Nicholas Miller
M.Arch I, '19

We often confuse stocks with the pillory. The pillory secure the neck and wrists, while stocks are for the ankles. Both originated in the 5th century and were located in public so the condemned were exposed to constant humiliation—an indication that these devices were not used to punish, but to teach.[1] In ancient Rome or early medieval France (the precise origins are unclear), a victim's ankles were placed into stocks and his feet covered in a solution of salt and water. Goats were then brought forth to lick off the solution. The sensation began as a tickle, but the goats' coarse tongues eventually rubbed the skin and flesh from the victim's feet. Other reports say the feet were coated in honey and licked until the victim reached insanity.

On March 20th, 2001, when I was ten years old, I visited the Museo della Tortura in San Gimignano. The purpose of the museum is to practice our memory.[2] I look younger in the photos than I remember. "Exhausted by his first day in Florence," my mother later wrote in our photo album, "Nick slept in then had a pizza breakfast on the square in San Gimignano." It was the Piazza della Cisterna. I recall sitting on the steps that surround the piazza's eponymous well, but that was after the torture museum, and I was eating gelato. She said that I begged her to go to the torture museum. How did I find out about it? Even at a young age, I had a strong interest in these sorts of things.

I remember walking beneath arches between the piazza and museum. A professional torturer's reputation often depended on what ingenious methods he had invented and on how complete his stock of complicated instruments was—regardless of whether these devices served any useful purpose.[3] Memorable devices and instruments included pyramids on which victims were made to sit, thumb screws, skull crushers, an iron maiden, hanging cages, chastity belts, spiked chairs, various collars, the pear of anguish, and a solitary confinement pit that was entered from above and only large enough to stand in. Some of these artifacts displayed a high degree of craftsmanship. Who designed them? They are modern inventions. They were not used for torture—the very construction of these devices belies any torturous function. They appear infernal, but any consideration of them as instruments of torture reduces their utility.[4]

Despite having been granted permission to carefully study the museum, my parents forbade me from visiting the final exhibit, which was housed in a small structure across a courtyard behind the main building. I have since wondered what was in there, and believe it illustrated some sort of human vivisection. Perhaps I caught a glimpse of something. Through this journey into machines used to cause death, public mockery, and pain, the exhibit shows horrors that our conscience has repressed but that have been part of human co-existence for centuries. Men applied as much creativity into finding new ways to inflict pain as into arts and culture.[5] If military technologies and strategies birthed the discipline of architecture, what did the crafts and sciences of torture bring forth?

But what else can architecture do but offer ambiguous objects? We create objects born of power—a power rooted in violence. The memories of all who encounter them cling to our objects like burs. While we can recast our objects as cautionary memorials, they attract the burs of their reflections. We know not when these burs will be cast to the ground, nor what fruits the seeds will bear. Memorials are meant to temper the growth of violence through the practice of memory, but they can also attract burs with violence as their seed. The form that our objects are given before they are heaved into fields of time may determine the nature of the burs they attract and the form they accumulate, slowly by association. Are we, as architects, designers of artifacts, and reckless custodians of memory, responsible for that which may be born from the burs that cling to our creations?

Architecture and the foundations of our culture operate through collective memories that are not remembered uniformly. Our inability to overcome ignorance of these fallible memories leaves our objects vulnerable to serve as evidence for the narratives of nefarious agendas. I worry, about the impact of unaddressed questions once brought to consciousness.[6] Architecture is a dangerously ambiguous vehicle that carries the underlying myths of society. From instruments of torture to monuments of subjugation, artifacts imbued with chronicles of violence support deceptive histories that shape and are shaped by the myths of our collective memories. Histories of violence are sustained and constructed by the artifacts that they inhabit.

I remember going back to the villa we stayed in that evening and having difficulty sleeping, troubled by what I had not seen. I later composed the pages in our photo album that document this day. The desire to impose our criteria without respecting the freedom of others is not a behavior delimited to a certain era.[7] A photo of me on the steps of the fountain, my grandparents on the same steps, a brochure from the museum, a ticket stub, and four postcards. The spiked interrogation chair, dramatically lit against a stone wall; the executioner's mask—pointed head, pointed nose, horizontal slits for eyes and mouth—sitting atop pink velvet; a hanging cage within the museum, a skeleton standing inside; and the Iron Maiden of Nuremberg, or a replica of said piece, because the original was destroyed during Allied bombing of Nuremberg in 1944. The Iron Maiden appears in no historical document published before the 1790s. It was at this time that a history was created.

1 Mark P. Donnelly and Daniel Diehl, "Stocks," *Big Book of Pain: Torture & Punishment Through History* (The History Press, 2011).
2 A Journey Through Human Cruelty," Museo della Tortura e della Pena di Morte. Web. 16 Aug 2017.
3 Daniel Mannix, *The History of Torture* (Lake Oswego, OR: eNet Press Inc, 2014). 83.
4 Chris Bishop, "The Pear of Anguish": Truth, Torture and Dark Medievalism," *International Journal of Cultural Studies* (8 May 2014), 11.
5 "A Journey Through Human Cruelty," Museo della Tortura e della Pena di Morte. Web. 16 Aug 2017.
6 Kyle Dugdale, "Re: re: Quick Turnaround." Message to Nicholas Miller. Email. 14 Aug 2017.
7 "The Worst Side of Mankind," Museo della Tortura e della Pena di Morte. Web. 16 Aug 2017.

Stock
Paprika! vol. 3 no.0, August 31, 2017

Issue Editors
Amanda Iglesias and Julie Turgeon

Designer
Jo Kim

In stock. Out of stock. Take stock, trade stock. What is stock? On one hand: a tangible, commonplace commodity ("The peanut butter is out of stock"). Yet simultaneously, a nebulous, highly potent economic system ("Billions lost as stocks crash"). Some stock is mutable—able to be inventoried and liable to change ("We have five size four jeans in backstock"). Other stock is factual, perhaps inescapable ("She comes from hearty German stock"). Further yet, other stock is actually capable of escape ("Livestock"). The word "stock" is itself highly temperamental: its meaning is a condition of syntax. Putting stock in someone is not equivalent to putting someone in the stocks.

Paprika! is taking stock, in all of its strange and lively connotations. Who are we, as students of the Yale School of Architecture, and what are we about? What is our métier, our mode of creating, shaping, and exchanging value? *Paprika!* posits these findings as a means to promote conversation, pique interest, and spark a few heated debates. Welcome to a new semester, YSoA. Start stocking up.

Alexander Benjamin
Alex is a data scientist. On the weekends he makes stock.

In restaurants the world over, when first light is breaking into the windows and as the first burner ignites on the stove, stock begins.

It could be a succulent *tonkatsu* in Japan, filled with pork and cabbage and a scalding layer of fat. It could be a French *fond blanc de vollaile*, with a foundation of *mirepoix* (a classic combination of coarsely chopped carrots, celery, and onions) and chicken carcasses that will sit boiling at the back of the stove for the rest of the day.

No matter where you are, the essentials of a stock are basically the same: water and stuff plus heat over time. The heat is usually low; the time is usually long. As to what that "stuff" is, there aren't many restrictions. Chicken, pig, beef, fish, shrimp, and mushrooms all make lovely and classic stock. Each can be accented with a variety of other vegetables and herbs to make an enormous variety of things, all legitimately called 'stock'.

These humble, essential elements can make it tempting to label stock as something that is easy or unworthy of deliberate attention. It is so decidedly simple. Indeed, many people take this point of view, purchasing stock in cans that could sit on shelves for decades seemingly unaltered, or in little cubes or packets of what once was stock, painfully reduced to dust and salt. These, however, are not stock. Not really. It can be necessary at times, and it certainly can be convenient, but it isn't the same.

This is because stock is a base, a primer on which other flavors will be built to make a meal. As such, stock reverberates, sending little ripples of delight throughout every subsequent dish. If you want to know the reason that risotto tastes so much better in that fancy restaurant than when you try to make it at home, stock can be the reason. If you want to know why the porridge you have in Hong Kong tastes so different than anything you'd get in New York City, again, look to the stock.

Taste a can of Swanson's chicken broth and you won't taste much. It's decidedly bland, blank, flaccid. Maybe a hit of salt comes across, but rarely much more. Some people like that. They think that's what stock is supposed to be. But taste a fresh pot of stock and you'll get something else entirely. Maybe a smack of fat still floats on top, an indulgent punch of flavor. What follows is depth and umami and something that seeks a deep part of your soul—some shared cultural memory—and warms it from within.

Recall the cooks in the early morning. They prepare their ingredients diligently, balancing different flavors and notes. They give the stock the time it needs to build flavor, not rushing or taking shortcuts. They skim and stir and smell. It is a process, and that fact is respected rather than resented.

Stock is that assumedly subtle difference that at the end of the day isn't so subtle. So how can we reclaim our stock?

We can make stock in the days we have at home. We can make it while doing other things, while pursuing other more modern feats. It doesn't take much and it freezes and lasts (almost) forever.

So maybe go out and buy a bigger pot. Purchase some bones or carcasses at a butcher—most will happily sell you their scrap at prices far less than that can of Swanson's. Get some carrots and celery and onions. Or go in another direction, maybe with some lemongrass and pork bones to make something Thai, or dried mushrooms and leek to keep it vegetarian. Brown your bones or don't. Do what you want and then put it on the back of the stove early in the day and just let it simmer. Taste it for salt, but don't add too much.

Most of all, participate in the process. Let it take its time. Go change the laundry. Then taste it again. Add another ingredient and feel it change. Let it simmer and bubble and fill the room with its aroma. It can take you places or keep you right at home in a way few other things can. Put it in your freezer and guard it like gold.

Upcoming Folds:
1 *Foundations* Anna Rose Canzano, Emily Golding, Emily Hsee, and Julia Medina, 9/7
2 *Process/Product* Jonathan Molloy and Sam Zeif, 9/21
3 *Post-Ironic* Lani Barry and Jeffrey Liu, 9/28
4 *Everyday* Haylie Chan and Kevin Huang, 10/12
5 *Halloween* Nicholas Miller, Matthew Wagstaffe, and Ethan Zisson, 10/26
6 *Horizon* Brian Cash and Luke Studebaker, 11/2
7 *Radical Dissonance* Jack Hanly and Maia Simon, 11/9
8 *Unqualified* Katie Lau and Seth Thompson, 12/4

Fall 2017 Coordinating Editors
Amanda Iglesias and Julie Turgeon
Publishers
Jeremy Jacinth and Nadeen Safa

OTG welcomes YSoA's incoming students. In the spirit of feeding the school's collective curiosity, we've solicited a few introductions.

Home is:
- Maryland
- Sri Lanka
- Henderson, Nevada
- Beijing
- Berkeley
- Minneapolis
- Shanghai
- New Haven
- Orange County
- Where the heart is
- Tokyo
- Where the bed is
- Ocean, NJ
- NYC
- Cincinnati
- Warren, OH
- Bucharest
- Bombay
- Where you no longer feel homesick
- California
- Cairo, Riyadh
- Bay Area
- True sense of bond
- Wherever I am
- Los Angeles
- Paris
- Where one is free to lie down under the stars in a state of dishabille

Architecture in a tweet:
- Seth Thompson (M.Arch I): "Architecture is not only about domesticating space, it is also a deep defense against the terror of time. The language of beauty is essentially the language of timeless reality." —Karsten Harries
- Armaan Shah (M.Arch I): Where one moment you headed exactly where you need to and the next you're completely lost; and again.
- Minakshi Mohanta (M.Arch II): Architecture is everything and nothing. It's like the dot suspended in space and the space around it. It is limitless.
- Michelle Badr (M.Arch I): Architecture is a spatial manifestation of identity.
- Clara Domange (M.Arch I): "Whatever good things we build end up building us." —Jim Rohn
- Jonathan Hopkins (M.E.D.): Architecture is covfefe.

Why architecture?
- Darryl Weimer (M.Arch I): To put it in terms of knives, I've always been more of a Swiss-Army than a scalpel or machete. I think architecture permits one to unfold in many ways.
- Anonymous: Our thoughts and desires enclose us.
- Nicole Doan (M.Arch II): Architecture allows for a never ending opportunity to learn and to explore topics that are tangential to the built environment (i.e. social issues, art, technology, psychology).
- Dina Taha (M.E.D.): Everything exists within a certain context and I believe architectural spaces may one of the strongest tools to perceive a higher order/truth.
- Armaan Shah (M.Arch I): It's just as difficult as it is comfortable.

Why YSoA?
- Michelle Badr (M.Arch I): YSoA values multiple perspectives pushing boundaries together, rather than one language being pushed on all perspectives.
- David Schaengold (M.Arch I): The ghost of Charlie Moore.
- Andrew Miller (M.Arch I): Nowhere else has such a strong diversity of opinion while maintaining a close knit class size.
- Armaan Shah (M.Arch I): Deborah Berke and MFG.
- Katie Lau (M.Arch I): Some programs were too big, some programs were too small. I got "the feeling" at Yale. It felt just right.
- Anonymous: Carpeted concrete.

A Current Fascination?
- Jen Shin (M.Arch II): How plants talk to one another
- Darryl Weimer (M.Arch I): Texas blues country music
- Michelle Badr (M.Arch I): Elon Musk
- Tayyaba Anwar (M.Arch II): Origami
- Andrew Miller (M.Arch I): How urban spaces shape societal ideology
- Cristina Anastase (M.Arch I): IKEA
- Minakshi Mohanta (M.Arch II): Ennio Morricone
- Tianyu G. (M.Arch I): Topographic maps of Ancient Rome

Read this summer:
- *JoJo's Bizarre Adventure*
- *The Classical Language of Architecture*
- *Jarry Mag*
- *The Underground Railroad* by Colson Whitehead
- *Gathering Moss* by Robin Wall Kimmerer
- *Log*
- *An Anthropology of Architecture*
- *Why We Build*
- *Wolf in White Van*
- *The Poetics of Space*
- *The Sun also Rises*
- Kate Nesbitt's *Anthology of Architectural Theory 1965–95*
- James Joyce
- Andrei Bely
- George R. R. Martin
- *The Global Architect: Firms, Fame, and Urban Form* by Donald McNeill
- Nabokov
- *The Universe in a Nutshell*
- *Architecture and its Interpretation* by J.P. Bonta
- *1Q84* by Haruki Murakami
- *The Prophet* by Kahlil Gibran
- *Essential Sufism*
- *The Distance Between Us* by Kasie West
- *Ontology of Ethics* by Hilary Putnam
- Barragán
- *A Dog's Journey*
- *Modern Lovers*
- *l'Élégance Du Hérisson*
- *The Houses of Philip Johnson*
- *Where'd You Go Bernadette?*
- *Dozakhnama (Conversation in Hell)* by Rabisankar Bal
- Houellebecq
- *The City in History*

Whitney or Met Breuer?
- Met Breuer: 77%
- Whitney: 13%
- Both: 5%
- Neither: 5%

Dimitri Brand
M.Arch I, '18

Stock material is provided in predetermined profiles, from the basic: 2" by 6", 1" by 1", 4' by 8', to the more complex: angle, wide flange, threshold. The material is sold by predetermined lengths: 8', 12', 20', with predetermined compositions: Pine, ASTM 36, OSB/3, and in predetermined finishes: #1 grade, hot rolled, cast.

On Instagram, accounts pay homage to stock's many complex forms, using the stock images of stock materials as ready-made forms of internet art (Duchamp would be proud). These manufactured products take on preeminent roles in our architecture, perhaps because we have to spend endless hours specifying them from catalogs. While the reasons for their seemingly idiosyncratic dimensions are little known, their existence is canon. As architects, our currency is knowledge, yet we know less about our materials then we would probably like and certainly less than we should. As a result, the materials' existence is fetishized, revered and heavily romanticized in its mechanically-produced end-consumer state.

Designers are often contented exposing the beauty of the mundane to the world through carefully-crafted details. The design-build world is replete with architects leveraging existing supply chains for (supposedly) cheap solutions. The work's draw is its carefully curated sense of honesty, humility, and frugality that promises the democratization of high design. The low material cost (potentially) makes "good" design available to the masses, appealing to a certain social agenda that many architects share. This method of creating design—while prioritizing material and process—has a lengthy, sprawling lineage, traceable through many different forms. Of particular note is its history in the context of 19–20th c. central Europe.

During its time (the early 19th c.), the Biedermeier chair was used as a symbol in paintings within candidly unimpressive spaces to signal that the space depicted was unpretentious, inhabited by good persons unconcerned with frippery. The Biedermeier style of furniture was a stripped-down version of Neoclassicism and Romanticism, characterized by the use of local timber (as opposed to mahogany) and the use of these materials in a "truthful" fashion.

With a focus on ease of craft, the reduction of labor through simplicity of form, and the use of local materials, the Biedermeier style was intended to offset the economic pressures brought about by the Napoleonic wars. More importantly, the Biedermeier style responded to a growing middle class, symbolizing a level of frugality and accessibility that intentionally and directly contrasted with the aristocratic world that existed above and before it. Biedermeier furniture's (relative) accessibility came to symbolize a new class consciousness: this class aimed for the comfortable while criticizing the ostentatious. Though seemingly infused with politics, the furniture became the comfort of choice for the staunchly apolitical everyman.

Biedermeier was a cultural moment, and as such lacks a dominant document such as a manifesto, defying a rigid definition of its aims. Still, the movement can be defined through the multiplicity of creative works developed within it. The poems of Wilhelm Müller (b. Dessau, Germany, 1794) represent the spirit of the Biedermeier well. In his poem, "Whither?" Müller writes "… Let them sing, my friend, let them murmur, / And wander merrily near; / The wheels of a mill are going / In every brooklet clear." The subject and tone of Müller's poems is contrasted by the works of the Romanticists working contemporaneously in many of the same locations.[1] In "Lines Composed a Few Miles Above Tintern Abbey," William Wordsworth (b. Cockermouth, England, 1770) writes, also referencing murmuring water, "With a soft inland murmur. / Once again Do I behold these steep and lofty cliffs, / That on a wild secluded scene impress…" The "steep and lofty cliff" from Wordsworth is large, natural, and untameable, while the "brooklet clear" from Müller is small, of a size easily controlled by the human, and punctuated by the wheels of the human-made mill. In poetry, as in design and painting, the Biedermeier style intentionally shed the grandeur of the Romantic in favor of the mundane.

Though seen by many as an inheritor of the Biedermeier tradition, the Bauhaus had clear objectives, and presented architecture as the apex of creative practice. While the Bauhaus does not lack for examples of architecture it is—like Biedermeier—succinctly symbolized by its chairs, particularly Marcel Breuer's iconic bent metal chairs. Designed in 1928, Breuer's final year at the Bauhaus, the caned Cesca chair is (for our purposes) an adequate stand-in for much of the design and philosophy that came out of the golden age of the Bauhaus.

Breuer's chair has many formal and spiritual similarities to the Biedermeier chair. While the Biedermeier style encouraged the use of local materials, however, Breuer was committed to the use of stock materials. The Biedermeier focus on ease for the craftsman is mirrored in Breuer's simplification of the fabrication process: each bend in the steel tubing is the same radius. Consequently, the chair does not switch machines and dies are not changed during fabrication, resulting in a springy, comfortable, affordable product that could be produced in a small shop with machinery readily available to local craftsmen.

In his 1923 lecture "On Form and Function at the Bauhaus," Breuer called for chairs to be "good" and states that all "good chairs" will match "good tables." In a later lecture, Breuer named the third of three "tendencies" of modernism "to create with truthful elements: (or indifference to create with forms of illusion…)" later admitting "there is a moral element to [this] work."[2] Breuer suggested that the expression of material and utility, which leads to the "good" chair, is superior to other forms that do not embody these characteristics. This moral code of form-making is evident in the Cesca chair: Breuer's focus on material and fabrication is obvious, and we can surmise that Breuer considered this chair an example of "goodness."

When Gropius exited the Bauhaus in 1928 (joined by Breuer and others), he appointed Swiss architect Hannes Meyer as his successor. Meyer elected to focus on the collaborative aspect of the Bauhaus, reorienting the school (with the support of many students) away from the reunification of the "artistic" disciplines and instead towards a series of collectivist promises made in the Bauhaus manifesto:

> "Collaboration of all masters and students-architects, painters, sculptors—on these designs with the object of gradually achieving a harmony of all the component elements and parts that make up architecture."

Focusing on democratization of method over democratization of means, Meyer introduced the humanities to the Bauhaus and curtailed the influence of the arts, which he saw as creating an overly narrow worldview. He criticized the previous pedagogy of the Bauhaus for its focus on form, calling it "style" (a critique also echoed from the right in their attempt to delegitimize the institution) and instead emphasized what he termed "life supporting design."[3] This would assure that the Bauhaus made good on its promise to design for the people. For Meyer, the focus on form and material, even with the intent to democratize accessibility, ultimately led to a system of exclusion. A self-avowed Marxist, Meyer believed in the inclusivity of the multiple disciplines. His process was one built on inclusion—inclusion as a means rather than an end—making it (in his estimation) less corruptible and more pure than the previous one built on the capitalist system. Not unsurprisingly, Meyer's tenure at the Bauhaus was short (1928–1930). Anticommunist pressure forced him out, and he was swiftly replaced with Mies Van der Rohe, a pragmatist willing to depoliticize a school that was increasingly acting as a lightning rod for anti-left sentiment.

Gropius was given the ability to write the history of the school for the wider world in his 1938–1939 Bauhaus exhibition at MOMA. He titled the show "Bauhaus 1919–1928," effectively shunning Meyer from the Bauhaus canon.[4] This affront is especially obvious in the exhibition's press release, which states: "the principal theme of the exhibition is the Bauhaus as an idea. That idea seems as valid today as it was in the days when the Bauhaus flourished." Gropius may have been shielding the Bauhaus from anticommunist pressure in the anti-red United States, but the decision to omit Meyer was a very specific one and excludes his contributions to "the Bauhaus as an idea."[5]

Meyer's contributions to the school are only briefly mentioned in the 187-pages exhibition catalog, but even then, no reference is made tohis divergent pedagogy or its effects on the school. Instead the catalog states that under his tenure "The pedagogic procedure followed in the architectural courses, as in all others, was the inductive method…" Suggesting that Meyer maintained the trajectory of the school, which is patently false.

The omission of Meyer from the Bauhaus' history (even now he is often called the "forgotten director") points to a continued and seemingly illogical inability for the democratization of means to coexist with the democratization of methods. The former is criticized for being a style that transforms over time, like the Biedermeier and the Bauhaus, into a placidly apolitical form. The latter is branded as inefficient, muddled, overly radical, and impractical; and, in the case of the Bauhaus, is excluded from the neat historical package that has come to define a movement. This history may bring to light questions that need to be applied to our contemporary trend back towards a design-build pedagogy that prioritizes material and process. A style of working that many of us, including the author, find much comfort in.

1 There is of course overlap between these two movements. including artists that worked between them and on the lines that separated them.

2 "On Form and Function at the Bauhaus." The Smithsonian Institute. Accessed August 22, 2017. http://www.sil.si.edu/Archives/cid=mets/2321.mets.xml;query=On%20Form%20and%20Function%20at%20the%20Bauhaus;brand=breuer.

3 *Co-op Principle: Hannes Meyer and the Concept of Collective Design*. Santa Monica: Ram Publications, 2016.

4 "Bauhaus: 1919–1928" The Museum of Modern Art. Accessed August 22, 2017.

5 For more information on the Bauhaus' overlapping and conflicting histories see *Bauhaus Conflicts 1919–2009: Visions and Counterparts*. The lineage we are discussing here extends into the Soviet Union, East Germany, Mexico, and the United States.

Kyle Dugdale
Critic, YSoA

Kyle Dugdale was asked to comment on why he asks incoming Vis. I students to take stock of their convictions by writing an architectural manifesto, "a public declaration of principles, beliefs and objectives."

In 1921, Le Corbusier wrote that "a man who practises a religion and does not believe in it is a poor wretch; he is to be pitied."[1]

He was talking, of course, about architects.

That his statement should use the vocabulary of religion to discuss architecture comes as no surprise—today we're accustomed to this particular appropriation.[2] And yet … on closer reading, it's a curious assertion. After all, it's not the conventional indictment of the man who doesn't practice what he believes; rather, it's a critique of the man who doesn't believe what he practices.

I don't always see eye to eye with Le Corbusier. But occasionally it's worth uprooting a Corbusian aphorism from its natural habitat. In this instance the words are more resonant in French:

> Un homme qui pratique une religion et n'y croit pas, est un lâche; il est malheureux. Nous sommes malheureux…[3]

Goodman's recent translation of *Vers une architecture* is more precise than the classic rendition of 1927. The lâche of Le Corbusier's critique is not merely a poor wretch. He's a coward. And that's worse. The wretch may be the hapless victim of circumstance; the coward must bear responsibility for his own cowardice. But more disconcerting still is what follows: "A man who practices a religion and does not believe in it is a coward; he is unhappy. We are unhappy…"[4] Suddenly the focus of critique shifts. We?

In fact, Le Corbusier goes on to criticize the great national schools of architecture. By their pedagogies they produce, he argues, a disingenuous profession, disenchanted and unemployed, boastful or sullen (*désenchantés et inoccupés, hâbleurs ou moroses*).[5] Such architects evidently do not believe in what they practice.

Practice without belief. Architecture void of conviction. Unhappy architects. Paprika! is no stranger to such topics. To quote a disputed article from an early issue on pedagogy, "one of the fundamental qualities needed in order to be a good architect is to know deeply what one believes about architecture. … The longer I am involved in architecture the more I am certain that to be successful one must have conviction about [one's] work."[6] These are fighting words.

Of course I cannot begin to answer for the consistency of my practice with my belief unless I know what I believe. At Yale School of Architecture, that belief is not imposed from on high. YSoA is light on doctrinal certitudes.[7] "The School adopts as basic policy a pluralistic approach to the teaching of architecture."[8] But that in turn shifts the responsibility to the student. And to know what I believe—let alone to work out its implications for architecture—is not easy. We live, after all, in a disenchanted age. To extend the analogy with architecture, religion has been relegated to the domain of private affairs, and our society is only now realizing the effects of having abandoned a healthy public discourse on matters of belief. And yet every building, no matter how undistinguished, represents nothing less than the materialization of a set of beliefs. Those beliefs may be incoherent; they may be downright indefensible; or they may simply articulate the values of our contemporary consumerist culture—no doubt much of America's built environment is today predicated on nothing else. It's a strong culture; and to resist it requires a corresponding strength of conviction.

So if, as a discipline, we are to nurture our continuing devotion to architecture with a clear conscience, we should (as St. Peter advised in his first epistle) be prepared to offer a coherent response to those who would question our practice. To write a manifesto is a hazardous endeavour that requires practice and demands courage, not least because our first attempts are typically fraught with pious banalities, bombastic hypocrisies, simplistic approximations. We're hesitant, for good reason, to make definitive assertions. And if we pause for long enough to take stock of our convictions, it's always possible that we might dislike what we discover. To articulate our beliefs—in the classroom as in studio or in print—is to expose our convictions to critique, to condemnation, perhaps even to correction.

And yet—in architecture as in religion—sincere disagreement is a sign of respect for the significance of what's at stake. No?

1 Le Corbusier, *Towards a New Architecture*, trans. Frederick Etchells (New York: Payson and Clarke, 1927). 14.

2 Equally interesting is the irreconciling use of the vocabulary of architecture to discuss religion.

3 Le Corbusier-Saugnier, "Esthétique de l'ingénieur, Architecture," *L'Esprit nouveau* 11–12 (November 1921): 1329.

4 Le Corbusier, Toward an Architecture, trans. John Goodman, ed. Jean-Louis Cohen (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2007), 94.

5 Le Corbusier-Saugnier, "Esthétique de l'ingénieur," 1329; my translation.

6 Daniel Luster, "Thoughts on the Situation of the YSoA," *Paprika! 2* (January 2015): 7. For the corresponding conviction that accompanies "relevant knowledge worth teaching"—doctrinal certitudes—see Rem Koolhaas, "Advancement versus Apocalypse," in *Ecological Urbanism*, ed. Mohsen Mostafavi (Baden: Lars Müller, 2010), 61

7 Possibly excepting its staunch belief in the rejection of doctrinal certitudes.

8 Yale School of Architecture, "History and Objectives of the School," http://architecture.yale.edu/school/history-objectives. This statement has been circulating for at least forty years; see, for instance, the school's entry in the 1976 *Peterson's Guide to Architecture Schools in North America*. For the school's longstanding commitment to pluralism see Robert A. M. Stern and Jimmy Stamp, *Pedagogy and Place: 100 Years of Architecture Education at Yale* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), passim.

Austin Sailsbury
Marketing Manager
The Hudson Company

The Heart Pine planks that would become the new Whitney floors were sourced from the antique timbers of abandoned American industrial sites, including a Philip Morris factory in Louisville, Kentucky and a Maidenform Brands Factory in Bayonne, New Jersey. […] After being acquired from their various points of origin, the Reclaimed Heart Pine timbers were transported to The Hudson Company's mill in Pine Plains, New York. Once there, metal detectors located old fasteners (nails, bolts, and screws) embedded within the timbers. All unwanted debris was removed by hand. Next, a double-edge blade saw mill cut the boards into manageable dimensions (1.75" × 10" × 8 – 20'). Because the finished Whitney flooring planks were uniquely designed to be 1.5" × 8", The Hudson Company team oversized the planks to 1.75" × 10" before kiln drying them to 165 °F, thus eliminating any remaining insect life and setting the pitch for stability and proper finishing. From there … the planks were re-graded, planed, ripped, molded, and checked for defects and unwanted irregularities before being delivered to the downtown job site. At several points throughout the milling process, architects Cooper Robertson and Renzo Piano and members of their respective teams visited The Hudson Company mill to participate in the custom-grading process. The final Whitney flooring installation exceeds 65,000 square feet of Reclaimed Heart Pine flooring throughout all of the galleries and administrative offices. [In total], the Hudson Company custom-milled over 270,000 board feet of reclaimed timbers—the largest weighing in excess of 1,200 pounds.

Jeongyoon Song
M.Arch I, '18

Though the specifics of each episode vary, the stories that Italo Calvino records in Marcovaldo are all variations on one theme. The protagonist—whom the book is named after—rejoices in the delicacy of mushrooms springing from a rainfall, waiting with excitement for the moment of harvest; he tosses at night while yearning for a tranquil slumber on a park bench amidst the park green; he grows jealous of his son, who escapes the grime of the city to herd cows in the mountain pasture. But the mushrooms end up being poisonous, the park just as riddled with discomforts as the bed at home, and his son returns a worn-out soul having toiled as a farm laborer. Romance, it seems, withers in the face of the real.

Like Marcovaldo, we often demand that the stars align—that they compose the perfect environment in which our purest ideas and forms come bursting forth into the world. But just as often, the world fails to deliver this to us, and our architecture—so preciously nurtured in the womb of Rudolph—ends up seeing the light of day only as stillborns.

I wonder, however, if jumping prematurely into mourning leads us to mistake fertile ground for hardened soil. For instance, I spent most of my summer drafting details. It started with doors, which turned into wall finishes, and finally millwork. As I began to articulate the composition of the seemingly insignificant moments in the building—a door jamb, a wall panel, a banquette—it struck me just how vast the building became despite its finitude, and the frequency and depth at which I became lost in it. I constantly and frantically shifted across various scales while struggling to keep a grip on them all; on multiple occasions, I laughed at the thought of having dreamed of one day designing a building on my own, let alone opening my own firm, as if I was looking at a naïve childhood hope with a shaking head.

To become utterly jaded would be to commit architectural suicide. At the same time, to let it remain sheltered from the world would mean a life never birthed, therefore never lived. We find ourselves caught in a dilemma where growing in architecture brings us and our values closer to both life and death.

This can be disheartening news if one sees this as the inevitable death of architectural dreams. But one can choose to believe otherwise—in life following death. Multiple lives are lived and deaths died for the very last rebirth of one's self and one's architecture. When understood this way, continual deaths of idealism and radicality become more like breaking ground and less like repeated tragedy.

To remind us of this simple truth, my brother and I often recall the story of my grandfather and his grapevine. One day, the branches withered, and the vine stopped bearing fruit. But having suffered a stroke, thereafter remembering little and forgetting much, my grandfather continued to water the vine every day. Though others in the family saw it as a habit of ignorance and futility, my grandfather persisted in shuffling to his vines every day with a watering can. Today, that grapevine stands in our back fence. When I go home in the summer, its broad leaves climb over the steel framework connecting the fence to our roof, its branches sagging with grapes bursting with sweetness and buzzing with bees.

> If the new language of images were used differently, it would, through its use, confer a new kind of power. Within it we could begin to define our experiences more precisely in areas where words are inadequate. Not only personal experience, but also the essential historical experience of our relation to the past: that is to say the experience of seeking to give meaning to our lives, of trying to understand the history of which we can become the active agents… What matters now is who uses that language for what purpose. —John Berger, *Ways of Seeing*

In pursuit of an understanding of the role, genesis, and distribution of stock imagery in the architectural context (and in our image-saturated society), the editors of "Stock" contacted websites specialized in supplying architectural entourage. Some monetize, some globalize, some localize. Some answered our questions directly, others turned the questions on themselves to mine the multifarious definitions of the term this issue explores.

The founders of Escalalatina (EL) "suddenly found themselves using tall blonde people as the users of a small marketplace in Oaxaca, Mexico." They created their website to fill a representational gap, so people seeking a different type of cutout would have more of an offering to choose from.

The work of Just Not the Same (JN), grounded in their self-styled digital exhibition, is "a gateway into critical thinking of culture, a new way of envisioning the future by empowering deep[ly] rooted communities that have been left powerless by years of unquestioned architectural stock."

Mr. Cutout (MC) is the pet project of a two-person team of architect-entrepreneurs based in Poland that offers free and for-a-fee cutouts sourced from around the world.

Nonscandinavia (NS), based at Columbia's GSAPP, makes it its mission to challenge people's default positions toward architectural entourage, posing the question "once diverse cutouts are as easy to find as homogenous cutouts, who do you represent in your work, and why?"

The founder of Skalgubbar (SG) calls this personal project "the gallery of his life," featuring only images of people he knows personally. Since its inception in 2011, SG has spurred the emergence of many specialized architectural entourage sites (including many featured here).

1

What power lies in an image?

- NS: All images have meaning, so our choice is between consciously shaping the message [an image communicates] or not. Most architecture is fundamentally utopian. We design to [realize] a better future, [and] renderings are a way of sharing the change we want to see in the world.
- MC: We contextualize Mr. Cutout within contemporary global economic conditions, revealing the spectrum of economic power images hold nowadays. Economics aside, people have a fundamental need to watch, to see. Images are the most reliable sources of information, the most evolved means of communicating, and the most powerful tools of persuasion.
- EL: An image is the most basic element of the language through which we communicate with each other [using] sight. Images determine a huge part of the way we perceive our context.
- SG: Endless power, especially pictures with people… or cats. I think [the] internet proved that.
- JN: *In stock: kept regularly on hand, as for use or sale; staple; standard: stock articles.* In stock: it's what is available, it's what we consume, and it's where we decide to stop our critical thinking. […] Culture can be described as a stock of materials with the capacity of building new narratives that also connects us. […] When we give importance to an object, it becomes valuable. It starts to redefine its reason for being consumed, and can eventually become rare. [W]ith this rareness, [we seek to challenge] the very way we engage storytelling in America.

2

Can architecture be represented without the human element? How and what do architects see through the stock citizens of the spaces they create?

- MC: Architectural visualisation is a marketing tool. Images of people strengthen [its] power, if used precisely.
- NS: Representation is fundamentally about filtering information to distill certain ideas, and sometimes human elements aren't necessary. […] But when human figures are included, they become part of the argument, and too often these figures are chosen because they are easy to acquire, or perceived as neutral.

3

Beyond providing a sense of scale, how do your figures either reinforce or rectify specific cultural narratives, myths, or histories?

- EL: Escalalatina figures are … a reflection of the Latin culture. We do not seek to induce a certain perception of our society by choosing details on our figures, instead we try to capture common people in common situations. Our culture is really rich in diversity and therefore our challenge is to represent as many realities as we can find in Latin-American public space.
- MC: We treat our figures as words, creating [a] rich vocabulary with our collection.
- NS: One of our challenges is replacing one kind of specific socio-cultural narrative with another, equally specific one. When this project first began, the landscape of architectural rendering was such that even having people of color in images felt like a step forward, and some of the images we were using reflected that bluntness of identity. Now, we're able to think more intersectionally about the kinds of people we're including, and hope to see that nuance continue to develop in educational and commercial work.
- JN: *Take stock: Review or make an overall assessment of a particular situation, typically as a prelude to making a decision.* We have taken stock. We have taken the human image back by starting to fill the gaps in representation with people of color. […] We have challenged what is in stock with the hope … that underserved communities in design take charge of their agency to create new experiences that challenge the stock in places and spaces.
- SG: I try to avoid thinking about a specific use for my pictures, because that's a good way of ending up with stereotypes. Instead I focus on mood, movement, interaction. Skalgubbar is a personal project; I only photograph people I know.

4

What sort of future(s) are your images helping to construct? Is the role of the architect today to construct new social landscapes?

- NS: The big question is: how do we go beyond replicating the commodification of diversity that we're seeing in fashion and conventional advertising? Diversity is in right now, but there's a danger in color-washing renderings that distracts from the more important issues—like are any of those people [depicted] able to actually live in the project they're being used to promote? By getting [diverse] images on the walls in academic studios, architectural firms, and developer boardrooms, we can make these issues more visible.
- MC: We hope that designs sold with our figures would enhance the way people inhabiting them think of [themselves].
- JN: *Trade stock: Trade, or commerce, involves the transfer of goods or services from one person or entity to another, often in exchange for money.* We acknowledge stock images and the privilege it bestows upon the artist and the value it can bring to architecture. Can we think differently about visualization and its power to steer the relevancy of social good(s)? Let's trade stock in exchange for a vision of the future that represents us.
- EL: At the end of the day the users are the ones who will decide what happens with the space around them; the designers can only create the framework and the people will fill it with their own experiences and stories.
- SG: A friendly future.