basis of “how fun they were,” architectural merits notwithstanding. Predictably, the two winners’ lists had no overlap. The young girls apparently shared none of the adult male jurors’ architectural interests—Aida’s entry won second prize.156 A juror (Robert Maxwell) commented on Aida’s Dollhouse IX:

The designer of real-life toy houses should be at an advantage in toy-life house. He was! His entry is delightfully balanced between the child’s plaything and the architect’s play: since his built work deliberately seeks the archetypal forms in the collective unconscious where memories of childhood actualize and make personal the characteristic stereotypes of inherited culture, he has been able to fuse the then and now in a privileged way.157

---

157 Ibid., 6.
Figure 101: Takefumi Aida, Dollhouse IX, 1983.
Dollhouse IX shows a tripartite arrangement. There is a dining and a drawing room in
the front, and in the back, a Japanese-style room. The two front rooms are framed by walls of
stacked blocks, which in turn support a roof of a large triangular block. In contrast, the back
room is the traditional Japanese roof supported by four columns at the four corners. The mix of
eastern and western architectural styles recurs in the interior. A fireplace (symbolic of the
western home) occupies the middle of the three rooms, which is topped by a chimney in a
stepped profile, whereas the interior of the Japanese room receives a tokonoma, an alcove for
display of flower arrangements, ceramics or calligraphy works (symbolic of the Japanese home).
Facing the tokonoma sits a shire [closet] on the right and a kazaridana [niche] on the left. There
is a hearth, above which is suspended a hook from the beam for hanging the kama [kettle]. By
and large, the composition follows that of the traditional tea-ceremony room.

Figure 102: Takefumi Aida, Dollhouse IX, 1983.
Unlike Aida’s earlier attempt to mask function, Dollhouse IX purposefully exposes it. In customary dollhouse fashion, each room has a wall removed to allow clear view and access to the interior and hence the interior life, each with the explicit purpose of accommodating typical activities in Japanese home: the drawing room for receiving and entertaining guests, the dining room for informal eating, the tatami room for private living, etc. As opposed to Aida Block’s use for creative play (creating a house, a horse, etc.), Dollhouse IX presupposes the user to be a girl in her imputed grown-up role of a Japanese housewife busied with everyday domestic chores: serving tea, tidying rooms, arranging and rearranging furniture, and so forth. Her life takes place inside—fittingly, the word wife in Japanese, okusan, literally means “Mrs. Inside.” The clear view of the dollhouse’s interior makes explicit the adult world in microcosm, which prefigures the typical life of a traditional Japanese woman.

Leaving the question of gender bias aside, this miniature toy house, vis-à-vis the real Toy Block House, introduces the literary strategy of fiction to architecture, where the reality of everyday life and the unreality of play are transposed to and fro. “Miniature” as a literary device, argues Gaston Bachelard, can lead the reader across reality into fantasy (The Poetics of Space)—as shown in the capacity of topophilia in the beggar fairy’s house hidden under a tuft of grass (Tremor des fèves), the wedded life in a flower of a botanist with a magnifying glass (Periwinkle), and the dispensation of power in the space of a horse’s ear (Petit Poucet).158 Similarly instigating a transaction between small (a toy) and large (a house), but in geometries rather than in words, the architecture of Dollhouse IX entices the participant into the unreality of play—although within, it is the reality of everyday life one imitates, e.g., serving tea and tidying rooms in the dollhouse. In contrast, Toy Block House reverses the logic of “miniature” in its

transaction between large and small, triggering an opposite switch (between the reality of life and the unreality of play). Comparable to the literary device of miniature, the image of a toy house opens a door into the sphere of imagination. Re-entering childhood, one transcends everyday routine—eating, sleeping, housecleaning, and so forth—to (pretended) play, where one is free and carefree. To live in the actually built Toy Block House means to play dollhouse in real scale.

Of course, a stretch of the imagination is required. This reverse transaction between Dollhouse and Toy Block House echoes the reciprocal play of Jules Supervielle’s poem, as quoted by Bachelard:

The man, the woman, the children  
At the aerial table  
Resting on a miracle  
That seeks its definition.159

But soon after an explosion of unreality, the poet comes back down to earth:

I am back again at my usual table  
On the cultivated earth  
The one that yields corn and flocks  
...  
I recognized the faces about me  
With their lights and shades of truth.160

Here the poetic center moves freely between the sky and the earth: the family table becomes an aerial table, with the sun as its lamp; the usual table resumes, grounded on the cultivated land in the light of truth. What serves as a pivot for the transformation, Bachelard argues, is the reciprocal image of “the lamp-sun” over against “the sun-lamp,” which by turns is

160 Ibid.
earthly and aerial, familiar and cosmic. This poetic transaction is active in both directions—as opposed to the miniature worlds of the beggar fairy’s house, the botanist’s flower, the horse’s ear, etc. The poem thus exercises and restores elasticity to the imagination. “The image can be said to represent the sum of the direction that enlarges and the direction that concentrates.”\textsuperscript{161} Transposing between two worlds, in the sky or on the earth, the poetic space is versatile and ever mobile.

Similarly transposing between the reality of life and the unreality of play, Toy Block House assimilates this poetic elasticity in architectural space. Comparable to the pivot of “the lamp-sun” vs. “the sun-lamp,” the pairing of toy-house vs. house-toy destabilizes Toy Block House’s architectural identity, stimulating oscillation between reality and unreality. Vis-à-vis Dollhouse IX’s microcosm of everyday life, Toy Block House fashions a macrocosm of play. In Toy Block House, play and everyday are interchangeable; the realistic and the fantastic are correlated. One is free to cross their borders.

\ldots

Apparently, Aida was not the only one to step out of the reality and enter the unreality of play. Prior to Toy Block House, Anti-Art and Non-Art were already impregnated with play. The Fluxus artists were especially enthused about creating games, puzzles and toys. Ay-O designed his own game, “Finger Box” (1964), which comprises a suitcase of small wooden boxes with various objects inside: beads, bristle brushes, hair, cotton balls, nails, nylon stockings, feathers, sponges, etc. Each box has a hole on top into which the viewer inserts a finger and feels the

\textsuperscript{161} Ibid., 171.
distinct tactile sensations of the contents in the box. Ay-O’s game is cognitive. Finger Box solicits the viewer to touch and guess its contents. The Fluxus artists also explored variations of common board games; for instance, Yoko Ono envisioned an all-transparent version of *go* (literally meaning “small stone”), a strategic Japanese game of territorial possession and capture based upon simple rules.

In addition, Takako Saito devoted herself to redesigning the chess game, twisting the conventional format by adding various sensory inputs. Her chess redesign series begins with “Nut & Bolt” (1964), which consists of a wooden board with various sizes of nuts and bolts combined to stand as the game pieces, followed by “Grinder Chess” (1965), which similarly contains six different kinds of metal grinder tops paired in two colors and a wood board with sixty-four small holes just big enough to hold the grinder tops in place. Imbued with the do-it-yourself spirit of a hardware store, both “Nut & Bolt” and “Grinder Chess” stimulate a coarse sensation in the fingers as one moves the pieces, adding a tactile component to the cerebral game.

Figure 103: Ay-O, Finger Box, 1964; Takako Saito, Grinder Chess, 1965; Liquid Chess, 1975.
Saito’s subsequent designs mandate other senses. “Sound Chess” (1965) contains six different sound-making objects in identical wooden boxes, which can only be differentiated by the volume and quality of their sound. Similarly, identical in appearance, the pieces of “Weight Chess” (1965) differ only in weight, whereas “Smell Chess” (1965) consists of uniform glass containers with liquids of varying odors, and “Wine Chess” (1970) involves wine tasting. Dispensing with particularized forms for every piece, these chess games downplay the visual, instead demanding other cognitive labor—to listen, weigh, sniff, taste, etc.—with the necessary assistance of memory. The player is destined to be continually interrupted during the game. In “Smell Chess,” for instance, one sniffs the pieces in question before taking a space or capturing an opponent’s piece. If one loses track while pondering a move, the act of sniffing must recur, the routine consequently interrupted though it observes the same rules. Between the thought processes inherent to chess are inserted cognitive intervals of sniffing, listening, weighing, tasting, etc. to firmly engage the participants. In Saito’s chess sets, art equates with participatory play and becomes inviting.162

In Aida Block, participatory play expands exponentially, where the unreality of play transforms into a building reality—non-architecture (the toy/design-tool) extends to playable architecture (a working model) and to an actual building (Toy Block House). Pertinently called Toy Block House Zero, this toy represents the origin of Aida’s Toy Block House. A house emerges out of stacking and balancing geometrical blocks based on trial and error. Since anyone can play with toy blocks, Aida invites his clients to actively participate in designing their own houses. Design therefore becomes a playful joint adventure. Once the form is settled, the

architect then translates the design into architectural drawings, making rooms and fitting programs into the space blocked out by the geometric solids (echoing the method of House Like A Die) and followed by typical construction documentation, administration, and so forth. Similar to Saito’s chess games, Aida Block turns building creation into a comprehensible common game. The toy consequently demythologizes the process of design, making it transparent, egalitarian, and fun.

Yet in terms of form—both design and play form—and aesthetic, Aida Block has more affinity with Bauhaus artist Alma Siedhoff-Buscher’s “Bauhaus Bauspiel (Ship) Building Blocks” (1923).163 Many Bauhaus teachers designed toys; Paul Klee created puppetry for his son, Oskar Schlemmer, a jointed doll for his daughter, Ludwig Hirchfeld Mack, spinning tops for his students, among others. In particular, Buscher’s Bauspiel Building Blocks (as part of her design for the children’s room at the “Haus am Horn” exhibition at Bauhaus) bears the strong imprint of the De Stijl’s abstract, economical style in color and form (adding some curve shapes and green color to it). As its instructions read, the toy is to be used “to build a ship, a slope, a gate, or what have you.”164 Comparable to Aida Block, structures consequently derived from stacking basic geometrical elements create meaning and function determined by their context. “Depending on placement, a yellow stick turns anchor or oar, lever or mast.”165 Likewise in Toy Block House, a block can mean a door, a column, a stair, or a roof.

Moreover, Aida Block and Bauspiel share the same kind of geometrical home in their packaging. Bauspiel Building Blocks are cut from two pieces of wood, whose shapes are restored

163 During her training at the legendary Bauhaus in 1924, Alma Siedhoff-Buscher designed this building game, which was produced in different versions afterwards in the Bauhaus workshops.
165 Ibid.
when they return to their box, which seems almost identical in size and proportion to Aida Block’s box—both toys come from a simple, slender block. Restoration hence makes the toy a puzzle: “Bauspiel itself is about constructing and dismantling equally; in fact, dismantling becomes constructing and vice versa, for stashing the blocks away into their box is a puzzle that requires concentration and acumen.”166 This dual play applies to Aida Block and is also explicit in Aida Box.167

167 Upon this notion, another toy bears special mention, whose aesthetic and function manifest a combination of Aida Block and Aida Box: Modulon (1984) by German designer Jo Niemeyer. Modulon divides up a cube into sixteen building bricks of seven different masses in the dimensions of the golden ratio. In one direction, the toy can be arranged to form many different shapes (like Aida Block), and in the other, it recomposes into a simple cube (like Aida Box).
Beyond their common form of play and De Stijl aesthetic, Bauspiel and Aida Block’s western and eastern differentiation breaks down in the realm of psychological meaning and reflections. Writing about Bauspiel, art historian Christine Mehring quotes Walter Benjamin and argues: “Surrounded by a giant world, children playfully create their own, suitable to them and small; the adult, however, whom the real surrounds relentlessly, threateningly, seizes the world’s horrors through its scaled-down image. The trivialization of an unbearable existence played a significant part in the growing interest in toys and books after the end of the war.” Likewise, the postwar Japanese artists and architects show extraordinary fascination with toys and play, from Saito’s chess games and The Play’s frisky voyages to Aida’s architectural puzzle and toys. A safe haven is thusly demarcated by the secluded spatiality and limited temporality of play. Conceivably, the scaled-down world of Aida’s playable architecture provides a brief respite from the instability and the unpredictability of life, where disasters, man-made and natural, can suddenly arise, razing a vigorous city to the ground. But absorbed in play, one crosses over into not only fantasy but safety, oblivious to the extreme cruelty of life. Contrary to Metabolism’s attempt to sublimate war trauma into mega-structures on a tabula rasa, Aida conjures up control in small-scale playthings. Aida Block boils architecture down to one rule: stacking. When play ends, the toy gathers and recollects scattered pieces into one box. This ultimate control and simplification reveals Aida’s play as another form of masking—to conceal the unbearable existence, the world’s horrors, and the architect’s anxiety about them. Although seemingly divergent from Noh play, deep down, Aida’s toy play functions likewise.

De Stijl’s influence upon Aida in Aida Block (non-architecture: a toy) becomes explicit in his House of Mondrian Pattern (architecture: a house). Aida attempted to translate Piet Mondrian’s painting “Rhombus: Colored Surface with a Gray Picture”\(^{169}\) (1919) into a building, by mapping its lozenge and grid in a one-to-one relationship to derive the house’s floor plan. For Aida, this was a game. “Planning the house was like solving a puzzle,”\(^{170}\) says Aida. “I played a game to see how a two-dimensional world might be translated into three-dimensional architectural space.”\(^{171}\) This game took place (in 1980) in-between the Toy Block House series (1978-1984), when thoughts of play obviously preoccupied Aida.

Predicated upon play, Mondrian Pattern runs counter to John Hejduk’s Diamond House, which also references Mondrian’s work, but instead of a literal mapping, explores the artist’s 45-degree tilted canvas figuratively. In his article “Introduction to Diamond Catalog,” Hejduk highlights this 45-degree tilt as the cause of disruption between Mondrian and Theo Van Doesburg. Initially, by tipping the internal right angle relationships within the canvas, Van Doesburg destroys the original internal 90 degrees that run parallel with the edges of the canvas. As a retort, Mondrian tips the canvas but maintains the internal right angle relationships (as far as the observer is concerned). Fascinated with the De Stijlists’ painterly polemics, Hejduk introduces Mondrian’s spatial logic to building design without referencing any specific painting (as Aida did).\(^{172}\)

\(^{169}\) Aka “Composition with Grid VII (Lozenge)” and “Lozenge: Color Planes with Gray Lines.”


\(^{171}\) Ibid.

Figure 106: House of Mondrian Pattern, 1980, based on Piet Mondrian’s paintings.
Figure 107: Takefumi Aida, House of Mondrian Pattern, 1980.
Despite their shared artistic influence, Aida’s (eastern) and Hejduk’s (western) architectural interpretations are worlds apart, one manifesting chaos and the other order. Extruding Mondrian’s grid into walls, Aida derives a maze of miscellaneous, misaligned rooms. To emphasize this painterly grid, Aida adds a surplus of structurally redundant columns to the house’s bearing-wall structure. To accentuate the painting’s original pattern, transparent screens, glass doors and openings are inserted into the solid walls. As a result, one can see the entrance hall, living room, courtyard, and tatami rooms in relation to one another. One can even see through several rooms from the center of the house. Aida also uses accent walls and decorates ceilings and cabinets in the De Stijl fashion. In effect, House of Mondrian Pattern is disorienting. Aida hangs a partial reproduction of “Rhombus: Colored Surface with a Gray Picture” at the house’s entrance to serve as a map to its kaleidoscopic interior complex.
In contradistinction, Hejduk’s Diamond House re-envision an orderly grid within a lozenge. Rather than an overflow of space from one room to the next, each room is clearly demarcated; each serves only one specific function, e.g., a piano room, a dining room, a spiral staircase. There are three variants of this spatial theme. Diamond House A inscribes four complete squares in the middle of a diamond. The lines of its grid intersect at one point in the center. In the opposite direction, they stretch to the edges of the diamond, which truncates the rest of its incomplete squares. In a reiteration, Diamond House B shifts this internal orthogonal grid by half a square, resulting in a cross shape consisting of five squares in the middle of the diamond. Therefore the center is a square instead of a point (like in version A). In Diamond Museum C, walls dissolve. A grid of columns hint at the same grid, within which fragments of vertical dividers are deployed. Incorporating this exact grid framework, all three variants of A B and C show a lucid spatial organization, as opposed to Aida’s kaleidoscopic interior complex.

Besides their contrasting approaches to organizing interior space, their use of colors accentuates the distinction between chaos and orderliness. Aida paints all the beams, columns, baseboards, and floors in metallic silver to make the grid apparent but neutral in character. He then applies red, blue and yellow, in Mondrianesque fashion, to certain sections of the walls, ceilings, screens, cabinet and furniture, with the majority in white. Consequently, these dispersed color patches throughout the interior cause further disorientation. By contrast, for example, in Diamond House A, Hejduk paints the structure-construction in gray, and the walls as well as all the interior elements’ vertical surfaces (furniture included) in white. He then orders colors in space in the extreme by dividing up the house vertically into four zones: 0 to 18”, 18” to 36”, 36” to 54”, and above. All horizontal planes within the first band are painted blue; the
second, red; the third, yellow; and white above. Accordingly, the colors slice the space like knives, creating a vertical datum and optimizing the house’s spatial logic.

The strongest disparity between Mondrian Pattern and Diamond House happens at their peripheral treatments. Hejduk encloses Diamond House A with vertical operable panels, which pivot up to 45 degrees. When open, the panels run parallel to the house’s orthogonal grid; closed, they intersect the interior walls at a 45 or 135 degree angle. This strategy poses a challenge to the Cubists’ interest in strong centralization of figures upon a canvas, with decreasing activity towards the periphery of the field, to which Hejduk alludes in his “Introduction to Diamond Catalogue.” The tension heightens at Diamond House’s perimeter, as its relationship between the inside and the edges vacillates, causing constant shifts. Its 45 degree tilt intensifies that instability. Hejduk argues, “A square, when tipped at an angle of 45 degrees, loses its previous static orientation. The four corners immediately become charged and filled with maximum tension”—in contrast to the non-directional field of a squared square, biased toward equilibrium. By extension, the rotation of a cubic volume at 45 degrees also causes a break in the equilibrium. Therefore deprived of frontality, Diamond House confronts the observer with a convergent (vertical) edge (at the corner of the house and center of its front facade). One can never rest one’s gaze, and is constantly propelled to move aside and about the house.

---

173 Ibid.
House of Mondrian Pattern, on the other hand, favors equilibrium. Although Aida meticulously orchestrates his recreation of Mondrian’s grid inside, outside he abruptly cuts the lozenge in half. This dissection results in a triangular plan and a broad front façade. The house thus appears to be in perfect balance at its front. In addition, as opposed to Hejduk’s operable enclosure capable of either preserving or dissolving the edges in the 45 degree angle, Aida erases the equilateral edges, leaving the staggered rooms in a zigzag profile to hint at the original lozenge shape. In the end, he adds a garden plan based on Mondrian’s “Composition in Black, White, Yellow and Red,” adjoining it to the triangular footprint of the house to arrive at an arrow shape (in plan). Thus moored and stabilized by the rectangle, all forces of gyration inherent in the diamond are canceled out.

Into this Mondrian-inspired design Aida injects an anti-thesis which distinctly expresses his eastern and western differentiation. (Hejduk also introduces a second system, but it remains
geometrical; he overlays curvilinear forms in his grid—in A on the top floor and in C with curve walls winding around columns, and amid straight walls.) Aida mischievously makes rooms for Japanese conventions amidst the western conception. He puts *tatami* rooms back into the house, incorporating unpainted wooden members of *nageshi* (non-penetrating tie beams) in contrast to the metallic silver grid. As a final touch, Aida installs *munamochibashira* (a ridge-supported post) pillars at the house’s exterior front, topped by heavy triangular blocks (this arrow shape is echoed in plan, where the half diamond of “Rhombus: Colored Surface with a Gray Picture” adjoins the longitudinal section of “Composition in Black, White, Yellow and Red” at the bottom). Thereby the game is over.

![Image of Takefumi Aida's House of Mondrian Pattern, 1980.](image_url)

*Figure 110: Takefumi Aida, House of Mondrian Pattern, 1980.*

---

175 A free-standing pillar arising from the ground to support an extended ridge on each of the gable ends in *shinmei*-style shrine architecture.
The geometrical motif of munamochibashira to support a massive triangular block, which characterizes the facade of Mondrian Pattern, inaugurates Aida’s toy play in Toy Block House I-X. (This house series recalls Eisenman’s House I-X, but they are fundamentally different in conception.\textsuperscript{176}) With reference to TBH, Aida describes “form follows fiction” as: “fabricating a vividly contrasting image against the actual surround” [虚構は実体よりも鮮明 にそれを投射する場所もある].\textsuperscript{177} This “fiction” begins with Toy Block House I (1978), whose image of a toy house in simple geometries forms a stark contrast with the surrounding real houses. TBH I comprises large solids laid out with near symmetry. Imitations of munamochibashira appear in both the front and the back facades. Inside, the toy vocabulary continues. An inner court faces a large square block (wall) punctured by four equidistant squares (windows) and flanked by two fat cylinders (columns). A perfect disk (skylight) cuts through the roof above. The floor surfaces carry the same circular and square themes. Then the munamochibashira motif recurs; the living room looks into a dining room framed by a top-heavy triangular prism over thick solid walls below. Overall, TBH I appears to be sharply outlined and outright simple—as if consisting of only stacked geometric solids and merely a toy replica. Form therefore follows fiction—in playing with building bricks. From columns, beams, walls, ceilings, floors, to stairs, one rule (i.e., stacking) determines all.

\textsuperscript{176} Eisenman’s House sequence is created as an abstract notational system. See chapter 00.

\textsuperscript{177} The Architectural Anthology of Takefumi Aida: Excursive Thoughts, 104.
Figure 111: Takefumi Aida, Toy Block House I, 1978.
As form follows fiction not function, TBH I flaunts its structural redundancy (again recalling Eisenman’s Cardboard House I-IV\textsuperscript{178}). Mimicking toy bricks, the architectural components from walls to the roof are unduly cumbersome. The dining room is framed by an extra layer of interior roof in the form of a large, solid triangular prism, supported by another extra layer of extraordinarily thick interior walls. Space is thus compromised, the toy’s expression achieved at the expense of spatial/programmatic economy. In contrast, on the outside (in elevation), the post that imitates \textit{munamochibashira} appears to be too thin to sustain the enormous roof block above, as if a gentle breeze could throw the triangular prism off balance. In TBH I, the logic of fiction clearly takes priority over its structural and formal functions.

\textsuperscript{178} See chapter 00.
Figure 113: Toy Block House I: Interior Court.
Figure 114: Toy Block House I: Dining Room.
In Toy Block House II (1979), fiction takes on a new meaning: fake. TBH II is a mixed-use building in a commercial area, with a coffee house on the first floor and a two-story apartment above. Compared to I, II appears less massive and in fact, it is—except for a variant munamochibashira motif in the house’s front. In TBH II, the toy-block expression only applies to the surfaces, as opposed to TBH I, which uses the same expression inside and outside. “The objective [is] to see if the feeling of toy blocks could be expressed merely through surface treatment,” says Aida. As a mere veneer over the building, the treatment feigns toy-vocabulary on the exterior envelope. The blocks are fake (in keeping with the Japanese definition of fiction as a lie).

In Toy Block House III, VI (1981) and VII (1982), in order to strengthen the fiction of play, the actions of stacking and the element of chance (a defining component in toy block play) are introduced and emphasized formally. In particular, TBH III breaks down into smaller solids of two basic modules: 600 millimeters (applied on the interior) and 1,200 millimeters (applied on the exterior). A randomly numbered chart is used to determine the color of the solids, giving the 600 mm pieces primary colors, with the rest in white or gray. The haphazard use of colors reflects chance and randomness, whereas the multiplication of blocks implies the predictability of stacking and piling. In addition, the jaggedness of the house gives the impression of incompleteness, as though the stacking of toy blocks was abruptly halted and the play was over.

Figure 115: Toy Block House II, 1979.
Figure 116: Toy Block House III, 1981.
Figure 1.7: Toy Block House III, 1981, 1st floor plan, archival drawing courtesy of Tadao Ando.
Figure 11.8: Toy Block House III, 1981, 2nd floor plan, archival drawing courtesy of Takefumi Aida.
Figure 119: Toy Block House VII, 1982.
Next, a reversed play happens—wherein the trauma of war in Aida seems to come to the fore. In TBH VIII (1983) and X (1984), destruction displaces construction. In speaking of play, Aida concurrently manifests pessimistic thoughts of annihilation: “Architects, after all, are mortal—and neither they nor their works are permanent; most works of architecture will disappear…”\(^{180}\) Now, instead of stacking and adding, in TBH VIII, pieces are removed from a pre-stacked pile to make space and a form. Some blocks are even literally destroyed; the broken pieces then become pavement in a cracked pattern. Again in TBH X, a similar reversal process takes place, coming to an abrupt stop at an unspecified moment. Symbolically, Aida places a solid sphere in red to replace the last block removed from the pile, which suggests equilibrium between the forces of construction and destruction, as well as marking the end of the creative process.

But Aida’s Toy Block House program ends not with the serene placement of the red sphere. In a rather dramatic, violent act, Aida openly detonates and explodes Aida Block (aka TBH Zero), from which this toy play germinates and by which it ends.

---

Figure 121: Toy Block House VIII, 1983, archival drawing courtesy of Takefumi Aida.
Figure 122: Takefumi Aida, Tokyo War Dead Memorial Park, 1988.
After Aida’s play and mask cease, catastrophic thinking grows conspicuous. Following TBH, Aida commits himself to the exploration of layered repetitions of walls to effect disjointed and dynamic space, predicated upon the logic of oriental ink painting, which expresses the depth of a scene by the layering of planes in different tones and densities. Aida argues, “This approach overlaps with my understanding of contemporary society: In today’s society there are many things happening—many changes, many problems—but civilization so far has been able to absorb, to adjust, to handle most of what comes along in an orderly manner. Yet it could be said that, so far, society has depended to some extent on hope and good luck—but we are more and more unable to ignore the possibility of catastrophe.” A sense of anxiety and fear of war lurks in his words. Coincidentally, Aida’s architectural exploration of wall repetitions culminates in “Tokyo War Dead Memorial Park,” 1988 in honor of the 160,000 Japanese from Tokyo who died during the war.

Stored away amongst the archival drawings in Aida’s office is an epilogue to Aida’s play. Once again Aida revisits the subject of drama in his unrealized “Romeo and Juliet” (1985), which is an architectural representation of Shakespeare’s tragedy, projected for the Third International Architecture Exhibition at the Venice Biennale. Directed by Aldo Rossi, this third edition has the theme of “Progetto Venezia” (Venice Lagoon). Rossi asked for redesign of several sites in the lagoon town.¹⁸¹ The site Aida chose contains the castles of Bella Guardia and

¹⁸¹ An international jury was appointed to select the best projects for each site. The competition drew approximately 1,500 entries from all over the world. Final winners included many well-known architects, including Peter Eisenman (who dealt with Castelli di Romeo and Juliet at Montecchio Maggiore), Daniel
della Villa—the castles of Romeo and Juliet—perched atop the first foothills of the Lessinian mountains in Montecchio Maggiore, facing each other with some distance apart.

To give it dramatic structure, Aida divides the original story into twelve scenes, one scene per month, and assigned a theme to each:

- Once Upon a Time – January
- Rosaline – February
- The Great Ball – March
- Moonlight – April
- Silent Wedding – May
- The Duel – June
- The Banishment – July
- The Oath of Love – August
- Agony – September
- Grief – October
- Death – November
- And After – December

The twelve scenes are framed in twelve kakejiku [hanging scroll], which form a set of Japanese lunar calendars to be hung from the ceiling. Originally created to illustrate paintings and calligraphies in ancient Japan, kakejiku allow for easy rolling and easy transportation, which made overseas shipping from Japan to Italy easier.

In his architectural adaptation, Aida creates “imaginary shadows” of the castles of Romeo and Juliet to represent the amorous protagonists. Each month a pair is plotted onto the site, yet not in compliance with the physical reality; rather, they are cast in the opposite direction toward the center between Romeo and Juliet. These shadows are made of rubble gathered from the razed walls of the castles. Recovering the ruins, this construct embodies the history of the buildings. The imaginary shadows are shadows of the past, so to speak. Over time, they expand

Liebeskind (who treated Piazza di Palmanova), Robert Venturi (who redesigned the Academia Bridge on the Grand Canal), among others.
Figure 123: Takefumi Aida, Romeo & Juliet, kakejiku lunar calendars, 1985.
Figure 124: Takefumi Aida, Romeo & Juliet, kakejiku lunar calendars, 1985.
in size and morph closer toward each other like amoebas extending their fingerlike projections of protoplasm, while the castles stay immobile.

In “Romeo and Juliet,” Aida abandons his humor and playfulness, opting instead for emotional flatness. This flatness coincides with his architectural representations: a set of twelve hardline drawings in ink showing the progression of the drama in the change of the shadows, plus a sketch with all their profiles superimposed upon each other to highlight the change at a glance. Additionally, there is the set of twelve kakejiku on Japanese paper that forms the lunar calendar. In short, everything is flat, in plan, since all the acts take place tangential to the ground.

To convey the intense emotions of the tragic characters, the imaginary shadows tilt from left to the right; they elongate as if longing to reach each other, finally meeting (at Death) but shrinking again (in And After), afterwards diverging backward and sideways from each other. In the kakejiku set, however, Aida tones down the shadows with impressionist-style prints in pastel colored pixels. Poetic patterns from nature, such as pedals and leaves, cover the dark shadows, concealing the dark emotions they represent. These patterns actually come from the Japanese playing cards, hanafuda (flower cards). In principle, the figures of the hanafuda express the seasonal variation in weather: flowers, birds, winds, and moon. They provide seasonal

---

information—for example, Aida covered the imaginary shadows of July in a pattern of lush greenery and October with maple leaves. A sense of quietness necessarily emanates from the picturesque sequence. But this calm yet lively aura sent forth by flowers and trees belies the passionate melancholia of the tragic drama. In July, on the theme of Banishment, when Juliet is suffering anguish and sorrow due to the indeterminable separation from her lover, the imaginary shadow shows lush leafy trees blooming in health and splendor. The same pattern occurs in Romeo’s shadow of April on the contradictory romantic theme of Moonlight. Consequently, the floral motif washes away their tragic sentiments. As if to comply with the Japanese decorum of emotionlessness, the impressionist veils enshroud Romeo and Juliet’s harrowing love. Aida’s play ends in yet another mask to conceal emotions.

Takamitsu Azuma

Although Azuma did not participate in the publication of *ArchiteXt* 2 on the specific theme of “my home,” his *ArchiteXt* 0 and 00 are indicative of his housing designs, especially where his body profile stretches to its maximum capacity across the magazine strip, his right hand pointing to the sky above. The architect’s own house (in *ArchiteXt* 00), Tower House (1967), especially reflects this vertical invention.

In fact, verticality contradicts the fundamental conception of Japanese architecture, where continuity extends horizontally from texture to pattern, pattern to space, and space to time. In *Katsura*, referring to this Japanese extension, Kenzo Tange argues, “Whereas the creators of Gothic architecture invented methods which enable them to overcome gravity and usurp new
space from nature, Japanese builders meekly accepted the space that nature has bequeathed them. Instead of defying gravity, they have preferred to seek space in which to spread out horizontally.\textsuperscript{183} But overpopulation in postwar Japan challenged this conception. Only a century ago (at the start of Meiji), there were 27 million people. Yet the number skyrocketed to 88 million—that is, on average, the population increased 2,240,000 people per year in the immediate postwar period. To make things worse, the country also lost about 46% of the 260,000 square miles of land it owned before. Consequently, Japan was confronted with the impossible task of housing its entire population on limited land. The situation was especially dire in the cities. Under these circumstances, the spatial conception of horizontal continuity was no longer practicable.

Meanwhile, the young Japanese obstinately pursued “my home-ism,” and Azuma was no exception. For most of WWII, Azuma was an evacuee from his hometown in Osaka. He moved to Tokyo in the 1960s. Tower House was Azuma’s first house, which he built for his family (he was married with a young child). He bought the biggest plot in the inner city he could afford, which was about 20 square meters (i.e. 215 square feet)—small even by Japanese standards. Because of this exceptionally small lot, up was only one way to go, even though that seemed outlandish for a Japanese house at that time. Most people lived in two-story wooden houses, with an average footprint of 100 square meters, and separated by a distance of only 50 cm from their neighbors.\textsuperscript{184}


Breaching convention, Azuma embraced the Gothic way. He made his house very tall and slender, rerouting the horizontal continuity distinctive of Japanese architecture vertically. Inside, the space spirals upward without obstruction. There are no solid doors or dividing walls other than at the building’s exterior enclosure—bath and toilet are closeted behind curtains—nor are there *shoji* screens and *tatami* rooms. To establish continuity from inside to outside, Azuma, with great care, designed small steps, a concrete gateway, an intimate front space facing the entrance door, and a narrow carport connected to the front street by a small lane. But then the house’s sharp angular walls brush just off the edge of the street, abruptly negating the connection. From there, everything is directed skyward.

After Tower House, Azuma designed various houses tailored to his clients’ needs without a particularly strong theoretical base. Unlike Aida’s designs, which were dictated by concepts, Azuma’s tended to be practical. To an extent, his eclectic way of working and suppressing self-expression is reflected in *ArchiteXt* 00, where the architect fills his dark profile with fragmented, sundry images of his architecture. Again, his absence in *ArchiteXt* 2 coincidentally parallels his omission of a theory re: home.
Figure 126: Takamitsu Azuma, Tower House, 1967.
Mayumi Miyawaki

As for Miyawaki, my home ≠ my house. In ArchiteXt 2, Miyawaki depicts home as a mapping of his trajectories in tendril lines (inside his house/studio). But in actual building, he created boxes: Box House—Yellow Box, Blue Box, Green Box No.1, Green Box No.2, Black Box, Match Box, Triangle Box, White Triangle, A Quarter-Circle, etc. In 1976, Miyawaki compiled a “Box Catalog,” which showed about a dozen Box Houses only. Yet soon after, his production suddenly escalated. By 1980, Miyawaki had designed over 180 Box Houses, of which 90 were actually built.

Although the intricate tendrils (in ArchiteXt 2) had ceased in Box House, they were still illustrative of Miyawaki’s busy life. Besides building Box Houses, he was the director of JAA, hosted a TV show, taught at various institutions (Kyoritsu Women’s College, Tokyo University, Hiroshima University, and Sapporo Design Institute, among others), delivered speeches throughout the country practically every week, and was often the honored master or guest at the parties and ceremonies he attended. Fellow ArchiteXt Makoto Suzuki remarked, “In all Japan, probably in all the world, no one is busier than Mayumi Miyawaki.” Miyawaki managed to overwork even by the hard-working standard of the Japanese.

Ironically, Box House began with a commercial building: Yellow Box, aka Akita Sogo Bank, in 1970. It was Miyawaki’s first big commission since he opened Mayumi Miyawaki

---

185 Mayumi Miyawaki, “Box Catalog,” The Japan Architect (June 1976), 51-58. Miyawaki catalogues his Box House in this special edition for ArchiteXt, which includes Blue Box, Kanno Box, Green Box No.1, Green Box No.2, Triangle Box, White Triangle, Fukumura Villa, Yellow Box (aka Akita Sogo Bank), and other branches of Akita Soga Bank.

Figure 127: Mayumi Miyawaki, Akita Sogo Bank aka Yellow Box, 1970.
Architect and Associates in 1964. Miyawaki worked with Arata Isozaki in Expo 70, through whom he was introduced to Akita Sogo Bank to design their branch offices, Yellow Box in Honjo city being the pilot. The idea of Yellow Box came from the Expo, inspired by a work of sculpture entitled “Primary Arts” set at the plaza which Miyawaki designed (in collaboration with others). Primary Arts’ pure geometries and colors captivated Miyawaki. Being a painter’s son, the architect had a special sensibility for form. Miyawaki reworked the conception into his theory of “Primary Architecture,” which accentuates cubes, prisms, pyramids, cylinders and spheres, and primary colors in building, while adding green, black and white to his color palette. In particular, his bank design under this conception materialized into a yellow box.

Yellow Box has a corner cut out for its entrance. The color is that of the water iris, the city flower of Honjo. A large grid marks its exterior surfaces. Miyawaki worked out every detail of the project on a basis of 1:20 scale models, and the actual building looks like a blown-up model. The box also gives the playful impression of a toy, or a cartoon character—in yellow skin, with a big grin.

But beneath the surface of Yellow Box’s playfulness lies condemnation. Miyawaki severely denounces the commercial trend in Japan toward an architectural pastiche of incongruous styles. “Designed to ingratiate the [uninformed] public, they were vulgarly decorated so that at least one could be distinguished from the other by surface trappings. Or they were examples of cheap, facile formalism.” In contrast, as Miyawaki argues, primary forms and colors make a unified statement; they are complete in themselves, transcending scale—a box

---

187 See Miyawaki, “On the Path,” 34
is nothing other than a box.\textsuperscript{189} When placed amid a chaotic jumble of motley building styles, they do not mingle. “[They] stand alone and unpretentious; they make no effort to spread some repellently coquettish network around them.”\textsuperscript{190} Hence distinguishing itself from its “cheap” and “coquettish” surroundings, Yellow Box bestows on the bank an identity otherwise lacking in the anonymous buildings arising from the commercial catalog. “A bright yellow cube of 18 x 18 meter is certain to be more conspicuous than the flashiest, tawdriest of supermarkets,” says the architect.\textsuperscript{191} Now the cartoonish grin can be interpreted as a triumphant smile. The big yellow creature playfully counters the flashy, tawdry commercial buildings by exceeding them in visibility. Play is Miyawaki’s defense.

Miyawaki’s indictment is especially aimed at house marketing. He condemns the flamboyant housing styles introduced into the market through commercial catalogs, which were studied by Japanese housewives. In postwar Japan, selecting and purchasing a house had fallen into the hands of the housewives, as their husbands were preoccupied with work. Miyawaki lambasts these women, “who thumb through books on houses and décor as if they were looking at the latest issues of \textit{Vogue},” and then behaved like ignorant buyers readily falling for the lines of the construction company or prefab-housing salesman.\textsuperscript{192} Putting aside the question of Japanese sexism, the architect blames these housewives for the urban condition of Japan, which was now packed with gaudy houses assimilating and plundering all genres and styles. To counteract this commercialism in Japanese housing, Miyawaki produces his own architectural \textit{Vogue}: a Box Catalog of playful, toy-like Box Houses in Primary Architecture.

\textsuperscript{189} Mayumi Miyawaki, “Declaration in Favor of Primary Architecture,” \textit{The Japan Architect} (October 1970), 34-36.

\textsuperscript{190} Mayumi Miyawaki, “Why Primary Forms?” \textit{The Japan Architect} (January 1972), 31.

\textsuperscript{191} Miyawaki, “Declaration in Favor of Primary Architecture,” 35.

\textsuperscript{192} Miyawaki, “Japanese Houses: Transitional Pains,” 5.
After Yellow came Blue Box House, aka Hayasaki Box, in 1971. Alighted on a grassy slope, Blue Box shows a colored concrete box on the outside—the front in blue and the sides in green. A corner of the cube is carved out to preserve existing trees, which penetrate the house and continue living. A reclined pyramid sits on top of the roof. The house is solid overall, other than a small circular hole on the front and a glass window (covered by heavy curtains) on the recessed surface behind the trees. There is a long staircase connecting the house to a carport at the bottom of the hill, where a colorful mural decorates the retaining wall.

Though playful on the outside, the temperament of the house quickly changes inside. The interior breathes an atmosphere of quiet, comfort and warmth. As a matter of fact, Blue Box consists of not one but two boxes. Inscribed in the exterior colorful concrete box is a wooden box. The inner identity is that of an intimate Japanese home customized for the owner. Miyawaki hired carpenters specializing in Shinto shrines to perfect this inner layer of wooden framing and wooden surface, which suggests nature, effecting a mood of warmth expected of a traditional Japanese home. This was unusual because fine Japanese woodworking was lost to the pastiche-style houses of Japanese architectural commercialism. Nevertheless, western furniture and amenities make up his fine interior: a television set on the cabinets, a recliner chair by the window overlooking the bamboos that penetrate the house, and so forth. The two boxes sandwich an interior courtyard between them, where evidence of domestic life abounds: scattered toys (a train and a horse on wheels), a rocking chair, lush green plants, etc. The double box consequently conjoins an extroverted (playful) character—Blue Box especially evokes a square version of the Japanese video game character Pakkuman (i.e., Pac-Man\(^{193}\)) but with a Mohawk hairdo, a blue face, eating bamboo plants and beams—and an introverted (intimate)

\(^{193}\) Pakkuman [パックマン] is an arcade video game developed by Japanese company Namco Ltd.
Figure 128: Mayumi Miyawaki, Blue Box House, 1971.
Figure 129: Mayumi Miyawaki, Blue Box House, 1971.
character back to back, with one circumscribing and concealing the other. This dual system also serves a practical function; the exterior concrete box protects the interior wooden box, where buildings are susceptible to earthquake damage in Japan.

Blue Box attracted Mr. Nara, Miyawaki’s next client for Green Box No.1 (1972). At that time, Miyawaki’s commissions came mostly from ordinary Japanese white-collar workers, who made orders by telephone, typically for small houses—the biggest at 100 square meters (about 1,075 square feet), and sometimes only 35 square meters (about 375 square feet). When Mr. Nara saw Blue Box featured in a magazine, he sought out Miyawaki. The client proposed that the architect design his home on the theme of a green box. Green Box No.1 had a building area of only 53.67 square meter (roughly 578 sq-ft). Again Miyawaki created a two story box with minimal and concentrated openings on the facades; to emphasize the primary form, Box House’s openings are always minimized and details kept terse on the outside. There are four skylights in each corner of the roof and a large opening in the south wall, otherwise enclosed.

The comic character of Miyawaki’s Box House peaks in Green Box No.2 (1972). Because the site was adjacent to a kindergarten, Miyawaki suggested that “the house should look like a huge building block, of the kind employed by children in play, set down on the site as if it had wandered into this residential district from some cosmic realm.”194 This client, a psychologist, readily consented. Green Box No. 2 takes the form of a simple cube in neon tea-green—green was the only solid color permitted in the neighborhood due to scenic preservation. There is an extraordinarily big circular opening (1.35 meter in radius, about 4.5 feet) cut into one corner of the box—the total building area amounts to less than 35 square meters (or 375 square feet). Four blank rectangles flank the large circle. In addition, a hollow semi-cylinder projects
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Figure 130: Mayumi Miyawaki, Green Box House No.1 and No.2, 1972.
out above the entrance to form an awning. Green Box No. 2 strikes one as a green monster with a huge singular eye and a long semi-cylindrical nose. Its strong character amuses onlookers. Reportedly, the children from the kindergarten next door were amazed by the design, and gave daily accounts of the progress to their parents during its construction.195

Miyawaki continued to build Box House in variation, as though he was playing with a puzzle. Sometimes the wooden structure is still completely contained within the concrete box; sometimes it thrusts outward beyond the box; sometimes the first floor is concrete and the second floor wooden or the other way around; sometimes a wooden structure is replaced by a steel frame. Often the Box House exhibits a comic character: a prism head with one triangular eye and an asymmetrical gape of the jaws (Triangle Box, 1972),196 a white triangular creature

Figure 131: Triangle Box, 1972 and White Triangle, 1974.

195 Ibid.
with a beak and long neck (White Triangle, 1974), and so forth. Miyawaki thus created his trademark Box House. In their geometrical smirks, winks, and grins, Box Houses make a humorous retort against the pastiche-style houses of Japanese architectural commercialism.

Makoto Suzuki

Like Miyawaki, Suzuki’s home as voyage in ArchiteXt 2 leaves no trace in his built houses. Although he established Makoto Suzuki Architect Atelier in 1964, his building practice was sporadic, about one building per year (Miyawaki was 10 times as prolific). Suzuki’s focus had been on education. He began teaching in 1968 at the School of Architecture in Waseda University (where he graduated in 1959 and completed his graduate study in 1962), received a professorship in 1980, and from 2001-2004, he was the school’s principal.

Despite his sparse output, Suzuki’s contribution to Japanese architecture was exceptional. He pioneered a technique of crafting exposed concrete with traces of holes left from the bolts that held the Japanese wooden shuttering used to mold a form. Suzuki first applied this technique to Shishido Residence (1965), and then consistently used it in his subsequent work, including Takahashi House (1970) and Shimamura House (1973) shown in ArchiteXt 00. This use of exposed concrete with surface texture instead of wood transforms a traditional Japanese home yet preserves certain defining characters, such as a tremendous sense of austerity. An ascetic mood especially permeates the interior of his houses as a result of his penchant for incorporating double- or even triple-high spaces stripped of decor.

197 See “White Triangle,” The Japan Architect (February 1975), 85-90
Figure 132: Makoto Suzuki, Shimamura House, 1973.
Austerity in Japanese residential architecture, which characterizes Suzuki’s houses, has its origin in the tea ceremony. There are two distinct types of the ceremony, which Kenzo Tange refers to (in architectural terms) as: “shoin tea ceremony” and “hermitage tea ceremony.”\textsuperscript{198} The shoin-style stems from a fashionable tea contest, which used to take place in the luxurious hall of a shinden (main) mansion and involved showy magnificence. In contrast to this artificial gaudy style, the hermitage tea ceremony commonly happened inside a frugal four-and-a-half tatami room\textsuperscript{199} in an unpretentious house (which a devout hermit might occupy). Bearing the imprint of Zen Buddhism, a sukiya (teahouse) of this style relinquished elegance and decor, which inspired the austere Japanese house sukiya-zukuri. Although recast in a modern concrete container, Suzuki’s houses still capture the essence of sukiya-zukuri originating in the hermitage tea ceremony.

Suzuki’s houses also epitomize the peculiarly Japanese predilection for shadows and darkness, which arouses great curiosity in western architects, who generally prefer light. This love of darkness is poetically theorized by modern Japanese writer Junichiro Tanizaki in his In Praise of Shadows, which was translated into English in 1977, with a foreword written by Charles Moore. Speaking of Japanese dwelling, Tanizaki writes, “In making ourselves a place to live, we first spread a parasol to throw a shadow on the earth, and in the pale light of the shadow we put together a house.”\textsuperscript{200} Further, he writes, “Our ancestors cut off the brightness on the land

\textsuperscript{198} Tange, “Tradition and Creation in Japanese Architecture,” 220. Shoin (書院) is the study place within a temple.

\textsuperscript{199} In Japan, the size of a room is often measured by the number of tatami mats. A mat measures roughly 3’ x 6’ in size.

\textsuperscript{200} Junichiro Tanizaki, In Praise of Shadows (New Haven, Conn.: Leete’s Island Books, c1977), 17.
from above and created a world of shadows.”\textsuperscript{201} Along the same lines, Suzuki argues, “the traditional Japanese approach [to] space begins with darkness and emptiness.”\textsuperscript{202} By nature the Japanese dismiss light in favor of shadowy habitation, paradoxically, as the opposite is almost universally preferred. Moore claims that, for westerners, when it comes to inhabitation, their most powerful ally is light, performed in cahoots with the sun—to bath the world in it, giving it light.\textsuperscript{203} Moore quotes Louis Kahn: “The sun never knew how wonderful it was, until it fell on the wall of a building.”\textsuperscript{204} Western architecture generally glorifies the sun. For Moore, it comes almost with “the thrill of a slap” to hear that the use of light (to dispel shadows) runs counter to the basic idea of the Japanese room.

This penchant for darkness also explains the Japanese decor in gold or silver, about which Tanizaki writes: “In the darkness of the innermost rooms, to which sunlight never penetrates, how the gold leaf of a sliding door or screen will pick up a distant glimmer from the garden, then suddenly send forth an ethereal glow, a faint golden light cast into the enveloping darkness, like the glow upon the horizon at sunset.”\textsuperscript{205} Accordingly, Japanese household items are customized for darkness: lacquerware decorated in gold, fabrics lavishly woven of threads of silver, and the flickering candle, for example.

The darkness of Suzuki’s houses is the darkness of Japanese architecture. Suzuki orchestrated light into his interior spaces only inasmuch as the gold leaf of a sliding door picks up a glimmer and sends forth an ethereal glow. Specifically, he employed three architectural devices: openings, wall pockets, and the “bubble” (light well). His deliberate introduction of

\textsuperscript{201} Ibid., 33.
\textsuperscript{203} Charles Moore, “Forward,” \textit{In Praise of Shadows}.
\textsuperscript{204} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{205} Tanizaki, \textit{In Praise of Shadows}, 22.
Figure 133: Makoto Suzuki, Takahashi House, 1970.
Figure 134: Makoto Suzuki, Takahashi House, 1970.
light creates a shadow play on the walls. For example, Takahashi House contains a main space of a double-high room framed by exposed concrete on all sides, except for the smoothed floor. At one end of the room, various openings puncture the walls: angular wall pockets, edge and corner cuts, and so forth. In and out of these apertures, light dances. Rather than bathing the entire room in brightness, light glows quietly, agreeably. At the other end, a cut in the roof spans the entire width of the room. The long slot admits natural light, which casts shadows on the wall in a simple geometrical pattern—the design resembles a minimalist painting. This pattern changes throughout the day, depending on the sun’s angle and intensity. Similarly in Shimamura House, Suzuki effected another shadow play. A distorted half ellipse morphs across the wall in the essentially dark room. Suzuki thereby valorized darkness. Light was simply in the service of shadows in his houses.

Although Suzuki initiated this technique of exposed concrete to create a poetic interplay between shadows and light, it came to be recognized as Tadao Ando’s signature work. Ando began building concrete houses almost a decade after Suzuki, starting with Azuma House (1976). But Ando took the method to its extreme, as seen in his “Church of the Light” (1989), where space is defined, symbolically, by light in the shape of a cross, entered from behind the altar through the cruciform cut in the concrete wall that extends vertically from floor to ceiling and horizontally from wall to wall. Inside, one senses profound emptiness. In contrast, Suzuki persisted in building austere concrete houses in praise of shadows, not light. He basically perpetuated a Zen practice in building. One can almost hear words of Tanizaki echoing in Suzuki’s interiors: “The beauty of a Japanese room depends on a variation of shadows, heavy shadows against light shadows—it has nothing else.”

206 Ibid., 18.
Figure 135: Tadao Anda, Azuma House, 1976 and Church of the Light, 1989.
Minoru Takeyama

Even after ArchiteXt and Ichibankan and Nibankan, the harenchi themes (of sex, lust and love) continued to preoccupy Takeyama’s thinking and building. In contrast to other ArchiteXt members’ orthogonal or angular forms, Takeyama’s composition often involves spheres, cylinders, ovals, and other curvy shapes. Pepsi-Cola Canning Plant (1972) comprises four gigantic cylinders (echoing the containers of the products produced within). Beverly Tom Hotel (1974) takes the form of a striated fat cylinder capped by a giant glass sphere constricted by wire meshes. Building 109 (1978) in Shinjuku shows a tall, silver cylindrical tower on the front with the large number 109 in red written on top, which lights up at night. Mikakuto Sweet Factory (1983) in Nara has sugar-coated skins in yellow and green tiles, itself an architectural candy (Mikakuto is known for their hard milk-candies in Japan). This geometrical tendency toward round shapes seems suggestive of harenchi, with clues written in Takeyama’s other readable non-architecture, “Imago Encephalogram.”

Featured in Space Design (January 1974), Imago Encephalogram presents Beverly Tom Hotel and Pepsi-Cola Canning Plant in a dazzling compilation of pictures. In the photos, these buildings are viewed from different angles, sometimes up close, sometimes distant, sometimes from the inside out, sometimes top down, or sideways, and sometimes dark, sometimes lit up, shining dramatically. Their multitudinous array of shots make one’s head spin. Especially when seen from a distance—in between the sea (in the foreground) and mountains (in the background), above an expanse of low-rise buildings, near the convergence of a long stretching railroad track, etc.—Beverly Tom seems to dematerialize, its glass sphere an ephemeral bubble ready to burst.

207 Takeyama, Minoru, “竹山実：空間の脳象図” [Takeyama: Spatial Imago Encephalo-gram 2], Space Design, no. 113 (January 1974), 107-120.
Figure 136: Pepsi-Cola Canning Plant, 1972; Mikakuto Sweet Factory, 1983.
In addition, Takeyama juxtaposes pictures of Beverly Tom with sketches, diagrams, and photos of large objects in round shapes or spherical forms, such as industrial wheels, hydraulic balls, and so forth. In particular, a sequence of bubble diagrams stretches across the top of several pages. Inside these bubbles are men playing ball, sitting down, lying down, running toward a woman, his arms extending out, and finally hugging the woman. As the man and the woman draw closer to one another, the cellular boundaries around them blur; eventually one cell encapsulates both lovers. Takeyama dubs these bubbles “the emotive cell” [感覚膜] and the

Figure 137: Sample pages from Imago Encephalogram.
Figure 138
sequential illustrations “the projection of feeling” [感覚の投射]. Outside Space Design, a reader finds an elaborated version of these bubble diagrams in Japan Architect, where next to the merged cell that encloses the man and the woman, it specifically reads: “Love In.” Takeyama seems to be suggesting that the geometry of a circle, a cell or a bubble symbolizes the outward projection of the amorous sentiment inside of men and women.

This bubble manifestation of love especially finds a built precedent in Austrian architects Haus-Rucker-Co’s “Balloon for Two” (1967). Balloon For Two consists of an inflatable transparent PVC membrane, which blows up to a large bubble. Supported by a steel rack, the bubble projects into the street from an existing building facade. Inside, it accommodates seating for a man and a woman, in two halves of a plastic bathtub. Haus-Rucker Co declares:

> Our balloons will help you to discover an unknown feeling of tranquility, of security, of relaxation. And love. We want to heighten your sensitivity. You will take a journey. Together with someone you love. Into inner space. Like Astronauts. Only an inward trip. You will attain a higher level of thinking and loving. Everything you do you will do better, because you are more relaxed…

Balloon For Two lays claim to enter the psychological sphere: “You will take a journey… Into inner space.” “Our balloons will help you to discover an unknown feeling of tranquility, of security, of relaxation. And love” (my emphasis). Love (like play) is arguably spatial; it is “disreality”—Roland Barthes coins the term to describe the state of being in love: “sentiments of
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208 Ibid., 110-111.
209 A clear illustration of this is found in Minoru Takeyama, “Living Room ’70,” The Japan Architect (July 1971), 73-76.
absence and withdrawal of reality,” as experienced by the amorous subject. Echoing Takeyama’s emotive cell, Balloon For Two secludes the lovers in a protected enclosure of a bubble, and then binds them to each other in two halves of a plastic bathtub. A sentiment of absence and withdrawal of reality are thereby pronounced through an illusion; a PVC membrane

promises seclusion and security of love. The illusion, of course, hardly exists beyond the lovers’ minds. Outside, in reality, their bodies become objects on display. Their legs dangle in the air and the bodies, unattended and unprotected, are subjected to passersby’s gazes from below. The illusive (psychological) disreality is mercilessly created at the (physical) body’s expense.

Haus-Rucker-Co’s architectural construct of love continues in “Mind Expander I” (1967). Now the two halves of a plastic bathtub (in Balloon For Two) evolve into a bucket seat for two, and in place of the enclosing bubble is a large overhead PVC cover. No longer sitting side by side, the couple sit with the woman on the man’s lap, their legs entwined. Then “Mind Expander
II” came in 1969, still showing a conspicuously large head-dryer cover over a loveseat, and the lovers’ legs still conspicuously entwined. Therefore from a balloon (with a bathtub inside) to a round cover (with a chair beneath), Haus-Rucker-Co persists in using spherical forms (and seating) to simulate (and cement) love.

Besides the sphere, another western architect finds another geometrical qualifier—that is, the cylinder—for securing or procuring love. In *Delirious New York*, Rem Koolhaas reports on an inventive architectural device called “Barrels of Love,” designed to counter loneliness and alienation of life in the metropolis:

Two horizontal cylinders—mounted in line—revolve slowly in opposite directions. At either end a small staircase leads up to an entrance. One feeds men into the machine, the other women. It is impossible to remain standing. Men and women fall on top of each other…

On top of a circular form, circular motions are brought into architecture to concoct love. This love machine rotates unrelentingly to fabricate synthetic intimacy between men and women.

But in Takeyama’s summation of a sphere and a cylinder, sex seems to triumph over love; *harenchi* comes to the fore in Beverly Tom Hotel. Programmatically, a hotel can serve as a site for love and sex. Formally, Beverly Tom’s phallic sign is inevitable, especially when seen intermingled with a pool of erotic cartoons in *Imago Encephalogram*. A movieola plays erotic visuals: the heaving landscape of a woman’s breasts, the woman crossing her legs in different ways, her seductive buttocks, etc. To its right, a voluptuous nude woman with her hips marked by an upside down heart shape strikes a sexy pose; to its left, a defeated man seems crushed by his sexual desires, a giant finger nibs him from above. In another page, another cartoon entitled “Environmental Autism” and “Environmentally Frigid” shows a naked man in a pushcart being
straddled by a pair of a woman’s bare legs over his shoulders. Varied themes of love, sex and mental illness penetrate these heterogeneous images. Their curve lines in turn knit together a harenchi story, which courses through Beverly Tom’s scintillating body at night, via its striated cylinder with pixel gleams (lights from the hotel rooms) to a thrilling climax in the constellation of shining lights above (lighting at the nodes of the mesh that covers the glass globe), as if the phallic form itself had climaxed. This harenchi story extends to Pepsi-Cola. Between a man’s mouth, into which projectiles of coke bottles forced, and through a pair of a woman’s plump, seductive lips holding a cigarette, Takeyama declares, “[this is an] irrational space for a rational process to produce [sic] an irrational product [sic].”212 Clearly, the gigantic spheres and

212 Ibid., 118. The words “produce” and “product” are misspelled.
cylinders are Takeyama’s rational (architectural) translation of irrationality, which encompass love chemistry and beverage chemicals.

Figure 142: Minoru Takeyama, Imago Encephalogram, 1974.
If spheres and cylinders with curved surfaces are signs—or “relators,” using the language of Takeyama’s Heterology—of irrationality, then one may speculate that cubes and prisms with flat faces (and other polyhedrons by extension) symbolize forms of rationality. Interestingly, Atelier Indigo (1976) corroborates that. This architect’s home/studio in Hokkaido (named after Takeyama’s daughter) has an origin in the supremacy of rationality, i.e. mathematics, as indicated in ArchiteXt 2. In “My Home Blue,” Takeyama illustrates a mathematical puzzle of turning an empty box inside-out and outside-in in twelve steps: “First make the diagonal straight lines on each strip so as to become well-foldable. Use the point of either a knife or a pin slightly along the straight edge…” Rigorous mathematical diagrams in squares and triangles, and cubes and prisms show the sequence/solution. The readable thus turns into playable architecture.

Atelier Indigo consists of two levels: “kinetic space” (above) and “universal space” (below). The “universal space” contains a large open room with a capacity of about 100 people, which serves the various purposes of holding seminars, workshops, exhibitions, parties, and showing motion pictures. Above this space on the flat roof is the “kinetic space,” formed by eight inhabitable boxes, each 2.2 x 2.2 x 2.2 cubic meters big. This set of boxes can be further broken down into twelve parts and recombined into different shapes. Comparable to playing with the Japanese mechanical doll karakuri, the assemblage is operated by a mast, pulleys and winches; no machine power is required. The users can improvise space in an ad hoc fashion to create workspace, gallery space, etc., depending on the programmatic needs. In general, the boxes are piled together into one big enclosed cube during wintertime, and in summertime, they are deployed in a more open disposition. Similar to “My Home Blue,” Atelier Indigo is

---

213 Minoru Takeyama, “My Home Blue,” ArchiteXt 2 (1972), on the back side of the first square.
HOW TO PLAY "MY HOME BLUES"

Figure 143: Minoru Takeyama, Atelier Indigo, 1976.
Figure 144: Minori Takeyama, Atlier Indigo, 1976.
mathematical and musical—musical in the sense of a spatial melody in cubic and prismical notes. This melodic construct of white cubes and mathematical logic distinguishes itself from the saccharine architecture of Pepsi-Cola Canning Plant and Beverly Tom Hotel in gigantic cylinders and sphere. Rational play prevails. In Atelier Indigo, architecture is literally playable: the house *is* the toy. There are 46,656 possible combinations to reconfigure the boxes.\(^{214}\) Therein ArchiteXt’s play reaches its summit.

... ArchiteXt prophesies ArchiteXt’s play in building. From tossing a die (Aida’s “the earth”) to singing a math puzzle (Takeyama’s “My Home Blue”), non-architecture carries over to architecture. A house takes the form of a toy, a puzzle, a mask and so forth. Design equals play, and building too.

This playful tendency visible amidst ArchiteXt’s pluralist constitution—Azuma and Suzuki contrarily built austere concrete houses against the colorful geometrical blocks of the others—acts as a significant catalyst for New Wave’s increasing trend toward playfulness. Deviating from Metabolism’s grandiose mega-structures in the 1960s, ArchiteXt pioneered playful, even risible, small houses. Defying the suppression of emotion so typical of the Japanese, these houses sanctify (via laughter) architectural forms characterized by their informality, humor and play. Other New Wave architects followed suit: Yamashita’s funny Face House (1975), Ishiyama’s colorful Fantasy Villa (1975), as well as Kazuhiro Ishii’s 54 Windows

\(^{214}\) For details of the house, see Minoru Takeyama, “Atelier Indigo,” *Japan Architect* (January 1978), 11-21.
(1975), which playfully lodges a plethora of 54 distinctly patterned, colored boxes onto its four facades—18 on each of the long sides and 9 each on the short sides.

Figure 145: Kazuhiro Ishii, 54 Windows, 1975.
This playful spirit continues to seep into today’s Japanese architecture, from SANAA’s Rabbit chair, Kobun Nakamura’s Bunny chair and Junya Ishigami’s Picnic chair, which wears a wool hat, sweater, and socks, to Sou Fujimoto’s Tokyo Apartment (2010), comprising several house-shaped apartments piled on top of each other. Further, in Final Wooden House (2008), Fujimoto stacks lumber in a most playful and game-like fashion, recalling Toy Block House, yet moves toward programmatic lightness by uprooting fixity in typology and usage. The house has
no prescribed rooms. The inhabitants climb up, bend over and squat down on the lumber, finding their own creative use of space. Living is play, jovial emotions welcome.

Originating with ArchiteXt and extending even to the present, in good humor and play, Japanese architects prove themselves to be *homo ludens*, not *homo majime-dens*.

Figure 147: Sou Fujimoto, Tokyo Apartment, 2010 and Final Wooden House, 2008.
CHAPTER 2

EDIBLE ARCHITECTURE

In their formative years, ArchiteXt’s individual creative output took the shape of magazines, maps, encephalograms, dramas, masks, toys, puzzles and games (some in the form of buildings), extending architecture into the realms of the readable and playable—through *acushon* in reading, writing, mapping, voyaging, masking, playing, and jesting. Also predicated upon non-architectural thinking, and expanding the subject to food, eating and cooking, this chapter focuses on the exhibition *Architecture and Macaroni* in Tokyo, 1995—arguably a pinnacle display of non-architecture—which showcased twenty eminent Japanese artists and architects’ macaroni designs and invited visitors to eat “architecture on a plate” in the gallery. Of ArchiteXt, only Miyawaki was included (and in fact penned the introduction to the show’s catalog: “Why Do Architects Design Macaroni?”215), whereas the entire ZO Atelier (the other New Wave group) was present. This inclusion/exclusion again conveys the looseness of ArchiteXt’s non-group vis-à-vis ZO’s collectivity.

Many new names have emerged since the beginning of New Wave in the 1970s, but the tendency of the movement to expand amorphously, like “clouds,” still held even into the 1990s, as reflected by *Architecture and Macaroni*. Non-architectural thinking, too, persisted, even intensified. The participants of the show collectively initiated a “descent to the everyday.”

---

Sponsored by the Japan Institute of Architects (JIA), Architecture and Macaroni aimed to convey architectural creativity to the general public, and consequently clarify the architect’s professional identity, a continual struggle since its post-war inception.

This fantastical feast consisted of two parts: display (for the eyes) and dinner (for the palate). On display were twenty macaroni models in colorless fiber-reinforced plastic (FRP)—a material for precision engineering, commonly used in the aerospace, automotive, marine, and construction industries—at a 1:20 scale on the pedestals. For dinner, the dishes were prepared according to Japanese food critic Hideko Kogure’s special recipes; they were cooked in a cafeteria kitchen on the premises and brought to the tables in the gallery for sampling. A deictic descent to the everyday hence took place. The “architecture on a plate” softened, swelled, blistered, melted, contorted, and deformed, and was finally consumed for gustatory pleasure.

In keeping with the show’s epicurean spirit and hopes of uncovering the macaroni’s purpose to impart (architectural) knowledge, my chapter presents the feast in seven courses, each grouping together several dishes, catering to a special theme:

Re: Display

Mathematics – Macala, Möbiuron
Structure – Semi Constructive, Tateroni, Extru, Taste it
Metaphor and Literalism – Magnificent Seven, Wave, i flute, Puncture, Serie Macchel’occhi
Symbol – She & He, 食

Re: Dinner

Utensil – Colchette, Cucchiaio
Sensuality – Madame Edwarda, Happy Earthday
Performance – Ottoco, Maccheroni, Punching
Itadakimasu [いただきます].

JIA commissioned graphic designer Kenya Hara to design a striking show to convey architectural creativity to the Japanese public. Hara sought to formulate the commission as a subset of his wider initiative entitled Re-Design, which questions the meaning of creativity by redesigning everyday objects—such as a toilet paper roll, match, tea bag, diaper, cockroach trap, and the exit/entry immigration stamp—and offering new takes on these common items. Hara wittily paired each designer with a topic related to his or her field. For instance, he asked architect Shigeru Ban to redesign the toilet paper roll. Ban is known for his invention of custom-made paper tubes for novel structures: Paper House, Paper Arch, Paper Theater, Paper Bridge, Paper Dome, among others. For the redesign, Ban subtly replaces the customary round core with a square core. The paper that rolls around it ends up in the shape of a square. Although a simple move, its functionality is striking—when placed into the dispenser and pulled out for use, Ban’s square roll resists the pull, and hence reduces consumption (verses the round roll that rolls smoothly and endlessly). When stacked for packaging or storage, the square rolls stack neatly and save space by leaving smaller gaps between the rolls.

---

216 Etiquette in Japan, the phrase is said before meals.
217 Kenya Hara is a professor at the Art University Musashino and the art director of the Japanese label MUJI.
Figure 148: Shigeru Ban, toilet paper re-design; Kengo Kuma, cockroach trap re-design.
Figure 149: Kengo Kuma, Air Bricks.
Figure 150: Kosuke Tsumura, Final Home.
Figure 151: Kaoru Mende’s matches and Naoto Fukasawa’s tea bag.
Hara paired the cockroach trap with architect Kengo Kuma, a match inspired by the house-shaped trap popular in Japan (which debuted in 1973). This device includes an entrance mat, on which the cockroach wipes oil off its feet upon entering the “house.” Once inside, the roach immediately gets stuck on the adhesives, and eventually starves to death. The colorful home (in bright red and yellow graphics) is advertised as “some happy cockroach family.” Absurd as it may sound, the idea seems to help assuage the consciences of the Japanese from the actuality of brutal killing. Instead of this opaque homicide, Kuma consecrates the roaches’ demise in a tunnel of translucent, illuminant prisms, which obscure their abominable shape. (The lightness of this redesign is also evident in Kuma’s architectural works, such as Air Bricks, consisting of inflatable units used in varied scenarios as chairs, lights, enclosure, etc. and Teahouse, saturated with light to the extent that its existence seems to lessen.) Kuma’s roach trap celebrates the Japanese minimalist, do-it-yourself spirit, with just a roll of adhesive tape. One simply cuts off the desired length and folds it into a square tunnel. Long and thin, the tunnel can be set into the chinks along kitchen cabinets, where cockroaches are likely to tread. Unlike the cumbersome trapezoidal house-trap, this clean-cut, elegant redesign adapts to modern interior spaces.

As for the disposable diaper for adults, fashion designer Kosuke Tsumura cleverly introduces the architectural theme “Final Home.” Originally a fashion line for Issey Miyake Inc., Final Home conceptualizes clothing as the “ultimate shelter”—as in times of disaster, wars or unemployment, which costs one’s loss of home, leaving him or her with only the immediate cover of clothes. Currently, the common form of the adult diaper bears unfortunate similarity to that worn by an infant; wearing it brings on the humiliation of regression to the infantile state. To ameliorate this stigma, Tsumura designs a pair of stylish trunks in trans-illumination fabric,
using a high polymer absorbent material inside to effectively prevent leakage. Their trendy aesthetics sever the pejorative association between the adult diaper and the shame of wearing them. One finally feels at home in this redesign. (This conception applies to the entire Final Home ensemble of clothing, including running shirts, T-shirts and shorts, which absorb sweat and other bodily secretions at different levels. (Their absorption performance is indicated by a number, with diapers ranking the highest at level 3).219

The ubiquitous match was redesigned by lighting designer Kaoru Mende;220 he replaces the thin piece of cardboard with a natural twig coated with incombustible substance. Product designer Naoto Fukasawa redesigns the tea bag in the shape of a dancing marionette, and others similarly come up with imaginative redesigns based on their professional expertise. These Japanese redesigns all make the known somewhat unknown, the premise of Re-Design. The collection eventually culminates in the show Re-Design: Daily Products of the 21st Century.221

---

219 For further details on Final Home, see Kenya Hara, Designing Design (Baden, Switzerland: Lars Müller Publishers, 2007) and also http://www.finalhome.com/ (accessed Nov. 28, 2012).

220 Kaoru Mende is the principle of Lighting Detectives. His innovative research includes investigating urban nighttime lighting in Japan, which identifies vending machines, convenient stores, and so forth, as the strongest nighttime lighting sources. Mende was the lighting consultant for Toyo Ito’s “Sendai Mediatheque” (2001).

221 RE-DESIGN (2001) was held on the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Japanese specialty paper company Takeo. The show aimed at redesigning familiar everyday objects as the essence of design.
Figure 152: Architecture and Macaroni, 1995.
Situated within *Re-Design, Architecture and Macaroni* further strives, even didactically, to make the unknown (architectural creativity) known (to the Japanese public). Hara chose food as its means of instruction because everyone can appreciate food—he seems to speculate that knowledge can be digested through actual ingestion of macaroni. The most common known shapes of macaroni on the market are the hollow tubes (*penne*), the spirals/screws (*fusilli*), the ribbons/butterflies (*farfalle*), and the shells (*conchiglie*). To reform these customary shapes, Hara invited the architects and artists (including himself) to enter the kitchen, put on an apron, and prepare “architecture on a plate.” The provocation certainly spawned unprecedented, fantastical macaroni forms: a joint symbol of she & he, a concentric ripple, a whistle, a blank Noh mask, a set of female organs (an ear, a pair of lips, and a breast), a rising string, a set of the architect’s tools (a pencil, an eraser, a t-square, a triangle and an arc, plus a pair of Le Corbusier’s glasses and a monopoly house), a two-blade rotor, an engraved plate (with sixteen Japanese kanji\(^\text{222}\) characters linked to food in meaning), a grooved vessel, eating utensils (a spoon and a fork), a butterfly knot, a punch card, a spiral, a ball-flower, a trio of an earth, a man and a woman, a tri-color möbius strip, and a perforated wavy wafer (Miyawaki’s design).

As fantastical as the macaroni redesigns themselves was their dramatic setting. *Architecture and Macaroni*, which ran from June 10\(^\text{th}\) to 18\(^\text{th}\), 1995 took place at the Kogakuin University in Tokyo. The display area was a semi-circle of round columns in alternating heights. The short columns (at table height) served as pedestals, and on top of each pedestal sat one FRP macaroni model. Spotlights were projected directly onto the models, with the rest of the space contrastingly pitch black. An additional ring of tall columns (almost touching the ceiling), offset from the pedestals, formed the backdrop for the exhibits. In contrast, the dining area was set like

\(^{222}\) Kanji is a system of Japanese writing using Chinese characters.
a typical Japanese noodle shop, with rows of tables in shiny black lacquer and chairs (of the same material), facing each other in pairs. In this jarring manner, *Architecture and Macaroni* juxtaposed art display with dinner.

In conjunction with the show, JIA published an exhibition catalog, *Architecture and Macaroni*, which features the edible designs in detail, including the artists'/architects’ notes, sketches, technical drawings, photographs, and Kogure’s recipes (composed in poems). The black-and-white photos of the FRP models in the catalog, illuminated by spotlights in an otherwise pitch-dark space, echo the theatrical undertone of their display in the gallery. These photos have obviously been photoshopped. Their formality looks homogenous; their subjects/objects look unnatural in their “brightness/contrast” setting. Because of this image manipulation, the macaroni models appear to be shadowless and afloat in a seemingly two-dimensional, darkened space. Juxtaposed with the colorful illustrations of their cooked forms—delicious-looking pasta dishes in the subtlest pastels and creams (on the opposite page), which reflect the actual dinner—the reds (in FRP) look especially stony and surreal. In the catalog as well as in the gallery, *Architecture and Macaroni* accentuates this interplay of contrasting characters—hard and soft, exact and inexact, inanimate and animate, inorganic and organic, and replica/representation and reality.
Figure 153: *Architecture and Macaroni*, exhibition design by Kenya Hara, 1995.
Figure 154: Architecture and Macaroni: exhibition catalog.
Figure 155: Architecture and Macaroni: typical pages.
このパピラスの細バスケは、
イタリア面雨の色をしている。
この色をそのまま生かしている。
そう思ってきたのが、
薄い面だけパラパラで作ったパラです。
薄いパラに一部を
オリーブオイルで閉じただけのなかに、
さくらパラスの絹を加えて下さい。
不溶媒で固定のパラスの絹を
ベアソルトでココに浸したのは、アラミ酸液、
(この入れ合わせ)

Figure 156: Takenobu Watanabe, Möbiuroni.
Course One: Mathematics
(Will vs. Fox)

From the very outset, “architecture on a plate” conveys mathematical thinking, which arguably underpins all architectural creation. Most explicitly, Takenobu Watanabe’s Möbiuroniqué appropriates a recognizable topological form, the Möbius strip. Watanabe ties a string-shaped pasta into a Möbius knot by twisting (180°) and joining their ends. Then following this basic conception, he joins three Möbius strips by passing one at the hollow (circumscribed by the strips) through the other to derive a convoluted knot. Each tri-piece of Möbiuroniqué is formed by a green, a white/eggshell, and a red pasta string—for the spinach, original, and tomato flavors—cleverly taking its food identity into account (the tri-color also reflects the flag of Italy, according to Watanabe\textsuperscript{223}). When heated up, the tri-strip splits again, becoming knotted Möbius triplets. This dish is to be served with red peppers in a radiant plateful. On the plate, Möbiuroniqué still complies with topological logic (of inexact form). The cooked knots soften into colorful weaves of distorted edible ribbons.

Jun Harada’s Macala likewise demonstrates mathematical thinking, but in geometry instead of topology. Harada engineered an intricate geometrical object, representing a ball-flower—a popular architectural ornament for cathedral design in the 13\textsuperscript{th} and 14\textsuperscript{th} century, essentially a ball inserted in the cup of a flower. This meticulous construct shows painstaking exactitude: a hollow ellipsoidal (50 mm in diameter in plan) of extraordinarily thin surface (1 mm thick) punctured by a rounded X-cross on the top. Their fanlike blades (flower pedals) curve up slightly (5 mm). In tandem, the bottom surface incurvates upward. Governed by precise mathematical measurement of the ruler and the compass, Macala evinces no ambiguity;

\textsuperscript{223} Architecture and Macaroni, 49.
no anomalies can be found. Everything is precise and intelligible. *Macala* represents a paragon of geometrical perfection in a vegetal-floral motif.

But *Macala* is surreal food. Contrary to the surrealist’s melted clock, the precarious Japanese macaroni petrifies. Illustrated by an enlarged FRP model on a pedestal, *Macala* transcends reality; its intricate geometry, to the minute measurement of 1 mm arises from a mixture of flour and liquid, expands and solidifies. The black-and-white photo reinforces this surreal identity. In a perfectly dark background, under a straight overhead light, *Macala* casts no shadows outwardly, only shadows contained inside the ball-flower projected from the blades of the top layer to the surface below. The scrupulous geometry is all there is, complete in itself,
without a legible relationship to a ground plane. Detached from reality, *Macala* resides in the purely abstract world of mathematics.

With its shared conceptual basis in mathematics, *Macala’s* photoshopped geometrical construct especially evokes Man Ray’s surrealist photographs—more than Salvador Dalí’s “edible beauty,” though Dalí’s work materializes in assorted food forms: bread, shrimp, asparagus, etc.224 Man Ray visited the Institut Henri Poincaré, where these mathematical models were stored; he photographed them and collectively entitled this photo series *Mathematical Objects* (1934-1936).

Back in the 1880s when non-Euclidean thinking emerged and bloomed, Poincaré took upon himself the making of mathematical models to explicate the complex new geometries. Essentially, there are two basic non-Euclidean geometries with constant curvature: hyperbolic geometry (with negative curvature) and elliptic geometry (with positive curvature); (Euclidean geometry has zero curvature). The hyperbolic geometry is hard to imagine, as it cannot exist in three-dimensional space. Poincaré’s models in wood, plaster, metal and wire helped one to visually comprehend the complex geometries, such as *Surface de Kummer*, a quartic surface derived from a set of algebraic equations:

---

(x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - μ 2w^2) 2 - λ pqrst = 0,
where \( λ = (3 \mu 2-1)/(3- \mu 2) \),
p = w - z - x,
q = w - z + x,
r = w + z + y,
s = w + z - y, and \( w \) is a parameter.

Contrary to Macala’s transformation into mathematics, Mathematical Objects aims to transcend mathematics. At the time of Many Ray’s photographic constructions, non-Euclidean geometry was a topic of endless fascination for the Surrealist artists. This is suggested by their work titles, for example, Non-Euclidean Psychology of a Photograph (1935) by Dalí, The Meeting of Parallels (1935) by Yves Tanguy, and Young Man Intrigued by the Flight of a Non-Euclidean Fly (1942) by Max Ernst. They were drawn to their evocative mathematical forms and spatial qualities. In keeping with their surrealist ideal of metamorphosis, the artists strived to transmit the rational to the irrational. Referencing Poincaré’s mathematical models in particular, André Breton said to Man Ray: “Now that these almost unknown objects have been brought to
our attention, it remains for us to interpret them in our own manner, in order to appropriate them."\textsuperscript{225} Man Ray replied, “My dear André, let me assure you, I have always been in accord with you on the necessity of perverting the legitimate legends of the mathematical objects, if we are to consider these as a valid source of inspiration.”\textsuperscript{226} Unlike the macaroni identity lost in their rigid FRP models and photoshopped photos, misrepresentation was intentional in \textit{Mathematical Objects}. Perversion was Man Ray’s goal.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{image1.png}
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{image2.png}
\caption{Max Ernst, \textit{Young Man Intrigued by the Flight of a Non-Euclidean Fly}, 1942; Yves Tanguy, \textit{The Meeting of Parallels}, 1935.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{225} Man Ray, “A Note on the Shakespearean Equations ” (1947) and “Man Ray’s piece in the catalog” (1948) \textit{To be Continued Unnoticed: some papers by Man Ray in connection with his exposition}, December, 1948 Copley Galleries. Also in \textit{Man Ray} (an exhibition organized by the Los Angeles County Museum of Art in cooperation with the museum’s Contemporary Art Council and under the direction of Jules Langsner), Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Lytton Gallery, 1966, 22-23.

\textsuperscript{226} Ibid.
Instead of a direct, single light source to deprive Macala’s geometrical flower of its exterior shadow, Man Ray employed multiple light sources and tampered with the angle of shots to engineer ambiguity. *Mathematical Objects* often evokes an odd anthropomorphic or zoomorphic association out of their already complex geometries. For example, *Surface A Constante Négative D’enneper, Dérivée de la Pseudo Sphère* appears as a truncated body with dislocated body parts—a torso with a large tongue sticking out of the cleavage of the chest. In a different view, the same model appears to be a headless and footless woman holding out what looks like a giant seashell, as if presenting an offering. Here Man Ray played up the curves of the model to elicit a connection to the female body. The soft lighting and shadows simultaneously evoke, however absurdly, a mischievous grimace (of a large tongue sticking out) and a submissive pilgrim (offering a seashell). Man Ray retained the original mathematical titles.
despite his dramatic manipulations, disregarding Breton’s urges to substitute these analytical titles for more “humanly evocative” names, such as: *Pursued by her Hoop, Death of the Paper Favor, Thus Spake..., The Round Knife, Hypnotic Sleep, and The Circus*. But the jarring mathematical label with the anthropomorphic or zoomorphic photographic content points up the surrealist intent to disrupt the mathematical rationale.

Figure 161: Jun Harada, *Macala*. 
In contrast, the disruption of Macala’s perfect geometry occurs between its raw form and the cooked dish. In the show’s catalog, this delicious rendition in pastel colors and creams is juxtaposed with the surreal, black-and-white photo representation (of the rigid FRP model). Therefore moving across the page/space, the geometrical object melts; mathematics transmogrifies into macaroni. No longer holding shadows in its cross-shape, Macala is now saturated with cheese. Its delicate flower pedals wilt. Its cross deforms. Instead, warmth and aroma waft out of the plate. Here form actually follows “fiction”—were it simply for “function,” a pouch would suffice to hold the cheese. Macala’s punctiliously calculated form of intricate curvature is superfluous, a luxury by design. When cooked, measurement and exactitude give way to lively colors and sensual pleasure.227

Comparing Macala to Mathematical Objects once again brings Japanese silence, which suppresses emotion, to the fore. Man Ray’s photos, on the other hand, provoke emotion, Surface Réglée especially. In Man Ray’s reinterpretation, this geometrical model metamorphoses into a fox head, its mouth muffled. The animal appears to be very angry but is holding back its anger. There is tension, amplified by taut wires and rising fumes (shadows), and mystery, suggested by the dark background that hides the animal’s body, plus a perplexing paradox; the elongated

227 Coincidentally, Mathematical Objects had also evolved into color illustrations. Twelve years later, Man Ray created twenty oil paintings, collectively entitled Shakespearean Equation, based on the originally black-and-white photos. Now Man Ray assigned these paintings new titles in place of their mathematical names. For example, Allure de la Fonction Elliptique P’(U) pour G2 = 0 et G3 = 4 is renamed Merry Wives of Windsor. This collection is better known than the photographic series of Mathematical Objects. Fortunè in “Man Ray et objets mathématiques” claims that Shakespearean Equations better illustrate Man Ray’s pictorial talents. However, in my opinion, the symbiotic quality of Mathematical Objects (of rational and irrational) has mostly disappeared in the pictorial translation of Shakespearean Equations.
hollow holes of the fox’s eyes produce a hateful gaze in their emptiness. The atmosphere of *Surface Réglée* is positively frightful.

Though similar in their representation, vis-à-vis the malicious fox, *Macala*’s delicate geometry cultivates an air of poise, delight and beauty. Its incurvated blades suggest an exotic flower in bloom, quietly, their extraordinary thinness revealed through the hollow of its cross. Unlike the fuming fox, the shadowless stony flower muffles emotions; in a way, their shadows evince their emotions, or the lack of them. Between the emotive animal and the emotionless floret, two mathematical objects end with two fates: mystery and silence.

![Figure 162: Surface Réglée vs. Macala.](image-url)
Course Two: Structure

“Architecture on a plate” necessitates structural design. In his *Semi Constructive*, architect Kengo Kuma resolved to build vertically, disregarding practicality. Unlike the bite-sized macaroni, Japanese noodles, such as *soba* (buckwheat-based) and *udon* (wheat-based), are string-shaped—*soba* has a round cross-section whereas *udon* has a square one, though both are created by slicing their (noodle) dough with a kitchen knife. Kuma called these string-shaped noodles “non-constructive,” and the bite-sized, compact macaroni “constructive.”228 The architect aspired to create a non-constructive macaroni, which nevertheless transcends the tangibility of a string-shape. Accordingly, *Semi Constructive* takes the ambiguous form of a slightly twisted and folded string. This lengthy, lithe pasta bends and turns upward then coils back down, terminating in a closed knot.

Unlike the essentially one-dimensional string noodle, *Semi Constructive* is vectorial and spatial. Though it begins with a line, the macaroni strip loops a trajectory in space. Its changing slopes and folds rise and fall, outlining a volume. Yet its flimsiness and thinness at once distinguish it from the mere objecthood of the hollow tube, spiral, ribbon/butterfly or shell macaroni one would find in a supermarket.

---

228 *Architecture and Macaroni*, 20.
Above all, *Semi Constructive* demonstrates structural sensibility—that is, its FRP representation. Unlike the common compact macaroni content with a recumbent position, the architect’s redesign insists on reaching upward. *Semi Constructive* shows that architecture must stand out against gravity, among other natural forces, such as wind and seismic load, that must be considered in designing a vertical structure. In reality, this “non-constructive” is nevertheless in-erectable. Made of dough, not FRP, the mini structure would no sooner stand than go limp. Like the impossibility of precision in *Macala*, *Semi Constructive* is structurally impracticable.

This desire to erect a vertical structure in the macaroni is also seen in Hiroyuki Wakabayashi’s *Taste It* and Kenya Hara’s *Tateroni*. Hara engineered a spiral tower out of a triangular thin slice of dough. His shows a mini food spire with big, perforated round holes reminiscent of Swiss cheese. In contrast, instead of a centripetal design, *Taste It* arises from a flower pattern. There is a small central core, out of which radiate six corrugated walls/pedals. *Taste It’s* direct vertical extrusion of a floral plan shows a centrifugal tendency.
Interestingly, this constructive nature shared by *Semi Constructive, Taste It* and *Tateroni* meshes with the history of modern Japanese elite cuisine, as illustrated in their unique genre of culinary writing called *ryoribon*. In feudal Japan, the shogunate enacted laws to control the commoner’s life in minute detail: what proper clothing to wear, what size home to live in, and so on. Food and dining were under especially intense sumptuary regulation. The game birds used in elite banquets, such as wild goose, wild duck, crane and swan, were banned. Likewise special recipes, such as *mitsuguri* (the artfully peeled chestnuts soaked in salt water), were forbidden. As a result, *ryoribon* emerged, which comprised manuscripts of special recipes with graphical demonstrations. These cookbooks were mostly disseminated privately, though some were eventually published. Because their contents were not subjected to the shogunate’s ruling, *ryoribon* allowed the commoner a peek into the secret world of elite cuisine.

---

229 For more details on *ryoribon*, see Eric C. Rath, *Food and Fantasy in Early Modern Japan* (Berkeley : University of California Press, c2010).

230 The first published Japanese collection of menus, printed in 1671, is *Collection of Cooking Menues*. 
“Taste may be the most important thing in the laws of cuisine, but taste is not restricted to just eating with the mouth,” argues the ryoribon author of *Collected Writings on Cuisine and an Outline on Seasonings*, 1730. The fantastical illustrations on the pages fed and satiated the readers’ curious minds. They were feasts for the eyes. In particular, the fanciful, eye-catching cuisine in *ryoribon* often arose from an architectural recreation of food. For example, “Spiny Lobster” refashions a lobster into a boat. “Snipe Wing” makes a flamboyant display of aliments by detaching, and then reattaching and rearranging the feathered wings. Like *Semi Constructive*, *Tateroni* and *Taste It*, “Spiny Lobster” and “Snipe Wing” give rise to a structure, though in a visceral manner instead of geometrical abstraction.

Catering to culinary fantasies, *Architecture and Macaroni* (the catalog) forms a contemporary *ryoribon* of its kind. This new fantasy is part culinary (as illustrated by its picturesque, colorful sketches and lyrical poems/recipes) and part architectural (the FRP models, their black-and-white photos, and the architects’ hardline, technical drawings). Now surrendered to gravity on the plate, the golden *Semi Constructive* mixes lustrous scallops with black pearly caviars. A troupe of egg balls (of egg whites, decorated with caramel sauce) embraces—and braces, structurally—*Tateroni*, swimming in bright yellow soup (of yolks). *Taste It*’s pedals (plucked off its core for cooking) stack neatly among other foodstuffs. Illustrated in *Architecture and Macaroni*, their superfluous construct and vivid imagination are similarly intended for the eyes, yet transcending the voyeuristic *ryoribon* to publicize architectural creativity.
Course Three: Metaphor and Literalism

Further, “architecture on a plate” uses metaphors and literal forms, as well as inducing them. This is true of architecture in general. “People invariably see one building in terms of another, or in terms of similar object; in short as a metaphor,” argues Charles Jencks in *Language of Post-Modern Architecture*. The pre-cast concrete grill used on buildings (beginning from the late 1950s), for example, is seen as a “cheese grater” or a “beehive.” Oftentimes a visual comparison is culturally coded, such as Kisho Kurokawa’s Nakagin Capsule Building (1972). The Metabolist building is said to resemble stacked sugar cubes, or washing machines piled on top of one another. Jencks actually addressed these metaphors to Kurokawa in person, who in astonishment replied: “They aren’t washing machines, they’re bird cages. You see in Japan we build concrete-box bird nests with round holes and place them in the trees. I built these bird nests for itinerant businessmen who visit Tokyo, for bachelors who fly in every so often with their birds.” Kurokawa’s flippant response shows the expectedly varied readings of a building form from culture to culture.

Metaphors abound in the Japanese macaroni redesigns. Shoji Hayashi’s *Puncture*, in the shape of a slightly curved strip covered with sharp-edged holes (comparable to the pre-cast concrete grill), is also reminiscent of a cheese or vegetable grater. Tadasu Ohe entitles his piece in concentric, radial circles *Wave*. Hara calls his *Tateroni* a “floating castle.” Akio Okumura’s *i flutte* looks like a whistle, whereas Kaoru Kasai’s *Ottoco* an organ (or a Noh mask). Besides, Kanji Hayashi’s metaphor is culturally coded. His *Serie Macchel’occhi* may seem like a pretzel to the westerners—purportedly the shape of the pretzel mimics a praying monk. But a literate Japanese would identify it with the Japanese character 咲 (pronounced me).

---


232 Ibid.
Figure 166: Kisho Kurokawa, Nakagin, 1972.
Figure 167: Shoji Hayashi, *Puncture*; Tadasu Ohe, *Wave*; Akio Okumura, *i flute*; Kanji Hayashi, *Serie Macchel’occhi*.
Still others’ macaroni redesigns exploit the bounds of literal forms. Kobun Nakamura’s *Colchette* presents a spoon and a fork in pair. Atsushi Kitagawara’s *Le paste di Madame Edwarda* shows a luscious trio: a pair of lips, an ear and a breast. Edward Suzuki’s *Macaroni Architectti – the Magnificent Seven* introduces a full set of architectural drafting tools: a pencil, an eraser, a t-square, a triangle, an arc, plus a pair of (Le Corbusier’s) glasses and a monopoly house. Fittingly placed on pedestals, the metaphorical and literal macaroni were meant to be read—before being moved to the kitchen (metaphorically), cooked, then served in the gallery and eaten (literally).

Collectively, the RFP models on display formed a concrete visual menu. The visitors “read” them and then sat down at the tables to eat the real stuff. This procedure and setup smacked of the idiosyncratic Japanese culture of *sampuru*, literally “sample,” that is, the fake food models used across restaurants in Japan. Restaurateurs from eateries and *izakaya* (Japanese bars) to coffee shops and even ice cream parlors arrange *sampuru* in the display windows at the front of their shops. These fake food models encompass both Japanese-style food, such as *don* (bowl of rice topped with deep-fried prawns, pork, etc.), curry rice, sushi, sashimi, *ramen*, *gyoza*
(pan-fried dumplings), sukiyaki (hot pot), tempura set and assorted sweets—and western-style food, such as sandwiches, hamburgers, French fries, pizza and beers (typically presented in a jug with spilling foam). Sampuru consequently makes up a unique cultural and architectural phenomenon, transforming the restaurant’s facade into a readable street menu of colorful food replicas for the passersby (i.e. potential customers). \(^{233}\)


Figure 169: Examples of Japanese fake food models, sampuru.
But unlike the fantastical, architectural macaroni in show, the streetward sampuru is grounded in realism. This bizarre Japanese industry began in 1932, by Gifu prefecture entrepreneur Takizo Iwasaki, who saw the business opportunity as western cuisines flooded into Japan and baffled the Japanese customers—even with a Japanese translation of the menu. His very first sampuru, a fluffy rice omelet with a drop of thick red ketchup on top, was inspired by the wax fruit and vegetables used in his nutrition classes at school. Subsequently, aimed at realistic representation, Iwasaki created truer and truer fake models—true in the sense that they even fake natural imperfections. Iwasaki engineered flaws, faking bruises in a banana sample; he orchestrated minute details, copying the patterns of the fibers and tendons in a beef strip. Eventually, Iwasaki streamlined the manufacturing technology of sampuru. (The technology has since progressed from wax models to plastic models made from vinyl chloride).234

The verisimilitude of sampuru further extends to their site of production: a fake kitchen, in actuality a factory. German director Wim Wenders’ documentary Tokyo-Ga (1985) affords a glimpse into this exotic behind-the-scenes activity.235 The “kitchen” has all the normal commercial kitchen equipment: sinks, ovens, etc., but the productive activities within are strangely shut off. A man crouches on the floor, pouring a clear liquid over (real) sushi and sashimi placed in a large metal tray; fake food actually begins with real food. The man is making a mold. Next he pours liquid wax into the mold, lets it cool and solidify. Near him, another man is making a sandwich. He piles (fake) lettuce leaves, ham, cheese, and toast and then shaves off their uneven edges. Working directly on the stainless-steel surface shows that, in

---

234 His company Iwasaki Be-I still owns the largest market share in Japan, and since 1975 it has extended business to America. See http://www.iwasaki-bei.co.jp/

235 The documentary “Tokyo-Ga” is essentially about Japanese filmmaker Yasujiro Ozu. But its subjects widely include scenes of contemporary Tokyo, such as pachinko and plastic food displays. “Tokyo-Ga” was screened in the 1985 Cannes Film Festival.
this kitchen, there is no concern for hygiene. The workers grab sushi with their dirty hands. They leave tools, not generally used for cooking, on the floor. They even paint food to correct its colors. On top of the visual blunders, there is likely a false smell as well (though not captured by the film)—rather than the tantalizing aroma of food, the smell of wax fills the kitchen.

The FRP models at Architecture and Macaroni mimic literal forms as well, but in a reductive manner instead of sampuru’s false realism. Rather than relentlessly mimicking food, Suzuki’s Macaroni Architectti – the Magnificent Seven rejects the look of food by looking instead like a pencil, an erasers, a t-square, etc. Avoiding details, the pieces show perfectly straight edges, perfectly round circles, perfectly smooth surfaces. The ruler has no measurement marks; the pair of glasses has no temple though it has a bridge. Enlarged twenty times, their reductive forms are manifestly harsh. The sharp tools simply look indigestible.

But by no means is the FRP macaroni under any obligation to look delicious or even edible, as opposed to sampuru, which captures every complex detail from bruises to fibers and tendons without slacking or loosening; self-expression is inhibited in every respect. Unlike sampuru’s role to verily represent food, the macaroni’s job is to reflect architectural creativity; the design references itself, inwardly. Although likewise exercising precision, the macaroni’s is that of geometrical abstraction. Every line, curve, surface, is measured, calculated to demonstrate architectural finesse. There is no room for ambiguity. In a sense, the FRP model’s rigidity and exactness are the architect’s creative expression solidified, whereas sampuru epitomizes the Japanese business ethos of perfectionism.
This Japanese spirit of exactitude reflected in their food-architecture is the diametric opposite of Claes Oldenburg’s messy food-art. In terms of subject matter, Suzuki’s Magnificent Seven (with the architect’s tools displayed on a plate) finds an intriguing paradox in Oldenburg’s False Food Selection (1966) with food—two fried eggs, a strip of bacon, hamburger, a tomato, a pickle, a chocolate donut and three wafers—contained in a tool box (False Food Selection is a prototype for proposed Fluxus Edition).\textsuperscript{236} In contrast to the Japanese macaroni of perfect geometries, the false food (of rubber and/or plastic) shows organic cooked forms commonly seen in real life. For example, the egg whites are amorphous and uneven, especially when compared to their round egg yolks. They glow with greasiness. They are adorned with traces of burst bubbles, as if incurred from the process of frying with cooking oil. But unlike sampuru’s built-in flaws of nature, false food is sloppy imitation. In their ostensive glow and unnatural colors they reveal their falsehood. Utterly different from the Japanese exactitude, False Food demonstrates what art critic Sidney Tillim calls the “exhilarating messiness of slob-culture” of the west.\textsuperscript{237}

Oldenburg’s food art also, by accentuating American excessiveness, starkly contrasts Japanese lack of emotion, which characterizes both sampuru and the Japanese architects and


\textsuperscript{237} Sidney Tillim, “Month in Review,” Arts Magazine (November 1962), 38.
artists’ macaroni redesigns. “Very often I am sitting at dinner and I take out my notebook. I get very inspired when I eat, for some reason,” says the western artist. Besides False Food, Oldenburg created two lines of foods. He made a floor sequence: Floor Cone (1961), Floor Pie (1962) and Floor Hamburger aka Giant Hamburger (1962), in acrylic on canvas filled with foam rubber and cardboard boxes. Unlike False Food Selection, this floor sequence makes no effort to imitate real food. The fake ice cream cone, pie and hamburger are disproportionally large, even more inflated than the FRP macaroni models. For example, Floor Cone is 11’- 4” long, about twice as tall as a person in its upright position. And like the human body, the soft cone of sailcloth yields to gravity; it flops right onto the floor without proper support. The floor sequence is punctuated with a kind of morbid humor.

In his other food line, Oldenburg made solid hamburgers and pastries in plastered muslin or burlap over wire frames, painted with enamel. His hamburgers include: Hamburger with Pickle and Olive (1960) and Two Cheesburgers, with Everything (1962), and pastries: Pastry Case (1961), Pastry Case I (1961-1962), Pie à la Mode (1962), and Ice Cream Being Tasted (1964). Herein “exhilarating messiness” culminates. Pastry Case I, for example, consists of nine different sweets: pies, cakes, sundaes, candied apple, and so forth, placed in three tiers inside a glass case. The design has the familiar look of a western delicatessen, except, of course, for its fake contents. This construct especially recalls the sampuru display in glass windows. But again Oldenburg’s enameled pastries are anything but faithful copies of their original counterparts. In fact, they deviate so far as if to mock the real stuff. If using the linguistic analogy, the pastries are parodies; they are “food” placed in quotation marks. Their paint job is slovenly—too dense, too shiny, too bright. In a splashy fashion that reminds one of Pollack’s

---

work, the paint seems about to drip. Consequently, the messy pies, cakes and sundaes acquire lives of their own; the chocolate syrup on the ice cream seems on the verge of overflowing; the yellow custards are about to ooze out of the pies; the pile of strawberries might tumble off the cakes, and so on. Because of this built-in possibility of transformation, the colorful delicatessen both exhilarates and disturbs the spectator, as opposed to the poised and precise Japanese *sampuru* or macaroni models, which hardly arouse any emotion at all.

Figure 171: Claes Oldenburg, *Floor Cone*, 1961 and *Floor Pie*, 1962.
Figure 172: Claes Oldenburg, *Pastry Case I*, 1961-62; 
*Hamburger with Pickle and Olive*, 1960 and *Two Cheeseburgers, with Everything*, 1962.
In reality, of course, no transformation happens in *Pastry Case I*. The inanimate food remains inanimate in its glass case. In contrast, *sampuru* and the macaroni redesigns have their edible counterparts. At the end of the day, the onlookers/visitors move onto the real stuff. The food models do not keep them staring at their wax, plastic, or FRP constructions. In *Macaroni Architectti – the Magnificent Seven*, served with a bowl of “White Bean Green Soup” [白いんげん豆のグリーンスープ・パスタ], the architect’s pencils, erasers, t-squares, triangles, arcs, (Le Corbusier’s) glasses and the monopoly houses swim in the hot soup. Their metaphors become literal (food).

Figure 173: *Macaroni Architectti – the Magnificent Seven* in “White Bean Green Soup.”
Course Four: Symbol

(Fantastic vs. Functional)

Me de taberu Nihonjin (Japanese people eat with their eyes)239

“Architecture on a plate” also shows that architecture can function as a symbol. Instead of metaphors and literal forms, several of the macaroni redesigns have recourse to logograms and signs. Norihide Imagawa’s She & He joins the accustomed male/female symbols—the circle with an arrow (for men) and the circle with a cross (for women). Their forms are immediately graspable, but their meanings discursive. On the surface, the symbolic connection with sex suggests the sensual pleasure of eating. Prepared with scarlet shrimps and large clams in fish soup, She & He looks tantalizing, and even suggestive of aphrodisiac powers. But Imagawa insisted that his symbolic macaroni carries the serious social message of unification. In Japan, surging individualism had weakened interpersonal ties. Instead of sexual pleasure, She & He purportedly advocates communal reconnection.

In contrast to She & He’s graphical symbols, Noriyuki Tanaka painstakingly engraved sixteen complex kanji characters onto the small of his macaroni square: 食. On one side of the macaroni is inscribed 食, meaning food; the character is also the lemma of the verb: eat (and the title of this redesign). On the other side, the macaroni shows a matrix of sixteen Japanese characters with 食 as their radical: 食 (food), 飯 (rice), 餅 (wafer), 餈 (candy), 飲 (drink), 飼 (fodder), 餌 (prey), 飢 (hungry), 飽 (full), 食 (eclipse), 飾 (ornament), 養 (feed),

Figure 174: Norihide Imagawa, *She & He*.
餐 (meal), 饗 (banquet), 饗 (gluttonous), and 饗 (ravenous). By literally engraving the Japanese characters, Tanaka engraves a Japanese character onto the western macaroni; 食 is unmistakably Japanese. Symbolically, 食 consummates the phenomenon of “doubling,” conjoining eastern taste (in look) with the western taste (in flavor) in one small macaroni square.

Interestingly, the culinary form of 食 coincides with Oldenburg’s Two Cheeseburgers, with Everything (1962). Two Cheeseburgers consists of seven extravagant layers of foodstuff in distinct colors: tomato/orange, mayonnaise/white, cheese/yellow, meat patty/charcoal-brown, and lettuce/green, sandwiched between two buns/beige. By comparison, according to Kogure’s special lasagna recipe for 食, the “macaroni dish” also consists of two lasagnas side by side, each also with seven layers: four layers of the macaroni squares and three layers of minced meat sandwiched in between them (putting aside the question of the technical difference between
lasagna and macaroni, which seems to matter little to the Japanese artists and architects). Though parallel in form, 食 and Two Cheeseburgers shows disparate artistic temperament. Like Pastry Case I, Two Cheeseburgers, with its unnatural coloration, glitter and superfluous substance, exhibits even more dramatically the “exhilarating messiness of slob culture” that Tillim speaks of. With their buns agape, everything in between seems about to break loose and free. Yet with everything still lumped together, their thick gluey overflowing foodstuff looks nothing but monstrous and repulsive, indeed the opposite of appetizing. Nothing falls short of exaggeration, excess and messiness.

In comparison, the Japanese pasta is well-mannered. Its squares stack neatly on top of one another, the reddish minced meat well-contained in between its demarcated square lot. Nothing is oozing out; nothing appalling. In contrast to Two Cheeseburgers’ heavy construction, 食 is thin and satiny, with an ethereal golden glow. The Japanese artist’s macaroni is purposefully tasteful.
Conceptually, 食 and *Two Cheeseburgers* illustrate two distinct architectural logical threads, demonstrated by Reyner Banham’s intriguing reflections on hamburgers. In *Los Angeles: the Architecture of Four Ecologies*, Banham distinguishes two kinds of hamburgers. One he calls “purely functional hamburger:”

The purely functional hamburger, as delivered across the counter of … any McDonald’s or Jack-in-the-Box outlet anywhere, is a pretty well-balanced meal that he who runs (surfs, drives, studies) can eat with one hand; not only the ground beef but all the sauce, cheese, shredded lettuce, and other garnishes are firmly gripped between the two halves of the bun.\(^\text{240}\)

The other he calls “fantastic hamburger:”

The fantastic hamburger, as served on a platter at a sit-down restaurant is something else again. Its component parts have been carefully opened up and separated out into an assemblage of functional and symbolic elements… The two halves of the bun lie face up with the ground beef on one hand, sometimes, the cheese on the other. Around and alongside on the platter are the lettuce leaves, gherkins, onion rings, fried potatoes, paper cups of relish or coleslaw, pineapple rings, and much more besides… \(^\text{241}\)

So the “functional hamburger” is in fact “fast food” and contains all its foodstuff between two half buns, easily held in one hand, and eaten while multitasking—eating it might be ancillary to the main activity, say, driving or surfing. As the designation “fast food” suggests, speed and efficacy characterize this “functional hamburger:” quickly prepared, speedily eaten, and shortening the time between one’s activities.


\(^{241}\) Ibid.
Fast food (among other prevalent consumer products\textsuperscript{242}) owes its success to war technology, expedited by the McDonald’s Corporation. Since the beginning of World War II, Colorado Springs became home to several crucial military bases, thanks to its strategic location: midcontinent, beyond the range of Soviet bombers, fine weather, etc. High-tech military installations and advanced communication networks proliferated, which attracted defense contractors, computer chip manufacturers, telemarketers and software companies to the city. Taking advantage of these resources, McDonald’s singled out Colorado Springs as its test site for creating and applying state-of-the-art restaurant technology: drive-through lanes with sensors buried in the asphalt to monitor the traffic; robotic drink machines to select properly sized cups, then filling them with ice and soda; and, dispensers powered by compressed carbon dioxide to shoot out uniform spurts of ketchup and mustard. In the kitchen, McDonald’s installed TV monitors, which instantly display the customer’s order, and wireless hand-held menus, which use radio waves to transmit orders. Essentially, computer software runs the entire operation, even forecasting future orders on the basis of ongoing customer flow and assigning tasks to various workers for maximum efficiency—adopting the “just in time” production philosophy of Japanese automobile plants\textsuperscript{243}.

What’s more, McDonald’s purchased commercial satellite photography to predict sprawl from outer space, and ultimately developed the software program Quintillion, combining satellite imagery with detailed maps, CAD drawings, demographic and sales information, to automate its site-selection process. This technology allows the corporation to “spy on their customers with

\textsuperscript{242} For a list of common consumer items linked to war, see Peter Nowak, \textit{Sex, Bombs, and Burgers: How War, Pornography, and Fast Food Have Shaped Modern Technology} (Guilford, Conn.: Lyons Press, c2011).

\textsuperscript{243} For the link of war technology to McDonald’s operation, see Eric Schlosser, \textit{Fast Food Nation: the Dark Side of the All-American Meal} (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2001), 61-66.
the same equipment once used to [fight] war.”244 Under military-like control, McDonald’s serves fast food even faster; “functional hamburgers” become ever more functional.

The “fantastic hamburger,” on the other hand, necessitates quiet, refined dining. The dish—it is after all a dish—is carefully designed and deployed on a plate. Visibly separated, each ingredient has its symbolic role even as a functional aliment. Eating the hamburger requires the common etiquette of sitting down, utensils in hand, and savoring the food with limited distractions. One is certainly not expected to be driving or surfing at the same time.

Oldenburg’s Two Cheeseburgers are “functional hamburgers.” The Pop artist seems biased toward this kind; even his Hamburger with Pickle and Olive, though placed on a plate (the hamburger alongside a pickle and an olive), still appears to be more “functional” than “fantastic.” In Two Cheeseburgers, despite its excess, the foodstuff still is compressed between its buns, and if not one hand, two hands can certainly hold the burger and move it to the mouth. These functional hamburgers of Oldenburg’s were specially admired by Denise Scott Brown and Robert Venturi, so much so that (in their “Learning from Levittown,” aka “Remedial Housing for Architects” studio at Yale in 1970), they urged architects to “Do for housing what Oldenburg did for hamburgers.” Scott Brown and Venturi argued that “Oldenburg has essentially made us look at hamburgers in another way because he has portrayed them in an unusual way: big, lacquered and in an art gallery.”245 (Based on their description of the hamburgers, they were apparently referring to Two Cheeseburgers, with Everything.) Filled to capacity, everything seemingly on

244 Schlosser, Fast Food Nation, 66.
the verge of gushing out, Oldenburg’s cheeseburgers have, in a sense, achieved the symbolic apotheosis of “functional hamburger.”

Scott Brown and Venturi commended Oldenburg’s (dis)placement of pop culture/food into the art gallery, and entreated architects to do likewise. Besides hamburgers, they pointed to soap operas, TV commercials, mass magazine advertisements, billboards, Route 66, Las Vegas, Los Angeles, Levittown, Co-op City, among other pop phenomena, as sources of inspiration for a changing architectural sensibility. In the spirit of “learning,” the architects produced a series of work entitled in the same manner: “Learning from Pop,”246 “Learning from Brinck,”247 Learning from Las Vegas,248 Learning from Levittown,249 et al. Scott Brown and Venturi particularly inspired “Learning from Hamburgers,”250 written by their employees at that time, Steven Izenour and Paul Hirshorn. With a special eye toward hamburgers, Izenour and Hirshorn embarked on an quest on wheels for the hamburger chain White Tower (based on the model of White Castle, the founder of fast food251). The two architects drove along the commercial strips in various cities, in search of this peculiar architecture for hamburgers, and photographed them at every

249 Unpublished manuscript. Architectural Archives of the University of Pennsylvania.
251 White Castle was founded by Bill Ingram, the “Granddaddy of the Hamburger,” as the industry’s trade publication Fast Food credits him. Focusing on an adult male clientele, this hamburger chain invented the 1st generation of fast food, as opposed to the 2nd generation—e.g. McDonald’s—targeting at a new market of families, children especially.
encounter. Their essay from these studies, “Learning from Hamburgers: the Architecture of White Towers,” was then published in *Architectural Plus* in 1973.\(^{252}\)

“Learning from Hamburgers” covers the general development of White Tower. The hamburger chain opened its very first shop, Milwaukee #1 in 1926, in the style of a glazed brick tower painted in white. Over 100 of these buildings on the same architectural theme of a white tower would be built subsequently, but with variations. Visibility nevertheless always played a key role. Chicago #1 (1928) exemplifies an ostentatious deviation (from Milwaukee #1). Covered in a checkerboard pattern, the tower showcases a large overhead sign, which reads “Hamburgers 5¢.” This sign serves as an integral part of White Tower’s subsequent designs. Later, porcelain enamel replaced the paint as the exterior cladding material. The company enlisted a metal building company to produce standardized, prefabricated “pure white cubes” with porcelain enamel panels attached to a structural framework in cold-rolled steel channels and rock wool to fill the space in-between for insulation. Camden #5” (1936), a porcelain enamel box with the basic tower elements: a central tower and gooseneck lamps,

on the cover of “Learning from Hamburgers,” exemplifies this prefab type.\textsuperscript{253}

Echoing the food sold inside, White Tower’s design logic follows that of “functional hamburger.” In fact, Banham extends his hamburger analogy to buildings. He specifically argues that, the architecture of the “fantastic hamburger” loads various forms onto one structure, as typified by Johnies (which actually sells hamburgers). This building’s plain shell is capped with a dramatically sloped roof decorated with stripes and garnished with lettering. Independent signs flank the building, including “a crowning non sequitur” of an enormous billboard as part of the structure though it advertises something entirely irrelevant to hamburgers. Together these symbolic garnishes to the front, on the top, and all around endue Johnies with a pop, commercial personality. Similarly, McDonald’s golden arch and orange roof create an architecture of “fantastic hamburger” (but sells “functional hamburgers” inside). In contrast, the architecture of “purely functional hamburger” yields primacy to a singular symbolic form. Examples Banham gives include Brown Derby in the shape of a hat, Cream Can in the shape of cream cans, and Hoot Hoot I Cream outlet in the shape of an owl (although this building in no way signifies what is sold inside).

Paralleling Hoot Hoot I Cream to a degree, White Tower falls into the category of “purely functional.” Its design takes on the symbolic architectural form of a tower, though in a reductive manner, which evolved from Medieval themes to Modern styles. The Medieval tower signifies “royalty, social and gastronomic prominence,”\textsuperscript{254} whereas the Modern tower suggests “luxury, cleanliness, speed and efficiency.”\textsuperscript{255} Yet the towers are consistently painted white—

\textsuperscript{253} White Tower finally floundered in the 70s.


\textsuperscript{255} Ibid.
Figure 178: White Towers: Chicago #5, 1928; Camden #5, 1936.
Figure 179: Reyner Banham’s illustrations of the architecture of “purely functional hamburger,” e.g. Brown Derby, and the architecture of the “fantastic hamburger,” e.g. Johnies.
like a surgeon dressed in white to perform an operation—to represent good hygiene and cleanliness. Advocating a pop aesthetic, this symbolic architecture serves a single aim: to sell hamburgers. Readily recognizable, the architecture itself constitutes an advertisement.\(^{256}\)

The modern White Towers of “speed and efficiency” especially speak to the emerging virtues of America in the age of automobiles (an interesting contrast with sampuru, which caters to Japan’s dense pedestrian culture). In the vast land of American suburbs, “space is not the most important constituent of suburban form, communication across space is”\(^{257}\)—hence the emphatic visibility of White Towers. In particular, echoing what Tom Wolfe calls the “drive-by aesthetic,”\(^{258}\) Camden #5 introduces flashy neon decoration and advertisements. This tower also sports a symmetrical design with large, wrap-around windows and a stepped tower over the central doorway. Its smooth curve gives the impression of a speedy machine, implying motion. To effectively communicate its message across the vast American suburban space, the building is kept close to the road. The tower image further serves as the “high reader,” whereas the added-on text signs—such as “Hamburgers 5¢”—the “low reader.” All in all, Camden #5 is designed to catch attention of the fast-passing driver in a car. (Inside, the simplistic graphic menu continues to extol the virtue of speed and efficiency. There are only 10 items, so that customers can quickly glance through it and decide what to order.) Just as the “functional hamburger” of

\(^{256}\) Pop Art has an origin in advertisement. Initially used by English art Critic Lawrence Alloway to describe the British Pop since 1949, the label “Pop Art” refers to the use of popular art sources by fine artists, including movie stills, science fiction, advertisements, game boards, and heroes of the mass media. “When Alloway spoke of ‘pop art,’” art critic Jasia Reichardt argues, “he meant: advertisements in glossy magazines, posters outside cinemas, leaflets, pamphlets, all give-away literature forcefully communicating a single message.” Although the usage of the term has not been kept entirely within this context, it was stated with reference to advertising art.

\(^{257}\) Scott Brown, “Learning from Pop,” 17.

Oldenburg’s *Two Cheeseburgers, with Everything* can be firmly held in one hand, White Tower can be quickly comprehended in a glance.

Urging architects to do for architecture what Oldenburg did for hamburgers, Scott Brown and Venturi further argue:

>In making popular art into high art he legitimizes it for the culture vultures. The popular environment, sprawl and strip is drastically in need of a similar service vis-à-vis the Fine Arts commissions… because Pop is unacceptable until it hangs in the academy and only the artist can put it there.  

Later in 1978, “Learning from Hamburgers” evolved into a book, *White Tower*, published by MIT Press, whereby Izenour and Hirshorn hung White Towers in the academy. Analogous to Oldenburg’s displacement of pop food into the gallery, the architects elevated fast-food architecture. In that sense, White Tower is the architectural equivalent of *Two Cheeseburgers, with Everything*.

>Although *Architecture and Macaroni*, like Oldenburg, also put pop food in the gallery, the Japanese artists and architects contrarily transformed macaroni into elite food, embracing the beautiful rather than the “ugly.” Then, after raising the everyday to art (in display, by mounting the macaroni on the pedestals), it initiated a descent back to the everyday (at dinner, serving the visitors cooked “architecture on a plate”). Contrary to the western pop art or architecture which draws inspiration from ordinary food, *Architecture and Macaroni* assumes almost an air of superiority, injecting flawless techniques and sheer artistry into the common macaroni dish.

---


Figure 180: Noriyuki Tanaka, 食.
The Japanese macaroni redesigns are, in contrast to the “purely functional” 
Cheeseburgers or White Towers, “fantastical hamburgers”—or rather, fantastical macaroni. For
example, in 食’s color illustration, a pair of a fork and a knife set alongside the “architecture on a
plate” suggests the macaroni’s fantastical status. But this is not to say that the design of 食
disregards its functional requirements. Understandably, “architecture on a plate” responds to
design criteria distinct from typical building design. Making a piece of macaroni involves
mixing grain powder with liquid, and shaping the soft, moist, malleable dough into a food form.
That being the case, macaroni can virtually take on any shape. But of course a viable form must
also consider practicality, including ample areas for coating with pasta sauce, and uniform
thickness (without a core) for even and proper heat conduction. Ultimately, the design must take
gustatory sensation and visual appeal into account; the macaroni must look delicious.261 No
doubt the exquisite thin squares of 食 satisfies the criteria for visual appeal and proper heat
conduction. Additionally, comparable to the common macaroni on the market, which
incorporates grooves in its design to increase the surface area for coating with sauce, 食’s
elaborate scores of the Japanese characters serve the same purpose yet in a uniquely exquisite
fashion.

Imaginably, to savor the “fantastic” 食 requires an entirely different dining style from that
used to engulf the fast food hamburgers sold in White Towers or Oldenburg’s Two
Cheeseburgers (were they edible). As opposed to the “functional hamburger,” which can be
eaten mindlessly, requiring little to no effort of the eyes—in the case of driving, one can hold it
in one hand, with the other on the steering wheel, looking straight ahead through the windshield

261 Kenya Hara discusses these criteria in his forward “Architecture on a Plate” [皿の上の建築群] in the
exhibition catalog.
at the road—食 bespeaks the fact that “Japanese people eat with their eyes” (me de taberu Nihonjin). Multitasking is out of the question. One must pay attention to which food element to pierce with the fork into and transport to the mouth. With 食, this fantastic macaroni demands an even higher degree of engagement. Even as one cuts the neatly stacked macaroni squares with great care, their delicate inscriptions arrest fascination and solicit attentive reading. In fact, several of the characters may not be recognizable to the general Japanese, such as 饗 (banquet), 飪 (gluttonous), and 饊 (ravenous); they do not belong to the commonly used kanji in Japan. Their meanings, not recognizable to most, might even require the use of a dictionary. In contrast, the message of Two Cheeseburgers, with Everything is immediate—they are hamburgers. Just like a talking mouth, their gaping buns loudly call out for attention. They flash their pompousness at the spectator in contrast to the exquisite Japanese 食, which quietly asks one to take in their textual details.

In the end, the very opposite of Two Cheeseburgers and White Towers’ oversized, sloppy fast food, “architecture on the plate” celebrates the small, slow and neat (even as it also opposes McDonald’s introduction of fast food to Japan, which shifted and accelerated Japanese eating habits262). Printed on a humble square, 食 only has the “low reader” in kanji. In fact, the “low reader” is so low that it requires slow reading. A character (i.e. 饗) even consists of as much as 22 strokes. Everything about the macaroni design happens at the local and in the detail—in the light scores on the thin surfaces of the macaroni. Instead of flashing information at the passersby,

262 Since the American occupation after WWII, consumption of red meat has been steadily rising in Japan. Then the arrival of McDonald’s in 1971 made the Japanese rapidly abandon their traditional diet. See Fast Food Nation, 242.
the Japanese fantastic macaroni disseminates architectural creativity by enticing visitors to slow discovery and small wonders.

Course Five: Utensils

(Fork, Spoon, and Chopsticks)

Eating the fantastic “architecture on a plate” necessarily involves utensils. Kobun Nakamura’s *Colchette* actually involves eating spoons and forks—made of pasta! *Colchette* comes in two sizes. In the big set, both the spoon and the fork measure 60 mm in length (2.36 inches). The widest part of the spoon in the oval measures 14 mm, and in the prongs of the fork, 12 mm. When placed flat, the oval rises to 7 mm high and the prongs to 5 mm above the surface. In the small set, both measure 45 mm long (1.77 inches) and 9 mm wide. The spoon’s oval is 5 mm high and the fork’s prongs 3 mm. Their title *Colchette* combines the Italian words *coltelli* and *colchette*—the Japanese architect obviously mistook knife to mean spoon.
Utensils have been a topic of fascination for both eastern and western artists. For example, Claes Oldenburg’s enamel desserts, *Ice Cream Being Tasted* (1964), consists of a wafer and three scoops of flavored ice creams—strawberry, chocolate and vanilla flavors as their colors indicate—in a crepe, on an oval plate in white; a metal spoon’s head cuts into the dessert, with its handle afloat. In addition, his *Spoonbridge and Cherry* (1985-1988), another spoon—a gigantic one in the size of $19\frac{1}{2} \times 51\frac{1}{2} \times 13\frac{1}{2}$ feet (in the Sculpture Garden of the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis, Minnesota)—bends in a streamline fashion without subtlety, along its handle leading to the head, where it raises an enormous red cherry more than a story high.

Bruno Munari also shows a predilection for eating utensils, especially forks. His *Fork* (1958)$^{263}$ consists of a set of three silver forks, each 216 mm long (8½ inches), each with four prongs. The first has the normal look of a fork. But in the second, the left three prongs begin to curl toward the handle, and then in the third, all four prongs go wild, bending or stretching out in various degrees and different directions—the distorted prongs evoke gesturing fingers, and look

$^{263}$ The work currently belongs to MOMA’s collection.
rather harmful. Although stripped of their useful function (if not entirely, at least severely impaired), the deformed implements can still be easily related to their utilitarian counterpart as table forks, which though without an absolute standard, include the customary types: the dinner fork (averages about 8 inches in length), cocktail fork (about 6½ inches), salad fork (around 6 inches, often with a longer center tine), ice cream fork (an early form of spork, about 5 inches, used during the Victorian era), and baby fork (only 4 inches, with blunt tines). Given their measurements, Fork are dinner forks. They are slim, sleek and sharp. (In contrast, Colchette is unrealistically small; even its extra large set is smaller than the smallest baby fork—too short, and too dull to boot, this Japanese macaroni fork is entirely dispossessed of its utilitarian function as a fork.) As the usefulness of Munari’s trio decreases, playfulness increases—culminating in his drawing Talking Forks (1958), where a set of ten forks each makes a gesture as if a hand: holding a cigarette between its middle prongs/fingers, keeping its fingers crossed, thumbs up, and so forth. Oblivious to their utility, these anthropomorphic eating “utensils” become humorously useless.

Figure 184: Bruno Munari, Talking Forks, 1958.
Besides the western artists and western utensils, Thai artist Rirkrit Tiravanija in *Young man, if my wife makes it...* (2000) replicated a plate of Asian noodles with lemon slices, green onions and slightly charred shrimp, above which hovered a pair of chopsticks with some noodles whisked around them. Though rendered in a realistic manner, the food looked eerily shiny. *Young man, if my wife makes it...* belonged to the American *Lifelike* show (of Radical Realism, at the Walker Art Center in 2012), which was the exact opposite of the Japanese *Re-Design*. Though it likewise instigated a confluence of art and life, *Lifelike* nevertheless disabled its everyday objects on display, yet without jeopardizing their identifiable appearances. Its subjects included noodles, eggs and toasts, milk cartons, trash bags, sleeping bags, a kitchen, and elevators, but with a twist in scale, context, perspective, and so on. Unlike *Re-Design*’s predication on the “unknown,” *Lifelike* centered on the “uncanny,” characterized by Freud (in “The Uncanny”) as an unsettling sensation originating from a cryptic, fear-provoking situation—the uncertain identity of a fictive figure (ambiguity as to whether he/she is human or an automaton), the double (seeing one’s own face in another), the involuntary repetition of a situation (an invisible evil force behind?), etc. The featured works were startlingly realistic, yet deviated from everyday normalcy in some way. For example, Maurizio Cattelan installed a tiny set of elevators on site, which looked and functioned exactly like real
elevators, except for their absurdly small size; the viewer must bend down to take them in. Watching the miniscule elevators in operation aroused an uncanny sensation, because their verismimilitude suggested a miniature otherworld beyond those small doors. Other such uncanny works included a believable kitchen with incompatibly large utensils, and a plateful of fruit covered by a whitish coating of mildew.

Food as subject pervaded Lifelike’s work, though not necessarily explicitly. Rain (2008), an immersion in moving image and sound by artist Thomas Demand, appeared to be real raindrops hitting the ground. In reality, the piece was constructed out of a stop-motion animation of candy wrappers photographed in 7800 shots through 8 layers of glass. The artifice extended to the soundtrack, where the sound of “splashing” droplets was actually an audio recording of eggs frying in a pan. “Nothing is wet or moving.” But everything about the rain was deceptively real. In practice, Lifelike was only life-like, not for life; the works on display had no utilitarian value. Conceptually, the uncanny art bespoke “something is wrong,” as opposed to the unknown redesigns, which illustrated “something different.”

Young man, if my wife makes it... excites an uncanny sensation because of the chopsticks, which hang in the air without an explicable supporting force. These unmoored chopsticks seemed to possess power to call the eating event to a halt (which they did), as well as to reset it back into motion. Should the viewer divert his/her gaze, these uncanny chopsticks would resume whisking the noodles.

264 Reads the placard at Lifelike.
265 Lifelike took place at the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis, Minnesota, from February 25th to May 27th, 2012. The show invites a close examination of artworks based on commonplace objects and situations, which are often playful, and sometimes surreal.
Figure 186: *Lifelike*, Radical Realism, 2012.
Oldenburg’s *Ice Cream Being Tasted* shares *Young man’s* suspenseful stillness, or imminent motion, hinged on the eating implement. The title itself in present participle, *being tasted*—someone is *tasting* it—suggests an ongoing operation. The construct of *Ice Cream Being Tasted* gives a contradictory impression of being frozen yet volatile. The ice cream of painted plaster looks creamy and soft, especially in the area around the spoon, where buttery paste sticks to both the convex and the concave area of the eating utensil’s head. Chocolaty syrups stream near and along the periphery of the crepe, as if coming off the melting ice cream. But this impression of motion is immediately contradicted by the suspended spoon half lodged in the crepe and half still in the air, which brings the scene to halt. But a torsion force continues to build around the spoon, as if any moment the stillness can come unhinged because of it.

Munari’s *Fork* suggests imminent motion too, but in a malicious manner. Evoking human fingers, their sharp pointy tines look downright harmful. This anthropomorphic trio gathers strong momentum, as if they would dart presently and poke the eyes out of the spectator.
Seemingly possessing a malevolent will of its own, *Fork* instigates terror more than *Ice Cream* or *Young man*.

In contrast, *Colchette* in its reductive shapes of a fork and a spoon, appears harmless and immobile. Deprived of a vibrant food context—no melting ice creams, nor greasy noodles or charred shrimp—its disproportional FRP model shows no sign of life, and no association with it. But *Colchette* embodies actual transformation, or transmogrification. Eventually, edible *Colchette* was served, while the other art utensils stayed useless (in the utilitarian sense). These nutritious macaroni spoons and forks softened on a plate.

Nakamura demonstrated eating *Colchette* with a fork! But instead of penetrating the macaroni—cutting, prodding, and wounding it—Nakamura simply scooped up the edible utensils, letting their soft elongated handles hang across the prongs of the real fork.

This image of dangling spoons and forks again conjures up the surrealist melting clocks, especially the one over a tree branch in Dali’s *The Persistence of Memory*. Befittingly, Kogure devised the recipe: *Surreal Pasta Soup,* for *Colchette.* In a bowl of creamy soup, these distorted macaroni spoons and forks wriggled like tadpoles aside a large sunny-side-up egg. As the dinner began, humor arose out of the irony of eating the utensils. The edibles swapped their identity as implements with that of the food. Humorously contrasting these macaroni forks and spoons, a real fork set the event in motion. Meanwhile, the real thing called the bluff of the edible copies, nullifying their feigned utilitarian functions. In this dramatic reversal, instead of transporting food (as expected of the eating implements), the macaroni forks and spoons were themselves transported to the mouth and eaten.
Figure 189: Kobun Nakamura, *Colchette*. 
Course Six: Sensuality

(Breasts and Lips)

Eating is essentially a sensual act. “Architecture on a plate” brings sensuality to architecture with added visual (and sexual) stimulants to the savory.

Although most of the macaroni redesigns demonstrate the customary Japanese emotional restraint, Shigeo Fukuda’s *Happy Earthday* and Atsushi Kitagawara’s *Le paste di Madame Edwarda* contrarily exude passion and lust. To begin with, *Happy Earthday* says “happy,” explicitly. The macaroni consists of a trio of a man, a woman, and the earth, represented by the symbols of a legged-square, a legged-circle, and a latticed-disk. Fukuda conceived *Happy Earthday* with the intent to promote green living and happiness. Accordingly, Kogure served the pasta in a green dish with pinto bean sauce and haricot. But the illustration of the dish looks nothing but morbid. Buried underneath the thick, creamy, green substance from which their half-melted legs project, the macaroni men and women appear to be very dead. Eating *Happy Earthday* meant eating soft corpses. The redesign ironically turned the visitors into anthropophagists.

*Le paste di Madame Edwarda* also produces anthropophagists, but instead with passion. Kitagawara eroticized his macaroni, yielding a trio of female organs of the erogenous zones: a breast, a pair of lips, and an ear. In addition, its title corroborates the erotic design intent. Originally, Georges Bataille’s *Madame Edwarda* tells an erotic story about a prostitute, who calls herself God, fusing sex and religion in a vision of the flesh. Kitagawara replaced spirituality with macaroni, fusing sex instead with food. His sultry macaroni titillates the

---

Figure 190: Shigeo Fukuda, *Happy Earthday.*
spectator in the mind, arousing gustatory and sexual desires at once with one implicated in the other—sex in food and vice versa. Making an intoxicating spectacle, Kitagawara’s *Madame Edwarda* works up double appetite in one plate.

Peculiarly Japanese, Kitagawara’s erotic “architecture on a plate” defies the enormous western edible construct, evidenced in *Vanilla Future* by Haus-Rucker-Co, which likewise connects architecture with food and sex. In a sensual manner, the Austrian architects declares:

> Future is for many people fearsome.  
> Full of cruel robots, mysterious rays and artificial catastrophes.  
> Future as we see is yellow—like vanilla ice cream.  
> Refreshing, sweet-smelling, and soft.  
> *Vanilla Future.*

*Vanilla Future* was projected for *Haus-Rucker-Co-LIVE!* (1970) at the Museum of Contemporary Art in New York City. In whipped creams, ice cream, cakes, frosting and icing, the architects whipped sex, food and architecture into a delicious seven-foot-high cake, fashioned in the replica of the museum, and served in front of it at the opening night of *LIVE!*

---

Haus-Rucker-Co-LIVE! shared Architecture and Macaroni’s spontaneous spirit; their feasts similarly divested the museum of its somber “please-don’t-touch” atmosphere. On top of *Vanilla Future*, *LIVE!* hosted a weekly food event that took place in the museum throughout the show. Every Thursday,268 Haus-Rucker-Co’s friend Maria Degroote made Hungarian Goulash (Viennese Schweinsbraten). To prepare the dish, Maria would sauté some onions, stirring constantly until they turn golden brown, then add vinegar, sweet paprika, minced garlic, beef, marjoram, caraway seeds and other ingredients, and afterwards, she would cover the pot and let it simmer for about two hours, and the dish would be ready. Haus-Rucker-Co (who took residence in the museum during the time) hosted the party, serving Maria’s goulash (at 5:00 p.m. on these Thursday afternoons, although this dish in Austria is typically served around 10:00 in the morning, as a second breakfast). About 20 to 30 guests were invited each time. They sat in a circle on the floor and ate. These food events were intended to resuscitate what the architects

268 On May 21st, 28th, and June 4th, 1970.
considered the “dead institution” for didactic displays of art. “You should feel cosy at ours [sic]. You should forget your desire for learning. You should relax. Forget your profession, your progressing, every feeling of unvoluntary concurrence, every ‘must,’ your anguish of ability and working.”269 Avoiding architectural propaganda, LIVE! was, unlike Architecture and Macaroni, mainly recreational and not in the least didactic.

Figure 193: Maria’s goulash at Haus-Rucker-Co- LIVE!, 1970.

*Vanilla Future* took place in the Manhattan street (the section of the 53rd street between 5th and 6th avenue in front of the museum) in a completely unrestrained manner, completely opposite from the emotional flatness pervasive in Japanese culture. Before eating the cake, Haus-Rucker-Co invited the visitors to engage in intense gymnastic exercise. The architects placed *Giant Billiard*—an enormous white mattress (50 ft x 50 ft in size) and several giant vinyl beach balls (10 ft in diameter)—on the same street, filling it from curb to curb (the street was temporarily closed down for car traffic). On the mattress, the crowd somersaulted, danced, fell, stumbled, and crawled about; then, climbing down one corner of the mattress, they lined up for a

---

269 A curatorial statement by Schmeller. Archive at the American Crafts Council Library.
hunk of *Vanilla Future.* The visitors ate right on the spot without utensils, in contrast to the civilized sit-down dinner of “architecture on a plate.” Together they devoured the seven-foot-high building replica in front of the real thing it modeled upon. The mood was, imaginably, exhilarating and the act messy.

Recalling Oldenburg’s pop pastries of “exhilarating messiness,” *Vanilla Future* operated under the same logic of superfluity and surplus. But Haus-Rucker-Co further exploited architectural images to magnify their edible constructs perceptually. In fact, the architects had projected bigger food events in the earlier stage for *LIVE!* In *Monument Lunch,* architectural monuments made of pastry and marzipan—Vienna’s St. Stephens cathedral, London’s The Tower, and Paris’ Notre Dame, for example—would be ceremonially eaten every three day, ending in the consumption of Manhattan on the closing day. In *Flying Architecture,* town models made of lightweight wavers and fixed to small gas balloons would fly through the museum, being shot down and eaten by the spectators.

---

270 *Giant Billiard* appeared in newspapers nationwide the next day, receiving titles such as: “Museum Exhibit Mattress,” “Huge Mattress Turns on Party,” “Bounce-In, Street Frolic,” “Fun in Fun City,” “Museum Hair Let Down,” “Museum Bounces Out its Stuffy Image at Meet”…

---
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(Eventually *Monumental Lunch* became Hungarian Goulash, and *Flying Architecture* turned into a monstrous cake of *Vanilla Future*.)

Even after *LIVE!*, Haus-Rucker-Co would continue to build grander and grander food events/pastry architecture. In 1971, the group created *Food City I* in the Armory Gardens at the Walker Art Center, erecting a scale-model of partial Minneapolis using 50 loaves of assorted sliced bread (rye, pumpernickel, white, Italian) and angel cakes, as well as 150 cans of Betty Crocker ready-to-spread frostings and icings. Roughly 8 feet by 15 feet in size and highly detailed, the edible construct accounted for both the suburban houses (in 900 tiny squares of white cake frosted with yellow, pink and blue tops/roofs) and the downtown scenario, including two high-rise apartment buildings (in round angel cakes—one with blue frosting and pink vertical stripes and the other pink frosting with yellow trimmed windows) and office buildings (of stacked pumpernickel bread with windows fashioned of cucumber and radish slices). The hedges were made of parsley sprigs, surrounded by slices of green pepper, and the trees were cherry tomatoes and olives on toothpicks. In addition, there were cream cheese streets and parking areas with borders of pickles and candy canes. Reportedly, Haus-Rucker-Co spent a day and half to color, tint, chisel, stack, slice, spread and shape *Food City*. Afterward, the visitors obliterated it in a disproportionately short time. In this case, the act of eating, i.e., annihilating the city, served an architectural purpose beyond “The entertainment: to bring urban problems to the public’s attention. city is killing itself with urban problems. *Food City* [allows participants]

---

271 *Monument Lunch* and *Flying Architecture* were proposed in letter from Klaus Pinter of Haus-Rucker-Co to the museum director Paul Smith, dated August 14\(^{th}\), 1969. Archive at the American Crafts Council Library.
Figure 196: Haus-Rucker-Co making *FOOD CITY I* in the Gallery 8 at the Walker Art Center. Photographs by Tom Berthiaume for the Walker Art Center (copyright: Tom Berthiaume).
Figure 197: Haus-Rucker-Co, *Central Park Birthday Cake*, NYC, 1972.
the opportunity to destroy obsolescence by gobbling the city up."

Consuming the edible city was a delicious way of critiquing the real city.

Moreover, in 1972, Haus-Rucker-Co chiseled and shaped an edible park, this time in the spirit of celebration. To commemorate the 150th birthday of the Central Park designer, Frederick Law Olmsted, they made a 6’ by 24’ birthday-cake version of the Central Park with tinted cream-cheese grass, green-dyed cauliflower flowerets trees, and high-rises of multi-decker sandwiches with carrot and cucumber windows. From Vanilla Future to Food City and Central Park Cake, a building, a park, and even a city were built and then consumed.

The making of Haus-Rucker-Co’s edible architecture was as spontaneous and messy as the eating of it. For Vanilla Future, the group entrusted Éclair, Inc. (a Viennese bakery in Manhattan) to produce the cake. Éclair mixed an estimate of: 600 fresh eggs, 125 lbs flour, 100 lbs sugar, 25 quarts milk, 75 lbs powdered sugar, 75 lbs sweet butter, 50 lbs chocolate and 25 lbs cocoa. The architects then freely smeared icing over the cake and clad it with assorted sweet confection—the smudgy architecture showed Oldenburg’s messy pastries coming to life.

Consequently, Vanilla Future is the opposite of the Japanese “architecture on a plate,” which demanded miniscule precision, not only in the perfect geometry of Macala, but also in the erotic organs of Madame Edwarda. Kitagawara instilled artistry into food in inimitable exactitude. Take his calculation of the breast for example. The circular frontality is just shy of a perfect circle by 1 mm; the width through the center is 34 mm, whereas the overall height is 35 mm. In profile, the breast projects out 17 mm, while the nipple only projects 2 mm. Nothing escapes meticulous calculation.


Eroticism in *Madame Edwarda*’s carefully fashioned breast is explicit, as one savors it in the mouth, whereas *Vanilla Future*’s is implicit but intentional. The enormous cake may have the look of a museum, but when Haus-Rucker-Co presented it in *Design Quarterly* (no.78/79, 1970),\(^{274}\) the architects opted for a sexy image appropriated from the cover of *New York* (August 3\(^{rd}\), 1970), which features a sensual blond goddess—her moist red lips slightly parted, eyes accentuated with blue eye shadow and thick mascara. In each of her hands the woman held an

---

\(^{274}\) This issue of *Design Quarterly* was devoted to “conceptual architecture” on the themes of communicative, psychological, and entertainment environments. Several avant-garde architectural groups and individuals—including Ant Farm, Archigram, Archizoom, Haus-Rucker-Co, and Onyx—were invited to prepare a few pages following certain rules and format. Afterwards *Design Quarterly* compiled and published the submitted work without further editing. Haus-Rucker-Co dedicated their allocated pages to *LIVE!*, which took place the same year. They included a brief biography of the company, clipped sentences from the newspaper coverage of *LIVE!*, pictures of “Giant Billiard,” “Magnet Box,” and “Eatable Architecture” (“Vanilla Future” and Maria’s Hungarian Goulash), along with the manipulated magazine cover.
ice cream cone in front, covering the breasts of her otherwise naked body. The original line read, “Everything You Always Wanted To Know About Ice Cream But Were Too Fat To Ask.” Haus-Rucker-Co replaced these lines with “Haus-Rucker-Co’s” on one side and “Vanilla Future” on the other side of the goddess—same sensual blond, same luscious ice cream, but in a black-and-white version. Savoring *Vanilla Future* means savoring women’s breasts. The ice cream licking will eventually arrive at the breasts, hence *vanilla future*. Nothing is exactly explicit, yet the innuendo itself heightens the seduction. Even its ingredients—whip creams, ice creams, cakes, frosting and icing—arouse thoughts of erotic play. Between the sexy illustration and the creamy bite, with imagination thrown in, *Vanilla Future* serves up a mouthful of luscious breasts.

![Figure 199: New York vs. Design Quarterly.](image-url)
Plateful or mouthful, explicit or implicit, *Madame Edwarda* and *Vanilla Future*'s sensual and sexual play is psychologically gratifying. Much of the erotic pleasure, though fictive at best, arises from the mathematical power of multiplication. In “How to Eat Ice Cream,” Umberto Eco reminisces about two kinds of ice cream available in his childhood: a two-cent cone and a four-cent ice-cream pie. The two-cent resembled the ones the blond woman in Haus-Rucker-Co’s illustration was holding in front of her bare breasts—a scoop of ice cream piled on a cookie cone. The four-cent, doubled in price, looked fancier—a cylindrical section of ice cream sandwiched between two disks of sweet biscuit. However, as Eco recalls, kids envied not the ones with a four-cent pie but rather those with two two-cent cones: “These privileged children advanced proudly with one cone in their right hand and one in their left; and expertly moving their head, from side to side they licked first one, then the other.”

Economically it does not justify the envy but mathematically it could. Two is multiple: “two ice creams suggested excess;” it is “a display of fictitious privilege.” Haus-Rucker-Co image of the blond with two ice cream cones demonstrates exactly this “fictitious privilege” of excess, this fantasized indulgence of wolfing down two ice cream cones, or two breasts, at once.

In the case of *Madame Edwarda*, this “fictitious privilege” is multiplied beyond a mere double. The visitors were served a plateful of breasts! If two implies a surplus of pleasure, the multiple macaroni breasts is hedonistic. For this erotic design, Kogure created a recipe with a secretive piquant red sauce having a pleasantly sharp taste that would stimulate the palate and excite the mind. This recipe further endowed *Madame Edwarda* with aphrodisiac powers by taste. A piece of the supple, slippery macaroni with a protruding nipple in the mouth could

---


276 Ibid.
conceivably cause quite a sensation. With the visual, the gustatory, and the tactile thus fused, sensual pleasure finally consummated in this erogenous plateful.

Figure 200: Atsushi Kitagawara, *Le paste di Madame Edwarda*.
Course Seven: Performance

(Bravo!)

Architecture and Macaroni’s acushon-oriented non-architecture reached its pinnacle in the food performance of ArchiteXt Miyawaki’s Punching Macaroni, as well as Kaoru Kasai’s Ottoco. Ottoco’s performance occurred at eating (whereas Punching’s at cooking). Kasai sculpted Ottoco to resemble the classic Noh mask with a protruding mouth—the design also looked like a heart organ with a dissected artery. Because of its dramatic reference, Kogure devised the recipe Pie Stuffed with Pasta and Carbonara Sauce for this Noh macaroni. Made of bread, the pie had a lid. Inside it jumbled the masks/macaroni with bacon strips in a cheese-based, creamy hot soup. Hence served, an unexpected performance began as one lifted off the lid of the pie. The macaroni actors in Noh masks bobbed up and down as if alive, their protruding mouths exhaling the steam of the hot soup in which they swam. For a moment, the pie served as a theater, where the visitors watched a food play by talking macaroni heads, before eating them alive.

At Architecture and Macaroni, food was more than food; the feast produced a confluence of art and life; in the case of Ottoco, theater and supper. Of course this was not unique to the Japanese macaroni show. ArchiteXt had rapturous eating and drinking gatherings while sketching out ArchiteXt. For Fluxus artists, too, food played an integral part in their art. Oldenburg’s False Food Selection (a Fluxus edition), exemplifies Fluxfood, which uses apples, eggs, butter, loaves of bread, jars of jam or honey, among other food ingredients in their artwork. At an even deeper level, George Maciunas’ execution of “One Year” (1973-1974), intimately connects art with his everyday life, for which he developed a peculiar eating aesthetic. For a time, Maciunas ate only “white food” (such as cottage cheese), saving every container, and then
Figure 201: Kaoru Kasai, *Otto*co.*
for another period only “red food” (such as canned raspberries), again saving every container. After a full year, finishing all the packaged food, Maciunas built a wall section out of the empty containers in his SoHo apartment in Manhattan. His monotonous color-ordered regimen provided him the raw material for the installation. “One Year” consisted of a section of identical cereal boxes, another of frozen orange juice cans, another of cottage cheese containers, another of dumpling containers of different fillings, and so forth. Maciunas’ everyday meals resulted in a tangible architectural creation. Very different from consuming “architecture on a plate,” the Fluxus artist produced a wall out of eating.

Figure 202: George Maciunas, *One Year*, 1973-1974.
In addition, Maciunas and three female Japanese Fluxus artists organized a dinner commune (Maciunas initiated the plan), *Fluxmeal*, during the 1960s. Takako Saito, Shiomi Mieko and Kubota Shigeko took turns to cook dinners for their members every night, beginning at Mieko and Kubota’s apartment on Canal Street in New York City. Fluxus artist Nam June Paik joined them too. Although in the original plan, the women and men were supposed to take turns grocery shopping and cooking, in the end, the women took over most of the tasks—Maciunas and Paik only participated in the task of eating. Even so, Maciunas lodged complaints from time to time—once he criticized the fresh shrimp bought by the Japanese women artists from Chinatown for being too expensive.277 Eventually Shigeko and Mieko found part-time jobs and left, and the dinner commune was discontinued.

But Saito memorialized *Fluxmeal* in her art circa 1998, with pen and ink on vellum and heated with candle. From memory, she depicted their dinner commune in a cartoonish fashion. Four artists—three women (the Japanese artists) and a man (Maciunas?)—sit in *seiza*-style (the traditional formal way of sitting in Japan), kneeling on the floor around a square table. The man sits at the center. With her head bent low, the women on the right laments: “Unfortunately, I couldn’t develop the experiment any further.” The woman opposite her responds: “You can show this in another way.” The third woman at her back agrees: “Yes, it is better that way.”

The man says nothing. He just eats (and listens?). The female artist is obviously distressed, vexed by work—despite the lighthearted cartoon depiction. Anguish looms in their in-house meal routine, artistic concerns wrecking it, invading their everyday sphere. Unlike ArchiteXt’s jovial gatherings in the bar, *Fluxmeal* miserably binds the women artists’ art and lives at the dinner table—Japanese men had more fun?

Also in SoHo, a decade later (in 1971), American artist Gordon Matta-Clark, along with Caroline Goodden, Tina Girouard, Suzanne Harris, and Rachel Lew, founded their one-of-a-kind eatery, FOOD (at the corner of Prince and Wooster Streets). During the running of FOOD, Matta-Clark produced the documentary film *FOOD* (shot in part by photographer Robert Frank), recording its operation: the artist foraying for a trout at the fish market, the staff sharing a joint before serving the food, architectural and decorative details of the eatery (e.g. disorderly notices

---

278 Ibid (my translation).
279 The neighborhood was actually not yet known by the name SoHo.
and signs placed at the entrance), its clientele of diverse demographics (a harmonica player, a woman in an immense white hat and sunglasses with a lap dog, etc.). More and more, New York artists began to frequent the scene, from Robert Kushner to members of Philip Glass’s ensemble and dancers of Trisha Brown’s company. In addition, Matta-Clark organized “Sunday Night Guest Chef Dinners,” inviting artists to cook, including Robert Rauschenberg and Donald Judd. To be expected, food at FOOD was of a decidedly artistic bent. Their “descent to the everyday” was imaginative and lively. Goodden arranged a party around a flower theme, where edible flowers were served to the guests who came dressed as flowers. Matta-Clark created a dish called “Alive,” serving live brine shrimp in the recess of a hard-boiled egg. On one occasion, Matta-Clark even cooked a whole sea bass and encased it in a block of aspic (nearly three feet long). He unmolded it at the table and gave the table a good kick; the aspic wobbled wildly, which made the bass appear to be fishtailing upstream—Matta-Clark’s live food performance reminds one of Ottoco’s macaroni that presents talking heads in a pie. In fact, having its kitchen fully open to and visible from the dining area turned every meal at FOOD into a performance. “The whole event,” in Matta-Clark’s words, from cooking to eating, was “a live ‘piece.’”

---

280 FOOD is an estate of Gordon Matta-Clark on deposit at the Canadian Centre for Architecture, Montréal. CCA Collection. See also the exhibition catalog of Food: an exhibition by White Columns (Oct. 3, 1999 – Jan. 2, 2000), curated by Catherine Morris.

281 Besides being innovative, FOOD’s menu was international as well. For example, under the suggestion of Hisachika Takahashi (artist Robert Rauschenberg’s right-hand man and an ingenious home cook), FOOD offered sushi and sashimi, which were still not widely seen in New York at that time.
Just like to ArchiteXt’s bar gathering, FOOD served as a meeting place for the creative crew behind the avant-garde art magazine *Avalanche* (1970-1976). *Avalanche* puts the media into the hands of artists and the artists’ portraits on every cover—recalling ArchiteXt’s theme of “self.” FOOD regularly advertised in *Avalanche*, starting with a photograph taken before the place was renovated, with Matta-Clark, Goodden and Girouard in front of it, and “FOOD” written in Magic Marker over and across the original sign of the store. In addition, the collective Anarchitecture (1972-1975)—consisting of the artist-restaurateurs Matta-Clark, Goodden, Girouard, and Harris themselves, plus artists Laurie Anderson, Jene Highstein, Bernard Kirschenbaum, Richard Landry and Richard Nonas—met periodically at FOOD. Similar to the intent behind ArchiteXt’s naming, Anarchitecture derived its name from the mixture of *anarchy* and *architecture*. The group also formed itself around dinner conversations, but its members championed a collective aim—to tackle architecture’s complicity in the capitalist mode of production. Anarchitecture used wordplay and found photographs to address building, property and city issues. Echoing ArchiteXt’s non-architecture, the artists examined spaces and places.

---

“outside of architecture, without architecture, or extra architectural,” reaching their summit in the exhibition *Anarchitecture* in 1974. Soon after FOOD closed down, the group disbanded too.

Figure 205: Advertisement for FOOD in *Avalanche*, no. 3, Fall 1971.

---

FOOD’s epicurean entrepreneurship was certainly not new. As early as 1931, Italian futurist Filippo Tommaso Marinetti conceived the Holy Palate restaurant in Turin, and published his manifesto: *The Futurist Cookbook* in 1932. Reflecting the futurist theme of high speed and technology, Holy Palate had an interior predominantly in aluminum, to give the impression of being inside an airplane. The restaurant served meals of “formula by the Futurist Aeropoet, Marinetti” (signed by the artist at the end of every recipe in *The Futurist Cookbook*). For example, aiming to prevent the pitfalls of eating alone, “The Bachelor Dinner” features “Blonde Food Portrait” (sculpted roast veal with eyes of garlic and dangling earrings of radishes soaked in honey) and “Beautiful Nude Food Portrait” (boiled capon thighs in a crystal bowl of fresh milk scattered with violet bits). Especially designed in honor of the 1931 Poet of National Record Farfa, “Architectural Dinner for Sant’Elia” pays “special sensitivity to space,” by putting the recipient 600 kilometers from those honoring him but links him to his audience with telephone wires. The dinner guests alternately built and ate, using their hands, towers, skyscrapers, battleship guns, military pontoons, and other architecture. Humor abounds in *The Futurist Cookbook*. Additionally, there were traveling banquets, such as “Aerobanquet” in Bologna, whose mise-en-scène consisted of tables arranged in sloping angles. The tables had wings and a huge propeller attached them (not turning, fortunately!).

Essentially, Marinetti’s eccentric dinners are gastronomic eulogies of Futurism. Popular Futurist dishes at the Holy Palate included: Aerofood, Sculpted Meat, Edible Landscape, and Italian Sea. For example, Aerofood comprises a slice of fennel, an olive and a kumquat, plus a strip of cardboard with velvet, silk and sandpaper glued onto it. One would eat with the left hand.

---

285 The interior of the Holy Palate was designed and decorated by architect Diulgheroff and painter Fillia.
Fire In The Mouth

(polibibta by the Futurist engineer Barosi)

At the bottom of a glass: whisky with liqueur cherries, previously rolled in cayenne pepper. Next layer: milk and honey or honey (1 cm thick) forming an impermeable division. On top of the honey: alkermes, vermouth and Strega.

Tennis Chop

(formula by the Futurist Dr. Vernazza)

Veal cutlets cooked in butter and cut in the form of tennis rackets. Before serving, spread them with a thick layer of a paste (made of mascarpone and chopped nuts); trace lines on the paste with tomato sauce mixed with rum. To make the racket handle, an anchovy with a slice of banana on top.

Then some perfectly round balls made from cherries soaked in liqueur (without stones), rolled in a paste of ricotta, egg, cheese and nutmeg. Cook rapidly to prevent the alcohol from losing strength.

Figure 206: Sample recipes of The Futurist Cookbook.
and with the right hand stroke the multi-textured cardboard. Meanwhile, a waiter goes around the room with a large spray can, dousing the diners with perfumes; eating futuristically involves all five senses. Above all, *The Futurist Cookbook* wages war on pasta, which Marinetti considers sluggish, backward, and unoriginal—“no more spaghetti for the Italians.”

While *The Futurist Cookbook* renounces pasta, the Japanese *Architecture and Macaroni* embraces it. ZO Atelier concocted a simple design reminiscent of a rotor—by kneading a small ball in the palm, and then compressing it with two fingers in both hands and giving it a final 90-degree twist to derive a twisted solid figure “8.” In contrast to ZO’s organic, hands-on molding,

---

286 See “Spaghetti for Italians, Knives and Forks for All are banned in Futurist Manifesto on Cooking,” Marinetti, *The Futurist Cookbook*, 56.
Miyawaki based his Punching on a relentlessly orthogonal construction. The architect brought his ruler along when Hara invited him to enter the kitchen and make “architecture on a plate.”

Emphasizing his cooking credentials, Architecture and Macaroni introduces Miyawaki as “well-versed in cooking and other domestic chores, [and] as part of his everyday routine, the architect cooks a full meal twice a week.”287 Miyawaki indeed took great interest in cooking, which was verified by his book, The Joy of Men’s Life [男の生活の愉しみ 288]. In particular, Miyawaki identifies food as one of the three keys to a man’s joyful life—the other two being travel and dwelling. From making his own food surveys in Japan (based on the system of New York Zagat survey) to showing the artistry of simple Japanese cooking such as miso soup, congee and set meals, The Joy of Men’s Life affirms Miyawaki’s culinary expertise and experience.

At the macaroni show, in contradistinction to other designs rendered in one repeatable unit, Miyawaki’s Punching began with a big block of dough, with a side profile of 63 x 63 mm; his FRP model consequently stood out in size on the pedestal. Then a matrix of 15 x 15 square holes was punched through the entire length of this block. Miyawaki argued, “if an architect is designing macaroni, it should show in the pasta’s shape… Punching out a solid square pattern


Figure 208: Mayumi Miyawaki, The Joy of Men’s Life [男の生活の愉しみ].
[gives] an intelligible form that bears some mark of the architect. Punching Macaroni brings to mind a modern multi-story building with uniform rows of windows. But even more so, its simple geometry and punctures devoid of any architectural treatment recalls the ossuary cube in Aldo Rossi’s City for the Dead—no roof, floors, windows or doors, only a shell of openings (for light, views, access, and the containment of cremated bodies). Rossi’s ossuary cube is nonetheless morbid; the physiognomy of the structure is reminiscent of the hollow of the eye sockets in a human scull, whereas Miyawaki’s macaroni block embodied nutritional value. Furthermore, Punching enlisted the natural force of gravity for a lively culinary performance.

---

289 Quoted in Kenya Hara, Designing Design, 63.
Cuisine is like a performance of Noh by the four troupes. The menu is the program for the performance. The fish, fowl, vegetables, and gourds are the actors.  

*Punching*'s performance proceeds with the preparation on the cutting board—as opposed to Ottoco’s in a pie on a plate. From the dough block, thin square pieces of 1 mm thick—that is, 63 x 63 x 1 mm per slice (about 2 ½ x 2 ½ x 1/25 inch big)—are sliced off. As they are being shaved off, the macaroni squares take on a unique course of life beyond the architect’s calculation. Each piece wavers and curls into a distinct curvaceous form. *Punching* therefore produces a food dance. Every cut under the knife spurs the macaroni into a voluptuous twirl. Rather than to resist or neglect gravity as, say, *Semi Constructive* and *Möbiuroni* in their impossible upright position, *Punching* takes the force into account, making use of it in an advantageous way. The design invites gravity to spontaneously shape and co-create the pasta; the macaroni dances to the force. There are numerous variants of the same dance. Each choreography is nonetheless unique and unrepeatable, and hence each shape and curve of the macaroni square.

If cuisine is the performance and the menu the program, then by extension, the recipe is the script. Miyawaki tried his hand at the script—he ventured to design a recipe for his macaroni.

---

290 *Text for Banquets, the Cooking of Fish and Fowl*, late eighteenth century, quoted in *Food and Fantasy in Early Modern Japan*, 121.
Punching Macaroni Cuatro Formaggio [パンチング・マカロニ・クァトロ・フォルマゾオ] featured the simple ingredients of four cheeses, basil leaves, and tomato sauce. How did his recipe fair? Kogure commended the cuisine:

そうそう、
クァトロ・フォルマゾオって
美味しいですよ。
複雑に混じり合った４種類のチーズの味が、
いっぱいいっぱい開けられた
穴に絡まって…
うー、美味しそう。
宮脇さんは
お料理まで考えて下さったので、
私の出る幕なしでした。
でも私も好きなソースなので、
あーよかった！です。

(You know, Cuatro Formaggio is delicious!
Delicately mixed with four cheeses,
stuffed into the holes of a wafer,
reaching saturation.
Ohh, delicious!
Thanks to Miyawaki’s thoughtful dish
I gladly resign behind the curtain, from cooking.
My favorite sauce,
Ahh, bravo!)^{291}

Echoing Punching’s performative macaroni, Kogure likened the delightful experience to happily retreating behind the curtain without participating in cooking—in place of his role as the recipe/script-writer behind the scenes. At the end, he gave a theatrical sigh “ahh” and shouts “bravo!”

---

^{291} Architecture and Macaroni, 45 (my translation).
Figure 211: Mayumi Miyawaki, *Punching.*
Imaginably, the shouts of bravo! reverberated in the gallery that staged the feast of *Architecture and Macaroni*. One fantastic steamy “architecture on a plate” was served after another: ball-flowers, spiral towers, mathematical structures, drafting tools: pencils, t-squares and triangles, surrealist spoons and forks, voluptuous breasts, lips and ears, dancing Noh masks, perforated wafers, and so forth. Finally with architectural creativity appreciated and satiated at the gut level, the veritable feast drew its curtains to close.

... 

*Architecture and Macaroni’s* curtains reopened twice afterward—in Italy in 1997, and China in 2011. PAVAN, a pasta machine maker, invited the Japanese to join their Milan pasta fair. In the introduction of *Architecture and Macaroni*, Miyawaki argues for the power of design to exponentially increase a commercial product’s sale value—he uses an example of his father’s generic no-name underwear, which, though not less useful, costs much less than a designer’s pair. In theory, the exquisite ball-flower of *Macala*, the majestic structure of *Semi Constructive*, the sensual breast of *Madame Edwarda*, the erudite inscriptions of 食, and the performative wafer of *Punching*, should assess tremendous artistic value. But in practice, the perfect, minutely measured geometry, the pedant inscriptions of the kanji characters, the unsustainable vertical structures, Miyawaki’s culinary live performance, etc. were impracticable. Although the Milan pasta fair considered these Japanese macaroni redesigns in earnest, in the end, none of them won a commercial offer for mass production.
In 2011, the collection of macaroni redesigns took their stands again in *Designing Design*, Kenya Hara’s debut in China at Beijing Center for the Arts. But this time, there was no dinner, only display—no cooking, no eating, only the enormous FRP models along with a slide show on the projection screen. Thereby excluded was *Architecture and Macaroni’s* non-architectural spirit predicated upon acushon (“action”), ivento (“event”) and hapuningu (“happening”). The mathematical metamorphosis of the stony geometrical macaroni into soft topological pastas did not happen. The descent of art (on the pedestals) to life (at the tables) did not happen. The spatial reversal of outside and inside—architecture (on a plate) entering the visitor’s mouth and stomach—did not happen. *Designing Design* only staged a formal show.

Figure 212: *Designing Design* at Beijing Center for the Arts in China, 2011.

---

292 The show ran from June 13 to July 15, 2011.
Architecture and Macaroni, though expended shortly thereafter like the ephemera of ArchiteXt, was historically and culturally significant. Demonstrating a full “descent to the everyday,” the twenty non-architectural dishes not only celebrated free expression but also fulfilled the Japan Institute of Architects’ wish to convey architectural knowledge to the layperson. For this purpose, the macaroni was the creative media, and the feast the means. The visitors digested knowledge through ingestion, eating architecture on a plate. Therefore by redesign, in making the known (macaroni) unknown, the unknown (architecture) was made known in a tasteful and tasty fashion.
CHAPTER EXTRA

NEW WAVE

Since Japan Architect’s depiction of New Wave as a nebulous summation of clouds, where the Thunder God Arata Isozaki and the Wind God Kurokawa shared the throne, the skyscape has evolved into a battleground for the two architectural deities. In his attempt to dethrone the Wind God, Isozaki usurped the title in his overseas exhibition The New Wave of Japanese Architecture (1978), which reformulated the murky New Wave conception and excluded Kurokawa. Though after a considerable time gap, the Wind God retaliated; in 1993, Kurokawa published New Wave Japanese Architecture (in English), concocting a new New Wave list, thereby reinstating himself and reclaiming his skyscape. Because of the lapse of time between the two events, their connection has generally been neglected. But their shared title reveals the architects’ continual struggle to seize the post-pyramid (post-Metabolism) era in Japanese architecture.

In fact, conflict between Isozaki and Kurokawa was evidenced even before New Wave. Both architects were avid advocates of Metabolism in the early 1960s, though Isozaki did not join the group until he partnered with his teacher Kenzo Tange in 1964 at an exhibition in Tokyo—they were since welcomed as “semi-Metabolists.” But soon after that, disputes arose among the members, finally leading to an irreparable rift. As a result, Metabolism failed to launch a sequel manifesto (as promised on the first page of Metabolism 1960) beyond a contents-
By 1971, Isozaki has openly denied his association with the group (in an interview with James Stirling).\(^{294}\)

---


294 At this point, Isozaki only conceded their common tendencies. See Gunter Nitschke, “the Metabolists of Japan,” *Architectural Design* (October 1964), 509.
Figure 215: Japanese New Wave key events and architects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Group 1:</strong></td>
<td>Fumihiko Maki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arata Isozaki</td>
<td>Takefumi Aida</td>
<td>Arata Isozaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisho Kurokawa</td>
<td>Tadao Ando</td>
<td>Kan Izue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osamu Ishiyama</td>
<td>Hiromi Fujii</td>
<td>Kisho Kurokawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazuhiro Ishii</td>
<td>Hiroshi Hara</td>
<td>Minoru Takeyama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadao Ando</td>
<td>Osamu Ishiyama</td>
<td>Hiroshi Hara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasufumi Jijima</td>
<td>Arata Isozaki</td>
<td>Yoshio Taniguchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Takefumi Aida (ArchiteXt)</strong></td>
<td>Toyo Ito</td>
<td>Yasufumi Jijima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monta Mozuna</td>
<td>Fumihiko Maki</td>
<td>Takefumi Aida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyo Ito</td>
<td>Monta Mozuna</td>
<td>Shohei Yoh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyokazu Watanabe</td>
<td>Minoru Takeyama</td>
<td>Tadao Ando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZO Atelier</td>
<td>ZO Atelier</td>
<td>Toyo Ito</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Group 2:** | **Group 2:** | Kiko Mozuna |
| Shozo Uchii | | Kiko Mozuna |
| Kiyoshi Kawasaki | | Kiko Mozuna |
| Takamitsu Azuma (ArchiteXt) | | Kiko Mozuna |
| Hiromi Fujii | | Kiko Mozuna |
| Takashi Kurokawa | | Kiko Mozuna |
| Minoru Takeyama (ArchiteXt) | | Kiko Mozuna |
| Yasutaka Yamazaki | | Kiko Mozuna |
| Kazumasa Yamashita | | Kiko Mozuna |
| Mayumi Miyawaki (ArchiteXt) | | Kiko Mozuna |
| Kazunari Sakamoto | | Kiko Mozuna |
| Masayuki Fujimoto | | Kiko Mozuna |
| Yoshio Taniguchi | | Kiko Mozuna |
| Hisao Koyama | | Kiko Mozuna |
| Hiroshi Hara | | Kiko Mozuna |

| **Group 3:** | **Group 3:** | Colacanth Architects |
| Koichi Sone | | |
| Makoto Suzuki (ArchiteXt) | | |
| Seinosuke Kimura | | |
| Shin Toki | | |
| Masamitsu Nozawa | | |
| Kijo Rokkaku | | |
| Yuzuru Tomminaga | | |
| Itsuko Hasegawa | | |
| Tetsuro Kurokawa | | |
When Isozaki devised *The New Wave of Japanese Architecture*, he had a new coalition in mind, defining itself against Metabolism. He handpicked a dozen emerging architects in their 30s and early 40s, whose theories and works were at variance with Metabolism, though he did include Fumihiko Maki for political reasons. His list included Aida and Takeyama (but not Azuma, Miyawaki and Suzuki of ArchiteXt), and Tadao Ando, Hiromi Fujii, Hiroshi Hara, Osamu Ishiyama, Kazuhiro Ishii, Toyo Ito, Monta Mozuna, Kazuo Shinohara, ZO Atelier, and of course, Isozaki himself, plus Maki. Shinohara eventually dropped out (due to a scheduling conflict), resulting in a final total of eleven participants. Kenneth Frampton (who later wrote an introduction for the show’s catalog) argued that, to a degree, New Wave was Isozaki’s attempt to emulate what Kenzo Tange did for Metabolism, i.e., as an inculcator, a mentor and an advocate of the group. The chosen architects participated in the event “under the patronage of Isozaki.”

To bring this (new) New Wave group to international attention, Isozaki projected his exhibition overseas. For a western partner, Isozaki contacted the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies (IAUS), based in New York City. Since 1976, the institute had launched a National Tour Program to sponsor architectural exhibitions, lectures and publications. In an effort to publicize their undertakings, IAUS organized a series of events under a recurring title: New Wave. This initiation began with *A New Wave of European Architecture* in 1977, a lecture series at the Rice Design Alliance. Six architects participated the event: Mario

---

295 Isozaki discusses his preparation and execution of the show in detail at the roundtable talk “Coming Back from America, the New Wave of Japanese Architecture” [アメリカに打ち返す日本建築の新しい波], *Architecture and Urbanism (A+U)*, no.102 (1979 March), 125-140.

296 Interview with Frampton by Lisa Hsieh, June 12th, 2012.

297 Andrew McNair, the program director of IAUS at that time, claimed that “New Wave” was IAUS’s propaganda to enhance the institute’s presence in architecture in the U.S. Interview with McNair by Lisa Hsieh, January 24th, 2012.

The diverse, counter-Metabolism theoretical focuses of the New Wave participants are shown in *Catalogue 10*, with a quick preview given by their essay titles (except for Maki’s), in alphabetical order by last name:

1. “Silence” (Aida)
2. “The Genealogy of Memories and the Revelation of Another-Scape” (Ando)
3. “Existential Architecture and the Role of Geometry” (Fujii)
4. “Anti-Traditional Architectural Contrivance” (Hara)
5. “Sewer-Pipe Architecture” (Ishiyama)
6. “City Demolition Industry, Inc.” (Isozaki)
7. “Collage and Superficiality in Architecture” (Ito)
8. “The Recent Work of Maki and Associates” (Maki)
10. “Heterology in Architecture” (Takeyama)
11. “What we are thinking of…” (Atelier Zo)

---

298 IAUS cosponsored the event with the Rice Design Alliance and The Museum of Fine Art, Houston.
Though incongruous among the young generation, Maki’s placement proved to be strategic, especially in facilitating communication with the western correspondents, since by that time he had already established a reputable presence in the United States (after graduating from Cranbrook Academy of Art in 1953 and the Graduate School of Design at Harvard University in 1954, Maki taught architecture and urban design at Harvard and Washington University. He also worked in the offices of SOM and Sert Jackson and Associates, among others300). In addition, Maki represented a “power figure” of the Tokyo establishment, expediently exalting Isozaki’s conception.301

In the introduction of Catalogue 10, Frampton frames New Wave using an analogy with Maki’s architectural theory, “Aggregate Form,” which advocates an artificial deck for gradual

301 Interview with Frampton by Hsieh.
occupation in stages. “One may take this ‘aggregate’ concept as the consensus view of the younger generation,” Frampton writes.\textsuperscript{302} As opposed to Metabolism’s grandiose visions, this new generation indeed made architectural interventions in a piecemeal fashion, at the microcosmic level within the Japanese metropolis. Frampton focuses on a formal analysis. He identifies a shared preoccupation among these architects in their use of three-dimensional cubic grid, the barrel vault, the patio and the stepped pyramid, and considers these formal themes the New Wave gestalt—while interpreting Takeyama’s “flamboyant” buildings as “Archigram-influenced.”\textsuperscript{303} Maki’s theory thus provides Frampton a useful reference for an overall view of New Wave.

In contrast, the contents of Catalogue 10 unveil the idiosyncratic singularity and the “Japan-ness” of New Wave uniquely expressed by each architect. Isozaki writes a fictional piece about a company called “Demolition Industry, Inc.,” founded by his (fictional) professional-killer friend. When being asked for his motivation, the killer showed the architect a newspaper clip: “Yesterday’s Traffic Accidents—5 Killed, 89 Injured,” as a piece of proof of the degenerated private enterprise of killing displaced by modern civilization. With hurt pride, the killer condemned the lack of artistry in the murder, which made people indifferent to death. In hopes of restoring this Japanese artistry (of killing), the killer conceives plans to destroy the city’s mechanism, including physical destruction (demolishing buildings, roads, and other facilities), functional destruction (abolishing traffic signals to cause confusion and gridlocks, and disturbing other communication network), and image destruction (obliterating all proposals for utopian city planning—such as Metabolism). Ironically, singing the killer’s praises, the architect called him “an old-fashioned humanist.” (This story was written in the 1960s when Tokyo

\textsuperscript{302} Frampton, \textit{A New Wave of Japanese Architecture}, 2.

\textsuperscript{303} Ibid., 5.
experienced an unprecedented economic boom.

With humor and sarcasm, Isozaki uses the frequent Japanese literary theme of killing—to artistically execute death in a precise, quick and clean fashion—to draw attention to Japan’s urban problems.

Other forms of Japanese arts and culture unfolded in New Wave, such as Mozuna’s “Cosmic Architecture,” which draws inspiration from ancient Japanese ideograms as a template to create the Cosmic Temple. In Japan, it is said that shrines are earthly imitations of the palace of heaven. Their ancient way uses the human body to organize the interiors of the sacred architecture: its main gate in the head, the hall of Buddha at the neck, the lecture hall in the stomach, and so forth (in contrast to the western Vitruvian Man as measurement of proportion). In similar fashion, Mozuna speculates the transference of a universal system from the macro to the micro world, using the Yin and Yang symbol and the Eight Trigrams as bases for his “cosmic” architecture.

In turn, Hiroshi Hara produces a closed architectural system: “Anti-Traditional Architectural Contrivance,” to replace the traditionally open Japanese architecture. The system is necessitated by their population increase, urban migration and densification. Hara argues that “the external facade when inverted re-emerges as the salient feature of an interior architecture.” Allegorically, he tries to “bury the city within the house,” by introducing the

---

vocabulary of urban planning into the house. As a result, heavy industrial pipes pack his houses, brutally obliterating their openness. In contrast, Ito’s “Collage and Superficial Architecture” and Takeyama’s “Heterology” reflect the scintillating signs in and of the Japanese city, Aida’s “Silence” speaks for the Japanese conception of restrained beauty (i.e. silence), ZO Atelier’s “What we are thinking of…” thinks of the vernacular, and so forth. The New Wave participants freely tapped into, interpreting and reinterpreting “Japan-ness.” Collectively, Catalogue 10 forms a strong antithesis of Metabolism’s universal biological analogy.

For the travel exhibition, each of the eleven architects designed his own presentation boards to address his individual design philosophy and work. Focusing on “Heterology,” Takeyama composed his boards in a consistent format: a central collage of his work featured in the cover of a magazine or a book, which features his work—Japan Architect, Progressive Architecture, Commercial Architecture, Japan Interior Design, Bauen+Wohnen and (Charles Jenck’s) The Language of Post-Modern Architecture—framed by small pictures of Ichibankan, Nibankan, Hotel Beverly Tom, etc. In addition, a title, a question, or a statement, underscored each board: “Self Help Habitat,” “What Time Is the Space?” “An Irrational Space for the Irrational Process of Irrational Products,” and so on. Coincidentally, reflecting “Heterology” spatially, heterogeneous images filled up Takeyama’s presentation boards.

Aida’s presentations stressed “Silence.” He showed only one project per board, also in a consistent format: large line drawings in the center, one small picture below, and his seal/stamp at the bottom right corner. He showed Nirvana House, House Like A Die, and their okoshi plans, Toy Block House and their axonometric drawings. Again, reflecting “silence” spatially, white space prevailed in Aida’s boards (in contrast to Takeyama’s filled boards).

Architecture and Urbanism’s special report on the New Wave show features partial exhibition contents (1979 March).
Figure 21.8: Minoru Takeyama’s presentation panels at A New Wave of Japanese Architecture, 1978, courtesy of the architect.
Figure 219: Takefumi Aida’s presentation panel, *A New Wave of Japanese Architecture*, 1978.
Other architects likewise highlighted their distinct architectural concepts and approaches. Tadao Ando put forth “Shadow of Topology;” his title board showed a “Tower Plaza” with a stairway towering over clouds and casting shadows onto itself—Ando seemed to mistake the word *topology* for *topography* and used them interchangeably. Hiroshi Hara “buried the city within the house,” reversing heavy industrial building components for interior use; his work showed almost suffocating compactness. Mozuna advocated his “Cosmic Architecture,” showing examples of Yin and Yang and Twin Mirror image applied to building. Arguing for “Collage” and “Superficiency,” Ito’s presentations zoomed in on exterior building surfaces. ZO Atelier declared that “Form should not seek after Novelty;” their boards showed metaphorical designs of “cretaceous,” “mountain mimicry,” adding the moon and stars in the background to stress architecture in harmony with nature, and so forth. In sum, the exhibition manifested the New Wave’s individualist and pluralist spirit.

Throughout the show, five (of the eleven) architects: Aida, Fujii, Hara, Isozaki and Takeyama, toured around to deliver lectures at various universities and institutions, going west to California and Utah, east to New York and Maryland, north to Minnesota and Seattle, and south to Texas and Florida. Aida opened the lecture series. To lessen the language barrier, he played Japanese composer Moroi Makoto’s (諸井誠) music in the background while showing his slides. He composed his slides in a set of three, each time presenting: his work (on the top), ancient Japanese architecture (on the bottom left) and some traditional Japanese form, such as the Noh mask and the Japanese sword (on the bottom right). Aida showed only about 10 projects in total. But the strategic placement of his work in relation to other cultural conventions conveyed the
Figure 220: Tadao Ando’s presentation panel, *A New Wave of Japanese Architecture*, 1978.
Figure 221: Hiromi Fujii's presentation panel. *A New Wave of Japanese Architecture*, 1978.
Figure 222: Hiroshi Hara’s presentation panel, *A New Wave of Japanese Architecture*, 1978.
Figure 223: Monta Mozuna’s presentation panel, *A New Wave of Japanese Architecture*, 1978.
Figure 224: Toyo Ito’s presentation panel, *A New Wave of Japanese Architecture*, 1978.
Figure 225: ZO Atlier’s presentation panel, *A New Wave of Japanese Architecture*, 1978.
(Japanese) derivatives of his architecture, even in sparseness and in (Aida’s) silence (amid Makoto’s music).  

Fluent in English, Takeyama was able to improvise his lectures, changing topics from place to place, comparing Japanese culture with American conventions. For example, at the University of California at Berkeley (which he had visited several times prior), he discussed their differences in architectural education. In Maine, he oriented his talk toward practical matters—as specific as the square footage of Japanese buildings. In Salt Lake City, he told anecdotes about his architecture. Putting aside his theory of architectural semiology, in a colloquial manner, Takeyama tailored his speeches to draw his audience in.

Back in Japan, Architecture and Urbanism (A+U) hosted a roundtable talk in 1979, entitled “Coming Back from America, the New Wave of Japanese Architecture” (A+U also published the transcript of the talk, a Japanese translation of Frampton’s introduction in Catalog 10, and part of the New Wave exhibition contents). The invitees were Isozaki, Aida, Takeyama and Fujii (who toured with the show)—Aida and Takeyama’s presence suggested, if not ArchiteXt, their individual importance in the New Wave movement. The talk was facilitated by the magazine’s editor Toshio Nakamura. The architects made explicit their heartfelt responsibility to elucidate “Japan-ness” when coming face to face with the American audience, as already evidenced by the contents of the exhibition, the catalog and their lectures. Clearly, Isozaki’s action plan had not only raised New Wave’s international profile but also the post-Metabolism generation’s awareness of their cultural roots, which Metabolism had disposed of.

---

306 Aida discusses his lectures in the roundtable talk “Coming Back from America, the New Wave of Japanese Architecture.”
307 Takeyama also discusses his lectures in the roundtable talk.
The New Wave of Japanese Architecture thinned Metabolism’s power somewhat, driving the Wind God out of the picture and closed the battle/movement of New Wave, temporarily.

... 

In Japanese architecture, much of the power is substantiated by who’s in, who’s out, and who determines it. The media certainly shares the power, such as the mainstream journal *Japan Architect*, which enthroned the initial 36 New Wave architects. Isozaki and Kurokawa likewise exercised their power via distinct media—an exhibition and a publication—deciding whom they wanted *in* and whom they wanted *out*. In *The New Wave of Japanese Architecture*, Isozaki cut down *Japan Architect’s* selection to only 11 architects, blatantly dismissing Kurokawa and replacing him with Maki. Subsequently, in *New Wave Japanese Architecture* (1993), Kurokawa raised the number back to 27—in quantity, ousting the Thunder God’s strike of lighting. Kurokawa reinstated himself, while keeping Isozaki and Maki—he claimed Maki’s work to be “psychologically” fitting to the New Wave generation. He also updated the list to welcome newcomers to the scene.

Eight architects mounted all three lists: Aida, Ando, Hara, Ishii, Isozaki, Ito, Mozuna, and Takeyama. Fujii, Ishiyama and ZO Atelier were on Isozaki’s but not Kurokawa’s; Itsuko Hasegawa, Kijima Yasufumi, Kijo Rokkaku and Yoshio Taniguchi were on Kurokawa’s but not Isozaki’s. In addition, Kurokawa edited out 15 architects from the *Japan Architect’s* list, adding 14 new names.\(^{308}\) (Across the board, Miyawaki, Kitagawara, Kuma, and ZO Atelier participated

---

\(^{308}\) Kurokawa edited out: Toyokazu Watanabe, Shozo Uchii, Kiyoshi Kawasaki, Hiromi Fujii, Takashi Kurokawa, Yasutaka Yamazaki, Kazunari Sakamoto, Masayuki Fujimoto, Hisao Koyama, Koichi Sone, Seinosuke Kimura, Shin Toki, Masamitsu Nozawa, Yuzuru Tomminaga and Tetsuro Kurokawa; he
in *Architecture and Macaroni*). To raise his endeavor to international attention, Kurokawa published *New Wave Japanese Architecture* in English, which was widely distributed by St. Martin’s Press in New York, Academy Editions in London, and Ernst & Sohn in Berlin.³⁰⁹

Kurokawa redefined New Wave vis-à-vis the “pre-war generation” of architects educated before WWII, such as Kenzo Tange and Seiichi Shirai. Although a former student of Tange, Kurokawa now ruthlessly criticizes him, calling his teacher’s works, particularly after Olympic Stadium, little more than “an uninspired, business-like copy suggesting the anonymous products of the planning department of a construction company.”³¹⁰ He divided the “post-war generation” into three groups: those born in the 30s (Kurokawa himself, Isozaki, Aida, Takeyama, Hara, Izu, Kijima and Taniguchi), the 40s (Ando, Ito, Mozuna, Hasegawa, Ishii, Rokkaku, Hayakawa, Komiyama, Takamatsu, Yamamoto and Yatsuka), and the 50s (the remaining seven)—except Maki who, born in the 20s, belonged to the “war generation.” In addition, he identified five architectural themes in relation to these (new new) New Wave architects’ works:

1. Tradition, *topos* and environment
2. Symbolism and the evocation of meaning
3. Relation and indefinite form
4. Provisionality and technology
5. Poetic realm, freedom and nothingness

Ando’s work, which expresses the Japanese minimalist language by way of light and shadow, strongly reflects “tradition, topos and environment.” Takeyama’s building semiotics added: Kan Izu, Shoichi Yoh, Kunihiko Hayakawa, Akira Komiyama, Riken Yamamoto, Shin Takamatsu, Hajime Yatsuka, Atsushi Kitagawara, Tadasu Ohe, Kiyoshi Sei Takeyama, Kengo Kuma, Norihiko Dan, Kazuyo Sejima and Coelacanth Architects.

exemplifies “symbolism and the evocation of meaning,” whereas Aida’s architecture demonstrates “relation and indefinite form”—here Kurokawa is referring to Aida’s work after Toy Block House when he moved on to explore layered repetitions of walls to create disjointed and dynamic space. “Provisionality and technology” finds a model in Ito’s “wind architecture,” such as his Tower of Winds (1986) and Egg of Winds (1991), stressing temporality and transparency. Kurokawa placed no work, however, into the fifth category.

Instead, Kurokawa advocates “poetic realm, freedom and nothingness” in principle, intriguingly, as an extension of Metabolism. He formulates a theory of Symbiosis, where architecture moves toward ambiguity, complexity and plurality, as a result of “invisible technology” when the society progresses into an age of information, of computer networking, etc. (from the “Age of Life” which Metabolism heralded). Yet curiously, sensualism still rules in Japanese architecture. The majority of architects still believe that architecture needs neither theory nor methodology; direct artistic intuition would suffice.311 In response to this sensualist tradition, Isozaki previously advocated New Wave in favor of conceptual designs. But now Kurokawa seeks a middle way—to transcend reasoning while retaining sensibility. He speculates a new direction for architecture, merging the disparities of logic and feeling, and technology and art, to attain symbiosis in freedom and nothingness. A Buddhist undertone marks Kurokawa’s fifth New Wave theme. In this “poetic realm,” without rejecting intellectualist or sensualist tendencies, Kurokawa embraces Isozaki, Maki, and many more. Conclusively, the Wind God makes peace with the Thunder God by inclusion.

---

311 Kurokawa speaks about this tendency in his introduction of *New Wave Japanese Architecture*, 18.
But the nebulous New Wave was still made blurry by the insistent overlaps with the Post-Modern tendency in Japanese architecture. Many New Wave architects were labeled Post-Modernists in different places, including Aida and Takeyama. But in terms of time, Post-Modern events in Japanese architecture took place mainly in the second half of the 1980s. In 1986 (right at the midpoint between Isozaki’s New Wave in 1978 and Kurokawa’s in 1993), the National Tokyo Modern Art Museum held a crucial architectural exhibition entitled: Modern Review—Postmodern Architecture, 1960-1986 [近代の見なおし—ポスト・モダンの建築一九六〇－一九八六]. Spanning over two and half decades, this selection made no differentiation between Metabolism and New Wave, encompassing nine frequent names in the architectural scenes: Arata Isozaki, Kisho Kurokawa, Fumihiko Maki, Tadao Ando, Osamu Ishiyama, Toyo Ito, Kiko Mozuna (aka Monta Mozuna), Shin Takamatsu and ZO Atelier—excluding ArchiteXt entirely. The selection nearly coincides with Isozaki’s New Wave list—except for Takamatsu and Kurokawa, who were nonetheless on Kurokawa’s. Who’s in this Post-Modern category were also in one or the other New Wave events.

Referencing Tokyo Modern Art’s selection, in 1987, architectural critic Matsuba Katsukiyo re-nominated ten leading Japanese Post-Modern architects in his Coordinate of Postmodern [ポスト・モダンの座標], published by Kajima Institute (a major publishing presence in the fields of art and architecture in Japan, including publishing Space Design). Katsukiyo instead selected: Osamu Ishiyama, Kiko Mozuna, Kazuhiro Ishii, Kijima Yasufumi, Hiroshi Hara, ZO Atelier, Bon Juko (aka Toshiro Tanaka), Shin Takamatsu, Shohei Yoh, and Arata Isozaki. Again ArchiteXt was ruled out. Katsukiyo also eliminated Kurokawa and Maki.  

---

Although his re-nomination differed significantly from Tokyo Modern Art’s, the only new name to the scene, which was never mentioned in either discourse of New Wave, was Bon Juko. Their difference stemmed from the disagreement in time—Katsukiyo focused on the architectural scene in the 1980s, instead of tracing all the way back to 1960. Because of this time period, his Post-Modern selection concurred more with Kurokawa’s New Wave than Isozaki’s.

Significantly, Katsukiyo’s *Coordinate of Postmodern* enlightens the key distinction between the Post-Modern and the New Wave movement. Diverting from New Wave’s efforts to re-root architecture in Japanese culture, Post-Modern architecture (in Katsukiyo’s description) emphasizes the fusion of eastern traditions and western—especially postmodern—influences. *The Coordinate of Postmodern* discusses the “western style imitation” [擬洋風] in Ishiyama’s work, the “foreign cultures” [異文化] in Mozuna’s architecture, Ishii’s “aboriginal cosmopolitan” [土着のコスモポリタン], ZO Atelier’s “indigenous scenery,” and so forth.313 Therefore New Wave and Post-Modern operate under distinct logics despite their participant overlap; whereas New Wave celebrates “Japan-ness,” Post-Modern manifests “doubling.”

As likely as not, the subject of Post-Modernism has more immediacy in the West than in Japan. In *Postmodernism and Japan*, Miyoshi and Harootunian point out that in view of the conspicuous economic success of the Japanese, their general attitude was, “who cares whether it is premodern or postmodern, as long as people are well-fed, clothed, healthy, thoroughly socialized and strategically informed?”314 In particular, in architecture after Metabolism, the diverse works and theories followed their own timeline, in connection with different axes of history, culture, economy, progress and power (distinct from the western world). The

---

Postmodern perspective perhaps helps place the Japanese works on the world map of architecture. But otherwise, just as New Wave, the movement remains indefinite, open to different interpretations.

One figure, though, prevailed through all events—Post-Modern or New Wave: Arata Isozaki. After his New Wave exhibition, Isozaki turned his attention to studying Post-Modern architecture in Japan, which culminated in *Postmodern Theory* [ポスト・モダン原論], published by Asahi in 1985. In a monologue style, Isozaki discusses the “schizophrenic syndrome” of Postmodern eclecticism, the “fictive signs” in Japanese cities, the technologically provoked desires, and the changing interests and catastrophes in postmodern time. Unlike the architect’s usual perspicacious writings, *Postmodern Theory* appears to be more general and comprehensive than critical.

Isozaki was also the only architect who contributed an article: “Of City, Nation, and Style,” to Miyoshi and Harootunian’s *Postmodernism and Japan*. In his article, Isozaki characterizes Japanese Post-Modern architecture as a cultural logic connected to Japan’s booming commercial culture, where building becomes increasingly an assemblage of commercial items, and a pastiche of styles. “When this happened, private individualism arose in opposition to the trend to lump all architecture in the commercial catalog.” In accordance, Isozaki identified two distinct ways in which this commercial trend was opposed (by individual architects): in one way, the architect worked closely with each client, tailoring design to his/her individual needs, so as to escape mass production (this method evokes the old harmonic

---

315 For details, see Arata Isozaki, *Postmodern Theory* [ポスト・モダン原論], Tokyo: Asahi Publisher [朝日出版社], 1985.
relationship between the carpenter and the owner to jointly create a home); another approach allies with the cultural context and elevates architecture to the status of Art. This latter kind often removes architecture from practicality, yet it gains validity in the name of art. Isozaki himself endorses the second way. 317 Similarly, ArchiteXt members aligned themselves with the Art approach—except for Azuma who, instead of an umbrella theory or method, worked one on one with his clients, embracing the first kind of “private individualism” described by Isozaki. Although ArchiteXt was dismissed by both Postmodern Architecture, 1960-1986 and The Coordinate of Postmodern, Aida and Takeyama were deemed Japanese postmodernists in the western publications. As mentioned (in chapter 00), The Language of Post-Modern Architecture features Takeyama’s Nibankan (1970) and Beverly Tom Hotel (1974)—Jencks even considers Takeyama the “quintessential” Japanese Post-Modernist, more than Kurokawa and Isozaki. Oppositions Reader also features Aida’s Toy Block House (1978)—in “Architecture in the Urban Desert: A Critical Introduction to Japanese Architecture After Modernism” (written by Japanese architectural critic Hajime Yatsuka). 318 Their roles shift indefinitely, depending on the context and viewpoint—appositely reflecting the amorphous nature of “clouds,” that is, the modus operandi of ArchiteXt—postmodernist or otherwise.

Ultimately, despite ambiguity and illusiveness, ArchiteXt’s non-group and non-architecture validate informality as New Wave’s way, breaking dramatically from the hierarchical order of the Japanese architecture which preceded it. In place of the pyramid, ArchiteXt presents a seemingly amorphous cloud, within which looms an elastic matrix of free-

317 Ibid., 53-54.
flowing elements: non-architecture (magazines, signs, maps, masks, etc.) and changing vectors: action (voyaging, mapping, jesting, eating, etc.)—with architecture at its heart. Thus channeling thoughts and actions, and mobilizing creators, creativity and creations, ArchiteXt’s expanded cloud gives birth to readable, playable, and edible architecture.

Three decades after their alliance and publication of ArchiteXt, each on their individual paths, the members of ArchiteXt had lost touch with each other. Yet serendipitously, in 2006, our Clip/Stamp/Fold reunited Aida and Takeyama. Once again in 2008, upon my return to Tokyo for further archival research and interviews for this dissertation, the architects met again, this time joined by Suzuki. In keeping with ArchiteXt’s lighthearted demeanor, we met at a Chinese restaurant in the Aoyama district, where the story of ArchiteXt began. Amid eating and drinking, Aida, Suzuki and Takeyama reminisced their venturesome youths, their initial gathering at Brook, et cetera, et cetera. Then they made a pact to resume meeting regularly. The clouds gathered again.
Figure 226: 2008 summer, photograph by Lisa Hsieh.
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