

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
HONORS EXCELLENCE OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

THE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS:
AN AMERICAN INVENTION



THE HONORS COLLEGE
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Excellence with Honors

Volume III ~ Number One
October 2003

ROBERT A. M. STERN, FAIA

DEAN OF THE YALE SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE
SENIOR PARTNER, ROBERT A. M. STERN ARCHITECTS

HONORS EXCELLENCE OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

T H E U N I V E R S I T Y C A M P U S :
A N A M E R I C A N I N V E N T I O N

ROBERT A. M. STERN, FAIA

DEAN OF THE YALE SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE
SENIOR PARTNER, ROBERT A. M. STERN ARCHITECTS

OCTOBER SEVENTH ~ TWO THOUSAND THREE
T H E H O N O R S C O L L E G E
F L O R I D A I N T E R N A T I O N A L U N I V E R S I T Y
S H O O L O F A R C H I T E C T U R E A U D I T O R I U M
U N I V E R S I T Y P A R K C A M P U S
M I A M I , F L O R I D A

Honors Excellence Occasional Paper Series, Volume III, Number One

©2003

The Honors College at Florida International University
University Park Campus, DM 233
Miami, Florida 33199
All rights reserved

Edited by John Kneski,
Assistant Dean and Fellow

ISSN: 1538-1668

Biography

Robert A.M. Stern is a practicing architect, teacher, and writer. He is a Fellow of the American Institute of Architects and received the Medal of Honor of its New York Chapter in 1984. As founder and senior partner of Robert A.M. Stern Architects, he personally directs the design of each of the firm's projects.

Mr. Stern is the dean of the Yale School of Architecture and was previously a professor of Architecture and director of the Historic Preservation Program at the Graduate Schools of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation at Columbia University. Mr. Stern served from 1984 to 1988 as the first director of Columbia's Temple Hoyne Buell Center for the Study of American Architecture. He has lectured extensively in the United States and abroad on both historical and contemporary topics in architecture. He is the author of several books, including *New Directions in American Architecture* (Braziller, 1969; revised edition, 1977); *George Howe: Toward a Modern American Architecture* (Yale University Press, 1975); and *Modern Classicism* (London: Thames & Hudson; New York: Rizzoli, 1988).

His particular interest and experience in the development of New York City's architecture and urbanism can be seen in his books, *New York 1900* (Rizzoli, 1983) coauthored with John Massengale and Gregory Gilmartin, *New York 1930* (Rizzoli, 1987) coauthored with Thomas Mellins and Gregory Gilmartin, which was nominated for a National Book Award, *New York 1960* (Monacelli, 1995) and *New York 1880* (Monacelli, 1999) coauthored with Thomas Mellins and David Fishman. Mr. Stern's work has been exhibited at numerous galleries and universities and is in permanent collections of the Museum of Modern Art, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Duetsches Architekturmuseum, the Denver Museum of Art, and the Art Institute of Chicago. In 1976, 1980, and 1996, he was among the architects selected to represent the United States at the Venice Biennale. In 1986 Mr. Stern hosted the "Pride of Place: Building the American Dream," an eight-part, eight-hour documentary television series aired on the Public Broadcasting System. Mr. Stern serves on the board of directors of the Walt Disney Company. Mr. Stern is a graduate of Columbia University (B.A., 1960) and Yale University (M. Architecture, 1965).

Foreword

I invited Robert Stern to lecture in Miami as the fifth speaker in the Honors College Excellence Series as soon as heard that he was designing the new School of Law Building for Florida International University. The architectural landscape of the University has undergone a dramatic transformation since its creation a brief thirty years ago and this new project is a welcome part of that transformation. The original structures from the early 1970s, which could be stylistically classified as *late-brutalism* (béton brut) somewhat reminiscent of the 1950s brutalism of Louis Kahn, Paul Rudolph, Vittoriano Viganò, or LeCorbusier, have since been complimented with works of late-modernist, new-modernist, post-modernist, and rationalist architecture in an eclectic collection of architectural styles.

Recent competitions to design new buildings at FIU involving firms such as Arquitectonica, Legorreta Associates, Perkins & Will, Michael Graves & Associates, Machado & Silvetti Associates, Bernard Tschumi, Kohn Pedersen Fox Associates, and Arata Isozki & Associates have provided the mechanism for creating a new, architecturally diverse and dynamic physical campus. University Park Campus will surely be a place for architecture students and architecture fans alike to visit in the near future to see a very interesting and diverse collection of buildings. And although *eclecticism* in general came to be considered a *faux pax* in architectural academic circles at some point during the modern movement, that urban condition has certainly provided to be aesthetically advantageous at this institution, as opposed to campuses designed in their entirety from a *tabula rasa*.

These competitions, unheard of at FIU before BR-850 - the project document which I assisted in creating that authorized the creation of the new School of Architecture Building in 1997 - have raised the architectural aesthetic consciousness of the University Community as well as bringing national attention to the campus. *Architecture Magazine* printed a feature article last year on the recently completed Paul A. Cejas School of Architecture Building at FIU designed by Bernard Tschumi. That project along with the new Graduate School of Business Building being designed by Kohn Pedersen Fox Associates are two examples of excellence in facilities design at FIU.

The addition of the Robert Stern design to the campus is therefore a welcome part of the architectural evolution of the campus and of the new competition based format for selecting new designs for the campus. Although Robert Stern's work is most often associated with the 20th century rather than this one, the manner in

which his architectural style speaks of *tradition* is in keeping with the administration's vision for the University campus and an expression of *continuity* that many expect to see on any university campus. The impact of Robert Stern's body of work on the American university campus, and the architectural landscape of this country in general, has been profound. When I was an architecture student in Miami in the 1980s, Robert Stern's name - as associated with the Post-modernist movement - was an essential part of the architecture studio dialectic. His work, referenced in many major treatises on late 20th century architectural theory or history, was a critical piece of the theoretical puzzle that made up that period. In 1977 Robert Stern declared of his milieu, "*the belief in the power of architecture to achieve symbolic meaning through allusion not only to other moments in architectural history but to historical and contemporary events of a social, political, and cultural nature, are central to the emerging post-modern position.*"

Designs for eleven major projects on university campuses precede Mr. Stern's intervention at FIU including : *Broadway Residence Hall* at Columbia University in New York, the *Spangler Campus Center* at Harvard Business School in Boston, *A. James Clark Hall* at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, *Manzanita Hall* of the College of Arts, Media, and Communication of California State University, at Northridge, the *William Gates Computer Science Building* at Stanford University in Palo Alto, the *Moore Psychology Building* at Dartmouth College in Hanover, *The Colgate Darden School of Business Administration* of the University of Virginia at Charlottesville, the *Brooklyn Law School* in Brooklyn, the *Smith Campus Center* of Pomona College in Claremont, California, the *Environmental Sciences Research Centre & Botanical Gardens* of Acadia University at Wolfville, Nova Scotia, Canada, the *New Residence Hall* of The Taft School in Watertown, Connecticut, and *New Northrup Hall* at Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas.

I am confident that the new School of Law Building for Florida International University will be in keeping with the excellent designs Robert Stern has created for those American campuses. I am equally confident that it will become an essential part of the new architectural landscape here in the same way that Robert Stern's aesthetic principles are an essential part of the mosaic of 20th century theory.

John S. Kneski, AIA
Assistant Dean and Fellow of The Honors College
Lecturer, The School of Architecture

v

"The University Campus: An American Invention"

Robert A.M. Stern

In July of 2002 I was given the responsibility to physically shape the building that will house what will become the Law School of this university. Daunting though the challenge is, it is also very welcome, given that FIU is only 31 years old and the Law School is brand-new, so that this is not just another building in our professional portfolio but an opportunity to help establish an institutional identity for a new educational enterprise - or, as the current jargon would have it, to brand the Law School. Designing the future Law School at FIU confronted me and my colleagues with other, related issues, growing out of a quite proper questioning of the basic role and character that large educational institutions should take in the new century, especially in light of the tremendous capacities for electronic communication that are now available, capacities that some people believe call into doubt the very need for university campuses.

Why build new universities? Aren't they really old-hat? Maybe even obsolete in the age of electronic communication? Why not just study from home? There are many answers to these questions, ranging from the innate human need to communicate face-to-face, to the simple reality that time spent studying among one's peers often leads to lifelong professional, business, and let's not forget, matrimonial relationships. As I'm not a sociologist, but an architect, in the time allowed me by this lecture, I cannot take on these important questions, except by indirection. Instead, I'd like to take a look at the American university campus as we now know it, and, in so doing, establish some organizational and architectural principles that lie behind its status as one of the hallmarks of American architecture, and indeed of American life.

More than a repository for books or a collection of laboratories and dormitories, the best university campuses constitute ideal communities. They are miniature cities, bringing together students, faculty, administrators, and facilitators alike. In the helter-skelter of our sprawling automobile culture, when our real cities are increasingly little more than bland, sprawling suburbs without focus or intimacy, the ideal city of the university campus is one of few places that permits us to experience community in the fullest sense of the word - they are one of the few places where architecture and urbanism symbiotically exist to establish symbol-

I

*The Honors College @ Florida International University
Honors Excellence Occasional Paper Series*

ic meaning - one of the few places where architecture and landscape convincingly shape public space.

American campuses - ideal, independent, socially and culturally coherent village--like communities for learning and research - are among the greatest expressions of the American dream and a distinctly American invention. At the core of the American experience is the sense of the continent as a place of new beginnings and of the need for democratic institutions to give each young person a chance to discover his or her talents, to chart a future, to invent and reinvent the circumstances of daily life. Given America's cultural diversity, the campus and the rituals that it supports - from sitting on the Yale fence to walking the line at the United States Air Force Academy - provide an essential sense of democratic community, uniting disparate people in a common pursuit.

Though it has precedents in the monastic quadrangles of Medieval and Renaissance Oxford and Cambridge ^{Slide 1}, the university campus is largely an American phenomenon - an American invention. While most European towns grew organically over time, the typical American town was planned ^{Slide 2}. American towns are deliberate acts of real estate development. This is probably so because Americans, faced with the vast geography of the continent, have had to deliberately and even arbitrarily lay out villages and towns, even before there was any real need for them. For very many Americans, the continent is a grand field of dreams - plan it, build on it, and they will come. Like the American town, the American campus is also an act of real estate legerdemain and, even more, than the town, the campus is a field of dreams.

The American campus is quite different from Oxford and Cambridge, universities that are embedded in their towns. The most representative American colleges stand physically and conceptually apart from their towns. This has been true from the time of our very first colleges. The College of William and Mary, founded in Williamsburg, Virginia, in 1693, stands on its own special site at the end of the main street of the town. ^{Slide 3} Princeton, founded in 1746 as the College of New Jersey, from the first occupied a parallel site to that of the town, across from and

completely distinct from it.^{Slide 4} At Princeton, the buildings were loosely placed on a large open site, a campus. In fact, Princeton was the first college ever to use the word "campus" to describe its site, "campus" being derived from the Roman word meaning field.

But it is Thomas Jefferson who really deserves the credit for giving physical form both to the modern campus and to the modern university, both as an educational institution and as a conurbation. Where universities in Europe and Latin America grew out of the religious orders, with the ratification of the Constitution, Thomas Jefferson pioneered for America a new type - a university rooted in a secular, as opposed to a religious, conception of society. Acting as both educator and architect, Jefferson brought this new kind of university to fruition in 1817 when he founded the University of Virginia, simultaneously shaping its curriculum and buildings. To isolate his new state-supported university from the bustle, temptations, and conflicts of the city, Jefferson located the University of Virginia a mile outside the barely settled village of Charlottesville.^{Slide 5} Jefferson's new university was planned as an "academical village." It was, in fact, the first planned university campus ever. It is worth our time to consider UVA in some detail.

To give this new institution shape, Jefferson adopted forms from the past.^{Slide 6} In developing the architectural style of the university, Jefferson, anxious to distance the new nation from its English origins as well as from the monarchical traditions of continental Europe, sought inspiration from the Ancient Classical world. In fact, the architecture of the entire village was meant as a model for the instruction of the students in great architecture, which for Jefferson was synonymous with the Classical tradition. The Rotunda, which housed the library as the centerpiece of the new university, was a half-size version of the Pantheon in Rome. Though in Jefferson's time the Pantheon was used as a church, it had been built in antiquity as an all-encompassing pagan shrine, which gave it an aura of universality that mirrored Jefferson's vision for UVA, which, he insisted, should be universal in outlook. The Pantheonic model perfectly mirrored his conviction that secular learning, represented by the library, should usurp the spiritual focus of earlier universities.^{Slide 7} For Jefferson the pure geometric figure of the sphere expressed the Newtonian conception of the world which he fully subscribed to. On the other hand, the Rotunda's temple front connected the state-supported, secular, tuition--free educational enterprise which he pioneered by founding UVA with the democracy of ancient Greece and the cultural and political authority of Rome.^{Slide 8} The Rotunda made it clear that worldliness of learning rather than religion was the symbolic heart of the life of this university, and that the new world drew strength from and directly built upon the old.

With the Rotunda as its focus, Jefferson organized his classroom buildings along a broad greensward which he called the Lawn.^{Slide 9} The Lawn expresses his pedagogical strategy of integrating the professors and students into the daily life of the campus community; professors lived above their classrooms in the pavilions that lined the Lawn; students lived in rooms to either side of their professors' houses in the ranges that formed the connections. Each of the professor's houses was modeled on a Greek or Roman precedent; Jefferson did this deliberately so that all the students would inculcate what he regarded as superior architectural values to carry with them in their future lives. As Jefferson wrote to Benjamin Latrobe, the young English-trained architect who advised him in the design of the buildings, the faculty houses in particular were meant to be "models of taste and correct architecture - and of a variety of appearances, no two alike, so as to serve as specimens of orders for the architectural lectures." High-quality buildings at the university, Jefferson argued, would help foster superior architecture across the rapidly developing American continent. For Jefferson, the architecture of the campus was an integral part of the educational mission.

UVA was uniquely lucky to have as a founder one who not only was a great architect but also an effective politician who could cajole the legislators of his state to fund his university project almost all at once. However, most American colleges only arrived at their plan and their architectural character over a long time. In fact, most of them grew and changed in a contingent manner, never developing an encompassing plan at all: Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, among others, fall into this category. Moreover, these oldest of American colleges were slow to establish their architectural identity, while UVA was born more or less fully fashioned. Forward-thinking though Jefferson's vision was, eventually the university outgrew the plan, resulting in the present helter-skelter of its sprawling present-day campus. But even as it sprawled, the University stuck to Jefferson's vocabulary of red brick and white painted wood Classicism until the 1950s, the Classical architecture he prescribed, so that UVA has a remarkable coherence, an identity, a brand. From the 1960s to the 1980s, UVA abandoned Jefferson's Classicism, swayed by the argument that each building should reflect the spirit of its own age. More recently, pressured by trustees and alumni, the administration has for some buildings returned to its Jeffersonian tradition, as was the case with the new Darden School of Business,^{Slide 10} which we designed in the early 1990s. However, it is fair to say that the struggle between amnesia and memory at UVA continues to this day.

The case of UVA is exemplary, but not typical. For example, take the case of

Harvard, which most people think of as a red-brick Georgian university that more or less consistently evolved over the years from a core of buildings grouped to form a campus in Cambridge, Massachusetts, which is referred to as the Yard. Nothing could be further from the truth. The predominantly Georgian character of today's Harvard wasn't always a foregone conclusion. Harvard began in 1636 with a building that looked like a modest house in Elizabethan England or Plimoth Plantation. ^{Slide 11} Only as it expanded in the 18th century did Harvard establish a campus - the Yard - and adopt the vernacular red-brick Georgian of the American colonies. Then in the nineteenth century, Harvard, transforming itself from a provincial college to a major university, at once burst beyond the Yard and also rebuilt buildings within the Yard, sacrificing architectural coherence to a trend that seems all too familiar today ^{Slide 12}: that is, to the idea that every new building should represent the moment of its construction rather than the continuity of ideas and ideals across time. Post-Civil War Harvard, in other words, may have built innovative buildings but it did not build a coherent ensemble. ^{Slide 13} Shown here are Austin Hall, H.H. Richardson's building of 1882 for the new Harvard Law School and Memorial Hall, 1876, by Ware & Van Brunt, which in a poll taken at the time of its completion was deemed by America's architects to be one of the ten best buildings in the country. Ten years or so later, architectural fashion followed its fickle course, as architects and Harvard students alike turned their love to hate, a hate which has only recently somewhat abated. The lesson here is that, though Harvard's late-nineteenth-century eclecticism makes an interesting textbook of the history of post-Civil War architecture, it is not very convincing as a coherent environment. A successful campus is not an art gallery of buildings. To succeed it needs to be share common themes.

As the 20th century dawned, Harvard, long the front-runner among American universities, was challenged by competition from a surprising variety of rivals, including a major start-up, Stanford University, ^{Slide 14} which in 1886 hired Boston-based architects and landscape architects to realize an ideal new campus at Palo Alto, California, forty miles or so south of San Francisco. The Stanford campus, set on 9,000 acres of open land, was wholly its own new community of courtyards and arcaded structures, the designs of which were unique though derived from diverse sources such as Romanesque monasteries, California missions, and English collegiate quadrangles. ^{Slide 15} Virtually overnight a strong and enduring architectural character had been created and a university had achieved its identity, indeed its brand.

Like UVA, Stanford was a place apart; it did not provide American university architecture with a new model, but with a new architectural synthesis that gave it

a strong identity of its own, an identity deeply rooted in the culture and geography of California. Stanford's founding in 1886, and the extraordinary power of its campus design, triggered a new wave of college and university start-ups, many of which, one might even say the best of which, took the issue of physical planning and architectural expression very seriously. Rice University, founded in 1912, adapted the Jeffersonian approach while finding its own distinct and appropriate locutions. If Jefferson imagined UVA as an American Rome, the architect Ralph Adams Cram conceived Rice ^{Slide 16} set in humid, watery Houston, Texas, as a fantasia on Lombardian and Venetian architectural themes. ^{Slide 17} Cram's plan of courtyards bounded by brick-walled, tile-roofed buildings with deep arcades has worked brilliantly and has been faithfully respected by the trustees so that in our time leading modern architects such as James Stirling, ^{Slide 18} Thomas Beeby, ^{Slide 19} and Allan Greenberg ^{Slide 20} have each added to the composition in sympathetic ways, largely sacrificing personal style to the great glory of the whole. As a result, Rice is a community of architecture, not a collection of self-important artifacts. Through thick and thin, Rice has stuck to Cram's vision and to the glorious St. Joe brick, capable of realizing infinite eye-pleasing details. The idea and the ideal of Rice has survived. It is the standard of expectation for all new buildings on the main quad, including our firm's new building for the Jones School of Business Management. ^{Slide 21}

At Pomona College, in Claremont, California, 50 miles east of Los Angeles, Myron Hunt's master plan of 1908 ^{Slide 22} adapted the Jeffersonian model to the landscape, climate, and cultural traditions of Southern California. The central open space, Marston Quadrangle, evoked UVA's Lawn, around which Hunt carefully orchestrated his group of buildings with open spaces and arcaded passageways. ^{Slide 23} All correctly oriented to the sun, all framing views of snow-capped mountains. Pomona has stuck with Hunt's plan for all its subsequent history. Our Smith Campus Center, completed in 1999, ^{Slide 24} uses the same materials - reinforced concrete and red tile roofs - and the same formal devices - arcades, single-gabled volumes - and connects with the perpendicular routes and axes of the plan that Myron Hunt laid out in 1913. The Smith Campus Center is its own thing, meeting today's programmatic needs, but meeting them with an architecture deep with memory and commitment to place.

The challenge posed by Stanford, Rice, and Pomona, new institutions in newly opened-up parts of the country, did not go unnoticed by the established colleges in the Northeast. In 1897, Columbia in New York moved from an inner city location to the outskirts of development, which afforded it the opportunity to create an entirely new campus. Founded as King's College in 1754 ^{Slide 25} Columbia had

been located in what is now called Lower Manhattan until 1859, when the city had so closed in around the college that it moved uptown to the new residential district near Forty-ninth Street, in what is now called Midtown.^{Slide 26} On 49th Street the college reinvented itself as a monastic cloister closer in organization and feeling to Oxford or Cambridge than to any other in America. Its architect Charles Coolidge Haight achieved what nineteenth-century critic Montgomery Schuyler described as an "air of seclusion of repose.... as completely attained on a bustling New York Avenue as in the sleepest university towns."

But Columbia quickly outgrew this new campus, and in 1890, President Low, who masterminded Columbia's transformation from a college into a comprehensive university, simultaneously engineered its move uptown to Morningside Heights, hiring the architect Charles Follen McKim to give form to Low's dream of a Jeffersonian academical village, but not set apart in the countryside. Seth Low's vision was that of an ideal town set within the world's most pragmatic city.^{Slide 27} At Columbia McKim reinvented UVA, placing the Low Library at its center, so that the campus could grow around it in all directions. Columbia built out most of its plan before World War II. But in the 1950s, it slipped badly in its architectural ambitions as it filled the few remaining sites on the campus.^{Slide 28} In 1956 it built a student center which was out of scale and character.^{Slide 29} This it replaced in 1999 with a new student center designed by Bernard Tschumi,^{Slide 30} so designer of FIU's new Paul Cejas [pronounced "Caius"] School of Architecture. Tschumi's building at Lerner Center far exceeds its predecessor in stylistic brilliance but still begs the question of the relationship of the individual building to the whole.

Columbia's village on an acropolis inspired the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which since its founding in 1859 had been located in Boston in a single building. In the first decade of the twentieth century, MIT, moving across the Charles River to Cambridge, hired the architect Welles Bosworth, who carried the idea of UVA and Columbia much further, creating what is in effect one continuous megabuilding.^{Slide 31} MIT's decision to build a Classical campus sent a clear message about the still-young institution: through the authority of Classicism, MIT told the world that modern technology was firmly grounded in the traditions of Western humanism. MIT's megastructure made no gestures to a local vernacular; instead, its Classicism was a pure expression of the clear thinking most people then associated with the limpid geometries of Plato and Pythagoras.

Stanford, Columbia, MIT, and the rebuilding of UVA after a disastrous fire in

1895, did not go unnoticed by Harvard, Princeton, and Yale. Harvard, under the prodding of alumni who had come to hold Harvard's esthetic individualism in contempt, turned to one of its own, Charles Follen McKim, who returned the university to the Georgian architecture of its early history which many alumni believed to be Harvard's essential image.^{Slide 32} In so doing Harvard took advantage of its greatest asset: its age, with all the positive virtues that great age can bring to an institution. The return to the architectural language of its earliest buildings was an expression of Harvard's pride in its past and in its present as an institution with a past - it was that past which provided reassurance, a sense of stability and with it the confidence to allow all kinds of forward-looking experimentation in classrooms and laboratories. Harvard's return to its Georgian roots can be seen in the gates to Harvard Yard, in the restoration of Holden Chapel,^{Slide 33} and in the Harvard Union of 1902,^{Slide 34} the first student-oriented center to be built at an American college. Later, in the 1920s, by which time the red-brick Georgian seemed very much the Harvard brand, the campus was dramatically extended with the River Houses, residential colleges with their own mini Harvard Yards, and the Business School^{Slide 35} that transformed a stretch of the Charles River into an idealized amalgam of Oxford and UVA. The business school also abandoned its traditional character in the 1950s but in the 1990s, beginning with Moshe Safdie's addition to Morgan Hall,^{Slide 36} it returned to its traditional architectural language. Recently, our Spangler Campus Center has carried that return further.^{Slide 37}

Yale's reinvention in the 1920s and 1930s is also worth noting.^{Slide 38} At Yale the red brick buildings of the colonial campus were gradually replaced in the mid-nineteenth century. In New Haven, as in much of New England, red brick had become a material for mill construction, compromising Yale's identity as a privileged educational environment. As a result, after the Civil War Yale's brick row gave way to a palisade of battlemented buildings^{Slide 39} that unfortunately seemed all too obvious a reflection of ongoing conflicts between town and gown. In the early years of the 20th century, as Yale grew into a major university, it rebuilt itself again, this time with stone-clad Gothic residential colleges, like the Harkness Quadrangle of 1917,^{Slide 40} which served to reassure would-be undergraduates that once alternately belligerent and besieged Yale's were in fact genteel children born of the marriage of American money and English antiquity. But I do want to make myself clear: Yale's Gothic campus, like those at Princeton^{Slide 41} or the newly-founded Duke^{Slide 42} were picturesque for a reason: the very choice of Gothic made it clear to the public that a university's role was as an ideal community where scholars could live and work apart from the everyday so as to better understand it.

Increasingly, beginning in the 1920s, university campuses took on Jefferson's sense of responsibility, but in a new context. More and more, as cities sprawled, campuses began to seem not so much a place apart from the city but as an alternative model to it, providing all those who experienced them with just that balanced sense of architecture and landscape and urban space that makes for a livable town - a combination that was becoming increasingly scarce in twentieth-century America, where the automobile - and the high-speed roads and parking lots that go with it - was laying waste to the nation's cities and towns.

So we come, in this much too superficial overview, to our own time, that is to the second half of the twentieth century and these first few years of the 21st - that is, to the Age of Modernism and Post-Modernism. While the curriculum of most American universities of the 1920s and 1930s were in most ways the most modern in the world - modern, that is, in their continual adaptation to and exploration of contemporary problems - as we have seen, they did not choose to look modern - that is to say, they chose to frame their modernity in an architecture and urbanism that carried forward a sense of the past. But on the eve of World War II, long prevailing stylistic models were challenged by a new esthetic and a new attitude to urban space that argued for a strict congruence between daily life and its architecture and urbanism. This approach, variously called the International Style or the Modern Movement, argued that buildings and towns should reflect the realities of the present without a sense of an idealized past which was dismissed as sentimental.^{Slide 43} In 1937, less than a quarter century after the pure Classicism of MIT, another engineering school, the Armour Institute in Chicago reinvented itself as the Illinois Institute of Technology, inviting Mies van der Rohe, the German architect who had served as the last director of the Bauhaus, a school which was the greatest hotbed of Modernist architectural thought and design in Europe between the World Wars, to head its architecture school and to design a new campus. Mies rejected as sentimental the historic associationalism of American university architecture, but he did not reject the Jeffersonian ideal of the academical village set apart from its context. Mies's design for IIT was the Modernist answer to Jefferson's University of Virginia, substituting up-to-the-minute industrial technology in the guise of a factory esthetic for an architectural vocabulary drawn from history. A factory as a university building is, in its way, as exotic, even as improbable, as a Gothic cloister. But like Jefferson, Mies was no mere stylist. IIT's glass-and-steel Modernist Classicism was as ideological as UVA's red-brick Traditionalist Classicism had been: each reflected a strong vision, Jefferson looking to the distant past to go forward into the future, Mies looking to the more recent past - that of the heavy industry of the Industrial

Revolution. Jefferson and Mies had much in common. Both were autodidacts as far as architecture was concerned. And both were Classicists. Both understood the use of traditional building materials and the importance of proportion. In his designs for LIT, Mies struggled to create a twentieth-century Classicism based on what he believed was the most common modern material, steel. For Mies the standard steel section of H-beams and I-beams was the twentieth-century equivalent of the traditional orders of Classicism.^{Slide 44} It is interesting to note how IIT's design, conceived on what Mies considered timeless principles without reference to history, today, seen from the perspective of our electronic age, seem dated, if wonderfully so; IIT even seems sentimental in its evocation of America's industrial past. For Rem Koolhaas, who has just completed a student center at LIT, Mies's industrial Classicism seems as inaccessible, as out of touch, as Jefferson's vernacular Classicism. According to Koolhaas, in our MTV era, we have no time to contemplate the refinements each of these embody. But that is another story.

Koolhaas's cynicism and impatience notwithstanding, UVA and IIT are important for us today. What is important about IIT is not how different it was from UVA but how much alike it was. Both are ideal campuses, with a clear hierarchy of buildings and public spaces, a strong center planned around public uses - at UVA, the library; at IIT, two large auditoriums that were never built. In other words, the revolutionary esthetic aside, Mies's campus reinforced the idea of the American campus as a coherently planned place apart, an academical village.

After World War II, returning to the stylistic eclecticism that they had pursued in the nineteenth century, many older universities peppered their campuses with a sampling of highly individualistic, up-to-the-minute architecture. This approach took hold most brilliantly at Yale, where, under Eero Saarinen's leadership as master planner, a series of buildings were commissioned that transformed the campus into something of an outdoor museum of Modernism, but one that was strictly framed in by traditional architecture. Saarinen's Ingalls Hockey Rinks^{Slide 45}, is a structural tour-de-force that batters at the gates of Yale's Science Hill, while Gordon Bunshaft's Beinecke Library^{Slide 46} more sympathetically takes its place in a Classical setting. Paul Rudolph's Art & Architecture Building,^{Slide 47} my base in New Haven both as an architecture student and now as Dean, is more complex, pushing Modernism toward contextualism, playing beautifully to Yale's many-towered Gothic townscape. Furthering this sense of contextualism, and of self-conscious imagistic exploration, Eero Saarinen's two residential colleges,^{Slide 48} Ezra Stiles and Samuel F.B. Morse, deliberately reflect Yale's dominant brand, its traditional Gothic, with courtyards, a variegated skyline, and ornament. Saarinen realized his buildings using a modern, even experimental,

building technology combining stone and gunnite concrete - but his intentions were to extend Yale's brand, its Gothic character, not to dislodge it.

Rudolph's and Saarinen's return to a form of contextualism and of symbolism helped shape my own views, so that wherever possible, I aim to fit in, even at the expense of standing out. I believe in the community of buildings, where individuality is tempered by conformity. It is with this understanding of the American campus that my colleagues and I have approached the design of the Law School at Florida International University.

FIU is a very new place; architecturally it is like a child just learning to speak. Some of the buildings are incomprehensible. Some of the spaces between the buildings are barely formed as a child's sentences are barely framed. I have tried to take the measure of this very modern place and to see what President Maidique has done to give it some direction, to take this child of the late twentieth century and to help it along - to make explicit its implied axes of movement and building organization, to clarify its grammar of concrete columns and slabs, to render it latent Classicism clearer and more vivid. In so doing, I hope our new Law School proves worthy of the shared ambitions for FIU as a campus that is modern but with a memory.

Thank you.

Slides

- Slide 1: LEFT: Oxford, England. Aerial view. RIGHT: Cambridge, England. Aerial view.
- Slide 2: Savannah, Georgia. LEFT: Aerial perspective, 1754. RIGHT: Plan, after 1865.
- Slide 3: Williamsburg, Virginia. LEFT: Schematic plan of town with The College of William and Mary. RIGHT: The College of William and Mary. Engraving c. 1740.
- Slide 4: Princeton, New Jersey. Princeton University. Nassau Hall, 1775.
A Limited Liability Partnership
- Slide 5: Charlottesville, Virginia. University of Virginia. Thomas Jefferson, 1826. LEFT: Aerial rendering. RIGHT: Schematic plan, 1822.
- Slide 6: LEFT: Rome, Italy. The Pantheon. RIGHT: Charlottesville, Virginia. University of Virginia. Rotunda. Thomas Jefferson, 1826.
- Slide 7: LEFT: Rome, Italy. The Pantheon (Interior). RIGHT: Charlottesville, Virginia. University of Virginia. Rotunda. Thomas Jefferson, 1826 (Interior).
- Slide 8: Charlottesville, Virginia. University of Virginia. Thomas Jefferson, 1826. The Rotunda and the Lawn.
- Slide 9: Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia. Thomas Jefferson, 1826. Pavilions along the Lawn.
- Slide 10: Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia, Darden School of Business. Robert A.M. Stern, 1996. LEFT: View to Saunders Hall at graduation. RIGHT: Courtyard garden.
- Slide 11: Cambridge, Massachusetts. Harvard University. LEFT: Aerial view, 1668. RIGHT: Harvard Hall I. 1642 (reconstruction).
- Slide 12: Cambridge, Massachusetts. Harvard University. LEFT: Aerial view of Harvard Yard, c. 1875. RIGHT: Weld Hall. Ware & Van Brunt, 1873.
- Slide 13: Cambridge, Massachusetts. Harvard University. LEFT: Memorial Hall. Ware & Van Brunt, 1866-1878. RIGHT: Austin Hall. H.H. Richardson, 1881-1884.
- Slide 14: Palo Alto, California. Stanford University. LEFT: Aerial perspective. RIGHT: Site plan. Frederick Law Olmsted, 1888.
- Slide 15: Palo Alto, California. Stanford University. LEFT: Arcades. RIGHT: Memorial Quadrangle. Shepley, Ruttan & Coolidge, 1885.
- Slide 16: Houston, Texas. Rice University. LEFT: Site plan. Cram, Goodhue & Ferguson, 1910. RIGHT: Administration Building. Perspective of preliminary proposal. Cram, Goodhue & Ferguson, 1910.
- Slide 17: Houston, Texas. Rice University. LEFT: Lovett Hall. Cram, Goodhue & Ferguson, 1912. RIGHT: Arcade.
- Slide 18: Houston, Texas. Rice University. Extension to the School of Architecture. James Stirling, 1981.
- Slide 19: Houston, Texas. Rice University. Baker Institute of Public Policy. Hammond, Beeby & Babka, 1997.
- Slide 20: Houston, Texas. Rice University. Humanities Building. Allan Greenberg, 2000.
- Slide 21: Houston, Texas. Rice University. Jones School of Business Management.

Robert A.M. Stern, 2002. LEFT: View from Jamail Plaza. RIGHT: View across Woodson Courtyard.

Slide 22: Claremont, California. Pomona College. LEFT: Campus plan. Myron Hunt, 1913. RIGHT: Aerial view. 2000.

Slide 23: Claremont, California. Pomona College. LEFT: Bridges Hall of Music. Myron Hunt, 1915. RIGHT: Arcade.

Slide 24: Claremont, California. Pomona College. Smith Campus Center. Robert A.M. Stern, 1999. LEFT: Aerial view. RIGHT: View from Marston Quadrangle.

Slide 25: Manhattan, New York. King's College. 1760.

Slide 26: Manhattan, New York. Columbia College, Midtown Campus. LEFT: Perspective rendering, c. 1890. Charles Coolidge Haight, 1874-1884. RIGHT: Hamilton Hall. 1880.

Slide 27: Manhattan, New York. Columbia University. LEFT: Aerial view, c. 1940. RIGHT: Low Library. McKim, Mead & White, 1897.

Slide 28: Manhattan, New York. Columbia University. Uris Hall. Moore & Hutchins, 1964.

Slide 29: Manhattan, New York. Columbia University. Ferris Booth Hall. Shreve, Lamb & Harmon, 1956.

Slide 30: Manhattan, New York. Columbia University. Lerner Center. Bernard Tschumi, 1999.

Slide 31: Cambridge, Massachusetts. MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology). Welles Bosworth, 1916. LEFT: Aerial perspective. RIGHT: Aerial view.

Slide 32: Cambridge, Massachusetts. Harvard University. Harvard Hall. 1642.

Slide 33: Cambridge, Massachusetts. Harvard University. LEFT: Harvard Yard Gates. McKim, Mead & White, 1889-1890. RIGHT: Holden Chapel. John Smibert, 1742.

Slide 34: Cambridge, Massachusetts. Harvard University. Harvard Union. McKim, Mead & White, 1902.

Slide 35: LEFT: Boston, Massachusetts. Harvard Business School. McKim, Mead & White, 1926. Aerial view. RIGHT: Cambridge, Massachusetts. Harvard University. The River Houses.

Slide 36: Boston, Massachusetts. Harvard Business School. Morgan Hall. LEFT: North facade. McKim, Mead & White, 1926. RIGHT: Addition (south facade). Moshe Safdie, 1990.

Slide 37: Boston, Massachusetts. Harvard Business School. Spangler Campus Center. Robert A.M. Stern, 2001. LEFT: Aerial view. RIGHT: Entry at Aldrich Courtyard.

Slide 38: New Haven, Connecticut. Yale University. LEFT: Old Brick Row, 1750-1820. RIGHT: Old Campus.

Slide 39: New Haven, Connecticut. Yale University. Farnam Hall. Russell Sturgis, 1870.

Slide 40: New Haven, Connecticut. Yale University. Harkness Memorial Quadrangle. James Gamble Rogers, 1933.

Slide 41: Princeton, New Jersey. Princeton University. LEFT: Blair Hall. Cope & Stewardson, 1987. RIGHT: Graduate School. Ralph Adams Cram, 1920.

Slide 42: Durham, North Carolina. Duke University. West Campus. Horace Trumbauer, 1930s.

Slide 43: Chicago, Illinois. IIT (Illinois Institute of Technology). LEFT: Crown Hall.

Mies van der Rohe, 1956. RIGHT: Master plan. Mies van der Rohe, 1939.
Slide 44: Chicago, Illinois. IIT (Illinois Institute of Technology). Navy Building (Alumni Memorial Hall). Mies van der Rohe, 1947. LEFT: Overall view. RIGHT: Detail at corner.
Slide 45: New Haven, Connecticut. Yale University. Ingalls Hockey Rink. Eero Saarinen, 1958.
Slide 46: New Haven, Connecticut. Yale University. Beinecke Rare Book & Manuscript Library. Gordon Bunshaft of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, 1961.
Slide 47: New Haven, Connecticut. Yale University. Art & Architecture Building. Paul Rudolph, 1964.
Slide 48: New Haven, Connecticut. Yale University. Morse & Stiles Colleges. Eero Saarinen, 1962.

The Honors College Administration and Faculty

Administration

Ivelaw L. Griffith, Ph.D. (City University of New York), Dean & Fellow
Stephen M. Fjellman, Ph.D. (Stanford University), Associate Dean & Fellow
Caryl Myers Grof, M.A. (Florida International University), Assistant Dean & Fellow
John S. Kneski, M.Arch II (Syracuse University), Assistant Dean & Fellow
Sharon Placide, M.A. (Florida International University), Director of Academic Services

Office Staff

Rosa Barredo, Program Assistant
Ana Cortada, Office Manager
Juan Lopez, Information Technology Officer
Lourdes Pereira, Senior Secretary
Melissa Petersen, Biscayne Bay Campus Assistant
Larissa Ramos, Coordinator of Student Services
Elizabeth Williams, Coordinator of Research & Programs

Faculty Fellows

Irma T. de Alonso, Ph.D. (University of York), Economics
Regina C. Bailey, M.F.A. (Pratt Institute), Art
William K. Beesting, Ph.D. (Florida State University), English
Christopher Brown, Ph.D. (University of Delaware), Biological Sciences
Manuel J. Carvajal, Ph.D. (University of Florida) Economics
Ricardo Castells, Ph.D. (Duke University), Modern Languages
Stephen M. Fain, Ed.D. (Columbia University), Educational Leadership & Policy Studies
Mary G. Free, Ph.D.(University of Georgia), English
Bernard S. Gerstman, Ph.D. (Princeton University), Physics
Bruce W. Hauptli, Ph.D. (Washington University), Philosophy
Marilyn Hoder-Salmon, Ph.D. (University of New Mexico), English
Robert H. Hogner, Ph.D. (University of Pittsburgh), Marketing & Business Environment
James E. Huchingson, Ph.D. (Emory University), Religious Studies
Krishnaswamy Jayachandran, Ph.D. (Kansas State University), Soil Microbiology
Barry B. Levine, Ph.D. (New School for Social Research), Sociology/Anthropology
Felice Lifshitz, Ph.D. (Columbia University), History
Peter A. Machonis, Ph.D. (Pennsylvania State University), Modern Languages
Tomislav Mandakovic, Ph.D. (University of Pittsburgh), Decision Sciences
Pete E.C. Markowitz, Ph.D. (College of William and Mary), Physics
Florentin Maurrasse, Ph.D. (Columbia University), Earth Sciences
Lesley A. Northup, Ph.D. (Catholic University), Religious Studies
Kevin O'Shea, Ph.D. (University of California, Los Angeles), Chemistry
Joyce Peterson, Ph.D. (University of Wisconsin-Madison), History
Darden Pyron, Ph.D. (University of Virginia), History
Meri-Jane Rochelson, Ph.D. (University of Chicago), English
Ediberto Roman, J.D. (University of Wisconsin), Law
Caroline Simpson, Ph.D. (University of Florida), Physics
John Stuart, M.Arch. (Columbia University), Architecture
Kimberly Taylor, Ph.D. (University of Pennsylvania), Marketing
Lorna Veraldi, J.D. (New York School of Law), Journalism & Mass Communications
Michael Wagner, Ph.D. (Florida State University), Music
Christopher Warren, D.A. (Lehigh University), Political Science

The Benefits of The Honors College:

The Best of Two Worlds

The Honors College at Florida International University in Miami offers the best of two worlds. It is a small community of outstanding students, dedicated scholars, and committed teachers who work together in an atmosphere usually associated with small private colleges. Yet, we do so with all the resources of a major state university, which is one of the nation's top doctoral / research extensive universities. Only 152 universities in the United States hold this superior rank.

The Honors College provides a broad foundation for dedicated students who want to get the most out of their undergraduate education. The undergraduate experience it provides is significantly enhanced by the broad interdisciplinary nature of the curriculum and opportunities to work closely with expert faculty and in the community. The opportunities for graduate or professional study and for employment are greatly expanded because of the range of unique activities and academic experiences made available to students in the College.

The Honors Curriculum

You may pursue almost any major available in the University and at the same time complete the honors curriculum. The curriculum emphasizes the following activities: Critical, integrative, and creative thinking; Group and independent research; Oral presentation; Close contact between students and faculty; Integration of class work with the broader community.

Outstanding Professors and Researchers

“Knowledgeable, caring, enthusiastic, and approachable.” These are some of the characteristics students use to describe the diverse honors faculty. Carefully selected from the more than 1,400 faculty members at the University for their accomplishments as both teachers and scholars, members of the honors faculty take great pride in their close association with their students and are committed to excellence.

Honors Place at Panther Hall

“Honors Place is remarkable. It’s like home and everyone there is family. We work hard and play hard, driven by our friendship and common pursuit of excellence” - Damion Dunn, Honors Place Resident.

The Honors Place at Florida International University is on-campus residence living. As an Honors College student, you will have the opportunity to participate in this special campus housing program.

Study Abroad Opportunities

The Honors College has been conducting study abroad programs since 1994 and currently offers opportunities for its students in Spain, Italy, and Jamaica. The summer programs are designed to fulfill one year (six credits) of Honors College curriculum requirement, while the Spain Fall Program offers from nine to fifteen credit hours. The Honors College Study Abroad Programs offer students the opportunity to experience immersion in another culture while pursuing a rigorous academic program integrated with the honors curriculum. Instruction is in English in all the programs.

Additional Opportunities in The Honors College:

Scholarships
Priority Registration
Special Advising
Research and Artistic Initiatives Program
Part of a Special Community of Students and Faculty
Excellence Lectures and Forums with Leading Scholars and Policymakers
Only College in FIU with an Interdisciplinary Curriculum
Curriculum Broadens the Horizon, Making for Well-rounded Individuals
Team-taught and Individually-taught Seminars
Student Information Technology Centers
Gamma Epsilon Phi—The Honors College Student Society
Funding to Attend National and International Conferences
Small Classes and Close Relationships with Professors
Honors Convocation with Recognition of Student Excellence
Internship, Mentoring, and Service Learning Opportunities
College Presence at Both University Park and Biscayne Bay
Awards Assembly for Graduating Seniors
Special Recognition at Commencement
Notation on Transcript: “Graduated through the University Honors College”



THE HONORS COLLEGE
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY PARK CAMPUS, DM 233
BISCAYNE BAY CAMPUS, ACI 200
WEB: HONORS.FIU.EDU